
HELSINKI – IANA Stewardship Transition and CCWG Accountability Work Stream 1

Tuesday, June 28, 2016 – 09:30 to 10:30 EEST

ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So good morning, everybody. We need to start because time is very short.

Please take your seats.

Before we start with this meeting, one important thing. I have heard that yesterday in some sessions -- in particular, the one on the two-character country code -- some representatives have not been able to speak because they haven't been seen. And just the setting here is not ideal because it goes very far back, it's very narrow, people are closely together. So in particular, those that sit in the back, and if you want to take the floor, please make sure that you hold your hand up until you get nodded that we have noticed you and put you on the speakers' list because it's a pity that people can't take the floor because the person who is chairing a session is not seeing you. So we want to try to avoid this.

So please signal. The further back you are, the more higher you have to hold your hand so that we -- and keep it up until you get a signal that we've noticed you.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Thank you very much.

With this, I would like to start our session on IANA transition. And we have some guests here that those who have been to previous meetings have learned to know rather well.

We'll divide the session in two, because there are two processes that are, of course, linked. The first one is the -- let's say the rather technical part of the process on the post IANA -- the post-transition IANA, and we'll get a quick overview on where we are now with this process after the whole package has been delivered to the NTIA by ICANN in Marrakech after the end of our last meeting, and particularly focusing on the Customer Standing Committee because this is the next question or the next thing that the GAC needs to decide on, how to -- if and how to use and profit from the possibility to have a liaison to the Customer Standing Committee.

So I'll stop talking and I'll give the floor to Lise and Jonathan, the two co-chairs of the CWG, as it was called or is called, to brief us quickly about where we are with the PTI.

Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, good morning. It's Jonathan Robinson. I'll be working today with you together with my co-chair Lise Fuhr.

We'll take you through a couple of update points, as Thomas said.

Can I check if we have the slides available for this? Do we have the slides available? Are they uploaded yet?

Okay. I'll just make a couple of remarks while we wait for those slides to come on.

Essentially we were the group that developed the transition proposal on behalf of the names community, as you know, and there were three proposals: one developed by the names community, one by the numbers community, and one by the protocol parameters community. And together those formed, in composite, the proposal that went to the NTIA.

Having prepared and submitted that proposal and the phase that we are now involved in is the implementation of that proposal. That implementation is being led by ICANN staff in their professional capacity as executives responsible for doing so. And what we agreed with the ICANN staff was that we would retain the Cross-Community Working Group for the purpose of, in a sense, overseeing that implementation or working together with ICANN staff on that implementation to make sure that it remained at all times coherent and consistent with, I guess you would say, the letter and the spirit of the proposal. And that's the work that we've been involved in for the last few months.

And it involves many different aspects of dealing with that proposal, from things like what sort of Service Level Agreements will be in place, what the organizational documents pertaining to the -- if you remember, if those of you that were familiar with it, the new -- the structure is that the post-transition IANA will be structurally or at least legally separated. It's an ICANN -- what in colloquial terms would be called a subsidiary. It's a second entity under ICANN, but it's a closely bound in separate legal entity called an affiliate, and that requires constitutional documents, legal documents to bring it into life. It will require its own board and, ultimately, employees. So all of that work, the detail on all of that work needs to be executed, and that is being executed by ICANN staff with the direct collaboration and cooperation with CWG.

So let me check if we have some slides to illustrate that at this stage.

Julia, can you tell us if we have those slides available?

Okay. I get confirmation that they're uploading now.

I have a couple of graphics to I am straight that, but one -- and we'll come back -- I can refer you to those. Okay. Here we go. Let's see what we can....

But let me -- I think we can....

Just one moment, please, while we upload the slides.

So I think I'm going to let -- it makes sense to hand over to Lise.

One of the key components of the structure is that there this post-transition IANA, this ICANN affiliate will have a direct relationship with the customers through an organization called the Customer Standing Committee. Now the customers are the registries that directly rely on the IANA function for their services and they will be represented via a Customer Standing Committee. And so let me let Lise talk that through with you, and then I can come back and summarize the structure.

We will have a slide deck available for you that we can share with you afterwards.

LISE FUHR:

Thank you, Jonathan. Maybe we can go to slide 7, then, because that's the slide about the Customer Standing Committee. Thank you.

