
PANAMA – High Interest Session: CCWG-Accountability WS2 Final Report
Wednesday, June 27, 2018 – 17:00 to 18:30 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

THOMAS RICKERT: Just before we start the recording, everyone is talking about GDPR these days and in our preparations for this meeting, I think it was Bernie, wasn't it, who was talking about the GDPI when we were discussing the global public interest so you get the best of both worlds.

[Laughter]

Can we have the recording started, please? Session is being started. That's great. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the cross-community session to give an update on ICANN's accountability project, the CCWG accountability. And I'm one of the three co-chairs. My name is Thomas Rickert. And with me we have Jordan Carter, the ccNSO-appointed co-chair, and Tijani Ben Jemaa from the ALAC.

And we also have our excellent Bernie Turcotte who is supporting us from staff. And today we're going to give you an update of where we are with the CCWG, which today doesn't even exist anymore. And that is part of the update.

So can we move to the first slide, please.

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.

So we're going to discuss the current status of where we are. Then we're going to give -- do a quick run-through of the recommendations. Many of you will have read the recommendations. Many of you, I'm sure, have publicly commented on the recommendations. So we're going to keep that part very brief. Then we're going to discuss a few Board concerns and implementation guidelines. And I'm going to explain during the introductory part why we did that and what the background for that is. We will discuss the process going forward. And then there will be time for questions, both from the floor as well as from remote participants. And when we're done with all that, we're going to adjourn.

Now, before we dive into the agenda, can I just get a show of hands of those who have been at the CCWG plenary meeting on Sunday? That's dedication.

[Laughter]

Or desperation. Nothing better to do -- (laughter) -- on a Wednesday afternoon. I'm glad you are all here. I see a couple of rapporteurs here. I'm sure should there be any questions on the substance of the recommendations, we can also turn to the rapporteurs, if need be.

Let's go to the next slide, please.

Now, we have concluded our work last Sunday. So, in fact, the CCWG met and we worked quite hard for a couple of hours in order to get our work finalized. Now, we're not completely done. But the CCWG as a group has completed its mission because unlike in Work Stream 1 where you will probably recall, it was part of the CCWG's mandate to also ensure that part of the recommendations are implemented. Implementation of the Work Stream 2 recommendations is not part of what we were supposed to do according to our charter.

So that means we had budget until the end of June. We had staff support until the end of June. And we managed to complete our report. And, therefore, the CCWG accountability has accomplished its task.

The only thing that's missing is the approval process. And you might ask why are we calling us co-chairs for a group that doesn't even exist anymore. Are we co-chairing something that everyone is just imagining at the moment? So basically we kept that role quite intentionally so that there is a point of reference during the approval process in case the chartering organizations have questions, in case the Board has questions so that we can be turned to and respond to those queries.

Also, as I just mentioned, implementation is not part of our mandate. So we will get back to that at a later slide. But we will

hand over the report to the chartering organizations and then to the Board. And the Board with ICANN Org, staff, will develop a plan on how to operationalize the recommendations. And there will surely be questions on how to do certain things.

Therefore, we have installed an implementation oversight team that can be asked for advice when it comes to questions surrounding how shall we -- how shall we implement this or that recommendation so that we can ensure as community representatives basically that the implementation takes place in the spirit of the original recommendations.

And this implementation oversight team consists of the rapporteurs of the subteams and the co-chairs. So this is why we are still.

Here. We hope that we don't get too many questions. We don't want to shy away from any questions there might be, but we do hope that the report is sufficiently clear that not too many questions will be asked.

So next week staff will tidy up the report, send it to the chartering organizations, and then it will be for the chartering organizations to hopefully approve the final report, the whole package, by ICANN63. It is in Barcelona.

For those who don't want to do a lot of reading, the good news is the recommendations haven't changed. So out of the almost 100 recommendations that we came up with, there were only four recommendations where the Board had concerns. And if you don't -- and, therefore, you don't have to read the whole report in order to understand what happened recently. But you only have to take a look at the implementation guideline, which is a couple of pages worth of reading. But the rest of the report has not changed since March. And that's the version that you will likely have seen.

Can we move to the next slide, please.

So implementation guidance or implementation guidelines as we call it, I guess I should give you a little bit of background what this means.

