## ICANN Transcription
## CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds
## Wednesday, 04 March 2020 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.
Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on the agenda wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/x/ZxyJBw
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

JULIE BISLAND:  Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds call on Wednesday, the 4th of March, 2020.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the audio bridge and we haven't already identified you, please let yourself be known now.

All right. Hearing no other names, I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise.

With this, I'll turn it back over to Erika Mann. You can begin, Erika.

ERIKA MANN:  Julie, thank you so much. Hello to everyone. Welcome back after the public comment period. We have three items on the agenda today. It's a pretty short agenda.  Hopefully we can get through it was quickly as possible.

---

**EN**

The first item is the review of the conflict of interest declaration. The second is the review of the public comment and how to deal with the comments we have received. The final item is any other point. We do have the review of the timeline to complete our work.

Let me ask you first and go back to the [first] item. Anybody have a conflict of interest update to make?

No? That's not the case? Okay. I have one short announcement. You have heard it already. I have to leave the call at exactly a few minutes before 4:00. I have to take a call with a client. Unfortunately, I couldn't postpone it. It should be a quick call. We will not disrupt the discussion. Emily and Marika and Joke will continue the debate.

With this, let's move to the review of the comments we have received. We had a leadership call on Monday. In most cases, we identified no big issue. This was either confirmation or slight modification, and we identified only very few items where we believe we need to have a discussion between us.

With this, I'll hand over to – is it Emily or is it Marika today who would want to make the introduction? Emily?

EMILY BARABAS:    Hi, Erika. This is Emily from staff. Marika is actually an apology for this, call I'll be working with you.

ERIKA MANN: No problem. That's fine. We have reviewed it together on Monday, so it should be all fine. What I appreciate is if you would quickly introduce the topic, the background—the question we have asked—the comment we have received, how we approached it from the leadership team, and what our recommendation is. Thank you so much. Back to you, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. Just to take one step back, what we've done here to support to the review of the public comments is to create a series of template documents that include each of the comments and response to those four questions that were put forward as part of the public comment period. Then there's a leadership recommendation about how to handle each of those comments, and then there will be space for the CCWG to discuss and determine how they'd like to determine how they'd like to take those comments into account. It's broken down into four templates, one for each of the questions, and we're working on the first one here. You can download if you'd like to in Word format if you'd prefer to follow along on your own desktop.

A total of twelve public comments were received, and you should also hopefully have had a chance to review those comments. A summary report has been produced as well and is available on the public comment page. I think the leadership's preference is to just go through one by one and do some triage and then potentially do a second round of looking at some of the outstanding questions in the context of the document itself as a second step in the public comment review process.

Before I start going into individual questions and this first template document, is there anything that you want to add to that, Erika, about the overall approach?

ERIKA MANN: No. Thank you so much for mentioning this. I Think it's a very nice format and very easy to follow. Well done, team. If something comes up—some colleagues recommend a modification during the call—we can always pick it up, but I really believe it's so well done that we will be all fine with it. I would recommend we just continue with the first question and we hear what our team members have to say.

EMILY BARABAS: Great. Thanks, Erika. The first question that was put out for public comment was, "Do you support the CCWG's recommendation in relation to the preferred mechanisms? If no, please provide your rationale for why not." I think, rather than reading the full recommendation from the CCWG regarding the mechanism— because I think all members are familiar with that at this point—I'll just highlight that the CCWG leadership noted that it saw strong direction in favor of Mechanism A, followed by Mechanism B. For those who want to read through further, you can download that template document in Word and read the rest of the text.

So the main question is based on this input from the public comment period: "Should the CCWG reconsider its recommendation for these two mechanisms? If yes, why? If no, why not?"

Scrolling forward, we'll just dive into the individual comments. Rather than reading those out again, I'll just provide a very brief overview and then the leadership recommendation. The first comment was from Sylvia Cadena. She supports the plan to recommend to the Board the first two-rank mechanism—just to make some note here, it's very important that the Board respects and follows the guidance provided by the CCWG in its guidelines and recommendations—and notes that a clear director from the Board about adhering to the guidelines and criteria will be important for a smooth implementation process.

The leadership recommendation here was that, indeed, the level of support for each mechanism will be included in the final report. That is the intention. The leadership suggested that perhaps a letter to the Board or to the chartering organizations accompanying the report can explain the importance of the guidelines provided in the report to ensure a smooth implementation process.

I'll pause there to see if there's any input or reaction to the leadership recommendation.

ERIKA MANN:          Thank you, Emily. Just one quick addition. I would add definitely [the] SO and AC and then-slash-Board because we are sending the letter and the report to the community and of course to the Board. So I would definitely [have to see them] in the leadership recommendation. We may have forgotten just to mention it.

Let me check the participant list.

We are fine here. I think we'll give a second, but I believe we are fine. Let me have a quick look at the chat room if something important is popping up here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ERIKA MANN: Somebody wants to talk?

No. We are fine here, too. Just continue. Take the next time.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. The next comment is from Judith Hellerstein, submitted in her individual capacity. She notes her preference for Mechanism C but also acknowledges some of the potential advantages of Mechanism B and that those might be the same as C. She goes into some of the details of her rationale for that, which I'm not going to read out.

I noticed that Sam, in his review of the comments in that shared Google Doc that we shared with the CCWG for their input about how to incorporate comments, did provide a comment here as well, although it doesn't look like it's specifically geared at how to respond to Judith's comment but is rather about the CCWG's overall approach for making a decision regarding the mechanism. Hopefully folks have had a chance to review that as well, but I think it's more a general look at the considerations that he thinks are important.

Scrolling down to the—ah. And Judith made a couple of other recommendations. She said that these are new ideas or emphasis on some of the ideas that have already been raised. She supports the creation of a standing committee, so she'd like it to be renewable at each round of projects. She also supports that projects should not be able to request 10-20% of the available funds within each trench.

The leadership here acknowledges her recommendation regarding the mechanisms and her preferences and also suggested that the CCWG discuss some of the points that she's raised about the standing committee and allocation of funds within each trench when doing that second pass of conducting a final review of the guidelines, so discussion of those items can be deferred until that next round of review.

I'll pause here for any comments.