As Jonathan mentioned, the new structure meant that we had a Customer Standing Committee, and that was because the earlier structure was that there was an oversight by NTIA overlooking several issues regarding IANA.

Now the new structure is that the Customer Standing Committee, which members you can see in the blue square, is going to be the ccTLDs, the gTLDs, and TLD representatives that are not G's or C's.

We will have several liaisons. One is PTI, and PTI is going to be a mandatory member. And there is going to be ALAC and GAC. You will be also a liaison with the Customer Standing Committee.

The role of this is actually to have the day-to-day oversight of the -- of the PTI of the new IANA, and it's to see that they fulfill the Service Level Agreements. It's also to be able to assess if PTI is performing poorly. We don't know if they will do so. They have not done before, so we think IANA will keep up the good work, but this is a group that can be the first part of taking -- of addressing any issues. And they are to escalate. If the PTI performance is not according to SLAs or there's an issue, they can escalate this to the ccNSO and the GNSO. And it's also to review and recommend changes to PTI service level targets.

So this group is meant to meet like once a month. It's meant to be an ongoing, and it's not that they have physical meetings but it's going to be quite a lot of work being in this group because it's going to be the technical insurance that PTI is performing.

Next slide is we have another committee that's the RSSAC. That's a technical one. It's not related to GAC as the other ones, so we just wanted to show you there is going to be this committee that is going to advise the Board if there is any changes to the technical parts of PTI.

And I'd like to share the last slide really quickly because that's a nice overview of PTI. As you can see, we have the Board with five directors where Jonathan and I are going to be interim until the NomCom has settled a process for choosing the board, and staff will be seconded at the first take and then we will, within three years, have them employed directly by PTI.

And as Jonathan explained, PTI is going to be an affiliate of ICANN.

You'll have those slides and can review them if you want to go into details.

Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Lise.

Let's look at the last slide which summarizes an overall timeline. You've really seen that we've gone through three different phases. There was the whole preparation of the proposal and all

of the work that went into that from the three different communities in phase one that ultimately resulted in a composite proposal that I referred to in the beginning from the names, numbers, and protocol communities, pulled together by the ICG, taken through the public comment period, and in parallel with that, the work on ICANN's accountability that you'll hear and discuss more about in a moment. Of course that then being submitted to the NTIA for review and evaluation during phase two. And the report coming out earlier this month, in fact, which dealt with the -- this community developed stewardship transition proposal and the fact that U.S. Commerce Department's NTIA found the stewardship proposal to -- developed by the multistakeholder community to meet the key requirements or criteria set out by NTIA back in March 2014.

And to remind you of those which you've probably heard many times before, but it was a requirement that it supported and enhanced the multistakeholder model, maintained the security and stability and resiliency of the DNS, meet needs and expectations of global customers of the IANA service itself, maintain openness of the Internet, and does not replace NTIA's role with a government-led or intergovernmental organization solution.

So the proposal is deemed to have met those criteria, and that brings us then into this phase three, this final point, where we

can finalize the implementation. And that is where we're right in the thick of things now, making sure that all of the detail of the implementation is self-consistent and consistent with the proposal. And so in many ways I think we thought our work was done a while ago when we handed the proposal over to the ICG but, of course, there's this significant phase three which now requires appropriate levels of work on the implementation and that's what we are sleeves rolled up in now. And as Lise said of particular interest probably to the GAC this morning is the CSE and your potential involvement with liaisons to that CSE. So I think with that I'll hand the microphone back to Thomas Schneider, your chair.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you very much. And I think we should use the moment and the fact that we have our two main experts on this part of the process here with us to ask them certain questions or make comments, but in particular ask them questions about the process. Ideally with the focus on the CSE.

Before that I would just like to quickly give the floor to our colleagues from the United States because they can give us a little bit of an insight on where the process is in that phase two and how -- how the next few months are -- what is needed to

happen in order for this to actually proceed. So Chris, if you could tell us, thank you.

UNITED STATES:

Thank you, Thomas, and good morning to all colleagues. In March ICANN sent NTIA the IANA stewardship transition proposal developed by the Internet's multistakeholder community. And as you all know, the plan addresses both the technical performance of the IANA functions as well as enhancements to ICANN's accountability.

