ICANN Transcription
CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds
Wednesday 05 June 2019 at 14:00 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://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/T2SSjB552bgZT70mRj3hw54MAtA2reymBxrU4V_ogK1aOsuQQ5erBete7PPHK6O7

Zoom Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/IBer3zqs9dt7H0KmjSswOgeoWpJ09nHyr0SPjTowIR5y-1ibED81WubitWMnn3Ek

Attendance is on the wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/m4yGBg
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page: https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

JULIE BISLAND: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds call on Wednesday the 5th of June 2019.

In the int4erest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, let yourself be known now.

Okay, hearing no names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute

---

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Julie. Thanks so much for the help as well. So the first two item I would love to mention briefly on behalf of the leadership team, so first of all, apologies again that we had to cancel the meeting two weeks ago. It was just not possible for Ching and for myself to arrange and we had sudden flight changes and none of us could manage it. So apologies for this.

And then I like to apologize for Marika today. She can't be with us, I believe she needs to – I forgot what she has to do, but she can't be with us, and she sent all of us her apologies for this.

Having said this, let's come to the question whether we have any updates concerning the conflict of interest declaration. No? That's not the case? Okay. Then let's do the point agenda item three update on status of outstanding action items. So there's a reminder, CCWG to regularly review overview of CCWG agreements to date, and the latest version is posted here, but the latest version, I believe, was sent to us as well when Marika and the team sent the agenda for today.

So this is just extremely important, because it captures all the items where we have achieved an agreement, and insofar it's always very easy for us to check whether the topics we believe the topics are covered or whether we want to come back to one point. Hopefully not, but in the case we have to do it, we can see it here.

Okay, then we have come to the first point, the subpoint A, board input in relation to Annex C, [1C] attachment. Can we see this now? And who is introducing it? Joke, are you ready to introduce it, or is it Emily?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hi, Erika. It will be Emily introducing it, but give me one moment and I'll pull up the screen.

ERIKA MANN: Absolutely.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Joke. I've put into the chat the document that was attached to the agenda for today, which is the full board input in relation to annex C. What Joke is bringing up now is following on to our discussion last month where we left off. Just to remind everyone – it was almost a month ago – what we discussed so far and what's yet to be discussed.

So last time around – and this is the template for annex C, so we've been working through these templates for the public comment feedback, and this is the one that we started to discuss on the last call.

So you'll recall that the group discussed concern by the board noting that there might be inconsistencies with the examples provided in Annex C and the consistency issues between the objectives and ICANN's mission, which therefore could result in confusion during the application and selection, and may result in challenges against the selection process. So that was the concern raised by the board.

And some of the things that were discussed by the group one the last call were that additional clarifying language might need to be added. There was a question of whether there could be legal risks involved in including the list, and the question raised of whether it should be potentially excluded or whether there was a different way to provide sufficient guidance to the evaluators.

So I believe we have Becky on the call today and Maarten as well, so under this agenda item, we're going to talk a little bit further about some of the issues raised on the last call, and also provide the opportunity for Becky and Maarten to provide additional clarification on the board comments. And it may be helpful for folks to open up that document in the

chat with the full content of the comments. I'll pass it back to you, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Thank you so much, Emily. I will not be able to open it the same time the other document, then I loose the steering function. Plus I had to take out my contact lenses, so I'm a little bit – will be difficult to move between two screens without my contact lenses. So whenever something comes up, Emily, you believe I missed, or we need to refer back to the document, please be so kind, just remind me and then just step in and do this. Or if Ching is able to open the document.

So you mentioned – I'm just checking if Becky is with us and Maarten. Maarten definitely is, and Becky as well. Maarten, would you be able to maybe take the lead on this topic?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Becky [inaudible].

ERIKA MANN: Becky, [inaudible] from you. I believe last time in the side e-mail exchange we had, I believe it was you, but it's totally fine. Whoever wants to do it from the both of you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I missed law school, hence Becky [can do it.]

ERIKA MANN: Okay. Can somebody check if Becky is on mute?

BECKY BURR: I am on mute.

JULIE BISLAND: Go ahead, Becky.

BECKY BURR: Can you hear me now?

ERIKA MANN: Yes.

BECKY BURR: Okay, great. Apologies. I'm getting a lot of feedback here. Apologies for –

ERIKA MANN: Becky, wait a second. Somebody needs to mute their mic, please. Can you all check, please, and go on mute? Thank you. Back to you, Becky.

BECKY BURR: Okay. I had a scheduling conflict, but I did go through all of the notes from the call, and Maarten and I spoke about it. So we just wanted to take a moment to step back and share how we are thinking about it and how the board's thinking about it. The bylaws prohibit ICANN from acting outside of its mission to ensure stable and secure operations of the unique identifiers, and then it goes on to say precisely what ICANN's role is. So with respect to names, it's coordinating the allocation and assignments of names in the zone and coordinating policy development through the bottom-up process, facilitating coordination and operation of the DNS root system, coordinating allocation and assignment of IP numbers and collaborating with others to provide registries for internet specifications.

That's the mission. Any use of the auction proceeds has to stay within the specified mission. In addition, the board has, I think, been clear that its view is that the auction proceeds should not be used for ongoing operations but that ongoing operations should be subject to the budget discipline.

So when we take both of these things together, we're thinking that the first thing that needs to happen is – you have an application for a project, and the first thing that needs to happen – and this is sort of a mandatory first step, is, does the project application propose to do something that

is within ICANN's mission? And I think the CCWG will come up with recommendations at least for how an independent review panel might make an initial evaluation of it, but just to note that this is a fiduciary obligation of the board, so that can't be – if the board feels like something is outside of its mission, it has to have a way to express that.

But if it is within the mission, then the next question in the board's view is, is this ongoing operations? And our preference is that if it is, that it would be ineligible. And then once those two questions are answered and resolved, then the it should be evaluated against the criteria that are proposed by the community through the CCWG auction proceeds process and then approved by the board. So we wanted to make sure that people understand how we're thinking about the analysis, which is this mandatory first step of, is it in mission?

And then we do think that in the final report, it should call out the at least the mission and preferably the mission and ongoing operations as sort of mandatory gating considerations in the way that it's evaluated.

The other thing that the board Is a little bit concerned about an and hopes – and maybe wasn't clear enough – is that we're not entirely sure how the objectives in recommendation two and the guidelines for review in annex C are to be applied by the evaluators. Are they all

mandatory? Are all of the criteria, the objectives in recommendation two mandatory, or do you just have to hit one of them? How mandatory versus aspirational are the guidelines?

And in particular, things like guideline three that encourages certain types of project and guideline four that establishes the goal for projects that implicates diversity, participation and inclusion, those seem to articulate priorities and goals rather than mandatory requirements. And so we were just indicating that we thought a little bit more precision on those points, what's mandatory, what's aspirational, would be helpful guidance.

So I hope that that it sort of gets at the discussion, and we are happy to have a conversation and answer questions.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Becky. Much appreciated. Let me give you – I believe you were not with us, and I believe Maarten was with us, but you joined the team a little bit later. So we come back to this point again and again, and it seems to be for part of the community a critical aspect, and the question from the very beginning was that some asked from our group, if a project is put forward which falls nearly within the mission but maybe not 100%, so it's not covering maybe all of the areas which should be covered, so the question then

arises, shall evaluators still look at it and judge it on its merit? Or should it be rejected from the very beginning?

So we are talking like which is typical in funding environments where you have set goals, and where you have a scoping environment, a funding scoping environment, that's totally natural. But then sometimes, we see projects which are so attractive and so interesting, and they are, let's say, 80% covering the mission, but not maybe for 20% outside of the scope.