ERIKA MANN:    Thank you so much, Emily. Judith, I'm not sure. I'm just checking. If you are on the call—actually, yes you are. So let me make a few points, very brief points, and then I hope we can have a quick exchange about this topic. Judith, I'm concerned about introducing a new committee. The standing committee we haven't discussed before. I believe we had a very long discussion about how we want to shape the various evaluation committees. And we had a long discussion on shall they be named review committees or not, and we came, I think, to a good conclusion. The standing committee would be something new, so you maybe want to

# EN

explain it—why you're introducing this topic now. I have a hesitation here to follow your recommendation here.

On the second, I would hesitate as well, concerning the 10 and 20%. From my own experience, I believe it is good to leave flexibility for the team who will be then evaluating the projects. There might be a rationale in the near future on why more allocation will be needed for a particular project. If you then have such a threshold included, it will be very difficult to override it. I don't see why there is a need even to do it because, in most cases, I would assume that project requests will be not automatically be on the 10 or 20% threshold.

So I have a hesitation here out of experience when other funds use such kind of mechanism and it created, sometimes, a very artificial barrier. So I would more rely on the rationale of the projects when they are going to be delivered. But we need to discuss it because these two items seem to be important to you.

Let me go back to you now, Judith. Are you with us?


JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:     Yes, I am.


ERIKA MANN:     Go.


JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:     My concern on the 10 and 20% was—I guess you could put it as a preference—that I would prefer that we have this maybe more as

# EN

a strong guiding principle. I understand your reason why, if there's some cases where we don't have it, that we don't have this as a [dragging] point. But I think we want to make sure that our preference is to make sure we can give money to as many groups as possible. If we don't have a set preference, then I was afraid that it would go in large chunks to different groups. So that was my concern.

So maybe if we could have, say, a strong preference that a request should not be more than 10 or 30%. That way, we could accommodate the issues that you mentioned.

ERIKA MANN:                   I don't want to have this a discussion between us. Let me check quickly if others are raising their hand.

I really would caution us to do this because, Judith, are you looking at it from a different level. You look at it from the angle of: shall as many as possible groups be satisfied? I'm looking at it more from the angle of: are their projects which are worthwhile to be support? which is a different tendency and approach because it's easy to have a many groups as possible with little money, but this might not be satisfying what we wanted to reach with our goals because that's a unique opportunity. Just to spend money is easy, but is it worthwhile? There then the questions comes, do we really want to set such a kind of target?

Let me go back quick. We need some other people come in. I see Alan. Alan, go ahead. I'll check in the meantime the chatroom.

# EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I understand and, at some level, agree with Judith on the sentiment, but I really think we need to do it a different way than giving percentages. I don't know what the annual traunch is going to be, but we're talking about $200 million over some moderate number of years. So we're probably talking about somewhere between $20 and $40 million in a given traunch.

If the group were to say, "Let's put half of it in a given traunch into a single project," that increases the risk whole thing unbelievably largely because we know some projects we will fail. We know some projects will not end up being as successful as we hope they are. One would not want to put a significant part of a traunch into a single project and risk failure in it.

So, because we want this overall project to be successful, it would be foolish for any group to do that. I think we want to have criteria in the selection process that sets risk at a reasonable level. That implies the size of projects but [doesn't] do it with a percentage number. I think we have to look at the end reason why we're restricting things and not necessarily just set an arbitrary number. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Alan. I like this approach. Judith, would you support this? So, instead of, say, setting a threshold, we would point to a risk if a too-high percentage would go into a single project, which then would be automatically a guideline for the project evaluator to hesitate to do this.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:    Yeah, I would support that.

ERIKA MANN:    Wonderful.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:    Basically, my concern is the failure of larger projects. Also, that won't leave us many opportunities for other good projects

ERIKA MANN:    Yeah. I think that's well-understood—your concern—and I believe there is quite broad support for such an idea in the chatroom. So we should be fine here. Good.

On the standing committee, Judith, what was your idea here?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:    I guess maybe it wasn't clear, on evaluating the projects, whether the evaluation committee would be for the entire length of the auction proceeds or whether they get renewed each year. Then there'll be a new committee evaluating. So I think that was my idea: if the evaluation committee is continuing every year and doesn't get changed, maybe some new thoughts come in. That's what I thought about the standing committee.

ERIKA MANN:    Understood, Judith. Maybe I can make a recommendation here and we can quickly check if this would have support. I believe

what we have to do for the implementation team, which will have to work based on the final mechanism [inaudible] to work on how the projects are going to shaped if there will be public tender and how long these tenders are, etc., etc. So maybe we can put in the guidance not a recommendation for a precise term because, I believe, one year, again my experience for evaluations is much too short and maybe the project cycle they come up with is maybe more than one year, so we don't notice yet. So maybe we should just put in a wording which cautions to have the same group of evaluators for the full length of the replenishment of the fund to look into best practice on how to design the time lengths for project evaluators.

Would this be something you'd appreciate, Judith and everybody else?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:    Yeah, I would appreciate that. That's why I put that down. It wasn't clear on the term of the evaluating committee and whether there would be more. So that's why I was trying to get more ideas out there.

ERIKA MANN:    We put this in the guidelines for the implementation team.

Alan, is this a new hand?

| | |
|---|---|
| ALAN GREENBERG: | It is a new hand. I would not support the language you have. Let me explain why. First of all, the use of the term "committee" I think is appropriate. A committee is normally some group pulled together within ICANN. We've already said quite clearly that the evaluation will be done by an external group. So "committee" is the wrong word to begin with. |
| ERIKA MANN: | Sure. I haven't used the term. You're totally right. It wasn't my recommendation. I agree. |
| ERIKA MANN: | No, Erika, I understand, but Judith used the term "standing committee." I'm saying that sets the wrong tone because, number one, it's an external group.<br><br>I would not say we want the same group. One of the responsibilities of the review process and the Board in its overseeing capability is to say, "Is this working?" If it's not working, we may yank the contract from that group and give it to someone else.<br><br>Moreover, I don't think the slavery laws right now allow us to say the group of people must be the same for what might be a five- or ten-year period. So to say it should be the same group I think is counteracting our own recommendations to have periodic review to make sure it's working and the reality of labor laws. |

So I really don't think this needs any comment here at all. We've already set it's an external group. There is going to be a review. And we've covered the whole thing, I think. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN:    Thank you so much, Alan. Even better. I just wanted to modify and help Judith with her concern. If we believe this is not needed, that's totally fine with me.