On June 9 NTIA announced that the proposal meets the criteria NTIA outlined in March 2014 which were just reviewed by Mr. Robinson a moment ago. Assessment against these criteria was a joint work effort of all U.S. federal agencies with equities in DNS operations. The interagency team provided a set of questions to allow for a detailed evaluation of how the plan met our top-line criteria as reflected in the matrices attached as part of our report.

In response to a recommendation by the U.S. government accountability office, NTIA also examined the IANA stewardship transition proposal against relevant portions of the internal control principles developed by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, or COSO. Evaluating the proposal against the COSO framework NTIA

found that the transition proposal adheres to the COSO principles with respect to organizational environment, risk assessment, and monitoring.

Regarding organizational environment, NTIA's review concludes that ICANN has structures and processes in place that set the tone for accountability, and the proposed enhancements reinforce this by allowing the community to hold the board accountable to its commitments and responsibilities. Further the post-transition IANA, which will be instituted as an affiliate of ICANN for purpose of performing the naming functions, is well on track to establish such processes and structures prior to the transition.

Risk assessment. The transition proposal does a good job of identifying risks and proposing mechanisms to address them, namely through contractual requirements, service level expectations, oversight in review committees and processes, and requisite ICANN bylaws to institutionalize them.

For monitoring, the proposal incorporates a variety of monitoring requirements including those associated with operational performance of the IANA functions as well as those associated with ICANN and the ICANN board's actions.

Finally, NTIA commissioned a panel of corporate governance experts including Columbia University law professor John

Coffee, Brooklyn law school professor Dana Brakman Reiser, and the Berkman Center for Internet and Society at Harvard University to review the ICANN accountability provisions. The expert panel concluded that the accountability recommendations are consistent with sound principles of good governance that reflect the unique and important mission of ICANN within the Internet ecosystem.

The transition proposal represents the largest multistakeholder process ever undertaken. On behalf of the government of the United States of America, I would like to extend our sincerest appreciation to the members of the GAC and the broader multistakeholder community for their tireless work and commitment to the IANA stewardship transition process. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much for this update. So the floor is yours, European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Yes, thank you, Thomas, and thank you to Jonathan and Lise for the very useful presentation. I just have a question, and it reflects also what Chris has just said from the United States. In the assessment by NTIA, as you recall, and there have been a

number of papers about this, there were some areas that were identified as yellow. In other words, they still needed a bit of work. And I wondered if the chairs of the CWG could give us an assessment of timing and progress on those aspects because you've talked about those but can you give us an assessment of whether the -- the August 12 date that you've identified here will be met and how much more needs to be done and what, if anything, the GAC can do to assist you.

LISE FUHR:

I can give a first go of this. Actually at the moment we're working on the PTI bylaws, and a lot of the areas that were mentioned are actually in process. It's been worked on. A lot is regarding code of conduct and conflict of interest documents, et cetera. Those are also being worked on, and we haven't discussed it, but I believe we would use a lot what's been worked on in the accountability group already so we don't invent new procedures for that. So I'm absolutely sure we'll meet the -- the deadlines and the time, but it's just a part of that we wanted to have the PTI bylaws concluded first and the IANA PTI contract which is on process.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

I would just make one follow-on remark. It's Jonathan Robinson for the transcript. If we could have the last slide, please, Julia.

There's one more slide in the deck. What you'll see is a project manager and summary, and I don't expect you to go through this in detail now, but I think what it symbolizes is that there's a professional project management approach which is -- ICANN's staff have been working on to support this. And -- and it breaks down the different tracks of work into detail and the different areas. So you can be assured that we are mindful of all of those details and they are being handled professionally and properly to seek to meet the targets -- target dates. So thank you for the question. I hope that's helpful in answering.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I have Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you, Lise, for the presentation. Just a question for you to -- to reply, if you wish. What would happen if transition does not take place? Thank you. For PTI actions only. I'm not talking of the CCWG accountability because we have already and sort of answer from ICANN board. But for the PTI actions over this one, what would happen if -- thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: In some ways I don't want to duck the question but I would say that's not something we are contemplating. We are working towards achieving the outcome and doing all the preparation work. I guess there might be a position of go/no go at some point but probably the most significant items might be things like -- the most obvious thing might be -- which would become in some senses irrevocable, might be something like the transfer of the IPR. But it's a good question, and we should think about at what point some form of change takes place that whilst not irrevocable becomes more difficult. So there's probably some key timelines where a change has to take place. But I think from my -- I mean, for example, creation of the subsidiary, of the affiliate, doesn't mean that the transfer of the -- of the -- the staff needs to take place or any -- so a lot of this is preparatory work. And it's a good question as to what -- at what point the change has to take place. And it's not something we've actually actively contemplated. Rather we've been focused on getting ready for that transition.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Since we should decide until the second half of July if and how and who we would send as a GAC liaison to the Customer Standing Committee I think we should spend one or two minutes on this one. First of all, do we want -- one question