So the question then is, do we still then want evaluators to look at it, or do we want to neglect it? So that's one of the issues which we continue to struggle with. And the second issue is the guidance. And I believe you're totally right, we need to have more clarity about the legal nature – let me use the word legal nature – of the guidelines, because that's true, we have to be clear, are they mandatory or are they not mandatory? What kind of character duty you have in case somebody is contesting in the future a case even if we don't have a procedure implemented for contesting a rejection of a project? Or we may not have a procedure in place, the topic we are still discussing, but even then, it can be still contested. So what kind of characters do these kinda guidelines have? I believe we need to do this.

It's maybe too early, maybe we want to wait until the very end. This would be my recommendation, and then have a

team reviewing it and coming back to us once we have finalized the guidelines and the guidance then to come back to us with a recommendation.

But thank you so much, Becky. I think that's extremely helpful. Let me look if somebody's raising their hand. No.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Erika –

ERIKA MANN: Yes, Maarten, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: What you just said, it's either contributing to the mission, or it's not. We don't expect all projects to fully cover the mission or whatever. It's just clear that it needs to contribute to the mission, otherwise that's not consistent with our fiduciary duties.

So I think it's really that no proposal will ever be fully covering the mission, but it needs to be relevant. We need to be able to justify it from the mission. So I think that's where we'll find out way.

ERIKA MANN:	Yeah. And you'll remember – just to remind everybody, we tried different versions to resolve this problem. One was that we had a separate chapter where we tried to capture the intention of what we are talking about, and then I believe it was the board, it was you, actually, Maarten who went to the board and you came, if I remember well, with language saying supporting the mission so that we would have a little bit of flexibility in the language and the past language we had selected. So we may have to come back to this point, but I think we have an understanding what we want. [There are] people with us. I'm not sure if they can join us today. One is Elliot, and Alan, both are [inaudible] recommending to have a broader scope and not just to be – I don't want to misquote them, yes, to do things which are supporting the mission, but which may serve a greater purpose as well.
	So since both can't be with us, I believe we may have to continue the discussion next time. But somebody else maybe who want to make a comment concerning this item. Let me check quickly. No. Okay, then I think we can stop here maybe. The discussion can move on. And Joke, maybe we are able to summarize. So the key point is we will have to continue the discussion and we definitely have to ensure that those who are actually pursuing a little bit different context [to] Elliot and Alan, we may have to come back to this point when both are with us. And the second would be the action item to put a reminder that we review the guidelines at the

very end and we clarify the nature of the guidelines. Joke, to you, please. Or Emily, whoever wants to capture the action item points.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. Joke is taking notes, and I'm sure she'll let us know if she has any clarification questions on capturing that, but it sounds like you summarized it quite well. So if there aren't any other questions or things to cover on that agenda item, we can move on to the next one. It's 3B, which is a follow-up on action items by the leadership team.

Would it be helpful, Erika, if we just ran through those items that are outstanding and provide a status update on those?

ERIKA MANN: Absolutely. Please.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. One moment, I'll share that document. Is everyone able to see the agreements document now? I'll assume yes, unless I hear otherwise. Great. Thanks, Vanda.

So the first item was number one, it's highlighted right at the top of the screen here that the leadership team was to prepare first drafts in a Google doc of the requests that would go to ICANN Org regarding what the expectations are

to a cost-benefit analysis. And you'll recall that that cost-benefit analysis was something that was put in the public comments for the CCWG to do some additional work on that.

And currently, the leadership team is in the process of scheduling a meeting with Xavier to discuss some of the similarities and differences in the financial models between the different mechanisms to inform the drafting of that document.

So that is underway, but still in the works. And it looks like actually Becky had another point on the previous item. So maybe we should go back and then go back to Becky and then we can continue on. Becky, do you want to go ahead?

BECKY BURR: I was just going to add it into the chat. We don't need to take time now.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. No problem.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Becky.

EMILY BARABAS: Thank you,

ERIKA MANN: [inaudible] let me maybe explore this option a little bit more to give some more insight into it. So we have, I believe, more than one comment related to this item where community members and the public raise points in saying, "Look, these different mechanisms are interesting, but how about understanding the cost-benefit environment with regard to each of the mechanisms?"

Now, I have done some work on this in the past in the context of some of the funds I was working with, so I evaluated the history how we had done this in the past, and then I checked the best [inaudible] and the best practice models which I could find from major companies, corporations who are providing services for such cost-benefit analyses, and I reviewed them and then came to practically two conclusions.

One is that apparently, independently of the model one selects, there are obvious [cofactors] which are pretty much identical and which will change only to a minimum degree. But then there's some other factors which actually changed quite drastically depending on the model one is selecting.

So what we want to do in this call with Xavier, to identify the similarities and the differences between the model based on the existing best practice models as far as we can apply them to our environment.

So that's the background. So we haven't scheduled the call yeah. We're in the process of scheduling the call. And if you have examples what we should look at or if you want to provide us with some information concerning this topic or you want to join us, please just let us know. Emily, I think we can cover the next item.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. Appreciate you providing that additional context. The next item was number 21, that the leadership team was going to work with Alan Greenberg to discuss the potential role of a community advisory committee. And the reason that Alan was singled out there is because he was the only one to volunteer to have that discussion. So that conversation has been kicked off by e-mail and is still in progress, and the leadership team will continue to provide updates on that as it progresses. And there will be an opportunity for everyone else to provide input as well once some initial thoughts are on paper.

ERIKA MANN: Yes.

EMILY BARABAS: Do you want to add anything to that?

ERIKA MANN:	No, I don't want to add anything. The only thing I want to draw attention to, maybe, is that this is a topic we haven't discussed in the past much. It's an item which came up again and again. So the role of the community, we mentioned many times, but we never clearly identified the role. And we have two approaches currently on the table.

So one approach is – and this is not mentioned in topic item 21 – what kind of role shall the community have in evaluating after a certain time, after a certain period, how the CCWG auction proceeds are working. Is it working well? Are they a project on target? Etc.

So this is the evaluation function. And the second function which came up is an advisory function. And again, we do have bits and pieces which were mentioned in different comments, and so what we are trying to do now to come up with a recommendation which we then will want to bring forward to you so that you can evaluate it and then can add the things you believe shall be added or take out aspects which you believe make no sense in our environment.

Back to you, Emily. I'm checking if somebody wants to raise, but I can't see a hand raised, so I believe it is accepted and understood what we're trying to explain here. Emily, back to you.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. And maybe I'll just read out the comment from Becky on the previous topic in case anyone is having trouble seeing the chat. Becky says the bylaws prohibit ICANN from acting outside its mission. So this is nonnegotiable. The bylaws also use the phrase "in service of its mission." We'd suggest using that language.

Of course, as Maarten said, a project need not serve all of the parts of ICANN's mission, but it must serve or further some aspects of the mission.

ERIKA MANN: Yes. Thank you, Becky. That's understood. The real concern of this group is about if we don't provide certain guidance, that future evaluator may turn down interesting projects. But this, what you just mentioned, we have covered in all of the languages so far. Thank you so much for it again. Emily, please.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. We are again looking at action item number 33. The leadership team had an item to propose a hierarchy of how to discuss and approach certain different related items that continue to come up. So things like the evaluation process, the role of the community review, role of evaluators and the correction mechanism. And this is [inaudible] progress. It's something that leadership team is continuing to

work on, and I'm sure if other folks have input on that, that will be welcome as well. Is there anything you wanted to add on that, Erika?

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Just a reminder, Emily. This topic came up, and at the very beginning we started reviewing the comments we received during the public comment period. Some of you may remember this. And in many of the comments we received, there were recommendations related to evaluation or to advisory role of the community. And they all captured a different environment, but they were all relevant. So Elliot then said, why don't we stop this here? And we did then, and we said we'll do this evaluation throughout all of the comments we have received, and we will build a kind of hierarchy just to understand the nature of the comments we received and the recommendations we received, and then we will bring this in one coherent overview and document and bring it back to you for further evaluation.

