

ICANN Transcription
CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds
Thursday, 24 August 2017 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds Call on the Thursday, 24 August 2017 at 14:00 UTC. 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 may be found at: <https://community.icann.org/x/Z2zwAw>

Recordings may be found at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-24aug17-en.mp3> AND <https://participate.icann.org/p2o284uac/g/>

Julie Bisland: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds call held on the 24th of August 2017. In the interest of time there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now? And I do have Elliot Noss noted.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Julie Bisland: All right hearing no more names I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. And with this I'll turn it back over to Erika Mann. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much Julie and welcome to everyone. Kavouss is still typing so he might be on audio. He is sometimes only on the audio so we might want to check with him that we don't miss if he wants to. Second point if the (unintelligible) or conflict of interest declaration. Anybody how wants to make a declaration or anonymous that some changes happened and it's already found to be on the Internet? Okay, so that's not the case.

Then let's move to point three which is the recap of the CCWG approach for dealing with the charter question rule of surveys, email exchanges and contains the (unintelligible). We have just - I want to do this quickly. We have some (likely) exchange on the email about some of the topics and there's some concern raised by some of our colleagues in arguing if we always capture and in particular in the mind mapping do we always capture the points you raise and if this always translated in the correct way.

My approach to this is we are trying really something new. And I really want to thank Marika in particular but everybody involved in this of being so careful and trying to capture the essence of what every (unintelligible) what you say in an email exchange for example or in a comment during our calls in these mind mapping exercised. Quite complex. I did it myself not to be to support and to help Marika a bit it's quite complex to get it always right.

That's why it is so important that once we send out these kind of mind maps or summaries and related to some of the points which were debated be so kind to review it carefully and like you did yesterday and today always send back replies immediately to help us to correct things which you think we haven't understood completely right. This is super helpful for us.

Just a reminder the charter questions are helping us to frame the - in a very early stage identified questions which are key in moving the other exercise forward. So they are really key in helping us and in framing the from our group identified key questions. The mind map is only a kind of translation and

a kind of overview which then helps us to see if all the bits and pieces come together or if there is something missing.

And we have seen over the last two days that some of the topics were not - apparently not kept up in the complete and in the right way. The Survey Monkeys or the surveys are just helping again to identify quickly topics which we see as relevant. In particular Marika identifies these kind of topics quickly where she thinks it's not perfect then we need to come back to you.

We always have a call and identify these topics together in the leadership team. And then Marika pushes them out to you. And it's just really key and important for us to fine tune some of the topics. If this is too boring for you and you believe it's done too often and too frequently just let us know. But it helps I think to continue to work in the way we are working and to get this done ideally until the end of the year.

The email exchanges now this is more my problem. I'm not a big fan of email exchanges. But I must say I think that over the last days we have found a nice way in (unintelligible) email key concerns. And it is quite focused the way we work by email. So I'm quite happy with this to continue it. And both Marika and I and Cheng we haven't found a different approach yet. There might be some but we have the feeling you feel very comfortable with emails.

Marika and I and Cheng we did something new which you will see the (unintelligible) summer we - where we with regard to certain important key topics like for example open Internet where we just kept again the essence of what has been later put into the - onto the mind map as well. But we kept (unintelligible) think it's a very nice way to help us to not lose something which is really key.

On the point which we lose sometimes we haven't lost them completely. Coming to a point (Sylvia) mentioned on the grant where she made a recommendation very early that we can work with (unintelligible). It is not lost

but we have to pick it up again. And hopefully Marika and the core team and I, the leadership team will find the time very soon to review all the missing bits and pieces which were mentioned in the past and which we will have to pick up again and come back to you in ensuring that these points are not lost. So we keep quite tight track of everything. Nothing is lost and we will have Marika and (unintelligible) often Cheng we will sit together in our latest in Abu Dhabi to review all these former calls and to check that nothing is forgotten. So let's (keep) asking for your comments on this point. Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I kicked off some of this discussion or continued in another case. And Erika something you said rang a bell with me and you were sort of implying that my comments or perhaps other people were critical of how ideas had been captured in the documents. Now I - as I said I have missed a number of meetings so that (unintelligible) to imply that there have been mistakes made but simply that I didn't agree with what was there which I presumed is what was said. And in fact my comments were sent out to some extent at Marika's request to make - to say that I, you know, I had commented to her privately and she said I should send it to the list if I don't agree and proposed alternatives. So there certainly was nothing critical in what I was saying (unintelligible) very clear. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes thank you Alan. Just another point too because some of you are sometimes not all - we can't always be on the call and then you want to raise an additional point which you think is missing. I mean this is absolutely helpful and needed so very much welcome of course. But I know that some have some points which felt that we didn't capture as well.

And I just want to ensure you please come back to us immediately. We need your input. And if we get something not perfectly right it's super important to hear back from you. Kavouss please?

Kavouss Arasteh: Erika I apologize in advance. I think it looks like that there's somebody sitting in front of computer and opening hundreds of pages of the word document

and then they don't know how go to the place that he really wants. We are offering so many items at the same time.

We talk of objectives. It was quite clear three words -- development, evolution, distribution. And all of a sudden we get into the Internet open or not open either talking of reserve margins and then we just jump into the system that not it is not correct to have 12 (unintelligible) the budget not. So I think we opening too many meeting at the same time. Could we at least try to channelize the issue that we could follow one issue at the time and then put in the other issue as well but not going are looking to the communication people commenting on anything, the people commenting on auctions requested by sorry ICANN the organization, the people talking of the reserve whether they should be 12 months or 24 months, who will decide on that.

Then we are talking of the objectives. Then we are talking the Internet open. So I think it is the habit of ICANN and open the issues instead of trying at some time to wrap it up and to channelize innovator to get something. All of you except me are expert specialists knowledgeable and so on so forth. You can comment many, many pages and hours and so on so forth but you don't have such time. Look at what you have done up till now. I think we should have done better. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you Kavouss. I take this as a constructive criticism and I think you're right. It's sometimes part of the ICANN culture but I think we're pretty good in narrowing down our scopes and what we need to reach. Sometimes we will have to pick up some other topics because they suddenly become relevant and important but I take your point. And we will try our best to work along those lines. Marika please?