Let me check what we see in the chatroom. Judith is saying she doesn't want to. Sylvia is agreeing with you. Maureen is saying that she's agreeing with me but that we need a clearer explanation about the role and tenure of the external evaluation committee.

[How can the leadership do] in light of Judith's concern and some of the chatroom's? Just a quick check if all of the items we just discussed—in particular, the points Alan pointed at—we covered, and then we don't have to follow through on this item.

Judith, would this be fine with you?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:    Sure.

ERIKA MANN:    Thank you. Back to you, Emily. We can take the next item.

ALAN GREENBERG:    It's Alan, Erika. Can I make a comment, please?

# EN

ERIKA MANN:          You can always make a comment.


ALAN GREENBERG:      Thank you. I'm a little bit concerned that we are taking these comments and effectively negotiating them with people who might be on this call. That does not give the same opportunity to commenters who might not be present on this call. I'm a little bit concerned about our process here.


ERIKA MANN:          You don't have to be concerned, Alan. I don't do behind-the-door deals, so don't worry about it. I believe you're absolutely right. My memory is currently very week about this item, but you have worked much more than I did on this particular topic. I just want us to do a quick check. I believe you're completely right in the case. I see an item missing, which I believe we can maybe clarify a little bit more. We would come to the full group. That's all I want to do.

                     Is this okay with you?


JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:  It's fine with me.


ERIKA MANN:          Alan?

                     Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:      Yes. Please [inaudible].

ERIKA MANN:          Thank you so much. Emily, please?

EMILY BARABAS:       Thanks, Erika. It sounds like we're moving on to ALAC Comment #3. This comment summarizes the ALAC discussion regarding the pros and cons of the different mechanisms and the process for making that selection. The ALAC expects that it has, by consensus, come to support Mechanism A as a first choice.

The leadership recommendation here is that no additional action is needed, just noting that ALAC support for Mechanism A is contingent on the existence of the independent project application evaluation panel to evaluate and select project applications as currently recommended in the report.

ERIKA MANN:          Thank you, Emily. Just checking. Alan, do you want to make a comment? Or somebody else from ALAC?

ALAN GREENBERG:      No. I don't think any comment is necessarily at this point.

| | |
|---|---|
| ERIKA MANN: | Perfect. Thank you so much. Then let me have a quick look at the chatroom. Maureen is saying, "No further comment." Vanda, too. So, fine. We can continue, Emily. Back to you. |
| EMILY BARABAS: | Thanks, Erika. Comment #4 is from the Registry Stakeholder Group. The core of the comment is that the Registry Stakeholder group still does not have a strong preference for a specific mechanism and does not therefore oppose Recommendation 1. |
| | The leadership recommends that no additional action is needed here, noting the support for the CCWG's recommendation. |
| | I'll pass it back to Erika if there's any discussion on that. |
| ERIKA MANN: | Thank you so much, Emily. Just checking if somebody wants to make an additional comment in the participant list. No. And in the chatroom. Neither. So we should be fine, and we can continue. Back to you, Emily. |
| EMILY BARABAS: | Thanks, Erik. The next comment is from the BC. The BC recommends that the final report be amended to require an independent feasibility study to compare the costs of Mechanisms A and B and to ensure that the Empowered Community retains oversight of the disbursement of auction proceeds. That's the core of the comment. And there's some additional detail provided there. |

The leadership's response to that is that the report already includes discussion of a feasibility study, Page 12 of the proposed final report, and that language is, just scrolling over, included her as a comment. I can read it out, just as a reminder. "In considering these recommendations, the CCWG anticipates the ICANN Board may conduct a feasibility assessment which provides further details on these aspect (referring to the previous paragraph) so that the Board can take an informed decision about supporting the appropriate mechanism. Such an assessment with have to factor in that it concerns a limited-time mechanism with the ability to sunset as the CCWG is recommending against creating a perpetual mechanism.

The leadership team further recommends that text is added to the report regarding the options for timing of such a feasibility study, which is not currently included in the report. So two potential options would be that the Board does the feasibility assessment before launch of the implementation team, or potentially the feasibility study could be conducted by the implementation team.

The final point is that the BC will provide clarification on points regarding the Empowered Community. That's also something that the leadership team has asked ICANN Legal to provide some additional guidance on, although I think that is a pending item.

I will pass it back to you, Erika, for discussion on this comment.

ERIKA MANN:          Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:   Again, all that will be included in the ATRT report.

ERIKA MANN:            Can you please say who's talking right now?

                       Hello?

EMILY BARABAS:         Hi, Erika. I believe that was an unmuted line. I'm not sure if that was actually be intended to be part of this conversation. But you do have two hands up [inaudible].

ERIKA MANN:            Understood. [inaudible] somebody was talking about something else but just was not muted.

EMILY BARABAS:         Yeah. You have two hands up from Sarah and Alan.

ERIKA MANN:            Yeah. I'm going to go there. I was just wondering who this was right now. What we believed on the call was just looking at the logic. Currently we already have in our report included a recommendation for a feasibility study, but, based on the comment we received from the BC, we thought it might be good to clarify the processes because, if you do a feasibility study, the feasibility can be done either probably triggered by the Board. I say "triggered" because there are different processes in place. Or

it can be triggered by the implementation team. Then the question is, shall we define the timeline?

I believe we don't need a real study—a really, long difficult study, which will take maybe forever, knowing ICANN's processes. Just a quick and dirty evaluation which gives us the main numbers and the main details would be probably sufficient.

Let me go to Sarah and then to Alan. Please, Sarah.

SARAH DEUTSCH:          Thanks, Erika. Can you hear me?

ERIKA MANN:             Yeah.

SARAH DEUTSCH:          Okay, perfect. I just wanted to clarify one thing that appeared in the BC comment. It appeared to be based on an understanding that Mechanism A will include costs to ICANN org. I just wanted to clarify for the record that all the implementation and distributions of proceeds are going to be reimbursed from the proceeds themselves. So the increased costs would be to the auction proceeds process and to the funds that all the recipients would receive.

ERIKA MANN:             Yes, I think you're right. The BC was, very early, concerned about the cost factor. So I think that the feasibility study is correct. How

# EN

much the perception is right or wrong is very difficult to judge without such a comparison to have.