EMILY BARABAS: Perfect, thanks. Erick. And I think we'll leave it there for number 33 and then move on to the final item for leadership, which is number 36. So this is the leadership to put a question forward to the board liaisons based on the comments asking for clarification on the input. So basically, this is the agenda item we just previously talked about

regarding annex C. So we can just consider that closed and move on to the next agenda item unless there's anything you want to add, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: No, there's nothing to add. I will just say the item is not closed, because it's a topic I believe we need to keep open until the very end once we finalized the review of the comments we received. But it is closed insofar as we don't need to talk about it today anymore. That's correct, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. So that's it for the action items, and then the final thing to talk about is the small group discussion that is underway over e-mail, and there are quite a few small groups and little side projects. So just to remind everyone what this is, this was Marylin, Elliot, Jonathan, Alan and Maureen, and they were working on potential guidance about how to establish what is in the ICANN operational budget versus what may have been funded on a more exceptional basis [and] potentially clarify some of the conditions around funding with a piece of language that could be used in the final report.

So there's a meeting scheduled for later this week for the group. There's been some productive discussion on e-mail, but the group is going to sit down and have a conversation

and try to hammer out some language there. Anything to add there, Ching or Erika?

ERIKA MANN: Emily, I believe it would be great for everybody else to see the agenda item we are currently talking about. I can't see it. I'm still with the last, annex C leadership, item 36. So maybe it's just me. If it's just me, then forget what I'm saying. If everybody else can see it, it's fine.

EMILY BARABAS: It's not just you. I think Julie is able to pull that up.

JULIE BISLAND: Getting that now. One moment.

ERIKA MANN: It makes it just easier to see. And then I would love to hear if somebody from the small group is able just maybe to talk about what they have come up with so far and what kind of understanding they do have so that everybody is informed about it. But if you believe it's still too early and you rather prefer to do it next time, that's fine too. But just let me ask the members from the small group. I believe Marylin was on it, Jonathan, if I remember this correct, and then you have to help me, Emily, with the rest of names. Somebody in the

group who would be able to talk about it? No? Okay. Doesn't look like it, Emily. Either we have no connection – because it's not typical that everybody is so silent. I wonder – oh, there is Maureen, I believe. Maureen, please. Is it you?

MAUREEN HILYARD:　　Yes. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN:　　Wonderful. Thank you so much. I was really concerned nobody is there.

MAUREEN HILYARD:　　No, I just wanted to – on behalf of the group, and I do realize that some members are here – and just to initiate some discussion at our next meeting, of course, which hi think is tomorrow, something like that. I've actually put forward another amendment based on the discussions that we've had. But I must admit in light of what we've been talking about today, one of the key things has been like our very first sentence, which is at the moment, the current proposal that we're making is, first sentence is consistency with the ICANN mission is a necessary but not sufficient condition for funding.

So that is something that we've just been talking about and need to – how do we get that balance between, as you say,

the rotoscope that people feel should be included in there. So yes, it should be a productive meeting that we have, and I think that that's probably what – we've been having e-mail discussions, and just really appreciated Sam's contribution there.

But I think the discussion that we have together will be very valuable. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Maureen. Thank you so much for the introduction. Anybody else who would love to comment on it? So Becky, maybe to Becky and Maarten, I believe everybody in this group understands that what we are trying to do must fall within the mission. But there is some concern, and you just heard this from Maureen too, and this is a concern which exists from the very beginning, not to narrow it down too much to the technical aspects of the mission.

I think these are valid concerns, and they're not just happening in out environment, but they often happen in other environments as well that you have a great fund and you have wonderful ideas, but you scope it too narrowly and then most of the even super valuable project ideas you receive, you have to turn down because of legal risk involved because the scoping might create legal risk if you would actually accept a project if it's not totally within the mission.

So these are the concerns which were raised, and you just heard a similar concern from Maureen. So I believe we will have to continue the discussion and have to wait until the language which we received from the group – and since Sam is part of the discussion, I believe you will be able to come up with a recommendation which will work for all of us, hopefully. But I'm just seeing Becky. Becky, please.

BECKY BURR: I just want to point out that ICANN's mission is clear and enumerated, but it is complex and it is not limited to strictly technical issues related to security and stability as those are defined in the OED. You have to read the ICANN bylaws, the articulation of the bylaws in light of the two annexes that are there as well. and I think you may be focusing too much on sort of dictionary definitions of stability and security as opposed to thinking about ICANN's mission more holistically and in the full light. So, so maybe this concern is just maybe we just need to think about, have a discussion about what ICANN's mission encompasses.

So that's just one thing that I wanted to say at this point, because it just occurred to me that we keep talking about narrow technical and, obviously there are strongly technical aspects about it, but that is not the full scope of ICANN's mission. If it was, WHOIS would probably be – I don't know. There are there are things that we do that we believe very

much are within our mission that might not fit the dictionary definition of stability and security.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Thank you, Becky, for the explanation. I think you're right. The terms I use – I have a little paper in front of me which are [inaudible] we discussed this topic, and these are all the points raised by someone from our group. So the technical and the narrow understanding, etc., came up during our discussion. I have a little book where I write this down just to be sure that I captured the spirit of what everybody is saying.

So I think you mentioned two aspects which are extremely important and we want to put this to our action item, Emily and Joke. And this is the word which you used, holistic, which I believe is a very good word in describing what we want to – and pointing to the fact what we want to achieve.

And the second one is that we may want to review as well the way we have talked about this topic at the beginning and when the topic comes up in our recommendation again. And just to check if we have included all the needed references to the bylaws. My memory is that we have done this, but maybe we haven't been precise enough, so maybe we want to check this.

And this might then already solve part of the problem we are trying to solve. Emily, do you want to repeat the action item, or do you believe it's sufficiently clear so that – or Joke, do you want to repeat it [to everyone] so that we have a clear understanding about this point?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hi, Erika. You mentioned two points, actually, that the CCWG agrees upon. First of all, you mentioned a holistic description of what we want to achieve. Could you perhaps clarify a little bit on what exactly is meant there?

ERIKA MANN: I would say you just write down the word "holistic" as a reminder. This was something Becky just brought up in her comment. And the reference was that she rightly pointed to the fact that we're not just talking about – the mission is not just talking about the technical missions but it's talking about many other aspects as well.

She then made two references. One was related to a more holistic understanding, which is as word which I believe is a good one for what we're trying to capture, and the second is a reference to certain aspects of the bylaws which capture the spirit of a more holistic approach as well.

So I just want you to capture the word "holistic." I have taken note about what we want to do here, and I can always go back to [Becky] as well if I wasn't right or if she wants to add something.

And the second one is the reference to check the bylaws if in our original recommendation and the text which we have made public for the public comment period we captured all these aspects correctly or not, or if something is missing here.

JOKE BRAEKEN: That's all clear. Thank you very much.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Joke. Thanks a million. Becky, I don't see your hand, so I believe you are in agreement. I'm not moving the chat room [right now] as well, because otherwise I lose the screen to see if somebody wants to make a comment. Maureen, I think this is helpful for you as well, this discussion. So when Maureen, Marylin, Jonathan and everybody else who is in the small group, I believe that's part of the discussion you want to have as well in your small team discussion.

Okay, Emily, back to you. Next item.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. We're moving on to the next agenda item, which is number four, going back to the continuing to review comments using the review templates. So we're going to bring up the annex C input –thanks, Joke – and start with comment two because we already just talked about comment one. That was the board and put on annex C during an earlier agenda item.

