ICANN Transcription
CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds
Wednesday, 30 January 2019 at 1400 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ccwg-new-gtlds-auction-proceeds-30jan19-en.mp3

Adobe Connect Recording: https://participate.icann.org/p62crub17n0/

Attendance is on the wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/GZgWBg

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds call held on Wednesday, the 30th of January 2019.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. As stated before, at this time we have Kavouss Arasteh, Sebastien Bachollet and Becky Burr who are on the audio portion only. If you're only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now?

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this I will turn it over to Ching Chiao. Please begin.

Ching Chiao: Thank you very much, Andrea and also everybody to join us. First of all any updates SOI and the declaration of interest? Any new updates we should receive from the participants, please let us know now. If not, I would like to begin by saying thanks everybody to join us. Hope you had a wonderful holiday for some of you last year and also related happy New Year's wishes to all of you wherever you are. I know that the beginning of this year someplace could be very could and we have some, you know, many things to do in the beginning of the years.

I know some of you are in Paris to join the IGF Net meeting and many of the business getting started we really appreciate your spending time with us for the next 90 minutes or so on the CCWG Auction Proceeds.

We have some apologies today, as you can see from the agenda. The co-chair, Erika Mann, she's on a business trip so she couldn't make it this time so I'm step in and to help manage and chair the call and obviously with the support as always from Joke and also from Marika. So with that, let's move on to the third item of the agenda is the proposed approach for reviewing and addressing public comments.

I think for this one before we really jump in into the -what's been put together mostly in the beginning by the staff and thanks, once again, to Marika and her team to put together the - using the, I mean, the review tool to put together this - the summary of the public comments. Before we dive into there, I think it's worthy to maybe to help some of you to kind of to capture what's been discussed last time in our last call happen in approximately one month earlier.

In the last call we just ended with the public comments. We received some feedback during the last call that the CCWG - the initial report wasn't really, you know, emphasizing that the community should be the ones to review the model and also to decide the - if the - eventually the structure of, you know, the auction proceeds or how this can viewed. So we have some opinions on

that and we also spent some time discussed that and to - and also to address - will be addressed for the - that type of concerns.

And also you - in this particular summary of comments, we have seen, you know, comments and also the opinions from different SO and ACs and to show support and also to show support but with some conditions, some new idea, so the leadership spent some time to analyze the comments with the staff and so then we have come up together with this summary as we'll be presenting to the members during this call.

So I think for - maybe to go through this I would like to probably to turn the mic to Marika and maybe to have her to help us walk through pretty much in the high level what has been done and what is the approach that we are using and maybe a high level summary for the work that has been done so far. So over to you, Marika. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Yes thank you very much, Ching. This is Marika. So what you see up on the screen, and this was also circulated with the agenda, is a modified version of the public comment review tool that we shared with you, you know, prior to the New Year. So what we had originally done was kind of break down the different comments and input that had been received along the lines of the different sections of the initial report as well as the different recommendations and questions that were flagged in view of facilitating the review by the CCWG of the input that was received.

So following that call last year, you know, we did some further thinking about how we could kind of even further facilitate your consideration and leadership was keen as well to develop some recommendations as to how to deal with the input especially focusing on next step and basically discussion topics for the CCWG that would help inform any potential changes that would need to be made to the report and its recommendation as it moves into the direction of a final report.

So what we did we added a column, and as said, the one, two, three, fourth column you currently see on the screen, in which we've basically tried to analyze a little bit further, you know, what is the type of change that is being suggested by the commenter and the possible action, or no question, for the CCWG that the commenter is asking to address or opine on. So we did that as a first step and that is basically I think the language you see on the top of that for each column.

In certain cases it will say, you know, there is nothing expected, you know, the commenter may be supporting a recommendation or a perspective of the CCWG. And in other cases, you know, commenters are asking for very specific items and as such we've tried to kind of flesh that out.

In addition to that, the leadership team, so Erika and Ching, then went through that list and tried to identify for those items where, you know, the CCWG is being asked to either consider a certain perspective or consider making this certain change, they kind of suggested, you know, what the next step of the CCWG might in order to address that comment. And that has been flagged as kind of the leadership recommendation for those items that it relates to.