Marika Konings: Thanks Erika. This is Marika. I just wanted to echo what I think you've already said and what Alan already noted as well. And in a lot of the documents that staff pushes out indeed we're just trying to help the conversation move forward, you know, trying to summarize a point or a input that has been

received. And again, you know, sometimes we may get that wrong. So we really rely on you indeed to review those documents and provide us with guidance where you see that we maybe missed contributions or misinterpreted certain comments.

And again in certain cases as well, you know, suggest alternatives. So I think that's what we're really looking for, you know, by putting certain things on the table to have people react to make alternative suggestions easier then as well for the CCWG as a whole to discuss those alternatives and hopefully come to some kind of agreement on where you all believe, you know, the group should be going.

Similarly if you have any suggestions or ideas on how we should do things differently or different types of documents we should be considering we're always (unintelligible) of suggestions and happy to try out new things. And I just want to thank you all for all the feedback you've been providing on the mailing list. And I do have to admit I know that some further comments have come on on a number of the documents between yesterday and now which I haven't able - been able yet to review and include in our documents. But hopefully we will have a chance to discuss those later and we'll be in a position to provide an updated version shortly after this meeting.

Erika Mann: Thank you Marika and thanks so much for all the great work you are doing and your team. It's just incredible impressive and professional the way you work. Thank you so much for this. On the consensus I would like you - I would like to recommend the this is actually a very good summary of the way how the rules of engagement work. And this includes the - some census part as well.

There is a very nice section which is called Section 5 in Rules of Engagement. We will put this in the summary of our days to days call the link to it. And then you then look to Section 5 Rules of Engagement. There is a very nice summary how we can work.

And I'm very much on the side of those who said can we come to consensus as early as possible? Whenever we sense we are ready and I totally agree we should do this. We will make a recommendation. Hopefully we can do it today. And it's - but we have to be careful. And I've seen there's another working groups that till the end we might have to reopen a certain consensus which we have to reach and we have to maybe include new language and find a new consensus. But hopefully we don't have to do it.

My idea and I know from Cheng as well to a situation where we can all agree what we present and which then goes to the public consultation. And then ideal scenario in particular in this case it would be wonderful if we could involve a situation where we need to have minority opinions included. If it needs to be done it needs to be done. But I'm still very hopeful and watching the way we work I'm still very hopeful and positive that we can find a consensus.

And I don't think that we need to discuss this much further. But we will put the link into the document so you can review this part and you can see how it was formulated. Anybody who wants to make a comment on this particular part of our consensus? No?

Okay then let's move to the next item which will - I will hand over to Marika because I can't open the Survey Monkey. Somehow they are refusing nowadays -- I don't know why -- that I can open. I just have to sign up first to the system which I haven't done yet. So Marika you have - please be so kind to guide us.

Marika Konings: And thank you Erika.

Erika Mann: You're on the screen?

Marika Konings: Yes. I'm just looking in the - in our documents and I just can ask Julie can you maybe pull up the results of the survey if you uploaded them? I don't see it here in the list of documents?

Erika Mann: No it's not there yet.

Marika Konings: Okay one moment please.

Erika Mann: Yes sure.

Marika Konings: If you give us...

Erika Mann: (Unintelligible) by now? No. Elliot you still with us on the call on the audio?

Elliot Noss: Yes I am.

Erika Mann: Wonderful, thanks. And please intervene...

Marika Konings: So...

Erika Mann: ...if you want to say something anytime.

Marika Konings: While Julie is getting that document up maybe I can already start talking about it. You can also all click the link that's available in the agenda that takes you to the results of the survey. So this is actually a survey that we already conducted a little while back but we deferred discussion from last week's meeting as the presentation by (Xavier) to a bit more time than we had originally anticipated.

But our assumption was as well that some of the materials that were presented by (Xavier) may help inform the deliberations on this specific question which dealt with the issue of the timeframe for the fund allocation and mechanism. So the specific question was is this a one-off exercise with a

very limited or set timeframe or is this a fund that could operate or mechanism that could operate more in a perpetual kind of manner?

The responses to the survey were inconclusive, had a 35% versus 40% breakdown on one of exercise versus potential long-lasting mechanism. Based on our initial discussion as well and I think it was actually a specific question from Alan which then triggered the conversation with (Xavier) was before we actually talk about, you know, a long-lasting mechanism we probably first need to understand whether that is even possible with the funds that are available and through investment mechanisms that are available.

But I note as well that there were as well quite a few people that didn't really have a strong view on this noting that as long as legal and fiduciary requirements were met and they were (clean). So one question for the group here is is there a way to come to a preliminary agreement on this question whether we're looking at this as a one-off exercise or whether we're looking at a long-lasting mechanism?

I think some have already pointed out, you know, even if we would go for a one-off exercise that doesn't necessarily mean that is short in timeframe as, you know, depending of course on the type of mechanism that will be chosen. It may still take a number of years before that is, you know, created applications and disbursements take place. So it's not necessarily a, you know, very short versus long timeframe but it's more to make sure of the fund, the fund mechanism.

So the question is is it possible to come to some kind of preliminary agreement on this specific question? The other question of course is that necessary or required before we move further? Originally it was identified as one of the questions that does need addressing before we actually start looking in mechanisms. And I think that's what we're hoping to discuss here.

There was a late question to this that asks what aspect should be considered to find a timeframe if any for the disbursements of funds? And here we did see a majority of respondents indicated that the focus of disbursements of funds should not give any specific reference to the duration of the projects. So at least in fair that there is, maybe, you know, (unintelligible) that in that case it shouldn't matter whether it's long term or short term. So that shouldn't be given specific consideration.

Another related question was what aspect should be considered to define a timeframe if any for the disbursement of funds? And again here a small majority indicated that they would find it preferably if funding would be released in trenches linked to milestone achievements. But again obviously that is also dependent on the type of project and duration of the project and whether that would make sense or not. But I think that gives you hopefully an initial idea of the thinking and is that I think the main question seems to be the first one on the overall timeframe of the fund allocation and mechanism.

Daniel Dardailler: Marika if you can...

Erika Mann: Thank you Marika.

Daniel Dardailler: ...(unintelligible) Daniel Dardailler.

Erika Mann: Sorry? Who is it?

Daniel Dardailler: Daniel Dardailler if you can put me in the queue.

