

CWG Stewardship Working Session – Adobe Connect Chat Transcript

<https://meetings.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/wed-cwg-stewardship>

21 October 2015 from 09:30-11:00 IST at ICANN Public Meetings in the Wicklow Hall 2

Brenda Brewer: Hello, my name is Brenda and I will be monitoring this chat room. In this role, I am the voice for the remote participants, ensuring that they are heard equally with those who are “in-room” participants. When submitting a question that you want me to read out loud on the mic, please provide your name and affiliation if you have one, start your sentence with <QUESTION> and end it with <QUESTION>. When submitting a comment that you want me to read out loud of the mic, once again provide your name and affiliation if you have one then start your sentence with a <COMMENT> and end it with <COMMENT>. Text outside these quotes will be considered as part of “chat” and will not be read out loud on the mic. Any questions or comments provided outside of the session time will not be read aloud. All chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior:<http://www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/expected-standards>

Chuck Gomes (RySG):Cannot hear you

Sabine Meyer:Hm, I can

Lise Fuhr:We are having technical problems at the moment - solved in a couple of minutes hopefully

Sabine Meyer:Maybe I should change my previous statement to "could" :)

Chuck Gomes (RySG):I just spoke on the dial in number.

Sabine Meyer:did not hear that

Grace Abuhamad:Still connecting

Grace Abuhamad:One minute please

Sabine Meyer:i do hear the people who seem to be testing the mics in the room

Greg Shatan:I am participating remotely but hope to join you physically at some point.

Greg Shatan:It seems I may not be missing too much yet.

Chuck Gomes (RySG):I just spoke again. Did you hear me?

Sabine Meyer:nope

Chuck Gomes (RySG):I can hear you now.

Grace Abuhamad:This is meeting #70!

Sabine Meyer:Are you saying this is getting old, Grace?

Seun Ojedeji:What a perfect number (round enough)

Staffan Jonson:Hello all

Grace Abuhamad:Link to slides: <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56143659/CCWG-Engagement%20%281%29.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1445247628000&api=v2>

Chuck Gomes (RySG):@ Thomas: In counting objections, are they measured by SO or AC?

Grace Abuhamad:@Chuck can you raise your hand in AC? Thomas is not in the AC

Grace Abuhamad:Thanks @Chuck

Lise Fuhr:Seun I see your hand - I will get back to you after Mathieu's presentation

Grace Abuhamad:Queue is closed after Avri

Jonathan Robinson:Please can this staff slide or slides be circulated to the CWG list

Grace Abuhamad:Yes will do now

Guru Acharya:In my opinion, in case a shift to the designator model is made, the following minimum conditions must be met by the CCWG to ensure that separability is not weakened: 1) First, the bylaws must provide a clear and unambiguous responsibility for the board to not reject the result of the community separation process. 2) Second, transparency mechanisms, including DIDP reforms, must be shifted to work stream 1 in order to ensure that ICANN can not frustrate arbitration proceedings by refusing to provide documents in case of an ex-parte judgement. 3) Third, the nomcom must make take measures to ensure that the replacement board, which is selected after a board spill, does not take the same decision as the previous board. These measures may include increased transparency in selection process or molding interview questions according to community decisions. 4) Fourth, there must be a new round for public comments for the changed proposal; and the community feedback must be sincerely taken into account while determining

Guru Acharya:consensus

Seun Ojedeji:I am in rough agreement with 3 and 4, I believe 1 would be address unnecessary; we need board to have the option to refuse based on their rationale and when that is not acceptable the community can remove them (after exhausting the escalation process). Item 3 and 4 will then kick in accordingly.

Seun Ojedeji:@Guru I am in rough agreement with 3 and 4, I believe 1 would be unnecessary; we need board to have the option to refuse based on their rationale and when that is not acceptable the community can remove them (after exhausting the escalation process). Item 3 and 4 will then kick in accordingly.

Jari Arkko:my point is on IPR

Jari Arkko:(feel free to schedule when it is appropriate to speak about that)

Grace Abuhamad:DTO members include: Cheryl Langdon-OrrOlivier Crepin LeblondAlan GreenbergChuck GomesMary UdumaVika Mpisane

Alissa Cooper:I have a question on the general process during implementation

Nurani Nimpuno:I raise my hand for Izumi to speak :)

Nurani Nimpuno:Thanks

Grace Abuhamad:We'll schedule for Thursday Nov 5 at 11:00 UTC

Greg Shatan:Apologies for not being in the room. I would be pleased to assist in dealing with the IPR implementation.

Jonathan Robinson:Thanks Greg. We'll put out a call for subject matter experts