And so everyone should see comment two from the BC on their screen. And actually, Joke, do you mind going up to the top of this document, just to remind everyone what we're talking about? So the overarching question is, as a result of the input provided during the public comment period, should there a CCWG reconsider annex C of the initial report? If yes, why? If no, why not? And if it's not possible to make a determination at this stage, what input or information would be necessary to make this determination? So that's just a little bit of context about what we're trying to do as we consider these points.

So Joke, do you mind scrolling down back to the BC comment? Perfect, thank you. So the feedback received from the BC was that the CCWG should consider whether the board statements regarding annex C number four and five were overly cautious and ignore the benefits of community engagement support. And just to provide a little bit of context on that, the board had previously provided input that annex C number four and five had the potential to

EN

be interpreted as directing the use of auction proceeds funds for ICANN's ongoing operations.

So this is actually a topic we've discussed earlier in this call, and since the small group is addressing it, it may be something that we can just sort of wrap into the work that they're doing. And the leadership recommendation there was to clarify whether such an application of projects from the ICANN community shall be allowed. And if yes, language and project role and scope for projects triggered requested from the communities may have to be clarified.

So again, this this ties very much into the small group work that's ongoing here.-But Erika, is there anything else you wanted to provide in terms of context for the leadership recommendation?

ERIKA MANN: No, not really. I believe that's the work the small group shall do, and should look into this topic as well. But I'm just checking if somebody wants to raise a point, maybe somebody from the BC. Marylin, are you fine that this be pushed to the small group as well? Since you're a member there, it should be easy for you to handle that.

I believe Marilyn has an issue today.

MARYLIN CADE: No, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Oh, there she is. I was worried. I thought you can't hear us or something is wrong. Please [inaudible].

MARYLIN CADE: I just have a bad cough so I didn't want to be disruptive. I think we could handle it in the small group.

ERIKA MANN: Wonderful. Thank you so much. And I think it fits perfectly well into the work you're already doing. Thank you so much for this. Okay, Emily, then Joke, you need to put this on the action item so that you just capture what we just discussed so that this topic item will be handled by the small group as well. And then Emily, next item, please.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. And we're going to be updating these templates with all of the notes from today and circulating those via the Wiki. So everyone will have all of that information as well. I know Marika does it in real time, but the two of us together are only part of Marika.

Next, we're going to go on to annex D. So that was the end of annex C input and we'll just go on to annex D input. And I think Joke's going to pull that off as well. Perfect.

So similar to the questions that we're considering for annex C, annex D ,the question is as a result of the public comment period, should honesty be reconsidered? This was the example projects list. If yes, why? If no, why not? And if it's not possible to make this determination,, what additional work needs to be done to make the determination?

So I think we can scroll down now to the first item there. The first comment was from Jonathan Frost, and he is making a suggestion about a new gTLD global awareness campaign. And the CCWG may want to consider whether such a campaign would be in scope of ICANN's mission and consistent with ICANN's integrity in light of arguments provided by the commenter.

So the leadership recommendation here was to consider whether we want to recommend a basket approach for specific projects that relate to specific goals and suggest that we could do something like that a global awareness campaign related project could target a specific educational basket dependent on project evaluation, such as a project that would go forward or not, and suggest that the checklist approach could be another approach that helps create competition and innovation.

So, noting that this sort of ties into a broader question about annex D and concerns raised by the board previously about the role of annex D, this has been discussed on the last call and also previously, that having a list of examples could create confusion about whether it's a list for people to use as reference when they're applying and what happens if someone applies for funds with a project that matches something on this list. Does that create additional problems?

So this all ties again into some of the bigger questions that were asked. So I don't know if Becky has anything else to say regarding the sort of board concerns about annex D or if Erick wants to clarify further the leadership recommendation provided here. Thanks.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Emily. Let me check. Emily, just let me make a compliment to you and to Joke, because I know you joined this group quite late, and so I think you're doing immensely good work, and I'd just like to thank you. So don't judge what you are doing against what Marika is doing. I think you're doing immensely good work for us. Thank you for all the support you provide us.

So second, the topic is extremely important, and we discussed it before, but we never came to a conclusion. So let me talk first about the list of examples. I liked the list a lot. And when it came up as the idea, it was exactly to provide

some guidance for future evaluator to allow them to look at it once they receive a project and they not totally certain is that within the mission of without the mission, to get them some guidance to evaluators against the list of examples, because this was a kind of test bed of something we did.

Now, one has to be clear that once you have such a list, of course, there are certain risk involved, they're many fold. They're probably even more than we can imagine right now. There can be legal risk, there can be a risk insofar as somebody might challenge the turn down of a project because somebody then might argue, "but it's similar to what was captured in this example list," etc.

So I believe we have to definitely take a decision about this. We don't need to do it today, but at least at the end of our review of the comments we received, we have to take a decision about it. And what I would love to do actually is to ask Sam. I'm not sure if she's with us today. But if she isn't – yes, she is. Then maybe just to just to review this topic and just clarify what kind of risk [inaudible] involved. And if there are certain risks, how she would recommend we mitigate this. There are different ways in doing and how to deal with such an example is, or we can totally ignore it. But in the context of the way we work these public comments, I don't believe we are able to do it. So we would probably have to do something else to mitigate any potential risk. Maarten, I see you. Your hand is raised, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Further to the question on clarification [inaudible] annex C, I think most importantly, it's important to consider what's already in the operational budget. While recognizing that activities could be or portions of it could be in the scope or not, the most important fact will be to look at – so how does it go against the operational activities? As we always said, these are the two main points that are key to consider before adding budget to these activities or acknowledging budget to these activities.

So when we see that part of this may fit in the mission but here's already operational budget available, that would take it out of funding as such. Does that make sense?

ERIKA MANN: I hear you, but I know that we have many members which have a slightly modified opinion about this, because they raise the point and argue – and hopefully somebody will do it themselves today – so they raise the point and argue that the operational budget gets smaller and smaller, and might even get smaller in the future, but there might be projects which are so important and which would have been funded on the operational budget in the past, but are not going to be funded because of budgetary constraints in the future. Shall these not be then considered? So if you make a very tight connection like you just did, Maarten, then practically it is not

possible at all. So I see Marylin. Let me take in Marylin, and maybe somebody else want to raise and come back to this point. That's okay, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, just to make clear that – just to finalize that for clarity. When it is in the operational budget, it's part of the discretion of the community of how much of the money they think is needed for it. Operational budget is not determined by the board. It's really the product of our joint activity. So just please consider that as well.

if new situations appear, then they'll have new discussions. But for now, this seems to be the approach that is necessary. But Marylin, you may have a different opinion.

MARYLIN CADE: A very strong different opinion.

ERIKA MANN: Marylin, please go ahead. [inaudible].

MARYLIN CADE: Maarten, thank you, and Becky, for the time you're devoting to this, but I'm going to challenge you just a little bit– and I hope in a productive way – about your statement that the

budget is discussed with the community and it's not determined by the board.

In fact – and I have been involved in ICANN budget working group since it was formally established. I was part of the four, five people, including Chuck Gomes and a few others, Tony Holmes, who initiated the idea of having community input on the budget. But I want to be very clear that we do get a chance to provide comments on the budget, but we do not determine the budget.

ICANN Org prepares a budget, and in some cases, due to changes in revenue flow, certain activities that were previously available to the community such as the special projects fund or travel for five CROP travelers, was significantly diminished in the eyes of the community. There are other examples of that.

So I use that as an example to you because those of us who are in the community and are trying to use a combination of ICANN resources and resources that may be available independently to make sure that broad and diverse participation can continue and engagement can continue.

And I'm not criticizing the work that ICANN does, I'm just pointing out that experience has shown us that certain resources previously available are not available in that same amount. So here's my two examples.