Alan, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. One of them was related to that. They use wording saying that ICANN will have to staff up … Let me find the exact words: "will have to build internal resources to choose the grant recipients." I thought we made it very clear that this would be an external group that was choosing the grant recipients. The cost, obviously, of hiring that external group, as Sarah knows, would be borne by the auctions funds itself, but there's no staffing-up within ICANN to do that. That explicitly not an ICANN function. I thought we made that really clear.

The other part is something that you noted in the leadership comments. I don't understand the reference to the Empowered Community having control over disbursement of the auction proceeds. Now, I would think, clearly—maybe it's not clear—that the allocation of the traunches to the auction process each year will be included in the budget, and therefore the Empowered Community has oversight over the overall budget and therefore that line item. But I don't see any direct control of the disbursement of auction proceeds by the Empowered Community. So I'm really confused about that. That's the last thing we want: the Empowered Community second-guessing the selection process. The Board can comment, saying this is outside of ICANN's mission, but, other than that, the community should not be involve in that process. So I'm really confused. Thank you.

# EN

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Alan. I agree with you. The leadership team was a little bit confused, too. It might be the case with the BC, but maybe somebody from the BC … I'm not sure. I have to check if we have somebody on the call. There might be some confusion, too, because, when you read the text carefully (their comment), it's not fully clear: are they worried that the way this group [works and operates and will source for the projects money from the budget] and this might have an overall implication on the community role concerning the overall budget? I believe there is come confusion, maybe, when you read the BC comments carefully. At least we felt there might be some confusion. We may want to go back to Steve DelBianco, who I understood wrote this comment, maybe to ask him for further clarification. The leadership team said we wanted to have first a discussion between us and understand if we all feel that the language is a little bit opaque and may need some clarification before we would actually approach the BC leadership team.

But let us finalize first this feasibility study so that we have this topic [off] the agenda because I believe it's the most easy one here to deal with. The question about the community oversight role and the Empowered Community oversight role is much more complex and complicated.

On the feasibility, what do we want to recommend? Do we want to extend the current language which we have and accept a certain part of the recommendation from the BC? Or do we want to say that, actually, the topic is covered, and the implementation team,

once they review everything, can make a recommendation, if they want to either ask the Board or if they want to issue it themselves?

Do we have an opinion about this here? Somebody wants to come and let me have a look at the chatroom?

ALAN GREENBERG:          Erika, it's Alan.

ERIKA MANN:              Yeah, Alan? Go.

ALAN GREENBERG:          I'm not sure a feasibility study is the right mechanism. I would have thought a call for an RFI (Request For Information) or something like that from potential vendors or implementers is the right thing.

Now, a feasibility study also includes the internal aspects and not just the external ones. But I'm not 100% sure I feel comfortable with the term "feasibility study." A feasibility study implies come back with an answer that says, "This is not feasible," and that's not an acceptable answer to that. So I'm just commenting that. It my be just a nomenclature problem.

ERIKA MANN:              I believe we have used the term ourselves in the study, if I'm not wrong, because the BC brought up—

ALAN GREENBERG:       Then I back down.


ERIKA MANN:       Yeah, Alan, I believe we did. But we can, of course clarify the language and what we mean. So your point it totally well-taken and it's super important. We have to do this. So I believe that we need to put a placeholder in here to clarify the language so it's understood what we really mean here. It's just they always said from the beginning: the cost effectiveness. Maybe we can just [put it to] the implementation team, clarify the language, and then we leave it up for the exchange between the implementation team— that may be the most clever approach—and the Board. They then can clarify how they want to handle it. We just put in what we mean, and then this should satisfy the BC.

Let me check again. Nobody else is raising … Anybody—Sylvia is agreeing. So we clarify the language and we leave it and put in the guidelines and leave it up for the implementation team, which will have continued discussion about this topic if they believe they need to.

Now let's come back to the more complicated question, which is on the Empowered Community. Sam, do you want to maybe let us know your legal wisdom about this item? Are you with us, Sam?


SAM EISNER:       Thanks, Erika. Can you hear me?

ERIKA MANN:               Yeah, I hear you.

SAM EISNER:               Okay, great. I know I owe an official response on this, but I do concur with how Alan laid out the issue regarding the Empowered Community. The Empowered Community has no specified roles, and the Empowered Community's rules are limited through the bylaws. They're granted and limited in there. So we would want to look specifically at the design to make sure that we're not building in additional fault points for the Empowered Community to override decisions as it relates to grants.

Clearly, as Alan said, there would be a budgetary component as part of the ICANN overall budget. We could consider how to provide some language that might firewall that out because the auction proceeds work is funded by the auction proceeds themselves and not part of ICANN's operating funds[/grants]. We can look at that.

But there's nothing that I see in the system right now that would give the Empowered Community the authority. We'd actually need to change the bylaws if a different authority to have any role in having the ability to challenge specific grants to individuals or grants to the grantees.

So I think that it's something that we should look at carefully, and the words that we use, but I agree that there does not appear to be a defined role for that.

ERIKA MANN:     Thank you so much, Sam. I'm looking at the chatroom. We have agreement from Stephen, I believe, from Sylvia about the clarification—Stephen, I see nothing in the bylaws from Carolin[a] and Alan and Sylvia. So there seems to be support from your approach.

Knowing Steve, I would recommend, when you do a review of what you just said. I think you want to be, in legalistic term, very clear that [the cut] out of the auctions proceeds is, with regard to the role of the Empowered Community place vis-à-vis the whole budget … That there is a legal term of true, clear separation so that the Empowered Community has no intervention rights or obligations which may interfere with what we have done here in our work. So that's one thing you have to check. The language needs to be clarified.

The second is related to it. When you read the text from Steve, he practically claims that the Empowered Community … I can't go back to it right now. Can you make, Emily or Joke, the text move around? So, in his wording, I believe he … Let's go and read it again. Emily, can you find the correct part? Yeah. This is the second item that [s]he touches on, where he practically claims that the Empowered Community should retain its ability to enforce accountability mechanisms.

Now, I will have put in so many accountability mechanisms in the way [inaudible] to set up the whole structure and then the transparency and accountability requirements that I don't see an additional need for the Empowered Community to do something.

But I wonder if there is a formal obligation where the Empowered Community would have a role to play. So I just want us to be certain when we—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:     [inaudible]

ERIKA MANN:     Go ahead. Who's talking?