When it came to approaching the deadline for the IANA stewardship transition, we wanted to make sure that we have momentum and we put that into the bylaws so that when we come up with all of these accountability enhancements, that the Board just doesn't ignore them or vote them down. Therefore, we have a provision in the bylaws that states that if the Board has concerns with recommendations coming out of this CCWG, it needs a 2/3 majority to vote that down, to reject that.

And these concerns must be based in the global public interest. As we call it as of today, GDPI. So basically we have the same momentum, the same power for Work Stream 2 recommendations as we had with Work Stream 1 recommendations, with a 2/3 majority requirement.

And that -- you know, if this actually happens, if the Board did raise global public interest concerns, then we would enter into a process that's described in the bylaws. And this process would likely take a couple of months, probably a year, to resolve.

This is why we as a team said, okay, if the Board has global public interest concerns with four out of these 100 recommendations, we should better understand what these concerns are because maybe we just succeeded in being sufficiently clear. Maybe we have -- we are part of the issue that our recommendations were understood in a way that give raise to these concerns. So we thought it would be good for us to be engaged with the Board, which we did in Puerto Rico.

So a couple of rapporteurs, the co-chairs met with some of ICANN's Board members and some staff members. And we tried to understand, you know, what are your concerns. Can we work on that?

And it turned out that we thought that if we give annotations, if we offer further explanations as to how the recommendations

shall be construed, the global public interest concerns would likely go away, right? And, therefore, we introduced the term of "implementation guidance" which doesn't differ too much from what the implementation oversight team would give during the implementation phase, only would put it in front of the bracket for two reasons basically. Again, one is to avoid the lengthy process of reopening the discussions with the Board. But, also, if we reopened our package, basically the recommendations that we already put out for public comment, the question is do you need to conduct another public comment period or consult with the community.

The good news is, as I've said, as of Sunday, we now know that there's consensus, full consensus -- there hasn't been a single objection -- full consensus on the implementation guideline, which we'll attach to the recommendations. And our group is of the opinion that this does not change the spirit of the recommendations as such.

So I guess this is just important for you to understand why we attach something to the report. And this is all the explanation why it took us slightly longer to get the whole thing wrapped up than we originally planned because we would have opened the chartering organizations can approve our recommendations during this meeting. So that's not going to happen for practical reasons. We do hope we're going to get this done by Barcelona.

But you will see a slide with the time line a little bit later during this presentation.

Now, the implementation guidance we issued on four different topics. One is the ombuds advisory panel. "Ombuds" is our new term for what has been the ombudsman earlier. It's a northern European invention. So we wanted to have it gender-neutral. Therefore, we just called it the ombuds.

And then three points with respect to transparency. That's transparency of Board deliberations, transparency of governmental engagement, and transparency of open contracting. We will give you more details on that as we move on.

Next slide, please.

So before we give you an overview of the recommendations and subsequently of the implementation guideline that we issued, a few facts.

The CCWG as composed in Work Stream 2 has had, I have to say today, 26 members. We had 254 active participants and 205 observers. That's quite a crowd. And I think that's again a great testimony of this community's dedication to improve ICANN's accountability.

We had 278 meetings. The collective hours on calls spent was 10,870. So that is quite remarkable, I guess. And only on this list -- it doesn't mean emails that have been exchanged elsewhere -- we had almost 6,000 emails in Work Stream 2.

So I already spoke about the implementation oversight team, so that will survive the termination of the Work Stream 2 CCWG. And that will exist for the lifetime of the implementation plans.

Next slide, please.

And with that, I can hand over to Tijani to give us a quick overview of the existing recommendations of our final report.

Over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Thomas.

As you know, in the framework of the CCWG Work Stream 2, eight subgroups have been created to address various accountability aspects. And the first one is the subgroup on diversity. The subgroup can come up with eight recommendations that ICANN and all SOs and ACs should implement.

These are broken down in three main themes: Two recommendations about defining diversity; three

recommendations about measuring and promoting diversity; and three other recommendations about supporting diversity.

These recommendations are structured to allow SOs and ACs to adjust the diversity requirements and conduct regular assessment to their needs.

Next slide, please.