is, do we want to have a liaison of the GAC to the Customer Standing Committee.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah, I think just to help you perhaps in that thinking, the Customer Standing Committee is a structure designed to help the post-transition IANA function properly in service of its customers. There was a strong feeling at the time of designing this that there were direct customers of the IANA function who need to have a direct relationship with that service provider. There was also some strong feelings that there was a danger, if we just focused on the direct customers, that some within the multistakeholder model might feel in some senses disenfranchised which is why, from my recollection, we ended up at a position where there was the opportunity for a liaison but not the necessity for it. So in a sense, the invitation is there. It's not going to go away. It's available to you to take up, should you wish to, I think is probably the way to express it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Jonathan. Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas. You raise a question, do we need to have a liaison. Perhaps the answer will be, why not?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for that very clear statement, Iran. I see the United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Thomas. And thank you, Jonathan and the team for presenting to us today such a comprehensive overview of the current state of plays. It's very -- it's very encouraging. The process as you say is very professionally managed well and it's -- it's a remarkable achievement by all involved.

With regard to this immediate question about the CSC, I -- I guess my first thought is that as I understand it, one of the functions would be to undertake some substantive review at some point, particularly if there was an issue requiring a bit of a rethink or adjustment of the PTI. And I guess at that stage the GAC would be very interested to understand what the issue was and if there was some element of public interest or an issue relating to stability and -- and integrity, if you like, of the new transition entity. I guess that that would be a point at which the GAC would need to be sort of involved and offering to provide

advice or input or consider an issue in particular if it was a matter of stability and public interest. So that's my initial thought.

Ordinarily I think the main operational function of the CSC is not something that we would need to be directly involved in on a day-to-day basis. I don't really see that. But the review function, if that is triggered, is probably the opportunity I would see as relevant to the GAC. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Thank you, Mark. I think this is exactly what the liaison is about. The liaison is probably -- Lise, correct me if I'm wrong. It's probably not an operational watchdog, but it's somebody who has the potential to report, if necessary, which is the basis for being able to participate in the review function, for instance.

Lise, thank you.

LISE FUHR:

Thank you. I just want to clarify that there is another review team that's going to review the IANA function as such, which is taking place first in two years and then every five years. The review that is meant in the CSC is more review of technical issues. And after one year, you will have a review of the charter

to see if it's fulfilling its purpose, if we meet the objectives of the CSC.

So I think at a more organizational level, it is a review team that's going to be more satisfactory for GAC. This is a very operational committee, not that it's not important and interesting for GAC to liaise with it but it's just to set the expectations.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Further comments?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Just one thing.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Just one brief follow-on to what Lise said.

So if the CSC was sufficiently concerned about the operational function of IANA, it could recommend that a review of the IANA function take place. So to that extent, it's connected but its primary role is on day-to-day, week-by-week effective

operational performance of the IANA function and less about periodic, strategic, or other reviews of the overall performance.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. One last comment or question?

So we should decide during this meeting what we do with this -- with this possibility to have a liaison. From what I've heard, I see rather a "why not" sense that we somehow have an interest in principle in this. We don't want to be too closely involved, but there needs to be some link for us to -- because this is a crucial function in the end. So please continue to discuss this. Give your views also electronically on the mailing list.

We have another session on the transition later this week, but that will be more focused on the accountability part. But we need to know what we want by the end of the deadline with the liaison. But I see that what I've heard is rather positive, that we should have one, than negative.

Yes, Lise.