In addition, what staff has done for those comments where, you know, no specific change has been suggested where it was more kind of either agreeing with the recommendations that have been put forward, staff has gone ahead and, you know, put in the right hand column proposed CCWG response that mainly goes to the nature of, you know, we thank you very much for your input and appreciate your support for the recommendation.

So basically the ask is now from the group is to, you know, review this document and indicate, you know, whether or not you agree with, you know, the next steps that have been proposed. Of course this means as well if you're of the view that in any of the comments we've indicated that no further steps are needed that you can flag if you do not agree with that. So that will

then hopefully kind of give us a kind of way to develop a work plan for the next phase because it means we can kind of break down the different topics that have been identified and items that need further consideration so we can kind of line them up in the form of a work plan that will hopefully then get the group to a final report.

So that is a little bit the thinking and behind this document. You know, again the intention really is here to, you know, facilitate your review of the comments and of course this does not take away the obligation for everyone to review the comments in their full detail, you know, for all the input that has been provided we have added the link as well to the full comments so you should be encouraged as well to go back there and see the full details of it. And of course if anything was overlooked or missed, you know, please feel free to call that out.

So I hope that's helpful. I don't know, Ching, if you want to say more about the leadership recommendations and, you know, I think one idea was to maybe, you know, give a flavor and maybe go to one of those and kind of talk it through so you kind of see where I think the leadership is coming from and, you know, how to move forward on these items.

Ching Chiao: Sure, Marika. Thanks for, you know, the explanation. I think this really - the staff, I mean, the staff putting together the first step and the leadership team tried to make a kind of a logical sense of the recommendations that could, you know, help the, you know, the group moving things forward. So yes, I mean, one quick, I mean, recommendation is if everybody can scroll down to let's say, you know, on Page 8 for example, just taking one example in the Adobe room which I can scroll down now.

On Page 8, the comments from ISPCP, so as you can see this particular recommendation submitted by the ISPCP for this particular one suggesting the CCWG to consider enhancing Option A with review of application for funding to be, you know, reviewed by a panel of experts from the ICANN

community, a professional project manager to be assigned by ICANN. So we - so the staff has helped us to label this as a new idea or we can say a kind of a variant to the original Option A.

So what we are, you know, trying to help with the group is to put together some preliminary recommendation as you can see from - on the screen is to, you know, some action item to, you know, discuss and then to check you see the - so the text mark in yellow. So those are the items we would like to check or discuss further with the group and with the rest of the group and seeing what would be a more concrete steps to address the comments from for example this one, ISPCP.

So yes, so I would encourage everybody to after this call because you just received this document, so I would really encourage everyone to go through this - so especially, you know, on the - during the initial report, we've tried to sort of rank the, you know, the mechanism A, B and C, and in the comments we did see different SO and AC submits what I call kind if innovative comments, you know, some, you know, echoing what's been produced in the initial report; but some also create, as I just mentioned, some new idea or the variants of the proposed mechanism. So I do encourage the members to spend some time on this.

And I see Alan has his hand up so, Alan, please, over to you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg speaking. Two comments, number one, a lot of the comments here basically said, oh, we should have community involvement in selecting projects and reviewing projects. I always assumed that was one of our suggestions for any of the methods and certainly for A and B. So maybe we - maybe I'm imagining it or maybe we didn't convey it properly but I always assumed that there was an orthogonal decision separate from the structure of who is exactly going to be involved in selecting projects.

And we've talked on a regular basis of having community involvement so I'm not quite sure why that's a new idea and I personally presumed it was one of the ways we could implement A or B is to have some community involvement, so that's number one.

The second one is I'm really disturbed that two years into this CCWG, and it's almost exactly two years because we started in January 2017, a huge number of these comments say, we should investigate Option X more deeply. And this is the CCWG that's going to go on forever if we can't somehow make some decisions. So I'm really disturbed by the results of this and maybe we didn't - maybe it's our fault for how we worded things or maybe the whole issue is just too confusing but I'm really worried that two years in we are getting comments saying, "We should study some things." Thank you.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Alan, for the comments. Somehow I share this with you, you know, taking - with, you know, with my personal, you know, in my personal capacity, I think it's - yes as you pointed out correctly, this is the second - we are actually moving to, yes, with full two years of operation already and yes, I mean, so, you know, as I, you know, brought up in the earlier, I mean, during the call earlier is that the - it's really - it's the CCWG who should have being put together the, you know, reviewing mechanism and later to decide the mechanism so I share the concern with you as well.