The second subgroup is about guidelines for good faith. In fact, it is guidelines for standard of conduct presumed to be in good faith associated with exercising removal of individual ICANN Board directors.

These are a few optional recommendations to ensure that representatives from AC or SOs using the new accountability procedure to remove ICANN Board director and following these good-faith recommendations will be indemnified if they are sued by the director they are seeking to remove.

Next slide, please.

The third subgroup is about human rights. As you know, the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 recommendations on human rights required that a framework of interpretation be accepted by ICANN prior to those recommendations coming into force. This framework of interpretation was developed in Work Stream 2. In fact, it's a high-level framework to help ICANN and

SOS and ACs to consider the application of human rights requirements in their work.

Next slide, please.

The fourth subgroup is about jurisdiction. And this subgroup come up with two sets of recommendations. Recommendations to ICANN relating to sanctions including OFAC ones. And these are ICANN terms and conditions for registrar accreditation application relating to OFAC licenses. The second is approval of the gTLD registries. The third is application of OFAC limitation by non-U.S. registrars. And the last one is about general licenses.

The second set of recommendations is related to the choice of law and choice of venue provisions in ICANN registry and registrar agreements. These are only suggestions as these cannot be made binding using this process.

Next slide, please.

The fifth subgroup is about ombudsman. And this subgroup issued 11 recommendations which are mainly based on the recommendations made by the independent external evaluation of the ombuds office.

So the first one is having a more strategic focus. Two, adapting its procedures. Three, communicating this to the community.

Four, establishing time lines for all parts of the community to respond to the requests from the ombuds. Five, establishing time lines for its own handling of complaints. Number six is ensuring that ombuds office has formal mediation training and experience. Number seven, ensuring diversity to those wishing to make use of ombuds service -- services.

Number eight, establishing an advisory panel to increase independence. And this is one of the recommendations that the Board raised concern about.

Number nine, reviewing the rules of the ombuds employment contract. Number ten, ensuring that annual report -- the ombuds annual report is published. And Number 11 is defining the requirements for ombuds implication in noncomplaints works.

Next slide, please.

Subgroup Number 6 is about SO and AC accountability. These recommendations are broken down into three tracks. Track 1, review and develop recommendations to improve SO and ACs' processes for accountability, transparency, and participation that are helpful to prevent capture. And here we have 29 recommendations that each SO, AC, and stakeholder group should implement.

Track Number 2, evaluate the proposed mutual accountability roundtable to assess its viability and, if viable, undertake the necessary actions to implement it. But, in fact, the subgroup didn't decide to implement it, while there is a small minority of the CCWG participants supported this recommendation.

Track 3, assess whether the IRP would be applicable to SO and AC activities. The conclusion of the subgroup is that the IRP should not be made applicable to activities of SO and AC groups. The appropriate mechanism for individuals to challenge SOs' or ACs' actions or inaction is through ICANN's ombuds office whose bylaws and charter are adequate to handle such complaints.

Next slide, please.

Subgroup Number 7 is about staff accountability. And here we have three main recommendations to address underlying issues or concerns identified through the subgroup analysis. Number 1, addressing the lack of understanding of the existence or nature of existing staff accountability mechanisms.

Number 2, addressing the lack of clarity about defined or broadly understood mechanisms to address accountability concerns between community members and staff members regarding accountability or behavior. And, number three, addressing the lack of service level definition and guidelines.

Next slide, please.

And the last subgroup is about transparency. And this subgroup come up with recommendations in four areas. Area number one, improving ICANN's documentary information disclosure policy, DIDP. 21 recommendations in this set of recommendations, in this area.

Area number two, one recommendation about documenting and reporting on ICANN's interactions with governments.

Area number three, three recommendations about transparency of the Board deliberations.

And area number four, eight recommendations about improving ICANN's anonymous hotline. And this concludes the recommendations of the eight subgroups.

Now I give the floor to my fellow co-chair Jordan Carter. Jordan, please.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Tijani. Good afternoon, everyone.

I'm going to take you through the implementation guidance. So if we could go to the next slide.

Yeah, there we go. No. One back. Yeah, that one. Thanks.