LISE FUHR:

Just to give a quick remark to this because I think the first year is going to be the year where you shape this committee. That's going to be where we find how is the CSC going to operate as

this committee. So this might be the most interesting part for you to be in the first year, and then you can evaluate if it's interesting or not to follow. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much.

Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Yeah. Just to comment on, one is like my friend Iran said "why not." I think it's good because customer of Internet, so many of them, and the GAC will need to know what is happening for our customers.

Secondly, I would like to ask a question about the PTI to Lise. About the PTI itself is basically about IANA. As I understand today, IANA is a U.S. D.O.C. organization managed by ICANN under a particular contract. What will happen after the PTI and the new multistakeholder organizations? I read some information about that. But perhaps due to my poor English, I couldn't get it properly.

Will IANA be -- still be a U.S. D.O.C. organization managed by the new organization or it will be separated totally from the U.S. organization and become a private organization owned by the

multistakeholder organizations? And it means there will be no U.S. (indiscernible) from inside? There is no U.S.-owned equipment, network, whatever? Can you tell me more about it? Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you for the question. I will attempt to answer that as accurately as I can.

The post-transition IANA is a -- will be a newly formed private corporation that is -- in my terms, in a normal sort of commercial terms would be called a wholly owned subsidiary company, if you thought about it. But because it's a not-for-profit, it is referred to as an affiliate and it will have its own board members and ultimately its own staff. But it is very closely associated with ICANN, but it is a separate legal entity and a private not-for-profit corporation.

So I hope that answers your question and allays any concerns you've had. We could give you more detail about the exact nature of it; but that, in essence, is what it is. Private, not-for-profit corporation, affiliate of ICANN, own five-member board, and capacity to employ its own staff and operate its own budget.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Last quick word by the European Commission, and then we need to move to the other parts of the discussion. Thank you.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thanks, Thomas. I don't want to extend the discussion, of course. But I just think that we should be taking a more substantive position on this. And you've mentioned this, of course. But to identify "why not" as an option for GAC I think is a bit wishy-washy. We should congeal this into a clear position. And as Lise said as well, I think if the GAC is part of the multistakeholder approach and model, we should clearly be participating at least in the first years to come. And we can identify a GAC official, either chair, vice chair, et cetera, as a liaison person. But that's for our next discussion.

But I wouldn't like the record to say the GAC can't decide and why not and maybe, et cetera. So that's for a future discussion. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for that clear statement that we should clearly participate.

So with this, I would like to thank Lise and Jonathan. Of course, you can stay if you want and listen to how the rest of the

discussion is going. But if you have more important work to do, then, of course, you don't have to stay here. Thank you very much in any case.

With this, I would like to immediately hand over to the three gentlemen that are sitting between two women on this side of the table. I forget your names, but you're somehow co-chairs of something, I think.

[Laughter]

Why don't you present yourself and start. Thank you very much.

THOMAS RICKERT:

I can just refer to us as the French, the Mexican, and the German that have spent the last 18 months together.

But joking aside, my name is Thomas Rickert. I'm the GNSO appointed co-chair to the CCWG. And I would like to invite those who don't have headsets to try to find a headset because after I spoke, my colleagues will speak in Spanish and in French.

This is to provide you with a little update on what we did this weekend kicking off our work in work stream Number 2. As you know, we have split the accountability work in two areas, work stream 1 and work stream 2. I would like to use this opportunity to remind ourselves that while work stream 1 is now completed

in terms of our part, work stream 2 is dealing with topics of the same importance. We just have not been able to handle all these at the same time.

So this has been called an unprecedented multistakeholder effort. And I think this -- nothing could be more true in this arena. And I would like to thank the GAC and its members again for contributing so tirelessly in this first phase. And I hope that you will continue to work with the other community parts at the same level of engagement in work stream Number 2.

Also, while our work stream 1 recommendations have undergone several phases of community interaction and community examination -- and we came to the conclusion that what we proposed was the right thing to do -- it was really reassuring, I think, not only for me but also for the other community members to hear again a few minutes ago from the U.S. that this proposal has been examined very thoroughly and that not only it meets the NTIA criteria but actually that this is the right accountability approach for an organization such as ICANN which is a one-of-a-kind organization. So we couldn't just copy any corporate or social responsibility models from other places, but we had to come up with a completely new process. And I think that's sort of revolutionary.

