

ICANN Transcription
Cross Community Working Group on New gTLDs Auction Proceeds
Thursday, 09 February 2017 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Cross Community Working Group on New gTLDs Auction Proceeds on the Thursday, 09 February 2017 at 15:00 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/pY7RAw>

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-09feb17-en.mp3>

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Hi, thank you so much, Mae. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the Cross Community Working Group on New gTLDs Auction Proceeds call on the ninth of February, 2017. In the interest of time today there will be no roll call. We have quite a few participants on line. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you are only on the audio bridge, would you please let yourself be known now.

All right, thank you. As a reminder to all participants, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Also, please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not using to avoid any background noise. With this, I will the call over to Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, hi everyone, welcome to today's call. We have prepared the agenda, that's myself and Ching Chiao, interim co-chair from the CCI cert together with staff, so I hope it makes sense to you and is an effective use of all of our time. If you do have any comments or input, please do let us know either when the agenda is first circulated to the group or in fact now.

Just making sure that everyone's aware that you can simply raise your hand in the Adobe Connect room by using the hand-raise icon in the top left-hand corner of your screen. If you want to speak and hopefully if you have audio, you will be able to simply speak at that point.

So at that I see a hand raised, and so we'll go straight to that. Go ahead. Oh, maybe it's just a text. If you'd like to speak I'll hold for a moment, otherwise continue with agenda.

Man: I just like that it works. Sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Wonderful, no problem. That's good, I thought it was an immediate response to speak. That's great, thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So I think we will try and work within, certainly well within the 90 minutes allocated and in general target working within an hour. Couple of remarks I suppose as part of the welcome and generally making sure that we are all aligned in terms of the work.

If you are a member, you've been appointed by your chartering organization, if you are a participant, you have chosen to participate in full and there are no

restrictions on your participation and no distinction between, you know, your input and participation to that of a member, save for in the rare circumstances that we may call for some form of vote, which we haven't historically needed to do, at which point the members are able to cast votes.

So if you are neither a member or a participant, you participate as an observer, in which case you simply track the mailing list and are free to watch what's going on on the mailing list and keep up to date with the work of the group. The reason I make that point is that everyone who is a participant or a member is required to produce both a Statement of Interest detailing your affiliation and your role within the broader community, and moreover, in addition to Statement of Interest, a Declaration of Interest with regard to your prospective, the prospects of you being potentially an applicant for or associated with an applicant for some of these funds in medium to longer term.

So we made those conditions mandatory, that you must fill out both the Statement of Interest and the Declaration of Interest, and so many of you have done so but some of you have not. And so because it's a requirement for your participation, it will be necessary to enforce that and downgrade your participation to that of observer status should you not have done so.

So please be on notice that we will not let you participate in the next call until we find, if you haven't completed those mandatory requirements. So please try and do so within about a week or so and make sure that if you are a member or a participant you've dealt with both your Statement of Interest and your Declaration of Interest. Hopefully the reasons for that are self-evident.

There have been some new joiners since the past meeting, so I don't want to go over all of the points we discussed last time. It's probably worth just

highlighting a couple of administrative and basic points. The calls are generally planned and led by the co-chairs who are appointed by the chartering organizations. At present you've got the two co-chairs, myself and Ching Chiao, and then there is a support staff that's working from either ICANN and associate with, potentially the different chartering organizations as well, working with us to make the mechanics of the whole process work.

We've elected in the first instance to run the calls at 1500 UTC every two weeks. I think I've got an open microphone, if you could check your microphone, it may look like your mic may still be open, if you could check that. Make sure your microphones are muted. And so we plan to run every two weeks at 1500 UTC, which is ultimately, was a reasonable compromise based on some work we did on the origins of the participants.

But we will analyze the participation in the relatively near future, make sure that that's not prejudicing someone from participating. And if you feel strongly that it is impacting your ability to participate, whether you're listening to this on recording or actually present at the meeting, please do let ICANN staff that are supporting this work know or let me know on the mailing list that it's a significant problem for you, because we really want to make the best compromises here, and we may go to a rotating schedule.