Sam, is it you?

SAM EISNER:     No. I think it's just feedback.

ERIKA MANN:     Oh, okay. I don't know. If you could have a look at this and everybody else. We have to be clear that we are not … What I'm concerned about is that we get a pushback from somebody like Steve and some others who might then join and we have overlooked something where their recommendation may be wrong and we may have overlooked something. I don't believe that's true. I just want us to be certain.

Sylvia and then Alan.

SYLVIA CADENA:     Hi, Erika. I hope you can hear me. I'm having problems with my voice tonight, but I will be faster if I talk rather than type. Sam, one

question. With the Empowered Community, if they were to have any role in this process, that will also mean that there will be a clear conflict of interest in applying for any of the grants under the auction proceeds, right?

So maybe another way or another angle to add to that response, to that legal language, to incorporate is also the fact that the auction proceeds fund is to support community projects. All of these external mechanisms for evaluation are actually looking at ways to keep the independence so that as many members of the community can participate as possible. I think that is important to highlight to say. It's not only to say, "You don't have power here." It's like, "Well, you don't have power here because, if you had, then that means you can't benefit from it." Right? I hope I made myself clear.

ERIKA MANN:                  Sam, do you want to comment on it? What Sylvia is [recommending] is that we have all the mechanisms already in place so that this is supportive of what we are doing for the community for the Empowered Community, too.

I believe what Steve is doing is he's focusing on the legal role of the Empowered Community. I'll give it back to you, Sam.

SAM EISNER:                  Thanks. I think that independence issue and that conflict of interest issue are really important points to raise in it. I really appreciate that perspective because I agree that it also helps formulate the lines between them. So, if there's a [inaudible]

Empowered Community … [I don't [read the comment]. It's really about the accountability mechanism as it relates to the budget oversight. So we could say that the Empowered Community's ability to challenge ICANN's budget is where that comes from and make those lines that it's not about individual grant applications because, indeed, that would then put the Empowered Community into an evaluation role. That would break many of the lines of independence that we're discussing. It would raise conflict of interest issues. The Empowered Community is made up of five of ICANN's SOs and ACs, so, indeed, it creates a very recursive problem. So I think that's a really important way to look at the issue. Thanks.

ERIKA MANN:              Yeah, I agree, Sam. I think that's a smart approach. What you're recommending is true.

Alan followed by Stephen. In the meantime, Emily, when I'm switching off on my side in five minutes—3:55—please be so kind to continue with the discussion. I will keep the screen open, but I will be on mute. Thank you so much. Alan, please?

ALAN GREENBERG:       Thank you very much. I'm a little confused about some of the discussion we just had. The Empowered Community is made up five ACs and SOs, which, by their very definition, are unincorporated association. And any grant applicant has to be an incorporated group so it has fiscal responsibility. So it's not an issue of the ACs and SOs conflicting because they may be grant

# EN

applicants. However, the Empowered Community is a very specific group with very specific rules. Steve was heavily involved in writing those rules.

So I'm not quite sure where this confusion comes from, but there's just no doubt in my mind that the Empowered Community cannot have control over decisions on grant applications or second-guessing them. I just don't see any intersection between the Empowered Community and this whole process other than at the ICANN budget level, or, of course, removing the whole Board because you think they're doing such a bad job overseeing it. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN:          Yeah, I agree with you, Alan. But it might just a misunderstanding that they believe—this is what we have to clarify with them – or Steve believes that, because of the carve out and the [quasi] loss of oversight for the Empowered Community in this particular field, this might have implication on the overall insight they have to some degree concerning the budget. That's the feeling I have: there's some confusion and some concern about this.

Stephen, let me go to you, and then I'm switching off. Emily, please watch when I switch off. Stephen, please.

STEPHAN DEERHAKE:    Thanks, Erika. I completely agree with Alan, having been involved in [AC-EC] matters for some time now. The only leverage that I can see that the Empowered Community would have over the grant is via the review that is offered [by] the Empowered

Community of the ICANN budget, of which this transfer of the funds to the granting authority would be contained in.

Other than that, I don't see any role/means for the Empowered Community to meddle with the actual process of awarding grants going forward, other than through the potential rejection of the Board's budget that contains the initial allocation – the traunch, so to speak. Thank you.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:    Erika, it's Anne Aikman-Scalese. I'm on audio only. Can I get in the queue, please?

ERIKA MANN:    I'm on audio only, but I will put it on quite silent because I don't want the people I have to have a call with to listen to what we are talking about. So, as soon as I'm back, I will send you a chat message, and then we can take it from there.

Okay with you?

[ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE]L Hello?

EMILY BARABAS:    Hi, Erika. It sounds like maybe you're going to be dropping into listen-only mode at the moment, so I'm happy to take over the queue management while you're off.

# EN

ERIKA MANN:                Please do so. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS:             Okay. So I'm noting that Anne has her virtual hand up. Already in the queue we have Sylvia. Is that an old hand or a new one?

Sylvia, we can't hear you if you're speaking. Is that a new hand to speak?

Old hand. Stephen, is that a new hand to speak or an old one?

Okay. Anne, please?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:       Thank you. I just want to confirm the same understanding as those who have said that the only power that the Empowered Community would ultimately have is in relation to the overall line item budget for ICANN.

I think that the request in the public comments is simply to clarify that that power that exists within the Empowered Community is not affected in any way and there are no bylaws changes associated with that power over the budget item or, as Alan points out, the ability to remove directors. I don't think there was any intent by public commenters to try to get Empowered Community power over individual grants. It was simplify to clarify that there's no change that results from [reciting] the necessity of amending bylaws … does not in any affect Empowered Community powers as they currently exist. Those powers are limited to the budget line item or possible removal of directors. That would obviously be

such an extreme case. But it was just a request that that be clarified. Thanks.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Anne. Just to clarify further, were you involved at all or have been in touch with those who were drafting the BC comments, or is that just your understanding of the comments based on the read? That will help the leadership team determine whether further follow-up is needed with the BC to ensure that there's full understanding of the comment. Thanks.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Well, [inaudible] a CSG rep, I have said some exchanges, particularly with Steve DelBianco. I think that it's always a good idea to clarify. I can state this definitely on behalf of the ITC: that that was the limit of the comment. I can also state informally that this was discussed between me and Steve DelBianco. But, as far as the actual final filing, it's always good practice to check back with the constituency, I think. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Anne. So it sounds like—[that note is in the chat—it's still] always a good idea to follow up directly with the BC to ensure a direct line and a clarification of that text.