This Sunday we had a whole-day meeting kicking off our work stream 2 discussions. There was very good turnout. So the room was full, and we had very engaged discussions. And the idea was to spark off the work stream 2 items by allowing for so-called lightning talks where volunteers from our group would speak to an issue that they're interested in so that we get the discussion going on how we approach these nine topics that we had in our report for work stream 2. You know all this. I'm not going to bore you with repetition.

The idea is, just so you know, we will have nine subteams that each of them have their own leader or rapporteur. But these groups will just do the groundwork. They will do fact finding. They will discuss recommendations and bring them to the plenary CCWG. So the subteam themselves will not make any decisions. They will just prepare recommendations for the whole CCWG to discuss. And then these proposals will be put in front of the community.

There will be a public comment period for each of those topics for work stream Number 2. And you can expect those to be rolled out sequentially because we do know that it would be overwhelming for the community likely to have a public comment period where they need to respond to recommendations on all nine work stream 2 recommendations.

So while they can be -- some of them can be combined as they get ready, please do expect multiple public comment periods where we put the recommendations in front of the community.

And then these public comments will be analyzed, and it is our plan, our hope, as community, resources permit, to deliver recommendations for all nine topics in the middle of 2017. So our work shall be completed in June 2017 when we again will present our findings to the global community.

So there's one remaining point that I would like to briefly mention. ATRT3 is to be launched soon according to plan. And some of the items that are on the agenda for ATRT3 are congruent or partially congruent with work stream 2 items. Therefore, there was a question whether our group should maybe pause and wait for the outcome of ATRT3. But our discussions have concluded in a way that we're going to prepare a correspondence to the SOs and ACs as well as to the ICANN board informing them that our group will conduct its work as planned, as promised to the global community in our work stream 1 report. So we will prepare our work stream 2 recommendations on all topics, not pausing or deferring because of ATRT3. And certainly it's not for us to determine how ATRT3 is conducted. But I think that you will hear from the board as we move on what impact that might have on work on ATRT3.

So with that, I'd like to hand over to Leon Sanchez, my fellow co-chair.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Thomas. I will speak in Spanish so you will need your headset, please. Go ahead and make use of the services.

All right. So we just were trying to project this image to intimidate you, but actually there are a series of smurfs behind these people, so for the purposes of the translation, the smurfs are presented as smurfs. So behind those helmets, there are actually three -- of the three stormtroopers are actually three smurfs.

So in line with what Thomas just said, this is an important time for the group and we want to invite you so that if you consider this necessary, you can review participation of different members appointed within the CCWG as well as to also invite you to include new participants, if you so wish, or also to review the members that are assigned to the CCWG.

So this is actually the right time to do this.

You can do this at any time, but we still consider that this is the right juncture in the process where this review is proper.

We believe the work has been very intense and it is possible that some of the volunteers who have devoted hours of work in this process are now exhausted, and so this is actually a good time for this review, and this has to be done under their own processes and needs.

It is also good to have a review of the issues to be dealt with within the working groups.

The first one is diversity. Diversity is an issue that was still pending for the second part of our job, human rights as well. Jurisdictions. Also the issue of accountability of SOs and ACs. The issue of the ombudsman. Transparency. Transparency for staff, accountability for staff as well. Also, guidelines or standards of conduct. What is it that we consider good faith and what if we need to exercise the power to remove some members of the board of directors or members of the board of directors. And of course to review the CEP, which is the cooperative engagement process.

So these are the issues that we're going to focus on, and Thomas has just given you a description of what is the aim of this group and how is it that we're going to work. But I also considered it important to remind you of all these issues and to invite you once again because we need many hands and we probably need new hands. So I insist that this is the right time to do this,

Thomas, so that you can assess whether those who are currently assigned as members of the group should remain, if they want to remain, or if the GAC itself needs to refresh this team that has been working with us.

So I would just want to thank all the GAC members for all the support they have shown in this process, for all the work they have done, and thank you again for inviting us today.

So I now will give the floor to Mathieu, my co-chair.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you.

My name is Mathieu Weill. I'm the co-chair of the assigned working group. It has been assigned by the ccNSO in the distribution of the work with my two colleagues.

So we now need to present the tasks or the request for tasks that will probably make our work more heavy.

This is the work that you have to do in this Helsinki session, because there are a number of points we need to complete to progress in our work.