But, you know, the comments are, you know, something that, you know, so to allow us to - from different SO and AC to - for their inputs potentially with different level of understanding the work which has been done so far, but I guess we're trying to put everybody together, you know, trying to - making sure that everybody reach to the same page. But I can - once again from the chat room I see Vanda says, "It is quite hard - difficult to read and also agree with Alan. We need to finalize our points."

Once again, yes, also from Marika point out that the document was circulated prior to the call so you know, now or later you can check your email and open

the document in the Google Doc, that would be somehow much more easier for us to - yes, you know, for you to read through the comments. Anybody else have further comments?

I notice we have some comments from the Contracted Party House from the Registry and the Registrars about, you know, a very specific proposal of how the funds should be used, you know, in some marketing or on universal awareness campaign. And we also - so received, you know, some suggestions of - for example which entities inside ICANN should be eligible to apply for the funding. And there is various comments and suggestions of how this can be possibly done. So I do, once again, do encourage you to spend time and read through this.

I think in the next agenda item we will talk about the next steps but I would like to still right now I would like to see anybody else has some comments for this summary.

One thing I also wish to point out at this stage is that we didn't bring this up but there was a Board - a letter from the Board around the, you know, the time during or after - please correct me if I'm wrong - the letter during or after the Barcelona meeting, you know, letter asking us for some clarification and so - for that - for this particular Board letter we did put some - a summary here in this document saying that we need to work on further reply to the Board letter. So I guess that will be an action item for sure for the next steps.

Okay, anybody have any further questions other than the document or the format of the document or how easy to read the - read it here? If not, I think we - for us so I guess you would - it will still leave to the members and your SO and AC to read through the - some of the comments and, I mean, maybe the members would help us to make more concrete suggestions on in particular the leadership, I mean, recommendation.

So I'd like to probably move to the next agenda item, Number 4, is the next step and the proposed timeline. So spend from now to Kobe we - I mean, there is only sort of 1.5 month away from the next ICANN meetings. And we - from - if you read through the summary of comments, there's also a potential decision that we need to make is that whether there's a need for a second public comment period simply - I mean, simply because of there's quite a good number of new ideas being brought up in the comment period. So we somehow still need to - we still need to address that.

So for this may I - so may I ask first for example, Marika, how do you see from the general, you know, process approach is that, you know, what's your feeling that maybe we should give the group, let's say, another two to three weeks to digest and come back with the comments and then I think by the end of - by the next meeting we will have some judgment on whether there's a potential second comment period needed or whether we can produce - we can proceed to produce the kind of - an updated report for the group to comment. What's your take on this?

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Ching. This is Marika. On that specific question, I think probably more time is needed to make that assessment. And my suggestion would be indeed for the group to work through the comments, you know, work on its report and make updates, you know, as needed. And then I kind of when you have your, you know, updated report I think then you're probably in the right position to make an assessment of, you know, are the changes that have been made substantial enough to warrant another round of public comments or in the end have you more fine-tuned your existing recommendations in line with public comments and as such you can move straight to a final report.

I think it may be premature to make that, you know, decision now because as said, you know, even though some people may have suggested, you know, to take a radically different approach, if at the end of the day as a result of, you know, deliberations and assessment of the input, the group decides that, you know, actually it should stick with, you know, what it originally recommended,

you know, you do need to of course, provide your rationale for, you know, why you didn't follow maybe some of the common suggestions, but, you know, it does mean that the report itself is fairly similar to the initial report and as such may not warrant another round of public comments.

However, if you of course go indeed in a completely different direction and, you know, come up with an option that's completely different from what was put on the table during the initial report, you know, you may want to consider having a public comment period on the proposed final report or whatever you call it; or it could be as well on kind of, you know, specific aspects of the report that you're changing and that you specifically want input on that very specific issue.