CROP, the community support program, is now available three seats only per year. There's an extended deadline for application, which creates another burden for the community in trying to meet those deadlines. There's no out of region travel using CROP even when the best speaker or outreach person might be living in a different region.

So those are more limited, constrained resources than were previously available, and than the community has called for. If you have a chance to read the outreach strategy [program documents] that have to be submitted from each of the community groups, then you'll see a description of what we're all doing, how we're using the ICANN funding, but how more funding is needed.

So just because something is partly funded in the ICANN operational budget, I think it would be quite unfair to say that a similar activity that is also in support of the ICANN mission should not be considered.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Marilyn. Maarten, would you like to comment on this?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I just would want to warn against taking the budget discussions if in the operational budget discussions things

are determined to be divided like that. We need to be very careful in saying, "Well, why not use this other pool of money?" The auction proceeds, as discussed so far, were always used for investments [up and beyond] the operational budget, and changing this would be a major change to what has been set over the last three years, I think.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Maarten. it's a discussion. It's one like the other ones we had before, it's a discussion we are coming back to again and again, and at the end, we will have to take a decision, but it has to be a decision everybody is able at least the large majority is able to support and decision which will find support from the SOs and the ACs, and it must be [inaudible] by the board, and the management team as well.

So the leadership recommendation which you see here was an idea which we had debated as well in the past, but one of the items we haven't taken a decision on neither. So one way in solving the problem via discussing right now to [inaudible] postponing the decision about what we are discussing right now into the future and let future evaluator decide this based on the criteria we give them would be what is in the funding environment called the basket approach.

So you would say from the $200 million, $20 million would be reserved for educational purposes, $10 million or $100 million, or I don't know the amount, would be reserved for

infrastructure-related purposes. So you would give them the basket, and then once the evaluators receive the project, they then can judge, is this such a great project that although it should ideally be funded out of the operational budget but it can't be financed any longer, but it falls within the mission, shall it be funded or shall it be not funded?

So to some degree, we would postpone the decision in taking such an approach. Another possibility would be, Maarten and Becky, we go back to you and we push the problem forward to you again, and would say – and to Sam – look, we send you like we had discussed we would do this, and you kindly agreed to provide answers. We would send this to you as a question and you would have some time in coordination with the rest of your board members maybe and with the management team just to decide what you believe, how you would like to see this framed. We then may still come up as a different approach, but at least you would have time to provide us with an answer which you believe based on this discussion and based on the discussion you would have with your colleagues.

So going back to you, Marylin, is this a new hand?

MARYLIN CADE: No, sorry. I'm trying to take it down.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Good luck. I'm like you, I can never find how to take anything down here.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Erika. I have a clarification question, and I'm afraid because of my host status I can't actually put my hand up. So just to make sure for our notes that we're capturing this correctly, is the proposal then that either the CCWG would propose a basket approach in place of annex D, or that the CCWG would ask the board and ICANN Org to essentially propose an alternative to annex D as part of the final outputs of the CCWG? Am I getting that right, or misunderstanding the direction there?

ERIKA MANN: No, I was probably not very clear, because I really don't know myself how we can take this item forward. So the basket approach the leadership made, it's a kind of idea which is an idea which is handled frequently in other funds. And it would not solve the problem we are talking about, but it would postpone the problem. But it would give a clear indication how much can be spent from the total amount for certain topic areas. And it's a postponement of the problem, it's not solving the problem.

The second part of my comment is related to the fact that we might want to go back to the board with the discussion we

just had, frame the questions very precisely, and we go back to the board and to Sam and say, "These are the concerns we have. In the light of our new concerns, how would you want to reply to them?"

So the advantage of this approach is it would give the board it me to reflect again upon the current reply they gave to us. It would give some time to review what would be an ideal scenario for the management, and it would give us time as well to reflect upon what we want.

In both cases, it's a postponement, and both of them can g o hand in hand even in the future.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. That is helpful. And I see a question from Sam in the chat.

ERIKA MANN: Can you please read it? I'm not opening the chat room today. I'm afraid that I lose again the screen.

EMILY BARABAS: So Sam asks, "is the question on whether bucketing could be appropriate?" So I think she's referring to the question that the CCWG would go to the board and the organization with. So she's asking –

ERIKA MANN: Yes, one question would be whether bucketing would be appropriate and whether it would be something you can imagine to work with and can support, and the B question would be concerning the question whether if there's a very tight operational budget available in the future and great projects come in which would typically have been captured by the operational budget but are not able to be captured and supported in the future because of the budgetary constraint, how would you then want us – what kind of guidance do you want to give for the future evaluators how to handle this? Is this clear, Sam?

EMILY BARABAS: I've got hands from Sam and Maarten.

ERIKA MANN: Sam, please go, and then Maarten, please.

SAMANTHA EISNER: Thanks. So that's clear. So, is there more work that needs to happen in the CCWG before that second part goes to Org and the board, or is that something that you see as should be sent over to us now?

ERIKA MANN: I'll leave this up to you. I typically prefer that we clarify the question and we send clear questions to you, but if you believe it's sufficiently clear what you have heard now, then feel free to go ahead and say we don't have to send you questions.

SAMANTHA EISNER: I think it would be helpful to get a framing of the questions in writing, that way we will have transparent documentation for anyone who's not following this conversation today. And then we can work on answers to both of those items.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Exactly. I would prefer this approach too. Thank you so much, Sam. Maarten, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. Just obviously as we've always done, and we're happy to do so, if there are fundamental questions, we're happy to receive those in writing and answer in writing, which will help us to add record.

But for now, I think it's just important to realize that such an approach where we use the auction proceeds to add to operational funds rather than to use it for investments [up and beyond that,] at that moment, it's really a change in scope. So just to make you aware of that.

If you look to the years up to now, yes, increased funding is getting less and less. But it's still increasing. Every year, we still have more budget than the years before. So maybe in the future if there would be a situation where our funding would dramatically go down, we might have a situation where we look to other emergency measures. I don't see that at this moment. So please take that into account.

And again, having said that, any question that you feel is the one, for instance coming out of the [little] group tomorrow, very happy to answer that in writing as well.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Maarten. And you touch on an important point, which again we discussed as well together many times. That's the point that we want to use the money for something which is new, and that's why you want to be careful with using or even evaluating the question whether it shall be used for project which typically would be financed from the operational budget. But we have to look into this, Maarten, because it's a concern for some community members, and we have to evaluate this carefully.

So Emily, back to you. We haven't answered actually the question from Jonathan, and it's question which comes up again and again, shall a global awareness campaign be financed? And I believe we will come to this when we review the other questions. There were even certain amount

mentioned, I believe one comment were talking about $20 million, but I might be wrong here. So it's a topic which will come up again and again. So there seems to be a certain part of the community that wish to use the money for this item.

So in our action points, we just have to ensure, Emily, that all the questions and all the comments which relate to this particular point about a global awareness campaign, that we all have this together so that we can come back to this point at the very end as well, because we will have to make a recommendation, either we recommend not to do it or we put it in the list of examples, or we would support it. So we have to come to a conclusion with regard to this item.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. So it sounds like there's sort of two pieces to this, just to make sure I'm understanding correctly. One is the bigger question about looking at annex D, the list of examples and whether the group continues to want to pursue that in light of board feedback and then the more specific item within that which is if annex D remains in its current form, would additional items potentially be added to that, and specifically, would the new gTLD global awareness campaign be an example to be included within that? Is that an accurate recap?

ERIKA MANN: I think that's an accurate one and would solve some of the problem, yeah. Thank you so much, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: Sure. And it sounds like those specific conversations about the contents of annex D will be potentially deferred with a focus first on the sort of basket approach; correct?