The first element is a message that we convey to the president, to the chair, and to the -- to all the chairs of all the organizations

that supported our work and our charter, and this has to do with the budget for the second part of our work.

This is so because we are working in Work Stream 2 and Leon actually referred to volunteers, but the new issue that he referred to requires support from staff. They -- you know, our staff has an excellent work, does an excellent work, and this is necessary to continue with these meetings, support for the member groups so that they can all be here. And also, the experience we have had so far has shown that there is a need to have external advice, legal -- independent legal advice, because the nature of the issues that we deal here requires that.

So we believe that with the support of the ICANN teams and a very narrow link with the finance committee, we have been able to estimate our needs for the following periods and we informed that to all the organizations that signed our chartering -- our charter and we know that the ICANN board is impatiently awaiting the opinion of these organizations to know whether the relationship between the added value of the work that we will continue doing and the cost is an appropriate relation from the point of view of each person.

This is something I know you want to know, to the extent possible, and we have prepared some motions and it would be interesting to have these present to keep these in mind.

This is the financial part.

So more pragmatically and in the dimension of implementing the recommendations adopted in Marrakech and presented by the new ICANN bylaws, there are several issues we need to consider.

First, the GAC is a participant, is a full-rights participant in the community, in the empowered community, and that is why it needs to be prepared, as well as the rest of the organizations, so that we know what are the procedures needed to start a petition to participate in the different phases to escalate the discussion, if the case so requires, and also, of course, to make a decision in the last resort if we reach this phase.

So we urge you to identify, among all of your procedures, the way to see how we can get organized, including time lines, to participate fully in the different instances.

Now, secondly, you will probably know that from now on, regular review teams will be made up by the different chartering organizations and also the GAC, and so it is necessary to implement a process to select representatives in these teams so that then this process can be applied in each new review.

Thirdly, for the time being, there is nothing we can do about this but it is good to start thinking about this issue. There will be a

selection process by the community. We will select panelists to independently -- for -- to have an independent review. This is going to be the IRP. And even though the work of this group is in course, it is clear that for the GAC, it will be important to position or to identify the way to contribute for this central element in the new governance device in ICANN.

So I just wanted to call all your attention -- the attention of all of you, so that you can start discussing these issues and to see how you will be able to fully participate in the governance of new mechanisms to be implemented by the recommendations that we have adopted so far in Marrakech altogether.

Thank you very much, and now I'll give the floor to our chair.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

So thank you very much for these very important informations. There are other issues that we need to discuss. We need to discuss this quite quickly, and the key issue for Work Stream 2 will be, which are the members of the GAC in CCWG.

You know that the -- you know that participations is essential. There are -- there's no limit in the number. And these discussions are still in course and those who are interested will know that we will have a proposal in the following weeks.

You know also that there is another space for discussing this issue. This will happen tomorrow in the morning.

And the second issue is what Mathieu has just mentioned. It is necessary that the GAC start reflecting and start acting and developing a process for more involvement of the GAC in the empowered community.

This is not super urgent because actually the system itself needs to be put in place, but actually this will exist and we will need to know how to participate in this structure.

So we have 10 minutes for questions and comments with our co-chairs here and you can also express your point of view here orally in the room, but you can also use electronic media to communicate issues maybe by email. Thank you very much.

UNITED KINGDOM:

And thank you, all the co-chairs of CCWG, for updating the committee this morning. It's very helpful, very useful.

Just one question about the time line for Work Stream 2. I wonder if you could explain a little bit about how that's going to work out, in view of the sequential request for public comment and so on.

What is the target endpoint, and is the cost of the support for Work Stream 2 something that's being factored into that? And I'm thinking in particular of legal costs, which of course have been quite substantial from the experience of Work Stream 1. So first of all, time line, and then, you know, cost management and lessons learned from Work Stream 2 -- Work Stream 1, if that's possible. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much for the question.

In terms of time line, we have an overview of who volunteers for what topics, and there are certain topics that have more interest by the community than others, so we're now reinforcing our invitation to the whole community to join one or multiple subteams for Work Stream Number 2.

So our hope is that we will have the human resources, the brains at our fingertips, to actually get all the work done in a timely fashion.