Erika Mann: Yes I will do this. Alan is first on the list. Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much, Alan Greenberg speaking. I guess the first question -- and I didn't answer the survey I'm afraid -- but the first question is should it be an ongoing process or is it a one-time I don't think frames the question properly.

The real issue is if we assume there is no more money coming into the process that either from another auction or benevolent people who add to the pile then how do you view this? And I think that's a question which is a lot easier to answer. We know from (Xavier) that we might make, you know, 6% a year or something. So if we start with the whole amount and we want to preserve the capital and make this go on forever then we're talking about giving away maybe \$10 million to \$12 million a year. And if all we're giving away is \$10 million to \$12 million a year we're spending an awful lot of time on this project which I think is out of proportion.

So if indeed that is what we're looking at I think we should scale back this whole process. But in my mind we are not trying to preserve this to go on forever but expect it to last for a finite number of years. And exactly how many that is remains to be seen. But giving away money at or funding projects at a much higher rate than \$10 million a year. And at that point if there is no more money coming in then it has a finite life because we're going to be spending it quicker than we can earn it on the market.

So I think if we frame it. Now that doesn't preclude another auction or someone coming in and saying, "Here's another \$200 million because you're doing such good stuff," and it goes on longer. But I don't think we can presume that at this point. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes valid point. But I - Marika can we put these questions maybe on the list for when we have to call this the external expert as well because I think it would be good to get one - at least one expert on the call that they're relatively fresh funds so we get an understanding and about the same amount we are handling to get an understanding how they are dealing with this topic. And I will put this on my reminder and to do list as well. Daniel Dardailler you are next and then I see Kavouss. Daniel Dardailler please?

Daniel Dardailler: Thanks Erika. So I think Alan basically answered my question. I'm wondering if we have some input from the new gTLD program as to whether there will be more auction in the future? That's one bit of information we don't really have.

And then there is the possibility that if we have a (grantage) in (unintelligible) that is focused on one particular, you know, area which is good for the Internet but we need be more people giving good expanding agency in addition to the auction fund. That's a second point so it could last longer because the setups that we have done is appealing to other parties that are willing to donate.

Then it all depend on the amount of project. You know, what is the amount of our project that we're going to give? If we limit ourselves to some millions of dollar per project then on average I mean, not giving a particular but as having a target of \$5 million per project maybe then we can understand how long this is going to last with interest and everything. So but I think if we find out that it's more than ten years then we might as well say that it's forever because that's the - basically the horizon of ICANN I think.

Erika Mann: Yes. I don't know if somebody wants to comment on these questions. I think they are all good to put on further auctions which we have to look into. Definitely the auctions my understanding is can go on until the end definitely of this round. If the new round -- and please object to it if I'm not correct. If the new rounds comes to a different conclusion how to handle this in the future it's a different question.

Pay into the system is probably something we have to discuss on the broader - in a broader way than just within our - in our group. And the limited I don't know, we never discussed it. I don't see why we should have any limits, annual limits. It depends on the projects that are coming in but that's my understanding. Kavouss please?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes Erika. I am participating in the new gTLD group. Perhaps I might have missed some of the track. But I don't recall that we have come to a conclusion to the permanency of having this auctions and so on so forth yet to be discussed. Until the time that we have more clear idea perhaps we should not definitely select in these two options. But we could base ourselves that it seems improbably that situation may continue.

Perhaps this one-off process is less probable than more continued one. But we not decide but at least address this issue at this time pending a better result from the new gTLD because I don't think that would be so quick because there's still we are discussing that. So perhaps we should base ourselves on that but not definitely select between one or the other essential.

Erika Mann: Yes that's one way as well. Thank you Kavouss. Elliot please. Elliot can you hear?

Elliot Noss: Yes I just had to turn off mute. I'd like to respond to Daniel Dardailler's questions which I think are very relevant here and really underpin a lot of my assumptions about one-time versus perpetual or institutional items. There are three significant differences between the first round and any subsequent rounds that will materially affect the, you know, kind of the funds available.

And now here I'm talking from a kind of a market or a business perspective. First there is no question nor could there be any argument that the significant majority of the most desirable strings when in the first round. You know, we see the predominance of the funds we have available really coming from the .web auction in particular. That's not to say there wouldn't be a significant pool of money that was made up by the rest. But you kind of have .web one or two more that were large only relative to the rest but small relative to Web and then a somewhat of a long tail.

So, you know, first and most importantly simply the excess economic rent which is what the auctions capture will be way less in the second round.

Second, you want to think about the processes when the new gTLD program was initiated and was going through it's kind of many years of dialogue and debate and then rollout nobody contemplated private auctions.

Private auctions, and if anybody is not familiar with them I'm happy to explain. I'll watch in the chat to see if anybody needs that. But private auctions are a mechanism that evolved through market participants as the process rolled out. So none of us I assure you who were intimate with this process and who were involved on the business side foresaw private auctions. If we did we would have made many, many more applications than a lot of us did.

The private auctions evolved and by all about halfway through the process they became the preferred method. By later in the process they were dominant. The only exceptions to private auctions were the situations like .web where you had a particular market participant who wanted to dissuade the others from bidding.

So it became an auction tactic to stay in the public auction in the ICANN auction and very much the exception. So you now have the most desirable strings gone and you also have a mechanism that's developed that's going to soak up the majority of that excess economic rent that exists. And again that will be private auctions. And the third thing is the budgeting process, the ICANN budgeting process in particular. When ICANN the organization budgeted for new gTLDs fully 50% of the application fees which were quite expensive and as many of you know, you know, there was significant community dialogue quite fairly about the size of the fee precluding sort of less developed economies and really harming diversity. Fifty percent of that fee was allocated to litigation.

There has been virtually no litigation. I might get this number wrong but I think there's something like \$80 million that's allocated right now and still earmarked sort of hived off for litigation relating to new gTLDs. That is a

massive excess that exists right there and at a minimum that need not be included.

So what you're going to have in the second round when it happens which is probably still 2020 my best guess for the start of that process is you're going to have less desirable strings the significant majority of which where there is contention will go to private not ICANN auction. And in any event ICANN should be budgeting in that process to contemplate those excess funds and to include them as a line item sufficient to allow them to lower the application fees even further.