In that sense there's, you know, the group is not restrained by, you know, what it should be putting out or what form that takes for the various approaches you could consider there. You know, what you probably will want to talk through as well as part of next steps and proposed timeline and, you know, there are of course, you know, substantial number of items that have been identified, you know, for further consideration and discussion.

And I think one of the questions there may be what is the best way of dealing with that? You know, does the group believe it's kind of collectively going through those items and kind of coming up with responses and then seeing how that impacts the final - how that impacts the report and the recommendations; is that the way to go? Is this something where, you know, offline work would be helpful? You know, do we line up some of those questions in the form of a Google Doc and ask people to kind of collaborate on the responses? You know, are some smaller teams helpful here to focus on, you know, a section of comments and work through those?

Again, I think there are a number of approaches that could be considered here and it may be helpful as well to get people's input on that because again that will then help us also kind of work on a draft timeline that kind of maps

the work, you know, between here and you know, either a draft final report or a final report and kind of work towards that timeline.

Ching Chiao: Got it. Yes, thank you, Marika, for the thoughts. I mean, so, I mean, so before I move the mic to Alan and Jonathan, I would like to, you know, say a few things on in particular this because I'm also for the one that who's been with the group since day one like many of you here.

It seems that at this point the initial report, I mean, even not consider some of the new ideas from the public comments I think with the process being, you know, time in the process being taken I think we have - sort of the group comes up with a pretty solid one and even though some of the, you know, the words as some of you pointed out, could be more concrete, could be less quote unquote (base), but I think right now is the time as shared by Alan previously is that it's really matter is how urgent we wish to kind of wrap up the work and move things forward.

I think this particular, you know, the next couple months I would imagine could be very critical for us. The personal level for myself is that opening up another comment period seems to be necessary to address the new ideas but that could lead to a, you know, open ended, you know, process that could, you know, could kind of make the whole, you know, the group thinks that the work, once again, being dragged along and, you know, people will start to feel a little bit more tired to join the, you know, join the work. So it's just, you know, the way I see it as, you know, with my personal capacity.

But let me hear from the - from others. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. By the way I've got some construction going on here so there may be some background noise. I'll try to keep my comments short though. I don't think we have a choice but to go out for another public comment because we just asked too many questions without any firm

recommendations in this one. But as Marika said, it may well be focused on only particular things.

The other thing is looking at the comments, the range - the diversity and strong comments for and against individual mechanisms and things like that indicate to me that we're probably never going to come to a full unanimous decision and no matter what we decide there are going to be some parts of the community who are against it.

And I'm not quite sure how to get around that; maybe we'll find a middle ground but I'm not convinced. And I think we're going to have to accept that, that we are not going to get unanimity or even close to it on a number of the issues and particularly on the model. Thank you.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Alan. We have Jonathan next.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Frost: This is Jonathan Frost for the record. Can you hear me okay?

Ching Chiao: Yes, we hear you very well.

Jonathan Frost: Great. Great. I just want to say I mean, I agree with Marika and Alan that, you know, it's possible that a new comment period might be needed. I would say that I would tend to think that it would be needed more to the extent that we're not able to integrate the feedback from the community into the existing report. I think it makes, I mean, I think it makes sense to bring as much into it as we possibly can because it's a community-based report. But we should kick it back to them to the extent that we're not able to give them exactly what they want.

Ching Chiao: Got it. Okay, thank you, Jonathan. And we have Robert next. Robert.

Robert Guerra: This is Robert Guerra speaking. Just echoing, you know, Jonathan and Alan said some of the things I wanted to say but I think if we're going to open up another comment period, you know, how is that going to be received? What type of comments is that going to create from the community? It's two years of work from a substantial pool of (unintelligible) that could advance a variety of different initiatives forward. Having that go forward is a good thing for the community and a good thing for ICANN. So I think going forward what do we want in addition to a perhaps an additional consultation?

I think one, we need to show that we are more focused in terms of what this group has been able to come to agreement on. If there's some differences of opinion or there's some options, those need to be clearly articulated, in essence show in a way part of what a report would look like but where we're seeing comments. And I think, you know, we just need to show a lot of progress. If we don't show progress there's going to be a lot of disquiet from the community and so I think we need to do a lot of work.