So Thomas has already explained the genesis of this guidance, why it's needed, what it's designed to do. I won't repeat that explanation. And what the next set of slides does is for each of these four topics, it says what the recommendation was that caused concern and then it sets out the text of the implementation guidance. So I'm just going to summarize each of those to get us through to the discussion part first.

So if you could go to the next slide, I won't read through this but this is the original recommendation about the ombuds advisory panel. So it sets out what the functions are, five or six bullet points. It's over this slide and the next slide, please.

So that's what that is. That's what's in the recommendation already. The recommendation hasn't changed. The implementation advice just qualifies and explains it.

So the next slide says what the guidance is. And the key points are -- first of all, we said why we are doing guidance. We reiterated the fact that this panel is not meant to be a decision-making body. It's there to help the Board in its job of providing the ombuds service to the community. And it doesn't get involved in any matters before the ombuds.

We sort of reiterate that the panel only has the six bullet points of powers. It can't just randomly add extra things to its purview.

Next slide.

This is probably the key point. The ICANN Board was particularly concerned about the recommendations saying -- giving advice to the Board the firing of an ombuds for cause. So something dramatically bad happened, they could have said to the Board committee, we think that this person needs to be sent out the door.

Only the Board can do that. The Board is responsible for engaging the ombuds person -- I will try to remember to keep saying "ombuds."

And so we are trying to find a way to not sort of create a confusion about the responsibilities of who was in charge of such a process of dealing with complaints.

So what this implementation advice asks the board to do is to put together a process whereby anyone can raise complaints about the ombuds. Not just if you're a special member of the magical panel. But any one of you has a problem or an experience with the ombuds can make use of the process. And the qualification, the advice is if the panel wants to do so, it has to use that process as well.

So it's been clear that the board manages the engagement of the ombuds, and if the panel as part of its work or consideration has a concern, they can raise it just the same way as anyone else can.

The next slide just adds a further qualification. One of the recommendations was to -- that there be other non-compliant work that the ombuds could help with. That's actually the subject of another recommendation, and the qualification here was that this should only happen if the board asks for it. The board's concerns could be characterized as trying to manage their ability to make the ombudsman system work and not taking away or diminishing that responsibility by splitting it with the panel. So the panel is advisory.

And lastly, the advice suggests making a formal process put together just like the panel members, stressing the independence that they need to have. Obviously it's not community participants who are the targets of participation on this panel. And publishing that process so that people know how it works as a basic issue of transparency.

So that's the implementation advice. Guidance, advice, I can't remember what we're calling it. Is it guidance or advice?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Guidance.

JORDAN CARTER: Guidance. Apparently there's a difference, for the ombudsman advisory panel. I hope that's as clear as crystal.

The next one, the next slide, please, is about the transparency of board deliberations. DIDP, my least favorite acronym, I think. There's an exception in the document information disclosure policy for deliberative processes. And sorry, the exception for deliberative processes, the original recommendation said it shouldn't apply to any factual information, technical reports or reports on the performance of effectiveness of a particular body or strategy. And the implementation guidance stresses a few things. One of them is that current publications of board briefing materials generally do fulfill their requirement. That's the view. And, you know, it's pretty clear that documents of information that have already been provided to a third party without a confidentiality obligation should not be withheld simply because of a process exception like that. So even if they are part of a deliberative process, if they're already public, providing to a third party with no confidentiality or obligation, they should be able to be released. So this whole set of (indiscernible) is about getting down that 90% rejection rate for DIDP inquiries, that's the context of these.

Moving over to the next slide, there's another original recommendation which was the revision of the bylaws so material could only be removed from the minutes of board meetings won't be subject to a DIDP exception. So you can only take things out of the minutes if you also wouldn't have to release the information under a DIDP. And, you know, the advice is there in front of you. The basis should be substantially consistent for board minute redaction and withholding info from a DIDP request. They should be treated in a similar way, to the extent that they can. We think that's the case already, and so this concrete suggestion is that ICANN publish a registry of all redaction of board minutes explaining the basis for it and it should show the relationship with DIDP exceptions.

On the IRP appeal point, the recommendation as worded says it should be subject to appeal. That is already the case in the bylaws, the new bylaws, so just clarifying that. Next slide.