So if you look at the auctions and you look at the pool of money that we have as measuring excess economic rent that goes to ICANN that number is likely to be almost irrelevant relative to the size of the pool it is now. So I just wanted everyone to hear all of that because I think all of those points are important. And I think, you know, especially given the timing it would be A, you know, we put ourselves frozen in amber if we were to wait to see what happens with the new gTLD process.

Erika Mann: Yes thanks. And thank you for reminding us about the background on how we came to the auctions. So the next one is John Robert Levine.

John Robert Levine: Thank you. I'd like...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: (Unintelligible) just let me repeat so that you know whom I see in case somebody wants to put in-between because I can't see the person. So I have Alan, Xavier, Kavouss...

Alan Greenberg: No John Robert Levine was before but somehow his hand got put down so you should go to John Robert Levine first.

Erika Mann: Oh your hand - yes I have John Robert Levine here. No...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Erika Mann: ...(unintelligible) down John Robert Levine?

John Robert Levine: No, I do have something I would like to say.

Erika Mann: Please.

John Robert Levine: Yes thank you. First I'd like to thank Elliot for that long and helpful explanation of why we shouldn't expect more money in the future. But I want to go back to what Alan said in the first place about whether this is a pool to be spent now or whether it's a foundation. I mean and turning this into a permanent endowment I think is completely incompatible with what ICANN is and what ICANN charter says.

I mean ICANN is an organization that exists to administer identifiers. I mean they are tax-exempt in the United States because they've lessened the burdens of government that otherwise would have to administer the identifiers. ICANN's charter and ICANN goals have nothing to do with giving money away. I mean this pool of money I think it's pretty clear from what Elliot said is essentially a mistake. Nobody expected there to be these giant auctions with the money going to ICANN. So our job is to deal, you know, is to deal with this and to spend it as expeditiously as we can, you know, in a responsible way.

You know, but it would be - I think it would be extremely inappropriate to try to straighten it out into a foundation. It would be equally inappropriate to attempt to turn look to some hypothetical future process for some hypothetical future stream of money. I mean this is a huge distraction from ICANN's main, you know, from what ICANN should be doing. I mean and most responsible thing for us to do is to figure out how to spend the money, arrange, set up the

process, give it away and be done with it so ICANN can go back to doing what they're supposed to do. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. The - what was just said I can support that we need to decide whether - and John Robert Levine gave his opinion -- I tend to agree with it whether we try to keep this going forever and only spend the revenue and keep the capital or whether we do it at reasonably expeditiously as possible. That's a valid debate to have.

But let me be rather blunt. I have 5-1/2 hours of conference call scheduled today and a discussion in this call of whether there is going to be more money or not and where it's going to come from be it auctions or benevolent people I think is a complete waste of our time. We are charged with doing something with the pile of money we have right now. And that's what we should be doing, not spending time discussing whether there's some future auction or some other process that might yield us another pile of money. Thank you very much.

Erika Mann: Thank you. Thanks Alan. Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes that would be one option as Alan mentioned. But we forget about the future, what we have some money how to spend that and that is one option. The other option is that yes if they continue but not same version but at the same evolution.

But something is important. If the new gTLDs (stop) or working group decides on the first councilor serve that process is very unlikely would lead to something as having auctions because the one who comes first is served first. So there is no such registration that (unintelligible) and completely and recouring to the auction so perhaps you can divide the issue in two parts. One part is what to do with what you have and then the continuation of that

with the same version or with lesser and so on and so forth. But at this time we cannot decide on the situation whether we take one time or we take a continuous until we have a clear idea about the situations of the new or subsequent rounds which we are still discussing at the level of the group. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Kavouss I think we might be able - Elliot is this a new hand? Elliot is this a new hand or is this an old hand I see?

Elliot Noss: Oh sorry.

Erika Mann: Okay.

Elliot Noss: I have to take off mute whenever...

Erika Mann: No problem, no problem.

((Crosstalk))

Elliot Noss: ...the hold.

Erika Mann: Kavouss I think that's, you know, an issue we can handle quite easily because I think if - we will see that something similar will emerge in the future. And the CCWG and ICANN can always call and the GNSO and involved parties can always call on repeating this exercise and then they already have a basis they can build on a new initiative.

And if in case the fund is still in existing because the money is still going to be there then they can certainly put this into the same pot and can continue the fund. But I think this is something we should leave to the future and very much in line with Alan and John Robert Levine and Elliot to leave this up to the future because I don't think so it's helping us. It's a very theoretical debate which is not really helping us right now if you would agree.

So I don't see anybody else here in the moment raising their hand again.
Marika is there. Marika come on please.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks Erika. This is Marika. So listening to the comments and interventions does the group believe that we're at a stage of achieving like a preliminary agreement that the focus is on the current proceeds available that there is a desire and principle to expedite not expedite but proceed with disbursement as quickly as is reasonably possible noting that of course due diligence will need to be done in setting up a mechanism how disbursement takes place but that there's no desire to create any kind of perpetual mechanism. Is that a reasonable assumption based on this conversation and something that could be put forward as a preliminary agreement to the group or...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: There's probably two points Marika. Honestly the discussion about the onetime which I think we've pretty much reached an agreement. On the second point I'm not so certain if you already have an agreement but Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much, Alan Greenberg speaking. I really would not want to use words like disburse the money as expeditiously as possible. That's almost sending a message that if we can do it in one year we should and I don't think that would be wise at all because I just don't think we're going to be able to handle a load that large or do we want projects that are so large that it allows us to get rid of the money quickly.

So I think we should use words that more focus on using the money effectively and judiciously and but yes, you know, we're not aiming to preserve it forever. But I don't think we should use speed as one of the criterias or one of the targets for doing it.

Erika Mann: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: I think that will get in the way of using the money effectively and for good purposes thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes and I think it would be against our goals as well. Jonathan Robinson? Jonathan are you...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks. Can you hear me?

Erika Mann: I can't hear you.

Jonathan Robinson: Can you hear me (unintelligible)?

Erika Mann: Not really well. I don't know if others can hear you it's fine.

Alan Greenberg: You're faint but (hearable).

Erika Mann: Now you're much better. Jonathan Robinson?

Alan Greenberg: He said he'll contribute in the chat he just wrote.