ERIKA MANN: No. I think the basket approach is a totally separate one, and I think we just put this forward as a question in particular to Sam how she would see this, and to Xavier, how they would see it from a legal, fiduciary point of view, and from maybe even from a tax point of view. So I think that's a neutral question we have to put forward to them, and of course to Becky and to Maarten as well.

I wouldn't connect it. I think what we did hear from the leadership, I think we confused something here. It's such a long time ago when I did the evaluation, so I believe what I did, because the topic about the global awareness campaign came up so many times and then when I went back, I think I took this as an idea, this basket approach, and just put it in, but I framed it wrongly. So there is something wrong in here, Emily, in the leadership recommendation.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. So, is there anything else we want to discuss today with regard to the Jonathan Frost comment specifically on annex D and the examples he gave of the global awareness campaign? Or is that something to defer at this point?

ERIKA MANN: We're fine here, we can close this chapter and move on.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. Thanks. So we're going to scroll down then to the next comment, which is from the NCSG, and on annex D, the NCSG has suggested that the CCWG may want to consider asking for input from the ICANN board for concrete examples of projects that could be supported with auction proceeds. The recommendation from leadership was to check whether the project example, annex should be updated.

ERIKA MANN: I recommend not to do anything here right now. I think this relates to the discussion we just had before. So once we take a decision, how we deal with the annex, then we can come back to this point, but I believe we are handling with it already.

If there's no disagreement and somebody else wants to raise the different point, I'm checking the – somebody raises their hand? No. I think we are fine, Emily, and we can move forward.

EMILY BARABAS: Great. Thanks, Erika. Going down to comment three from the Registry Stakeholder Group. The suggestion was that the CCWG should further consider whether – and this looks like it is again about the global awareness campaign.

ERIKA MANN: Let's put this into the basket of – let me not use the word "basket" – in to the same rubric of the topic we discussed before. [inaudible] same item. Yeah, and let's move forward, please.

EMILY BARABAS: Staff comment four was from the BC, and the BC provided some specific examples to include in annex D. So the leadership recommendation was to review the proposed examples, but in light of what you just said, it sounds like maybe reviewing specific suggestion for annex D might be something that would be deferred. But I'll [inaudible].

ERIKA MANN: No, I agree with you. Totally agree. We don't need to do it now.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. So it sounds like we're then – unless there's anything else – I believe there's not, I think that's the end of this document – then we can move on to the next item, which was the template on general comments.

While it's coming up, I can just provide a little context of what the general comments are. These were often for feedback that was provided in a narrative form. Some of the commenters provided just some general statements about what their comment is focused on, who they are, why there why they're responding and so forth. So not all of these will require any sort of action. And again, it's just a question of whether the content of the initial report should change in light of that. So I think we can scroll down. And it looks like there was actually only one comment from those general comments that might require further discussion. That was a comment from John Poole, and he stated, "I have read with interest other comments submitted by certain contracted parties advocating ICANN allocate the auction proceeds for a worldwide marketing campaign, AKA awareness campaign, for the benefit of contracted parties, who've discovered that many consumers, registrants, don't want their garbage extensions that fail to work as expected on the

Internet, break stuff and are totally untrustworthy as they have no maximum price increase caps or schedules. Should ICANN succumb to this money grab by contracted parties? I will enjoy petitioning along with others the U.S. government's IRS, the California State Attorney General, and other government authorities for revocation of ICANN's nonprofit IRC 501(c)(3) status and the imposition of other statutory penalties and remedies."

So the question here is, is there anything that is needed to be discussed by the CCWG, or can that just be taken as a general comment about the overall report?

ERIKA MANN: Yeah, thank you so much, Emily. I picked this comment from John because I believe it connects well to the potential difficulties and potential dangers in supporting a worldwide marketing campaign. I'm not saying that a worldwide marketing campaign couldn't be financed or supported by the auction proceed fund, but the risks which are involved in doing so are actually highlighted by him.

I don't think there's anything we need to do, it's just a point of recognition and something we should look at when we take our decision.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. And since you don't have access to the chat right now, maybe I'll read out a comment from Carolina about annex D in general. Of course, Carolina, if you want to speak to it and you are able to, please do so, but otherwise I'll just read out what you've said.

She says, "I think we may need to remove annex D. I feel that the request to include the global awareness campaign is showing that it is generating the idea that projects listed there are likely to be funded. In addition, if there are legal risks associated, I would say we remove it. Also, my sense was that this was an early exercise that allowed us to get our thinking straight when the CCWG started. While it was useful at the time, again, I think we may need to remove it."

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Thank you so much, Carolina. I don't believe – the difficulty in the ICANN environment, because everything is public and we have made it public in our public comment period, so we can't remove it. Not in the strict sense of remove. We have to find a process on how to make it not relevant anymore in the future for the work the future evaluators will do. So we can't totally ignore it, but we have to find a way – and I agree with you – we should find a way in pulling it out of the process. How to do it, I believe we need to have a discussion in particular with Sam about this, because it's a legal issue as well involved in this. And if

others agree, I don't think we need to take a decision about this, because others may want to keep it. But just we need to have a discussion about it, and if you want, we can put this in the question which we have to send to send to Sam anyhow, we just agreed to send to her some question, and to the board as well. We can put this item on the list as well, just how to deal in withdrawing the examples list from the annexes.

Just checking. Yeah, let's deal with it next time. I believe we have understood the difficulty involved in the list of examples, but we may have to come back to it. So Joke and Emily, I would recommend for our action item just to put this on our list as a point which we have to come back to.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. While Joke's taking that down, there are a couple of additional comments in the chat, specifically about this topic. Should I read them out?

ERIKA MANN: Yes, please read them out, and please ensure that they show up in the action item list so that we can review them when we have the leadership call, and we can then take a decision whether we want to put this automatically, immediately on the list of questions we want to send to Sam, or if we rather prefer to have a discussion, another

EN

discussion in this group about it before we send it to Sam, because everything we do will leave a kind of trace which we may not want to have. So that's why I'm a bit concerned. But please read the comments.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. You have a comment from Vanda. She says, "Carolina, I believe I'm aligned with your point. Additionally, I believe there will be risks for future questions from already existing projects running in any part of the world and will [contain] disclosure without authorization."

And then Maureen says, "The global awareness campaign is raised similar to whether UA is also relevant as a funded project. I think that we spend so much time on suggestions for prospects that could possibly be funded, but not specifying them as projects that should be funded. There are other factors that would be taken into consideration for all projects proposed."

And Vanda says, "The annex may be sent to evaluators, but not the public." I'll pause there.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah, Vanda is right. [inaudible] separates what is going to be public and what is not going to be public. I'm always

concerned about this topic, because ICANN is so particular about having everything public. So just to avoid any problem.

So let us take these points – we're coming to the end anyhow of our discussion today – let's please put [all the comments we received] in the chat room –

CHING CHIAO: Erika, this is Ching.

ERIKA MANN: Ching, Go ahead.

CHING CHIAO: Thanks, Erika. Particularly on this point, I'm actually speaking just for myself in my personal view, not speaking for ccNSO, any other parties. So point number one, I'd like to see this – because of this – we're simply talking about the auction proceeds generating from the new gTLD program. So personally, actually for me, it will be a little bit interesting, or even awkward to see if, let's say, the CCWG eventually decided that the fund cannot be used for the global marketing awareness program to promote somehow usefulness or some educational aspects of the new gTLD. I will say that if the group eventually decided that the funds should not be doing that, this will be somehow – let me put it this way, interesting for us to generate that point.

So that's my point number one, and two is that – and this links back to the "operational budget" or this particular auction proceed fund, for this particular global awareness campaign, I think many of us here remember that ICANN pays for the promotion, and actually initiate the global awareness campaign during the 2012 round, they have events hosted by themselves and partnered with other firms or entities.