There's a third transparency of board deliberations, one with advice and this is saying where material is removed from the minutes of board meetings, the default should be to allow for its release after a particular period of time, once the potential for harm is dissipated. And without going -- because we are really getting into the detail of the detail of the detail of the process. I'm not going to read all that. But basically ICANN should identify if a redaction of a document can be released or not.

Perhaps there are some classes that will never be disclosed for but law or other reasons and the CEO would annually review the redaction information. So just kind of keeping -- you know, detailing the process and making sure -- because this has all been discussed with ICANN -- that it's mutually agreed that this is workable implementation guidance. Next slide, please.

The third area is on government engagement. So this is the second of the three topics related to transparency. And the original recommendation says there, public disclosure of -- regard to disclosures of over 20,000 per year devoted to political activities, both in the U.S. and abroad. Next slide.

And those are the bullet points. They were all in the original recommendation. Personnel for outside contractors, identities, types of engagement, whom they're targeted, topics discussed. Next slide.

The implementation guidance notes that there are DIDP exceptions already in place for information provided by our two governments which is about, you know, protecting ICANN's relationship with these people. We can't put the organization in a situation where no one will actually be up front and frank with it about sensitive matters because it will automatically be disclosed. That point that I just made isn't a new assertion. It's always been the case. It's always been the case and that

remains in place because there was nothing in the recommendations that suggested changing it.

So the next slide carries on and provides some more context around it and draws attention to the fact that there's already quite a lot of information available that does explain these governmental context. For example, in the ICANN quarterly reports that are regularly published on the Web site. And we don't want to have a duplicate disclosure thing. If information is already disclosed, it doesn't make sense to redisclose it and then incur all the cost and expense of doing so.

And the next slide suggests also that ICANN should publish an annual government engagement strategy which describes the focus of its interaction with governments for the coming year. And that will be derived from existing documentation including annual planning, CEO reports to the board, correspondence with the GAC and so on. So providing in one place a hub where you can say, ah, are they talking to governments? Yeah. These are the ones they're talking to and this is what it's about. So it's, you know -- it's in keeping with that transparency approach that the reports and recommendations set out. Next slide.

Fourth topic, open contracting. This is about open contracting and the implementation guidance is fleshing out how to do this. The first point is that wherever possible means someone has to

define what's possible, and the suggestion is that ICANN do that, clearly stating its position on the use of NDAs and documenting the information that will make available on its contracted relationships as discussed below. So they have to state what is possible.

The next slide. The notion is that in the first year there will be a register of all suppliers that pay 500K or more per fiscal year broken down by the categories of what that spending is going in. And in the second year that would flow to 250K. The board should review that threshold on a regular basis and future ATRT reviews should consider whether this info set is adequate or needs to be gone into more detail or whether less detail is okay. It's important just to point out, I think, that the 500K is not per contract. It's per supplier. So there's a reasonable amount of work required to ascertain that information. Most of the work will be being done through the finance system and other systems. This is just making it public. Taking steps down that road of more contracting transparency.

Next slide. No, not next slide. Back. That's it. That's my four implementation guidance explanations for you. I hope you found them rivetting. I sure did. Thomas, I'm handing it over to you, I think, am I, for the next steps?

THOMAS RICKERT: I can do the last slide and then we'll go to Q&A with Tijani. Okay? Next slide, please.

This is basically a follow-up on what I've started discussing at the beginning of this session. What you see on the slide in front of you is the approval process. You have the process going forward. So we're now in the phase where we submit our final package to the chartering organizations, the chartering organizations will hopefully give their blessing to our report, then everything will be sent to the board. And it's important to note that the board will -- this is for the board to confirm, but according to our information, the board will not just approve our report but they will ask the -- they will ask staff to come up with a feasibility assessment report, as they call it. So basically that is an assessment, an analysis of what it takes in terms of resources to implement the recommendations that we came up with and you can expect this -- this implementation report, implementation plan, to be published for public comment so that the community can chime in.