Erika Mann: Okay, okay let's have - let's do two discussions. Let's have the first about do we have an agreement that this is a - we are debating one time initiative and we leave all future scenarios and we don't deal with it? Can we get an agreement on this one or do we have objection to it? And I'm only looking for objection. I'm not doing a poll. Just if somebody wants to object to it I'm watching and we are watching the chat room for a while. Just put this in or raise your hand.

(Sylvia) please on this point? Oh no it's (Glen) sorry. I don't know why (Sylvia) popped up quickly (Glen) please. You want to make a comment on this point?

Alan Greenberg: I think he was just making a tick, putting a tick mark.

Erika Mann: Okay, okay then I think we have an agreement here. Wonderful, so let's move to the second question speed shall not be relevant but a (care point) is prudent and getting it right and not speed is - was the point Alan raise. Again same question can we get an agreement here?

I'm not doing a poll. I'm just asking you if you're not in agreement please indicate in the chat or raise your hand or if you're in agreement please do the same? (Wale) is saying that she discovered that with persons on the mailing list are not including in meeting's agenda. We come back to this a bit later to this point. Elliot is asking of the question was ask - I have Kavouss who raised his hand. Kavouss please?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I have no objection to what you said. Please Alan what are the criteria that he associates to effectively? What does it mean effectively? Would you have some criteria because you can use many words effectively, efficient appropriately, comfortably, normally - not normally sorry. So (unintelligible) could you ask what is the criteria of effectiveness? Thank you.

Erika Mann: Who are you asking Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: I'm asking Alan. He said that effectively...

Erika Mann: Alan. Okay Alan.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...not used expeditiously. I agree with him.

Erika Mann: Yes thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: So what is effective yes?

Erika Mann: Yes (unintelligible) I saw that you wanted to say something as well because he then can respond directly to Kavouss' question. Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much, Alan Greenberg speaking. I don't know what that answer is. And I thought in fact if we were to summarize why this CCWG was convened it is exactly that to define the criteria. We also have to build a mechanism. But the most important question I think we have to answer by the time we finish is what are the criteria with whoever's is going to be making the decisions on yes I find this project, no I don't fund this project. What are the criteria that we're going to use to decide whether to fund or not fund?

And that I think is the main reason we're (unintelligible) if we eventually get to that. And the objectives which we'll be talking about later which we've talked about before I think are the core that we'll start allowing us to put words together so that whoever is making the decisions in the future will be able to follow our wishes. So I don't have the magic words right now but I knew one of the words I did not want to use was do it as fast as possible or one of the phrases is do it as fast as possible because I don't think that it goes along with you doing it well.

And but so that's the only point I was making. I hope by the time we continue meeting some dozen more dozen or two dozen more times we'll start getting closer to understanding what it is that identifies a good project from a bad project or potentially good one. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes thanks Alan. I'm going to (Detma) and then Elliot and then I would love to get the (voice) to Marika because she's in the meantime we are working on a

new language so we - she can then read it and we can see if we can get agreement on this one. (Detma) you still on?

Alan Greenberg: Erika it's Alan. He was just putting a tick markup supporting.

Erika Mann: Okay, thanks so much.

Alan Greenberg: Only Kavouss has a hand up right now.

Erika Mann: Yes Kavouss I think it's an old one but I can ask him. Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I partly agree with what Alan said but I think even for now we could have the skeleton of that effectiveness. If we be able to define or agree on the objectives. The effectiveness means to meet the objectives on which the group has established and so on. So effectiveness is this one but first the key word is the objectives which is sillier discussing the (unintelligible) widely here. And it was very simple at the beginning but now it's open. So I - to the effectiveness or effectively needs to meet the objectives in a timely manner and then we have to see what is objectives. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes Kavouss and (unintelligible) in principle means that project (unintelligible) now long term. (Unintelligible) this is my problem or somebody else (unintelligible)? So it means practically a longer term goal and not just to getting the money out of the house. Marika I would love to ask you now to read the text which you put in the chat room so that everybody can understand it. Please be so kind.

Marika Konings: Thanks Erika. So this is Marika. So having listened to the conversation and feedback received I've written up the following potential preliminary working group agreement on this topic which could read as follows, the CCWG's focus is on the funds that are currently available without any assumption that additional funds will become available. The CCWG will focus on developing recommendations that will enable the disbursement of the funds in an

effective and judicious manner without creating a perpetual mechanism, i.e., not being focused on preservation of capital.

Okay shall we do a quick call in this case so we get an understanding if you can support it? The text was in the chat room so you can review it. As you have on the top you can put in confirm or I'm not sure. I can't sit on mine actually. Strange to (unintelligible) that I don't have a - the button so in case you don't have it or you don't see it just put in the support in the chat room and we follow this.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, Erika. So for those that cannot find it if you go to the raised hand bottom at the top of your pod there's the little man or woman with the hand up. If you click on the drop-down menu you'll have there the agree or disagree options. So you may use...

Erika Mann: Yes it's just next to the phone actually on the top. I think as far as I can see there's a lot of support. Anybody who wants to argue against it right now? I have Alan, (Carolina), (Detma) again. And please let me know if these are old hands or new ones or these are just tick marks. Okay I've got you, thanks.

Marika Konings: Erika this is Marika. What I would like to propose then as well that we'll include this preliminary agreement as well in the notes from this meeting and make it an action item for any of those that are not on the call if they have any concerns or objections that they share that with the mailing list.

Erika Mann: Yes I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Okay with this one I think we can conclude this topic. And if in case there are further questions coming up to this topic feel free to send them to us or if you feel that some of your concerns are not fully covered please send them to us that we can put it on our follow-up item list. Okay anybody else who wants to - (Carolina) you want to say something or it's just what is just the support? (Maria) on my Adobe it is not totally clear. Okay I think it was just the support. Thank you so much.

If nobody else Elliot I think it's the same in your case, same in my case. Okay then let's move on of the agenda and let's pull up the next topic which is a review of - Marika I need your help. What is (unintelligible) the .5 or are you already 1.6? We are .5?

Marika Konings: Yes, that's correct I'm just pulling up the survey results for that one.

Erika Mann: I was trying to exactly so please be so kind and guide us.