So it's in the operational budget, and it seems still natural for ICANN to use the operational budget for this initiative. Plus, if there's more need to be added, and if the ICANN budget is somehow limited to do other stuff, I don't see why not the fund can be used for the educational or building awareness for the new gTLD.

So that's my point number two. But once again, this is just my personal view. I'm not speaking actually for anyone. But thanks for hearing me. Let me stop here.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Ching, for jumping into the discussion, because you're totally right. There's two items which we have to be very cautious about once we come back to this point, one is shall we make a negative recommendation, so should not fund, which I believe we shouldn't do anywhere, we should find words which are not excluding something in principle, with the exception that our guiding principles as the mission

and the bylaws. So this is within what can be funded, and then whatever shall not be funded, I don't think – and we haven't been so far explicit about. We have never said "should not." But I think that's an extremely important point you make.

And the second point is, you're right, there's an overlap with the operational budget. So Joke, I think it's important to notice when we do the evaluation in the leadership team about all these points which relate to the operational budget, the question we want to send to Sam and to the board and to Xavier, and so we want to put this all – have all these questions connected to it. And please note the point Ching just made so we don't forget it.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Noted, Erika. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Perfect. Thank you so much. Emily, where are we in our agenda?

JOKE BRAEKEN: We are now in item 4C, and we're just wrapping that up. I was going to read one more comment from Carolina, and then I think we can go on to 4D which is maybe something we can also treat in a sort of holistic fashion which was

specific proposals that were put forward in the public comment on funding allocation.

So it sounds like we've talked about that in a general way and we may not need to go into a great deal of detail, but maybe we'll bring that document up in a second. So the comment from Carolina says, "I think it is not our position to make judgment about whether this campaign should be funded, which is why I feel the annex is generating the wrong incentives."

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Okay, thank you. Just a quick time check. How much time do we have today? Until when?

EMILY BARABAS: This is actually a two-hour call. We don't need to use the full time, but we're now an hour and a half into it.

ERIKA MANN: We have a little bit of more time available. Good. Okay, perfect. Then please just let's take the next item. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. So what's coming up right now is not actually responsive to anything that the CCWG asked for in the initial report, but [with that] being a question, a number of

responses to the public comment period proposed specific projects that they would like to see funded. So to help look at those altogether, staff pulled those into a single section of the public comment review so that they could be examined together.

So essentially, the question that we're trying to answer with looking at these is, as a result of these inputs, should any changes being made to the report? So I think we can scroll down and just look at a couple of examples of the types of things and then decide if the CCWG wants to discuss any of this further or just wrap this into the broader discussion about annex D and how to move forward. And noting a comment from Maureen, she says, "Building awareness of all aspects of ICANN's mission as a major role within At-Large and considerably decreasing funding from ICANN as Marylin has mentioned from other constituencies as well."

So Erica. Shall I just maybe read out the first one so you get a sense of the types of things that have come up?

ERIKA MANN:　　　　Yes, please. Let's go t4hroguh it and get some understanding. And hopefully, we can finalize this section today too. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS:　　　　Sure. And noting that there's a lot of overlap here with the specific feedback on annex D. So some of the comments specifically referred to annex D and other ones were general comments that provided suggestions for funding. So there's going to be some overlap here. You'll see the first one was from Jay Westerdal, and he's again proposing a global awareness campaign as a potential funding recipient.

ERIKA MANN:　　　　Yeah, and then he went on to talk about the endowment fund for such purpose. So it relates to the same topic which we just had, and that we just connected to the evaluation of how to deal with this topic. I don't think that we need to have a discussion about this item here and would recommend we just continue.

EMILY BARABAS:　　　　Okay. So maybe what we'll do then is just scroll down and see if there's anything that stands out as being different from what we've already discussed. So comment two is more of Jonathan Frost's comment about the global awareness campaign.

Comment three, again about a global awareness campaign. And noting the comment from the leadership here which says to check whether a funding mechanism can be used for

new gTLD advertisement and coverage of ICANN-related costs.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah, in particular comments to the [boot] cost, I believe. Everybody of the comments which we received here relate to the idea of having more support for the global awareness fund, but then each one identifies a different topic on top of it. So what I did, I just pulled out this particular topic which is different than what others are talking about.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks for the clarification. So, shall we just continue to scroll through and just touch on some of the other ones?

ERIKA MANN: Yes, please.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. Comment number four was from Ben Deschenes, and again, this is a specific proposal, and Crystal Ondo, again put forward a specific proposal, and it looks like we can scroll down to look at the details of those if we want to, but it looks like they're not listed right there.

ERIKA MANN: There were no real details mentioned there. That's why I haven't put them in. But we can evaluate this again. Maybe I overlooked something.

EMILY BARABAS: Then we have comment number six from Jothan Frakes, and again this is about global awareness, so we can probably just keep scrolling.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. He made a particular point, so maybe we should read it, because he was quite – he evaluated and elaborated in quite length on this topic. He mentioned in particular there's a large gap in awareness of the evolution of the naming system. The DNA is developing educational resources and campaign to prepare users for success of domains and top-level domains. These efforts are constantly measured against budgetary constraints and pragmatically hobble those efforts to match the available budget out of necessity.

So I took this point because he was giving some background and some connection to broader issues, so that's why I pulled them out, and he's right. if the evolution of the naming system is not catching up with the rest of the Internet, one day it might become less relevant. So there's some concern mentioned in here. But otherwise, it's the same topic. We can continue.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. It looks like comment number seven is similar to the previous comments. Comment number eight, again a similar theme but a variation which focuses on offering educational awareness, outreach exercises to young people.

ERIKA MANN: Yes, and I've put this in particular in because again, this whole group which is concerned about of course their business, but not just about their business but about the dominance of other business model vis a vis the domain name system. They have a point, so I just wanted to be fair and capture what they're saying. Yes, please, Emily. Back to you.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. Comment number nine is again a specific proposal and this one is a little bit different. It includes participants from developing countries, reflecting functional geographic and cultural diversity. And then specific projects such as bridging the digital gap, accessibility and inclusion for persons with disabilities, gender equality and enhance the use of ICT for empowerment of women and girls. Child online protection, green ICT and many other human and environmental protection-oriented initiatives towards one world, one Internet.

And the leadership recommendation here is to check whether a basket approach is appropriate to segmenting the need for a particular groups or topics, and is that recommendable. Erika, I'll pass it back to you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Emily. Here you see in my last point the basket approach. I just took the example how a topic like this would be handled in other funds to ensure that all the communities involved have access at least to certain amount, if provided these kind of projects fall within the mission.

So this is a quite particular one. It's very broad, it's much more about the Internet [than] it's about ICANN's mission. It goes quite far, but we will have to provide an answer to it. And if somebody wants to make a comment right now, I would appreciate it. Otherwise, please take it home, evaluate it, and we have to put this thing on the list for next time again to evaluate it.

Personally, I would say it's something where we can say the most of it, if projects are come from different geographical regions, they would have to be treated fair fairly anyhow. And I believe we have language here. So maybe Joke, we should check if the language is sufficiently fair and neutral and objective so it captures the point raised here. We certainly are not talking about women. We're not talking

about children, but I believe we have captured the language in such a way that, of course, we would be able to recognize gender equality, not in the sense that we would qualify the projects which are put forward, but that these projects would of course be recognized. So we have to look at, we have to evaluate the current language which we have as a placeholder to capture such items. Emily and Joke, can we put this on the action item list?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hi, Erika. Yes, we will do so.

ERIKA MANN: Perfect.

EMILY BARABAS: And Erika, maybe I can read a few more comments in the chat that relate to the basket concept.