But in the first instance we're trying to keep it simple and run on a single time slot. So I probably sense that that's not necessarily helpful to everyone.

There was some discussion about face-to-face meetings, and the forthcoming ICANN meeting in Copenhagen. And to be clear, this group doesn't currently have funding for any specific face-to-face meetings of this group. In other words, the kind of meeting that might facilitate the travel of members to a particular co-located venue. However, it is given that many of you, not all of

you but many of you, are likely to be at one or more of the ICANN meetings during the course of the year.

So what we will certainly do is schedule meetings of the group during the course of those ICANN meetings, which whilst not strictly a face-to-face meeting of the group will have the effect of getting many of the members and participants and even observers in the same room and working together in that way. So currently there is no plan to fund that, and if you feel strongly that that's potentially a shortcoming for this group, that needs to be known and we need to deal with that as a topic. So I guess that's really a call to action to the group.

If you feel that the group is going to be strongly compromised by any, by not meeting face-to-face and having telephone meetings and taking full advantage of ICANN meetings you need to let that be known and we need to have that discussion and see whether there's any proposal to go so far as to motivate for funds or face-to-face meetings.

Let me pause here and take the hand that's up from Elliot Noss in the group. Go ahead Elliot.

Elliot Noss: Yeah, thanks Jonathan. I just wanted to comment because I had mentioned a couple times on the list getting together in Copenhagen. You know, I think this is a very large group and dealing with funding would be, is significant administrative overhead.

You know, I would at least put out that even if there was just a brief social gathering, you know, I think the groups like this are more effective when, you know, people can have some sort of personal relationship. So even if we weren't discussing business, I would hope that even for people who couldn't

be there they'd be comfortable with just, you know, a small social gathering for folks that were there. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Elliot, so in case it's passed you by, I suspect not, but in case we have a 90-minute meeting scheduled during the course of the meeting in Copenhagen, which the group will in effect meet face-to-face, at least for those who are in Copenhagen. Are you suggesting that in addition to that we try and find some other slot to get the group together?

Elliot Noss: Well I was making that comment, I did see that meeting, I'm looking forward to it. I was making that comment in relation to some of the dialogue on list where it seemed some were concerned that they weren't going to be there, they were going to be compromised and you know, I just wanted to put that out there, whether it's for Copenhagen or future meetings. I think the more social contact the better and I think everybody will benefit from it, whether you know just as a group whether you're able to make that or not.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks. So I think that that's helpful to know that you make that suggestion, you know, in addition to the sort of meeting of the group coincident with the Copenhagen meeting. So we should take that on board and see if it's possible to get members of the group together in some other way and we can look at that. And also, I think it'd be useful to poll the group actually and see who is present. I think, who plans to travel, I thought we did something like that, but we can, somebody can remind me if we did already do that, that would be useful to know.

Okay. So I think those cover the main areas that I wanted to cover in the opening remarks, save for the fact that I put a note out to the group earlier today and not all of you may have seen it, but I guess some of you would have

seen regarding my role as co-chair. I've written to the GNSO to ask for a replacement co-chair based on the reasons I outlined in that mail.

I don't want to distract the group with it now, but just to make sure you're aware of that, I expect the practical outcome of that will be their work to try and identify an alternative co-chair to join the group and I'll run with this until such time as they are able to do so.

So hopefully that will be relatively short-lived period of uncertainty and I'll make a handover together with Ching and staff and any other co-chairs that have joined at that stage to make sure that this sort of leadership group, of this group is intact and well-informed, but that'll be the plan there.

Elliot, if that's a new hand come in or if not put it down and following that, Ching, please go ahead.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Jonathan. And as I responded to the list about, so like others I'm very much appreciate what you had, I mean inform the group and also like to keep the group in mind that my current role as a co-chair is with an interim basis.