Are there any other contributions on this comment? Otherwise, I can summarize the high-level agreements [and then respond].

Seeing no hands, it looks like have three agreements. The first is to check the language regarding the feasibility assessment currently in the report to make sure that it's clear and leave it to the Board and implementation team to determine how to implement that guidance.

The second agreement was: the CCWG is to further consider whether language is needed regarding limitations on the role of the Empowered Community and the allocation of [inaudible] with potential additional input from ICANN Legal and, finally, that the leadership team is to clarify with the BC the intent of the comments regarding the Empowered Community.

Not seeing any comments on that, we can move onto the next comment, which is from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. So, seeing no additional comments, Comment #6: The Registrar Stakeholder Group expresses a preference for Mechanism A, provides some additional comments regarding the comparison that they conducted regarding Mechanisms A and B, and also discussed in some length their assessment of Mechanism C.

The leadership's recommendation here is that no further action is needed, noting that a preference for Mechanism A is stated in the comments.

Are there any additional discussion points that anyone would like to raise with respect to this comment?

Okay. Seeing none, we'll move on to the IPC comment. Here the IPC has looked at Mechanisms A and B and expressed the

preference for Mechanism B and discussed the specific reasons why they consider that the mechanism of choice.

Again, here the leadership recommends taking no further action but noting the IPC's preference for Mechanism B.

Any additional comments or points of clarification there?

Okay. Seeing none, we will move on to the Comment #8. This is a comment from the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board, regarding the mechanism, so stated it will not be indicating a preference but welcomes the auction proceeds approach to providing the Board with two mechanisms for consideration and notes that the Board will review those recommendations in line with Board principles, collaborating with ICANN org to make a final decision.

The leadership recommendation there is that no further action is needed that this time, noting that the Board welcome's the CCWG's approach but is not indicating a preference for a mechanism at this stage.

Are there any additional comments or questions about the Board's comments?

Seeing none, we're now looking at Comment #9 from the NCSG. The NCSG expresses support for Mechanism B and describes why that is the case and makes one additional comment recommending that the selected organization must be as neutral as possible with experience working with global projects and diverse communities. Here the selected organization that's being referenced is the partner organization working with the internal department under Mechanism B.

The leadership recommends that no further action is needed, noting the NCSG's preference of Mechanism B and recommends that the CCWG should discuss points regarding the neutrality and experience of the selected organization when we're reviewing the guidelines in that second pass that's expected to take place after the initial pass of the comments.

Does anyone want to further clarify any of the points here or react to them?

Okay. Seeing no further comments, I think we can then assume that this is support for doing that review during the second pass.

The final two comments in this section I won't summarize, but it appears that they were mistakenly submitted in response to this public comment period and actually were intended to be submitted in response to a different public comment period regarding .com. If anyone believes that that's a mistake and that these are relevant, please do speak up. But we only included them here to be complete. But, as they are off topic, they won't be discussed here.

Any objections to moving on to the next template, or any additional comments on all of the responses as we reach the end of this template?

Judith says that she's agrees they should not be considered, which makes sense.

I'm going to go ahead then and bring up the next template for review, and we'll go onto Question 2. Just a moment … Apologies. That's the wrong one … okay. So the second question for public comment was, "Do you have any concerns about the updates the

# EN

CCWG has made and listed in Section 1 above in response to the public comment forum? If yes, please specify what changes concern you and why." If you'll recall, in the public comment Question 2, there was a series changes listed to each of the sections in the report since the initial report was published. So those were listed out here as well. I won't read thorough them.

For your consideration as you go through these, the question is essentially the same. "As a result of the info provided, are there further revisions needed to [inaudible] final report?"—it looks like there's an open line. Thanks. "Are there any additional changes that are needed? If so, why?"

Starting with Comment 1, we have Sylvia Cadena from the APNIC Foundation. She expresses support for the modifications proposed, and she notes that it's crucial that the management of grants, independent of the mechanism, is conducted efficiently—a maximum of 10-15% of the auction proceeds pool—so that at least 85% of funds in the auction proceeds pool directly benefits the community project selected. So this is a comment about setting a cap on overhead.

The leadership has recommended that this is a topic that has been discussed by the CCWG and includes it as a topic of discussion and that the CCWG has determined that a specific percentage would not be included in the report and that that would be an implementation detail to be determined in the implementation phase. The leadership further recommended that, in the review of the guidelines, the CCWG may want to see if additional text should be added that makes clearer that the CCWG is recommending a prudent approach to setting a standard of

**EN**

overhead. That's on Pages 30, 31, and 32 of that report: when that review takes place.

Are there any comments regarding Sylvia's feedback on the report?

Maureen says that she agrees with the leadership recommendation. Is there anyone else who would like to comment, or should we assume that no additional comments means that the leadership recommendation will be taken?

Okay. I'm seeing support expressed in the chat for going with the leadership recommendation on this comment. We can then move forward to the next comment, which is from Judith Hellerstein. She agrees with Recommendation 2 and supports Recommendations 3, 4 through 6, and then [through] 12, and Recommendation 8, which is about ICANN org being a recipient of auction proceeds. She says that she does not believe ICANN org should be able to participate in auction proceeds but states that she's not as clear about one of the representative bodies within one of the ICANN constituencies, which are legal entities in their own right or whether the [AOS] which exists in its own right as a legal entity can submit a request, provided that all applications meet the stipulated conditions and requirements, including legal and fiduciary requirements.

Just taking a step backwards, I see that there's some additional comments about Sylvia's input. So, just taking a step back to that, [Carlita] says, "While I agree with Sylvia's estimated max overhead, I think it was a complicated debate which we should not

# EN

revisit." Judith supports that. So it sounds like that's additional support for the leadership's proposed approach.

Coming back to Judith's comment, the leadership recommendation is that the CCWG reviews Recommendation 8 to ensure that the text is clear. Recommendation 8 states that the CCWG did not reach consensus to provide any specific recommendation, whether or not ICANN org or its constituent parts could be a beneficiary of auction proceeds. But it does recommend that, for all applications, the stipulated conditions and requirements, including legal and fiduciary requirements, need to be met.