The comments made earlier, let's see what we can do as a group would be a good first step and try to have the call for comments try to be as focused and as narrowed so it's on a couple of key questions and not elicit the large number of comments that we've got now. And so let's not try to repeat this but just, you know, if there are some key things that we can't come to agreement on but just not having to go through 85 pages of comments, you know, is not something that I would be keen to see again. Thank you.

Ching Chiao: Thank you very much, Robert. Jonathan, is that a new hand or an old hand? Okay, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Ching Chiao: That's all right. Thank you very much. Yes, so I guess what I hear from at least from Alan, Jonathan and Robert is that, you know, a reservation for comment period, you know, there's pros and cons but more reservations

towards to a comment period, I mean, an additional comment period. But once again I think for the groups to digest - sorry, I'm seeing from the chat that writing and Daniel saying, "I will assume that I will tend to agree that a new public comment be as focused as possible," yes, thank you very much for the comments for this one.

Yes, so before - once again jumping to the decision on the next steps I think for us to really to digest this summary of comments. I think the leadership team will you know, to encourage the group to, you know, share thoughts in particular the, you know, the leadership - I mean, the recommendations. I would like to find a more concise and easier way for the groups to work on, you know, either to - either to agree or to, you know, to share with more views on the leadership recommendation.

So I guess for, you know, for this time - at this time I would like to maybe take this maybe to exchange further thoughts with Erika and also with Marika on how to help the group, you know, to focus on let's say the leadership recommendation at this time. Maybe one thought jumping out of my mind right now is to maybe to provide a two to three page summary of, you know, the leadership recommendation for those new ideas in particular let's, you know, maybe focus on this recommendation first.

But, I mean, obviously you're always welcome to address the other concerns, you know, from the comments from, you know, of the other SO and ACs. So I would like to take this back when Erika has time and then I'll exchange with her and try to come some, you know, some maybe, as I said, a shorter document for you to - for you to work on.

Yes, Marika, why don't you share what you're trying to put together or what you have in mind right now. Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Ching. This is Marika. Not anything particular in mind. You know, I would like to encourage the group instead of focusing on whether public

comment is needed or not, to really focus on reviewing the comments because as said, I think it will become clear, you know, going through the review and, you know, the changes that may result from it, you know, whether or not additional public comment is needed and how that, you know, can be conducted. So, you know, I think the first priority should really be on this.

And then what we can maybe do is, you know, basically give everyone a week to review this document and to kind of flag if you have any concerns about, you know, the leadership recommendations particularly with regards to how to deal with some of the comments and how to approach them. You know, following that week then I think staff can kind of maybe put together and of course the public comment review tool is already organized in a way that takes the topics together so we can maybe, you know, put those specific questions and next step together in a separate document so that the group can start, you know, working through and kind of organize it by themes or topics for upcoming calls.

And as said, you know, we'd still really appreciate any kind of input the group may have on how to best tackle, you know, going through those questions. Is that something that, you know, should be done plenary style and we just, you know, continue on our schedule of every two meetings and for each meeting we basically have a set of questions and issues that, you know, are to be discussed and kind of answered and from that, you know, we can then of course derive, you know, that changes if any need to be made the report.

Or is there another better way of working to get through this, because, you know, obviously, you know, going plenary-style, you know, will probably take a bit of time because, you know, as you can see there's quite a bit of input that has been provided. So as said, I think that may be, you know, next immediate step for the group to go through this. And I think, you know, you shouldn't also hesitate if you believe, you know, a suggestion is being made that the group already considered in detail and for good reason either, you

know, didn't go in that direction, I think that's also, you know, perfectly legitimate for the group to call out.

But as said, you know, there are still a lot of input that has been provided that the group will need to digest and kind of determine, you know, how that impacts, you know, work and recommendations.

Ching Chiao: Yes thank you, Marika. So I think we're in the same line in terms of focusing on the comments at this time. But I think it also helped the previous discussion, the last 20-30 minutes is to form, you know, the group I think kind of have a general feeling that we don't want another comment period, it's been enough time, we think at this time it's our goal to wrap things up, you know, in the shortest amount of time as possible as there's just so many - I mean, moving this is another, you know, PDPs going on.