ERIKA MANN: [Please do.] Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS: So Carolina says, "Before we move, a quick note on the idea of having thematic baskets. I think this is a very important issue to discuss because this will have big implications. I

think we should analyze pros and cons of this approach versus prioritizing projects based on their quality, regardless of the area of focus. wonder if this is something leadership can tackle.

And then Nadira says, "Carolina, I see this awareness suggestion from my perspective as another example of project proposals." And Carolina says, "Nadira, remember if we have other examples of awareness projects in the annex? If we do not have any examples, it would make sense to add something along those lines. I'm just worried that we are sending the wrong message with this annex or even [editing,] the sense that to get funded, you need to be on the examples list."

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Thank you so much. Just to clarify, the basket idea was an idea I personally added to the list of leadership recommendations. It was once when I reviewed all the proposals, I put this in, and I took it from examples [inaudible] funding environment I know, and I evaluated how other funds deal with issues which relate to particular either geographical region or particular topics or particular concerns but they don't want this to be become an issue all the time when the evaluator start evaluating project, because it can be quite time consuming.

So this is just an idea. It's not something we have to do. You're totally right. We have to talk about this. So just please don't take this only as one proposal. But we don't have to do it at all. And it's just even my own personal proposal. It's not even something we have discussed so far. I remembered there were a few colleagues from our group who brought this up in the past, but we never have discussed the topic systematically and we don't even have to pursue it. It's just an idea. And the other one item which you mentioned, yes, we have to put them to the action item list. And I think it is quite well understood in this group today, in our call today that we have to be careful with the list of examples. We just have to find a way how to we deal with the withdrawal of the list of examples in case we want to recommend it, because nothing which was public will ever be not public in the ICANN environment, so we have to be very cautious here how we do it.

So back to you. Or do we have some more comments in the chat room?

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. We have two more comments in the chat. The first one , from Thato, says, "I think bridging the digital divide is a serious challenge within certain regions like Africa, affecting the growth and uptake of the domain names,

so I agree with the comment number nine." Thato Mfikwe from South Africa.

And Maureen says, "The final sentence that is currently in our statement is, 'Examples provided are specifically intended to be illustrative, not definitive.'"

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Thank you so much. So just put the topics which are unique and which just came up in this context, put them to our action item list, and the leadership team have to evaluate it, formalize the question for Sam and for Xavier, and for the board, and then come back to the group, hopefully in two weeks' time. And if not, then in a month's time.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. So we'll just continue then and just finish up this list of specific proposals. Comment ten was from Mary Uduma. It's similar to the previous proposals on global outreach, and the leadership recommendation is to check whether the inclusion of ccTLDs or legacy gTLDs in a potential awareness project is helpful.

ERIKA MANN: Let's just continue.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. Comment 11 from the dot-art domain registry. Again, putting forward a similar proposal to the previous ones, with a new argument related to creating competition and allowing potential projects that target awareness projects to be seen as falling within ICANN's mission and would therefore be eligible to apply for funding. And quoting from the comment, "What are market mechanisms that promote competition? The first is to design the marketplace, e.g. the registrar accreditation program and the new gTLD program, then make your audience aware that markets exist."

ERIKA MANN: We have to see them all in context, Emily and Joke, when we review this. So these are modifications, and sometimes getting new language added to it to explain why they would love to see such an awareness program being funded. So, next item, please.

EMILY BARABAS: The next comment, number 12, is from Access Now, and this was a specific proposal about a number of examples mentioned related to the funding of civil society projects. So again, this sort of feeds into the broader question of whether and how these recommendations should be taken into account. I'll just continue onwards.

Comment 13 from Top Level Design, again similar to the previous comments about global outreach, and again, comment number 14 from the Registry Stakeholder Group had a similar recommendation about global awareness and outreach. I think we can just keep scrolling.

And then the final one, number 15 from John Poole, and he states that all of auction proceeds should be used for awareness campaigns to warn about the use of gTLDs. I think that that's actually the end of the proposals, so I'll pass it back to you, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Emily. Maybe, Joke, would you be able just to mention all of the action items which we have collected during the discussion we just had? Would you be able to do it? Or do you rather prefer we do it in a follow-up call? Are you fine?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hello, Erika. If you would allow me to have a final look at the notes that I took and send you a proposal with the action items that I noted down. If there's anything missing or anything that looks off, we can review it and finalize the list of action items. Hope you agree with that.

ERIKA MANN:	Absolutely, Joke. No problem. I'm available and we can finalize this today, of course. Thank you so much.

JOKE BRAEKEN:	Thank you very much.

ERIKA MANN:	Okay, Joke, then I believe – apologies, I was talking and I was on mute. Yes, I was just saying if there are no further comments in the chat room, no hand raised, I believe we can move to the next item of our agenda. [inaudible] Emily, so you will have to remind me or you will have to read it.

EMILY BARABAS:	Thanks, Erika. We don't have any other substantive comments in the chat, so I think we can move on to our final item on the agenda, which is confirming next steps and the next call. Our next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 19th at 14:00 UTC, and a note that that is the week before ICANN 65. So there's a question from staff about whether we want to go ahead with that meeting or cancel it, depending on the availability of leadership and members.

ERIKA MANN:	Yeah, let me ask the group what the group thinks. Do we have an update information about our situation in

Marrakech? Do we have a confirmation about the time, or were there some recent changes, Emily?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Erika. I don't think there's been any recent changes to the scheduled times for meeting in Marrakech. I can double check those times and pop them into the chat in a moment. And Maarten asks, can we check whether we would be able to have a critical mass on the call?

ERIKA MANN: Yeah, absolutely, Maarten. If people know this already now, so it's always hard to know this in advance. We can of course always keep it on the agenda, and then depending on how it goes, a week ahead of the call we can check who can join the call and then we can take a decision three days ahead of the call. But let me ask the question, who knows already now that they can join the call in two weeks' time? Do we see something popping up in the chat room? Oh, it's working again, my chat room.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Erika. I see two responses from Thato and Wanda that they'll be available. Maarten says he will not. Maybe we can just ask if folks in the room can raise their hands if they think they will be available, and we can get a rough count.

ERIKA MANN: That's actually a good idea. If people know how to raise their hand, it's below the participant list, the little screens there, the tiny icons which you can see there, yes, no. So yes would be for yes, you would be – you can come, and the no would be you don't know or you can't join.

EMILY BARABAS: And Erika, we've got four people, including Ching who said that they can attend, two green checks, so it looks like we'd have six, and then a handful or red Xes. So maybe it makes sense for us to do a Doodle poll or something like that offline.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. For the moment, I'd like to keep it, because I'm very conscious that we have to finalize the work, and even if we're a small group, I think there's a lot of just purely technical stuff to do, which might make sense even in a smaller group which has no decision making, but just something to prepare for Marrakech or some other stuff. So I just would like to keep it on, and then we can always take it off if we believe we don't need it.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. I think that gives us everything we need. I'll just ask Joke if there's any – oh, and I think Ching has his hand up. And then I'll ask Joke if she has anything else. Thanks.

ERIKA MANN: Ching, please.

CHING CHIAO: Sorry, that's an old hand.

ERIKA MANN: Interesting, it just popped up. Okay, then if there are no further topics, then I just wish you a great rest of the day or a great day, wherever you are. And either we talk in two weeks' time, or we see each other in Marrakech. In the meantime, we have the various groups going on, and you will see the topics which we have discussed today popping up in your e-mail list when we send the questions to Sam and Xavier and to the board for example. Thank you so much, everybody. Back to you, Julie. Are you managing it today?

JULIE BISLAND: I am. Thank you so much, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you.

JULIE BISLAND: I'll go ahead and end the recording. You all have a very good day or night. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Bye. Thank you so much as well.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]