The idea is that we would kick off the -- all of the subteams after this meeting. Maybe there are two or three that we will roll out a little bit later, but then you should expect us using the two bigger ICANN meetings as opportunities to consult with the community extensively, so that actually, we will be able to

deliver our final output on all the subteams -- or the whole package of nine subteams in May-June 2017.

And, yes, we have prepared a budget, together with ICANN staff, that would allow for us to deliver on all these items, but I should also note -- or refresh your memory that there is a new way of approaching the budget. I.e., we will work in a new fashion that's going to be presented to the community in the near future, and that would allow for the account- -- the enhanced community, actually, to have budget ownership for certain parts of the work.

So that will allow for us to exercise cost control in a much more efficient manner than previously, and that will also help us to meet financial targets, and there will also be a process for the hopefully unlikely case where we need more budget than anticipated at the outset.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So you will go for a crowd funding campaign for the CCWG. That's excellent.

I have Iran next on the list.

IRAN:

Thank you very much. The three heroes that done this job for 17 months. I take this opportunity to sincerely thank for all good things you have done and are going to do.

Just one complementary question to what Thomas Rickert said. With respect to the ATRT3 and Work Stream 2, although we don't get involved what ICANN wants to do, but we have to mention and we have decided to mention that if they do the work in parallel, they would be overlapping because many areas are common in our process.

So it is important that it is taken into account to avoid any overlapping and the need of feedback from one to the other. That is not something that is -- full freedom for ICANN is to take that into account. That was mentioned.

With respect to the issue raised by Mathieu, I hope -- I think, if I have heard it correctly, it would be beneficial if we receive, GAC receive an input from CCWG with respect to these two issues, review team and panelist qualifications, scope of work, nature of the work, and so on so forth, in order that we really know at what time we have to do.

With respect to empowerment of community, of GAC participation in the decision-making, it is already in our communique of Marrakech what we have to do. We have already discussed this in general.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran.

Switzerland is next.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much for giving me the floor.

And first of all, besten dank, muchas gracias, merci beaucoup, and I'm very glad to see you with so much energy starting Work Stream 2, or you are pretending to have that energy in a very reliable and credible way. But I'm very happy to see you here with such a lot of energy.

And as the time is short, I would just like to thank you that in these negotiations about the support for the Work Stream 2, you have taken up a lot of the points we've made on the transcripts, on the staff support for drafting, because this is very important for the inclusivity and the diversity of this effort.

And on this note of diversity, I would like to make my pledge or my urge to you is that you keep on with your good guidance and you keep on with your maneuvering and your management of the discussions of this very difficult effort and you try to include as much all the different stakeholder groups in all positions in

the subgroups that are going to start this work, because we have learned some lessons about diversity in workstream 1, and I'm sure you will take the right conclusions out of them.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you.

You want to quickly react or should we use the time -- India, please.

Thank you.

INDIA:

Thank you, Chair.

So we feel that the issues that are going to be raised in the nine areas that are going to be raised in Work Stream 2 are extremely relevant for us, and across the community, across all the stakeholders in the country we are more than happy as well as keen to involve and associate in more than one ways in issues, in all the issues, particularly relating to diversity, jurisdiction, human rights.

So we would like to volunteer to be the volunteers as well as participate in all the discussions.

And also, as we go forward, we feel that the next year, the coming year, is extremely crucial, and not only in Work Stream 2 aspects but also in the CSC. The kind of -- You know, the challenges that are going to be there are going to be there in this first year, so it's important that the GAC also maintains great liaison with the community, with the emerging PTI structure, and we feel there should be an important role of GAC in this.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you very much, India.

Other comments or questions?

Or you want to have the coffee break?

I see no more questions or hands up, so that means that I would like to thank you, to everybody who has contributed to this session.

There's a lot of substance here. We have very little time so we really have to get to grips with this and use all our communication ways to exchange views in order to be ready in time to take the decisions to know where and how we will continue to contribute in these processes, because they are fundamentally important.

So thank you to everybody also in the GAC and with the observers who is willing to share the burden, because it's a lot of work, but it's worth it.

So this is the coffee break.

We will reconvene at five to 11:00, because otherwise it would be too short until everybody gets a coffee. And we have five-minute update about the communique. And at 11:00 sharp we will start with the next session.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

[**Coffee break**]