So I think in order not to have another comment period, so it really matters that the group would - the members at least to focus on, you know, the review for this particular summary documents and comes up with the recommendations of who to move things along. So I think you know, as you know, just, I mean, following up previously about how the staff with the leadership team to help put together something easier for the members to review and to read so I would like to make that as one of the action items and talk to Erika when she's available.

I'm seeing in the chat room from Maureen asking how we supposed to deal with submission that where there are concerns especially if there are checks and further studies to be made of the submission idea. And there's response from Marika saying that the group - the CCWG will need to explain how those concerns were already considered or considered this concern - how this concern can be addressed whether it's through further checks for the study or for updates.

And I do recall that when during those comments some of the comments we would propose, I mean, some of the comments or suggestions, I mean, even need to be addressed in the next phase of the work. So once again really it's up to the group to work on and also to review.

I guess for this one the next step and the proposed timeline, are we comfortable with let's say, by the - prior to the next meeting which is two weeks from now, is the members here are comfortable with, you know, submitting your suggestions or ideas - or sorry, comments - for the summary reports? Is everybody okay with the time or do you need more time or do you have some other ways to - for us to tackle those papers?

I can see from the chat room Carolina saying, "Yes, that sounds okay." And Maureen has - there's still a follow up question. Yes, Marika, please answer if you can.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Ching. This is Marika. And I think now it donned on me what Maureen is specifically referring to. In the last column indeed, you know, there's usually a kind of - we have a preset of words we can select to kind of reflect, you know, what the comment is about so it's either I think it's agreement, concern, new idea. And, you know, maybe concern doesn't accurately reflect - it may not be specifically concern, it may just be, you know, flagging an issue or a topic that may need further consideration.

But we've kind of used, you know, the concern just in general to flag anything that's not agreement and anything that's not you know, a completely new idea; we have flagged that as concern. So I think you need to kind of take it a little bit with a grain of salt whether the comment is actually a concern or it's maybe just a suggestion for something the group, you know, should further consider or more of a question where, you know, someone may not be clear on, you know, whether something has been factored in or not.

So again, I think you, you know, it's really important just to kind of, you know, indeed review the comment and kind of assess, you know, what you think the commenter is asking for. And as said, we've tried to kind of flag that in that third column to kind of say, this is what the commenter is asking the CCWG to do but of course it's up to you to consider, you know, whether you want to go down that path or whether you are of the view that it's something you have already considered or whether there's just no support within the CCWG to go down that route for, you know, whatever reasons that you can, you know, explain or respond to in the public comment review tool. So I hope that helps clarify.

Ching Chiao: Yes thank you. Okay thank you for both Marika and Maureen to raise this. I guess this is helpful and also I mean, clarify the designation, I mean, the categories itself what does it mean by concern and new ideas. So I guess the general feeling that we need two weeks for the members and potentially going back to their perspective SO and ACs to sort of channel through the - this summary of comments and then when we get back to the others next time in two weeks from now we then will have, you know, the next opportunity to address specifically let's say a particular item to be pointing out and spend more times potentially some items that there's - we need to address for example a mechanism that needs to be further discussed, an allocation, a method that needs to be addressed or a particular project.

One way to discuss it is that in the next two weeks please let us know I mean, in this - in our mailing list that saying that this is something that we really think the group should be - should be, you know, taking into consideration before the final decision is made. So please do share your thoughts to us to any particular comments and also I mean, the recommendation that's put together by the leadership team. And then this will help us to organize what, you know, the potentially the next one or two meetings how the discussion can be moved forward.

So okay, so for this I guess we're good and at least some general ideas of, you know, some times and also whether we will allow the members to have more times to go back and forth on - in the comments from their groups. So let's move on to the next item is the plan for the next - for the Kobe meeting, ICANN 64.

So on the agenda box you see two times. We also received a kind of a notice from Marilyn, who's not able to join us. Let me see if she's in - no, she was mentioning the Wednesday meeting that the BCs and potentially some of us other SO and ACs may find the second slot on Wednesday a little bit challenging. And we all understand how, I mean, how scheduling in the ICANN meetings could, you know, put us in and out of the rooms and really could be really messy.