Marika Konings: Yes so thank you Erika. So this is Marika again. On the screen and also on the link that was circulated yesterday on the mailing list you can find the results of the survey that we conducted based on last week's conversation on the question of should ICANN organization be permitted to apply for funds to replenish the ICANN reserve funds? As you can see from the responses we had a 23 members and participants respond to the survey. Only 17% responded a yes to this question, 52% responded no and there was 30% of responded that did not have a strong view either way. So again, you know, based on this these responses it's probably for you to discuss whether a preliminary working group agreement can be derived from this feedback.

And there was a related question that noted that if you responded yes what conditions or requirements should be in place as well as if the CCWG would decide that ICANN the organization be permitted to apply for funds? You know, what should be the maximum percentage that should be available, would be made available to apply for. But it may make sense to first deliberate on that first question because obviously the other two questions are only relevant if should the working group decide the ICANN would be permitted to apply for funds.

Erika Mann: Yes, thank you so much Marika. When we reviewed the comments which came in it was a clear indication that most of you have a preference not to support a replenishment of the reserve fund. And so we thought in the

leadership team it's now the time actually to ask you if you would then want to say that this shall not be done.

I see there is one board member I mentioned before that (Asha) is still in a meeting and she couldn't join us. (Becky) I give you a little bit of time. If you want to comment on it maybe a little bit later please do so. It would be good to hear maybe there was a rethinking and maybe you have a different approach to it of (Xavier) who is on the call as well, the two of you if you want to comment on it. How you want to proceed with this topic please let us know. But in the meantime I see Alan and Jonathan Robinson, Alan is first. Alan please?

Alan Greenberg: Yes if either of them wanted to speak I would prefer that they go first.

Erika Mann: I want to give them a little bit of time to think of about...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay all right. Again I couldn't be on the call last week because of a conflict and I would have suggested different wording for this if I had been. Given the comments that were on the mailing list on the use of auction funds for replenishing the reserve I think there were a number of both assumptions and in some cases of a lack of understanding of the scope that might have - that was being suggested by the board when they asked us to consider this.

You know, I certainly I support using auction funds for this but I would certainly limit it to a certain both a percentage and an absolute amount. Since we don't know whether we were going to have \$100 million or \$240 million just a percentage is not appropriate nor is an absolute number. But for instance if we're dealing with the full amount of \$230 I wouldn't want to see this go on above \$40 million a \$50 million at most.

So there were other people who were assuming that we might spend 80% of the funds, you know, and be left with just \$20 billion to distribute which I think would be wrongheaded. The other problem I have is I don't think again when I was on the call but I might have missed one, there was a really good discussion of why we're in this position. And it's not just that we haven't been prudent and put money aside but there was a large draw on the reserve because of the CCWG accountability that wasn't expected. And that put us in a significantly bad position compared to where we otherwise would have been.

And I think those all contribute to a decision on whether we should be able to use it for that or not. And I'm not sure but I'm willing to be corrected that all of this was presented before the questions was asked. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you Alan. Jonathan Robinson?

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible) you can hear me probably now. I restarted in the (desktop).

Erika Mann: I can have a difficult time hearing you but it could be just me so let me ask the others. Can you hear Jonathan Robinson?

Woman: He is faint but we can hear him.

Erika Mann: Okay, perfect. Go ahead, Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll speak up. I'm sorry if the quality isn't quite as good as it should be. But I think I have first of all quite a lot of (unintelligible) with the point that Alan made. I'm also respectful of the fact that the survey shows just over 50% of people not wanting to see this. So I accept that that's where we are at present. But I do think we need to retain an open mind subject to certain conditions, and some of those conditions Alan mentioned. For example, we

may want to restrict the extent in any event how much we would want to see these (unintelligible) contribute.

But also, I think more importantly, it would be good for someone from the Board and/or the organization to articulate, as Alan said, why they're in the position they are at the moment, what they plan to do to get out of it, and what kind of proposal they might do. So I would ask that we don't close the door absolutely. Preliminarily, I'm perfectly happy to accept it being closed based not the survey but we really should make that subject to hearing some form of articulation from the organization as to what they (unintelligible) with respect to (unintelligible).

What are the (unintelligible) where does it stand in respect to that 12 months reserve fund? What is it doing itself about replenishing that reserve fund? How long might that take and how could the auction fund potentially help that? So if there were more detail and a bigger picture around it, we might be in a better position to ask for that, which is why I would advocate not closing the door completely subject to hearing, convincing, and better articulated from the organization. So thanks.

Erika Mann: Okay. Sylvia, I see (unintelligible) comment. He is saying then we should also have an articulation as to why this is (unintelligible) so this will then be included. And the question we should ask, and there's some other comments, which I can't read at the moment quickly enough. I give in the meantime the floor to Sylvia and then Becky, I would like to call on you and (Sabine) maybe or somebody else who wants to talk on behalf of the management.

So Sylvia please.

Sylvia Cadena: Thank you, Erika. Well, I think that my comment on the mailing list about how much is actually the amount that might or might not be required for the reserve is also in line with the issue that they deal with closely, that is not

decided yet. So you don't really know, Alan mentioned, how much is actually the (unintelligible) of money that we may or may not have.

And then by deciding, let's say, in years that someone was saying, let's support for the one year, for the 12 months, for the four months, or for the percentage, whatever amount it is, it could be a very large amount. That will not impact on the legacy that ICANN has, while doing something for the community, with the community, that supports the development of the internet will have an impact on what the ICANN legacy is.

A reserve is actually money that stays put and if something really bad happens or there are extraneous tremendous circumstances that makes you use that money. So it would be money sitting literally under a big mattress, but it will be a mattress anyway. And I think it would be good for ICANN in terms of establishing the future and all of that. But there are a lot of questions around it and the questions that I posted on the mailing list were also referring to another interdependency that might be one of the reasons why we ended up discussing so many things at the same time. But as I mentioned before on the chat, there are some issues that just kind of one eliminates the other. Unless you discuss the two other things and it is very difficult to figure out how it would actually look at (unintelligible).

So for example, if (unintelligible) that the funds is not going to support projects in the long-term, and on the other hand, we say we are going to support contribution to a reserve, and that that contribution has to depend on a bunch of requirements or a list of things that ICANN should be doing, like the one that Jonathan mentioned, only (unintelligible) now a few minutes ago, that kind of contradicts each other. Because you're saying let's say support the reserve for five years and then in five years, what. If the fund is to be finalized in ten years (unintelligible) and reserves have not used or everything goes well, so then what?