So I guess for everyone in this room will have their favorite topic when it comes to accountability enhancement. For some it is the jurisdiction topic. For others it's transparency. And there will be some tough decisions to be made. I mean, let's face it, if you want to implement everything that we've recommended in a very short period of time, it will be overwhelming for the

organization in terms of budget and in terms of human resources, as well as in terms of community resources. So we want to be abundantly clear that this is likely going to be a process that's going to take a couple of years. So ICANN will likely put a budget, an annual budget aside for this exercise and then things need to be rolled out. But the community will be able to chime in on how it is going to be rolled out. So if this is a matter of interest for you, keep your eyes open for ICANN's publication or sharing of such an implementation plan. Right? So the implementation plan will be done, and once the board understands better what it takes to implement all this, the board will hopefully approve our final report. And then as you see on the right-hand side of the slide there are two options. Either the board is happy with what is happening and takes it green and approves it or it raises global public interest concerns and then this -- this iterative process starts, which I outlined earlier.

Now the good news is, that according to everything we know, there will be no global public interest concerns raised because we've gone through that. Right? And I also -- we don't have any indication that there will be a rejection from the chartering organizations. I think the processes for the individual chartering organizations are -- are different because all the chartering organizations have their own processes and I certainly will not

jump the gun and preclude the discussions there might be inside the chartering organizations, but we do not have any reason to believe that any of the recommendations need to be unpacked again, you know. Because we had public comment on all the individual subteam reports that together in their entirety make our final report. We had a public comment on potential inconsistencies. We've included everything that we could include in order to -- to reflect the outcome of those public comment periods. So we have all reason to believe that we're in good shape, that everything is more or less done and dusted for the approval process to be -- to be conducted in a smooth and efficient fashion. With that, I'm going to end my overview of the process to follow and Tijani will now manage the Q&A.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Thomas. So now I will give the floor -- I will give you the floor. There is two microphones. Please queue behind them, and I see Siva behind this microphone. Siva, please.

SIVASUBRUMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Sivasubrumanian Muthusamy from the Internet Society (indiscernible). I've been a part of this process. This process has proceeded and progressed smoothly, more smoothly and swiftly than it would have been in a conventional, multilateral arrangement. And congratulations to all the participants who

have done quite a lot of work and came up with many useful recommendations. However, accountability is a continuous process and not all improvements are decided and implemented overnight. For an organization of this (indiscernible), it's a global body responsible for the Internet and that coordinates DNS resources and so the exercise has to be a continuous exercise. So could we consider this accountability process that was -- particularly this claim that was introduced in the context of IANA transition as rather adjourned than concluded? Can we continue not with the same budgetary outlays, not in a great setup or not in an expensive way but at least by a mailing list, by an expanded mailing list, until such time as we have -- we constitute a face-to-face accountability stream? Could we think about it? Could we keep it continuous? A lot of work needs to be done. Quite a lot. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. I think this question was answered by Thomas at the beginning, but if someone wants to give another answer? Yes, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

Just a brief one. I hope that caused that. No, it doesn't. Right off the course of track of thoughts. The continuous improvement process deals with the topics of the CCWG has

dealt with as the accountability and transparency reviews. So to the extent that the work that we've been doing as accountability related, it should be able to be picked up and advanced on the quinquennial basis of those reviews, every five years. And I think that one is chartering now. I don't think that will have a lot of reviewing of these to do because it wouldn't have been implemented, but it does mean that another review will start in 2023, if my math is right. So when these reforms have been in place for a couple of years.

In terms of continuing the conversation in between times, and that would be something for the SO/ACs to consider with the organization. I think it's probably out of scope for the CCWG at its sort of -- at the end of its work to make sort of future process recommendations.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Steve.

STEVE DelBIANCO: Steve DelBianco with the business constituency. While we formally did ask the board for potential concerns with respect to public interest and it was in fact responsive and I think we've resolved those. Did we ask org if it had feasibility assessment concerns that would have been instructive to know about prior

to getting the feasibility in? So did board check with org when it came back with concerns on implementation?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sam?

THOMAS RICKERT: So Sam Eisner from ICANN legal is here. What I can say from a co-chair perspective, we did not trigger a response on that, but the ICANN organization saw all our reports out for public comment and we would have assumed that the board, if it had any concerns it would have learned from ICANN org with the -- with the submissions that the board made. But Sam, maybe you can speak to that.