So for this one I think for the time being this is the best we can have. On the personal level, for myself I really would love to see this in a high level interest - high interest topic but it seems that we couldn't make it this time. I will also envision this to become something like a town hall meeting, so we will have specific members or SO and AC to share with their views on specific - on the specific topic.

So for this next one, I will assume that with the face to face I would imagine the goal for these two meetings, one is to really to sum up the work for the public comment period and then potentially the decision to either to start to work on the final report so we can present it for the Board; or that would be the time for us to really to say that hey, we just need more time and even we don't feel like doing that or we just need more time on this. So I guess that's - that would be something to be plan to be worked on.

Yes, Marika. Sorry, I didn't notice you. You raised your hand; please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes no worry at all, Ching. This is Marika. Yes, just to note that indeed at the request of the group we identified some additional time. Unfortunately it was not possible to kind of a half day, I think as Erika had suggested, so what we did find an additional slot on Wednesday. You know, Marilyn has indicated that that may be problematic for CSG participants as they have another session at that time, so we will have another look to see if there's any other slot available. But, you know, as Ching already noted, you know, the scheduling is always a challenge as, you know, there are many other meetings and of course especially in a cross community working group we have members from different communities that all have their own schedule and own challenges related to that.

However, what we will do, and as said, we'll first see if there's an alternative slot we could identify. But what we will do is send out a Doodle poll so we can assess the availability of members to participate in these sessions because I think these are in principle really foreseen as working sessions and we only have I think a couple of weeks to go before many people will start traveling to Kobe so it's likely that we'll still deep in public comment review at that stage so it is important that we have sufficient participation to make, you know, successful use of those sessions, you know, unless indeed there's another way in which the session can be used.

So please look out for that. And as said, you know, apologies if this is - these slots are difficult to attend but I think we're facing competition from a lot of different efforts that are also meeting at the Kobe meeting.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Marika. So that brought us to the next one, the next meeting, as I said, that will be two weeks from now, so a Wednesday the same time slot. I'll send that - many of you are with different working group especially the EPDP groups, and for myself I think I'm okay but we also need to confirm for Erika for her - if she is available. So but I think we will stick with the time on February 13 1400 UTC. If there's a change needed we will let everybody know as soon as possible.

So that would be the - this one. So anyone has question for, you know, for ICANN 64 or for the next meeting in two weeks' time? Okay, if not, yes, for - so there's - if there's any other business so just for myself because if you - so if you recall in the last meeting we do have one particular agenda that the group agrees to discuss is to kind of to reconfirm the membership.

It's not really to ask you to go back to your SO and AC saying that you need new - you need new volunteers, you need new people. In particular at this point of time it's being two years so many of you have been gone through this long road with us. We're kind of getting closer to, you know, to producing the - the end result but I mean, the reason for this item that I brought up once again also in the last call is we do see some change of the attendance seems dropping but it seems that for this particular one that potentially maybe it's, I mean, everybody's - most people are going back to the normal working mode and it seem that this particular one that it's going back to the, I mean, kind of the normal level.

So I'd just like to just to be ensure that we're kind of getting close and really wish that the members could stay, you know, with us and then to make sure that, you know, the participation level is good enough. So Marika, you have anything to add on this?

Marika Konings:	No thanks, Ching. Yes, no I'm here. Nothing to add. Just, you know, as you said, and I think that it's something that, you know, Erika has noted beforehand as well and it may also be an opportunity to kind of flag to the different chartering organizations where things stand, you know, what next steps are and indeed also remind them of, you know, the importance of having members actively participate because, you know, the further we get along the closer we'll get to a final report and potential consensus call that would involve the members.

Ching Chiao: Absolutely, yes. I mean, yes, your active participation and also when we get to the time for a consensus call that's really matters is if enough members and joining the level of participation is good enough to make sure that the final report is - has a group representation and from the SOs and ACs. So I guess that's the item from me. So any other business from the members? Any kind of words before we close the call today? Seems that we are on the top of the hour and we're good and so I guess we're good with this call.

If I'm not hearing anybody I will once again wish you a very good week ahead and see you on the next call. Thanks very much for joining us this time. Thank you.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END