I see Alan's hand is up. I'll go to him. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Thank you very much. In my mind, there is no lack of clarity. For instance, an At-Large Structure within At-Large, if it's legally incorporates in Uganda or in Canada or wherever, should be a legitimate applicant. The fact that it has some affiliation with ICANN should not alter that.  Similarly, if there is a sub-group within the GNSO that is legally incorporated—I don't know if there are or not—then clearly it should be allowed.

If indeed we are not sure about this, I think we need to be clear in our final words because we certainly must have clarity on what groups are eligible and what groups are no eligible. Whether they give a good application or not is a different issue. But I think we need to be very clear about what groups are eligible or not. So, if

indeed our words are not sufficiently clear, I think that's something we need to work on. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS:    Thank you, Alan. Is there any other comments in response to Alan's comment?

I note that Maureen has agreed with Alan here. Are others interested in revisiting this issue in terms of the language for Recommendation 8 at this stage, or do others think that the language is sufficiently clear in terms of the fact that the CCWG has not reached consensus on any specific recommendation on this issue?

I'm seeing Vanda say that she agrees with Alan. She's also saying that she doesn't feel the issue should be revisited.

Alan, please?

ALAN GREENBERG:    I guess I'm saying, if there is a belief among anyone that it is not clear, then I think we need to fix it. If not us, who's going to do it? This is a really crucial question: who's eligible to apply for these funds? If we can't come to closure on it, then I'm not sure where we're booting it to you. Thank you.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:    Hi. It's Anne. Can I get in the queue?

EMILY BARABAS:             Hi, Anne. Please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:     I just want to register my agreement with Alan. Even though I joined the group late, I certainly don't think that there was any prohibition against qualified SOs and ACs applying for grants if they are otherwise qualified, as Alan mentioned. I do think that he's correct: if there's issue in relation to this, it should be clarified. I don't believe there was any prohibition on that. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS:             Thanks, Anne. Alan, is that a new hand or an old hand?

ALAN GREENBERG:          Sorry. That's an old one.

EMILY BARABAS:             Thanks, Alan. Just noting that the recommendation here doesn't state specifically that the CCWG is recommending that it's allowed or not allowed but is simply saying it hasn't reached consensus on the issue. So in the proposal to essentially reopen this issue is the intent or the expectation that consensus can be reached on this particular point, noting that the Chair will ultimately make that decision about whether a topic will be reopened. But it's helpful to have feedback from the group about whether there's a belief that consensus can be reached if this topic is reopened and the specific point is further discussed.

# EN

Alan, please?

ALAN GREENBERG:     That is a new hand now. I guess I'm really confused on how we can say—I think we are saying it somewhere—that any legal entity can apply assuming it meets a certain criteria. Maybe there's a rule somewhere saying it can't be a government or something like that. I don't remember exactly what we did say. But I'm not sure why there's a lack of clarity and a lack of consensus on whether entities associated with ICANN can apply or not if they meet the other criteria.

So I think, if we're saying we can't make a recommendation and it is not ultimately clear who can apply and can't apply, we do need to reopen it. I think we at least need to understand what it is we're not agreeing on or we don't have consensus on because, in my mind, it's not 100% clear right now, and I think it's one of the items that we really do need clarity on. So either we need to make a recommendation or we need to tell the Board that they have to choose. But, ultimately, when we announce the first round, there needs to be clarity. Thank you.

If Emily is speaking, you're muted.

EMILY BARABAS:     Apologies, Alan. Carolina has agreed with Alan. Stephen has also agreed. Sylvia says, "I believe, on the issues, the CCWG does not reach consensus. The implementation team/process will have to do the comprehensive review and put language together. I think the text was clear that there was no prohibition."

I think, on this item, given that Erika is not available, it sounds like maybe this is an item that there's some agreement on that it needs to be revisited as a recommendation, and perhaps—welcome back, Erika. We'll just very briefly catch you up here. We're looking at responses to Question 2. This is the input from Judith Hellerstein regarding the question of Recommendation 8 about who can receive auction proceeds. A number of folks have said that they think it's important for the CCWG to revisit Recommendation 8 and provide clearer guidance on which entities are and are not eligible to receive funds.

I don't know if you have any initial thoughts on that in terms of reopening the issue of revising text on Recommendation 8, but please feel free to weigh in. If you don't feel comfortable doing so, we can perhaps park it for now and you can follow up on the mailing list with your input after reviewing the recording. Thanks.

ERIKA MANN: I believe, Emily, that's smart because I couldn't follow the full discussion and I want to really listen and hear that colleagues have said. And I want to look to review the chatroom, which I could do to some degree but not completely because I had to focus on another topic.

Just my initial thought always on this one is—but, again, that's my experience—I think it is always smart to say who is not able to participate but not to go any further because, if you are too precise, it can cause difficulties. I experienced so many in the different funding environments I supported and evaluated. It can

cause major issues, even in legal terms, if you are too prescriptive. So I think we want to be careful here.

But let's park this topic for right now because I have to listen to what was said and the arguments. Then we can continue discussing by e-mail.

EMILY BARABAS:      Thanks, Erika. Unless there are further comments on that, it sounds like we can move on to the ALAC comment. Perhaps that would be a good place to pause because the ALAC comment and Judith have some common points. Then we can perhaps go on to look at the timeline and finalization of the work.

Does that work for you, Erika?

ERIKA MANN:        Absolutely. Totally. Please continue, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS:      Thanks, Erika. So this is a comment from ALAC, #3. Here ALAC is agreeing with Recommendation 2, Recommendation 3, 4 through 6, and 9 through 12. On Recommendation 7, there's a comment that they believe that Recommendation 7 should read "must not have access," instead of "should not have access." As a reminder, Recommendation 7 has to do with access to ICANN's accountability mechanisms and currently reads, "Applicants and other parties should not have access to ICANN accountability mechanisms, such as IRP or other appeal mechanisms, to

challenge a decision from the independent project application evaluation panel to not approve an application. But applicants not selected should receive further details about where information can be found about the next round of application, as well as any educational materials that may not be available to assist applicants."

So the comment is essentially saying that, instead of saying that applicants and other parties should not have access to accountability mechanisms, the proposal is that they must not have access.