Then if there are issues about how you evaluate and assist a project and the request for reserve funds is managed like a project, that means someone would have to go and check all the policies that ICANN has in place and how they're actually doing and that will overstep on what the Board actually does and what the financial advisors do. So I think one kind of kill each other.

So we really need to be careful on not putting ICANN on an even more difficult position and if a contribution to the reserves is allowed, which I do not agree with, then all of those issues have to be addressed and resolved because otherwise it will be a legal issue that will be very complicated to manage. You can't appoint a project, like a project evaluator to monitor reserve mechanisms. That is a completely different thing.

So it is something that we really need to be careful because it's not just a yes or a no, although it's very good start that we have a lot of us saying that we should not look like a good idea. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. There's some further question coming in, in chat, one in particular from Marc raising the question whether this would be an agreement practically to self-donate money to ICANN, if it would be in agreement with all the procedures and with the tax procedures. That's a question we probably will have to come back to. Xavier, I sense that we need to discuss this topic a little bit more. Not sure if we should finalize it today. We probably have to come back with a more in depth question to you and reframe, as Alan recommended, the questions.

Kavouss, I see your hand. Let me in the meantime see if Becky and Xavier want to comment on it now. I can't see it at the moment. Becky, do you want to make a comment or recommend a procedure. Maybe you want to go back to the Board and have a debate in the board and then recommend to us something that you would see as a work about recommendation. Becky, are you with us? I'm not sure she is. She can hear us. Xavier, how about you?

Xavier Calvez: Hi, Erika. Thank you. Hello?

Erika Mann: Yes, I hear you.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you, Erika. Thank you. I cannot substitute myself to a board position that I think has been a bit discussed but for the sake of this conversation, I think we would require to more substantially formulate it and Jonathan and a few others have commented on the type of information and positions that we (unintelligible). I think it would be best that with the board members that are in this group, Asha, and Becky that I reconvene with them to ask that position is more clearly formulated on the topic and helps inform the group here to discuss further this topic.

So I will take that action if that's making sense to the group and so that we can revert back.

Erika Mann: Yes, I would be fine with it and I'm sure the group would agree. But can you comment on the question on whether this would be in contradiction to tax procedures, and I would add audit procedures maybe as well?

Xavier Calvez: When you say this, do you mean that some of the auction funds would be used?

Erika Mann: Correct.

Xavier Calvez: So I think I already responded to that question. The funds currently, legally speaking, go to ICANN and ICANN with adequate governance procedures, meaning board decisions, for example, can completely decide on its own, tomorrow, to allocate any part of the fund to a reserve. So that's not a governance issue. It's more a matter of purpose and discussion as to whether that's their right intent. But from a purely procedural and governance standpoint, there's in my view zero issue in that happen.

Erika Mann: Okay. Some might have a different opinion about it, but I -- from a procedure, I think you're probably right. Kavouss, I'd like to come back to you and then if nobody wants to raise another question or add something, I would love to then make a recommendation. Kavouss please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I think I raised some question to (unintelligible) the goal after Alan talk about this (unintelligible) and my question have not answered. What we discussed, does this group discuss whether or not ICANN should have reserve budget. And if this group wants to discuss that, does this group want to set a level for that reserve budget? And the third question, does this group want to decide from existing and not future, because we don't know about the future, existing fund available in auction, allocation be made to that reserve budget.

I am not sure that this is the duty of this group. Whether or not ICANN should have reserve, it is something entirely with the ICANN organization and ICANN board. Usually every organizations profit and nonprofit they have this (unintelligible). Amount is different. I don't think that this group is requested or asked to decide whether or not ICANN should have reserve and what will be that level. This group could only decide whether or not if ICANN ask that the reserve budget be fed by the auction, whether this group allows that or not. That is the only thing this question amounts of the reserve is up to -- is not up to this group and I don't understand why we intervene in that issue. It has not been given to us unless it is something that I missed. We are dealing with auction. We are not dealing with the normal day-to-day tradition of process of the ICANN whether it should have or should not have reserve budget and what would be the level of that.

That is outside the mandate of this group. This has nothing, reply (Mikhail) make a question to me and I want to make it quite clear I want really an answer to that. Still I believe it is not up to us to talk about the reserve, nor the level of the reserves. We only could decide whether or not if ICANN asks that the reserve be fed by the budget or money available in auction was

authorized or not authorized. Please kindly reply to this question either by now or later on. This has not been clear as everybody was talking.

(Unintelligible) answers that 12 months is too much. Somebody says six months is too much. Somebody says two years is too little.

It is not up to us, this issue. I don't understand why we get into this issue.

Thank you.

Erika Mann:

Thank you, Kavouss. I think I'm on line at the moment and I'd just like to comment on two things. I think Kavouss, there was an understanding and even I think the Board and Xavier would agree on behalf of the management. There was an understanding and we had an agreement in the CPWG as well that the fund would be used for extra funding for extra project and would not be swallowed by the budget.

There was an understanding and I don't think that we have to read it back this point. The question whether this group can then decide about the amount -- I think this would be done in correspondence and in agreement with the board and so we would open this channel as Xavier recommended, and I pointed out to you as well. We would open a channel now of debate and discussion and would formally request from the board and in correspondence, the board with the management, and Xavier's team to send us more concrete ideas. And then based on the dialogue we will open, we will come to a conclusion -- this is my understanding. So far, we always were able to find a diplomatic way of solving this such kind of questions. I have Alan next in the -- and I support Xavier's. I see that Becky is apparently having difficulties at the moment and Asha will not be with us. She promised to join later but she's apparently have difficulties.

So Xavier, we will follow-up with these two board members and Marika will help as well to frame the questions, and then we would in an ideal scenario, we would love them to come back to us in two weeks' time. If this is too tight for them because they will probably have to go back to board members and

get a more conclusive answer, we will be ready to give them more time depending on the time they need.

So Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Kavouss mentioned a statement, something I had said several weeks ago, and I certainly don't remember exactly what I said. But I never intended to say anything about whether ICANN should have a reserve fund or the level that ICANN's target is for that reserve fund. That is not our business. The only question on our table right now is in response to a request from the Board to consider whether we will allow some part of the auction funds to be used to partially replenish or to add to the reserves, not necessarily bring it up to the top, but to add to the reserves.