SAMANTHA EISNER: Thanks, Thomas. And thanks, Steve. This is Samantha Eisner, deputy general counsel with ICANN. When the -- when the submissions to the various public comment processes were made throughout the Work Stream 2 there was probably at a high level, I think you could say, feasibility issues raised. So I think you saw that with some of the open contracting issues that were raised, et cetera. No, org has not done an extensive feasibility assessment over what it would take to implement each of the recommendations and therefore that might impact

budgetary implications, prioritization, and so I think that we see that as falling into the next cycle of when it comes out looking at it. But we're not intending -- I think from the reviews that we've done, we don't expect that any of those feasibility assessments would come out with this is not feasible. I think we understood that was the obligation as part of this. If we thought something wasn't feasible, that was also something that was important to raise. So I think you'll see information about why things might be difficult and how we can work as a community to then prioritize what things go first, what we spend the money on, but in terms of having something come out and say no, we just can't do it, we would not expect that that would be the answer to any of these.

STEVE DelBIANCO: Great. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Sam. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: (Speaking French.)

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The chartering organizations approve the --- (speaking French.)

Let's see if there is another answer here.

JORDAN CARTER: Can I just add one more thought. Pardon me for speaking English. My French is not up to continuing.

I hope that the org will be quite transparent and up with its proposed implementation plans in a documentary sense as part of their planning process. Maybe it's a supplement to the annual activity plan so that people can just see very clearly.

And I'm convinced that the goodwill of org in terms of working with the implementation group to be checking in on staff and getting a reality check. And in the end, if none of those things end up coming true, the empowered community and the Work Stream 1 accountability reforms are embedded and are at our disposal if we need to use them.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do we have remote questions? We don't seem to have.

Nobody is standing behind the microphone. Shall I understand that there is no questions?

Okay. Everything -- everyone is happy with everything.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Maybe -- not one sentence, a few sentences on the IRP IOT, which has organizationally included in Work Stream 2 but it is a remnant of Work Stream 1. So the work on the implementation - - on the independent review process is independent from the Work Stream 2 work. So that group is still alive and kicking, right? So in case you see David over there, David McAuley, who so able chairs this group, they are still continuing their group. They still have budget because it's Work Stream 1 budget. It has nothing to do with our group. But that is history already, right? So that's important to note.

And also let's move to the very last slide. I think there was one more slide that we haven't yet spoken to.

Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I would be remiss as part of the IOT, we've just recently published a public consultation on repose, which is a critical element. It's not a long document as David has noted in other

fora. Three pages gives you the gist of this thing. And the comments close on August 10th, I believe. David?

We would really appreciate it. We know it's the northern summer period. It's very tough after an ICANN meeting. But it's a very important topic. We've condensed it down as much as we can, and we would love to have your comments. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Great. David, is there anything you want to say? Not at the moment? Okay.

With that, I'm looking to my co-chairs. I think we can adjourn early. This is probably going to be the last public presentation of the CCWG. And I want to thank the excellent staff that we have for the awesome support that we got.

[Applause]

The subteam leaders or rapporteurs, as we call them, in Work Stream 2 did a great job in helping with the substantive work.

[Applause]

My fellow co-chairs, Tijani and Jordan, for being excellent colleagues in this journey.

[Applause]

I've learned an awful lot from them.

And some of you might remember Mathieu. Do you? A big shout-out to Mathieu.

And to Leon. Leon is now on the Board. He always takes the easy way out, right?

[Applause]

And certainly to the wider community for providing us with input that helped us adjust our recommendations to be as good as possible but also to ensure that there's no disconnect between the community's wishes and our group that pretty much worked, you know, in a silo if you wish.

But talking about silos, I think the CCWG is a cornerstone in ensuring that ICANN post-transition is not the same as before. I think this -- this particular group with a lot of GAC representatives working with other parts of the community has torn down silos and, you know, people are friends that have only written nasty letters to each other previously, right?

[Laughter]

And I think it really helped the community grow together more than anything else. And if there's one wish that I have with this,

let's maintain the spirit of collaboration. I think it will help this organization a great deal. Thanks so much.

JORDAN CARTER: Hang on. We want to say thank you to the one remaining original co-chairs.

[Applause]

So now you can get to really inspiring but keep going.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, everyone. Bye for now. Thanks to the remote participants.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]