On, Recommendation 8, similar to Judith's comment. ALAC states, "We do not believe that ICANN org should be able to participate in auction proceeds and again request clarity on representative bodies within ICANN constituencies."

The leadership recommendation for Recommendation 7 suggests, perhaps instead of using "should" or "must," saying something like, "No right will exist for applicants and other parties to access ICANN's accountability mechanisms." That was the proposal from leadership.

The item regarding Recommendation 8 will be parked pending Erika's input on the mailing list. I'll pass it back to you, Erika, to facilitate the discussion on these comments. Thanks.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Emily. I believe, on Item 7, we have agreement here regarding "shall" or "must." "Must" is stronger, but in principle it has the same meaning.

We had a complete understanding between us: There shall be no right (or there must be no right) for applicants to access to the existing accountability mechanism. So we in the leadership just turned this around. Instead of having a negative formulation, we're more looking for a more general formulation, which is similar to what we said before but just sounds a little bit, let's say, like it typically would be expressed in such a funding environment.

I took the text when we discussed it from another funding environment, where something was prohibited for certain entities—to use existing accountability mechanisms—in such an environment. So it's just a formulation.

As Emily said, on Item 8, I'd like to review what you have said. Then we can continue the discussion by e-mail.

Concerning 7, would you be okay with the leadership formulation, or would you rather prefer the original text which we had included?

I would even exclude [inaudible], Emily and colleagues. So it should just read, "No rights exist for applicants and other parties to access ICANN's existing accountability mechanisms, such as [IRP] or other appeal mechanisms."

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:   Hi, it's Anne. May I ask a question about the language?

ERIKA MANN:   Sure.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: That sounds like good language, Erika. I think that would cover the issue that we raised about no access even if the issue is an approved grant as opposed to a not-approved grant because, I think, in the proposed final report, it talked about access to these mechanisms for grants that are not approved. We had commented that it should apply even for grants that are approved because you could have third parties trying to challenge those grants.

But I'm audio only and in the car, so I can't see the language. Does it now cover either an approval or non-approval [inaudible] exempted?

ERIKA MANN: That's a good point. We may want to extend the language. You're absolutely right. So we could say, "No right exists for applicants and other parties to access ICANN's accountability mechanisms," and then we continue, "Neither does any right exist to challenge any decision taken concerning applications or non-applications." So we could continue the same sentence and make your point clear in the same sentence.

Would this help?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah. That would be great. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Just checking with everybody else. Are you all agreeing that you're supporting this language?

ALAN GREENBERG:    I have my hand up. It's Alan.

ERIKA MANN:    Oh, why don't I see it? Oh, sorry. I didn't scroll up. Alan, please?

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you. I'm not sure if the wording that you're proposing is identical in meaning. I'll leave that to the lawyers. But I don't think it is nearly as clear as saying, "Applicants and other parties must not have access to the various measures in respect to grant applications." I see it's only in respect to grant applications. I don't have the full wording in front of me. Clearly an applicant can use an accountability measure in relation to something unrelated to auction proceeds.

But I think clear language saying "must not have access to these things for these purposes" is a lot clearer than the way you have it worded. I'll leave it to the lawyers to decide whether in fact the two are functionally equivalent or not. But I think clarity is important here. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN:    Thank you, Alan. I agree with you. Clarity is important. That's why I looked at some very legalistic funds and took the language from there: I believe exactly what you are recommending is not very clear. "Must not have" is a strange negative formulation which practically implies that you take away a certain right.

**EN**

The other—


ALAN GREENBERG:         Erika, we are taking away a right.


ERIKA MANN:             Not really. It was never given to them. So it's a little bit different. We're not taking anything away because it was never given for this particular environment. So that's why I'm a little bit concerned. But we agree. We want clarity, so we give it to Sam. You have a little bit more work to do, and review what is the best language here. Any anybody else who wants to look at it from the legal point of view. We are on the same side. Then we extend it to, "Neither can a rejection be challenged." So we want to continue with the language we just discussed.

                        Emily, I'm pretty sure you have captured it in your note.


ALAN GREENBERG:         Erika, it's Alan.


ERIKA MANN:             Alan, go ahead.


ALAN GREENBERG:         To be clear, the accountability measures give everyone the right to appeal and to use the accountability measures under certain circumstances. So we are taking away a right which would

otherwise be there. And, as Sam noted, it will require a bylaw amendment. We need to make sure that that's flagged clearly.

But, implicitly with ICANN accountability, everyone does have the right to appeal things and to use the measures. So we are removing it. That's why I favored the wording that was first.

But, again, we want to make sure we have legal clarity. I'm not going to spend a lot of time quibbling over the words. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Totally agree with you, Alan. Thank you so much. I believe we have an understanding here. So there's no need to discuss Item 8 because we will do this now by e-mail.

Emily, do we have another item on … I can't see it. Do we have another topic which we have to discuss before we look at the timeline?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Erika. I think this is a good point to stop. Perhaps we can go to AOB and just very briefly look at the timeline to remind everyone where we are. It should be only take a minute, Alan.

ERIKA MANN: Please be so kind and do it.

EMILY BARABAS: Is everyone able to see the timeline?

ERIKA MANN:            Yeah. I can see it at least.


EMILY BARABAS:         Great.


ERIKA MANN:            Let's see everybody else. Yeah, no comment. Should be fine, Emily.


EMILY BARABAS:         Great. So this is just a reminder from the timeline that was circulated over e-mail. Here we are today, March 4th, kicking off the review of public comments. It's anticipated that we'll have three more meetings to go over public comments and then, in mid-April, publish the final report with any applicable updates following the review of those public comments and then [hold a] survey of ultimately the mechanisms that will be selected for the final report in the recommendations, a confirmation of those results—the consensus call by Chairs – at the end of April, and the finalization of the work by submitting the report in May.

So that's a just a reminder of where we are and where we're going. I'll pass it back to Erika to close the call. Thanks.


ERIKA MANN:            Thank you so much, everybody. I believe there's no discussion we need about the timeline. Hopefully we can skip one call and we

can finish a little bit earlier, instead of April 8th. There's nothing to discuss, so thank you so much, everybody. Concerning Item 8, we will continue the discussion by e-mail. Thank you so much, Emily and team, and Joke.

Back to you, Julie.

JULIE BISLAND:          Thank you, Erika. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This meeting is adjourned. You can disconnect your lines and have a good rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**