Should we decide that is a good thing we want to do, then we have to decide the mechanism that is do we allow the foundation to give money to ICANN on a one-time basis to do this? Do we decide that we want to carve out the money before it goes to the foundation, which might require a charter change if we decide that's the optimal way of doing it? Or do we decide that we don't want this at all? But there was never any question in my mind about whether we decide if ICANN should have a reserve or the target level for that reserve. That's not our business. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. So I see some more points coming in and Xavier, you (unintelligible). There's some more related from Sylvia, for example, if I (unintelligible) from Judith. Somebody raised a point about the legal concerns again. So maybe in the comments you would send to us you will be so kind to look into this as well so that we get ideally in two weeks' time when we have our next call, or otherwise latest I would say in Abu Dhabi. But ideally, earlier as complete as possible answer to the topic debated today and (unintelligible) concerned about the -- he's concerned about the whether it's only part of the fund, complete, or it's only part. We are talking about very much an agreement what Alan just said.

Marika, do you have a quick recommendation how we want to proceed in a language or can we just, with my short summary, we just gave how we want to proceed can we live with it? Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I've made note of the action item for ICANN org and the board to provide further information. I don't know if at this stage the group does want to note preliminary tentative agreement based on the survey or whether it just wants to park this issue for now until further information has been received and then either run the survey again or basically ask if anyone has changed their opinion based on the input that has been provided so that a preliminary agreement can be achieved.

Erika Mann: I would recommend to park it and then to edit with more precise language when we do it again based on the input we receive and to frame it in a little bit different way. So my advice would be park it now, get more complete answers from the board in coordination with Xavier's team and the management, and then reframe the question, put it forward again to the team, and then we can probably conclude the topic. And I would latest we would should do it in Abu Dhabi and not later. And hopefully, we can maybe even do it earlier.

Anybody objection to this or comments? You agree on the procedure? Somebody not in agreement? Only write something in the chat if you're not in agreement right now.

Okay. I assume -- I see Xavier, and Stephanie, and two other (unintelligible) I hope this is in agreement and not in not agreement. Sylvia, is that an old hand or is this a new hand you raised?

Sylvia Cadena: It's a new hand, Erika.

Erika Mann: Oh, please Sylvia. Go ahead.

Sylvia Cadena: I just wanted to say that if we park it anyway for (unintelligible) information on the notes on the screen, I think it would be good to capture on this particular survey over 60% of the say (unintelligible).

Erika Man: You mean now or you mean then?

Sylvia Cadena: Yes, to keep that record because that's how -- I think the question was right fair and square and the comments actually reflect that. So I don't think that -- yes, we can discuss many details about how, but in practice, let's say, out of all of the respondents of that survey, there was a strong indication.

Erika Mann: Yes, I understood.

((Crosstalk))

Sylvia Cadena: Then what is required that decision is in a way of seeing it and that everything can happen, let's say, all bets are open, but it's important to capture that this was the opinion at this particular stage.

Erika Mann: Absolutely. Well understood. Marika, so let's put it in our record, which we will do anyhow, but Sylvia is right. So I see -- I'm watching the time. It's 2:25 -- 2:26 so we are over time. We have to practically conclude and we will have to put the topics, which we -- the other ones, which we had on our agenda on our call in two weeks' time and we can continue the debate by email.

Marika, have we sent these two templates, which we invented, have we sent them already to this group concerning the open internet question? Have we done this already?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So those went out yesterday, as some of you already responded that some comments may have been missing. Some of you have continued the conversation so I can maybe take as an action item to go back

into those documents, add what has been provided. You're of course all welcome as well to directly do that and maybe then we can indeed use those documents to continue the conversation.

I believe some of you have made specific suggestions on how certain wording could or should be changed. So staff may also make an attempt at a new wording or proposal on the table. Again, I said before that is really to help move forward the conversation so we'll look to you to provide further suggestions and comments and hopefully then by next week's -- not next week's -- in two weeks -- our next meeting we'll hopefully be in a position where we hopefully have more or less language that has been thrown around by the group and hopefully meets the support of most.

If I can also note on the previous item, I did put them in the chat, (unintelligible) will take them as an action item to start documenting all the surveys that have taken place to date on the wiki so that whenever someone wants to go back and look at surveys that have been conducted previously, there's an easy way to find them. So we've made a note of that and we'll work on that and hopefully have that in place by the next meeting.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. That's very helpful. We need to spend here maybe two minutes to talk about the Abu Dhabi meeting and the clash, which we now have concerning our meeting there. (Unintelligible) that actually we should continue with having the meeting on Thursday because Friday is a difficult for many who cannot join or who cannot commit right now and it might take too long until they will get a reply back. That's true for the GAC and it's true for ALAC.

ALAC we know from Alan, he will be not possible to join and I think we should have this core team as (unintelligible) on the call. It would be wonderful to have you all there. And so we recommend to keep the Thursday, the two slots. But we are aware that one slot, which is in clash with the GDPR debate to many colleagues may not be able to join. So we will then transfer this

meeting into a more internal working meeting like things which Marika just recommended, go through all the previous records and see if we missed something. So this will be purely technical working meeting and the second one will be our ordinary meeting.

Just want to hear back from you quickly if you can agree on this and that we can move forward with this. Again, only if you are totally against this approach make a comment in the chatroom and otherwise let's move forward and have the Thursday on our list. Okay, Marika, I think we can assume that we are on the right track in keeping the Thursday. Wonderful. Thank you so much.

And then our next meeting, I'm watching the chatroom in case somebody comes in and is not in favor of this approach. Our next meeting is on September 7th, same time, 14:00 UTC. Apologies to everybody in the Asian room. I know this is not a pleasant time for you and we appreciate this very much that you are with us all the time. Anybody -- any other comments, somebody, something which we missed?

No. Marika? Anything else?

Marika Konings: Nothing from my side.

Erika Mann: No? Okay. Okay, with this, thanks to everybody. Thanks so much and talk to you on the 7th of September, 14:00 UTC, and in the meantime, the documents in particular, open internet is open and continues the debate. Thank you so much. Have a good day or good evening. We conclude the discussion. Yes, please.

Julie Bisland: Thanks so much. Today's meeting is adjourned. Verizon op, would you please disconnect all lines and stop the recording, and everyone have a great day.

END