So at this specific time, we will still, you know, look forward to a relatively stronger guidance and leadership from the GNSO until CCNSO, you know, we have determined a more quote, unquote formal way of participation, meaning that this interim role would be replaced with a more formal role that probably will take a more proactive approach of getting involved with the group.

So just want to point it out that we would, you know, look forward to a more smooth transition and but hopefully once again I'd like to emphasize that, so Jonathan your leadership is definitely needed at this point of time. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching, I'll work to do whatever's possible to make sure that it's a seamless situation. Okay. So we then have to go on to the, we may as well move on to the next part of the agenda, which really deals with the items on the assessment of the skills and expertise.

As you'll see, the way in which this agenda's structured is to have a look at the initial work we've done on the skills and expertise of the group, and then start to flesh out what might be the best structure for a work plan, and would really like to run by you, the sort of potential structure for an initial work plan. And that's really the substance of I guess the meeting today and item four.

But before we go on to that, let's look at item three, which looks at the CWG skills and expertise. And here, we have dropped it, in fact (Marika) can take some of the credit for the initial drafting of this and then it's being reviewed by both myself and Chiang and then members of this group. And really what the idea behind this survey is to essentially admit the participants to both self-identifying and look at what their own skill set might be.

So you can be sure what your own skill set is, but also were each of our shortcomings are in relation to the kind of skills that we might require. And then simply to be aware of each other's skills and expertise within the group.

So idea here is to scope out, in a sort of transparent way, that the skills and expertise of the group, this is really a final opportunity for anyone to make any other comments on this survey, I mean I guess it's not the final end of it all, but what we plan to do is lock down a survey shortly after this, and then

run it for about ten days, such that the initial outcomes of the survey can be shared with the group at the next meeting in 10 days, in two weeks' time.

So if you have a view or if you have any thoughts or feedback on the survey, or you just like to see it circulate and got on with, that would really be good to know too. So this is really a last call for any points or inputs on the survey, if you have that.

Many of you may have seen it online and made any comments before. Open mike there, I haven't identified whose that is, but if you could just be aware if your microphone is switched on or if you have an open telephone line, please mute the line.

Okay, doesn't look like we have any particular comment or input on that, so if you would like to, we can settle that at this point and we'll circulate this, we will distribute this as an actual survey and hopefully that will identify then clearly to each of us where our own skill sets are in relation to the likely requirements of the group and also to share those and self-identify and make awareness of those.

All right item four starts to then look at the more detail of the road plan, road map and the work plan for this group. And I think the idea here is that we really try and sketch out a high-level plan that takes us at least on to perhaps, say for argument's sake ICANN 59 in June, and possibly further out into 2017. So that we can all buy in to sort of a timetable of work that sees where we're going to take this group and what we can reasonably achieve by that time.

The working assumption will be these two weekly meetings. No face-to-face meetings as discussed earlier, and some at least partial get-together in Copenhagen and possibly the next ICANN meeting in Johannesburg.

So the proposal really from the co-chairs and the, to the extent the staff has assisted us, to really take a high-level review of the charter questions, really a systematic first pass through the charter questions and to make sure that we really have at least made a single pass. And to some extent that's happening with the online document. You'll be familiar, some of you have already started to put input into that. There is an online document which is referenced here, I believe, which shows that all the charter questions and some initial answers. but here's where it would be very helpful to have your input.

We felt in preparing for this meeting that there are three sub-questions that arise on any given charter question. And they are as follows, really. One, well I guess three additional points. Are there any sub-questions, is the question asked by the charter complete or does it need to be further fleshed out with sub-questions. Second, do we require any external input? Because one of the key things I'll come back to in a moment is this possibility of getting external or specialist input, and then third, are there any initial answers?

And what we started to do with the first pass of the Google Doc was simply to throw out some initial thoughts, some answers, but perhaps it's better to both before going much further with those, the sort of off-the-cuff answer, just to think about what other questions does this particular charter question throw up that the group should be thinking about. What are the sub-questions, and do we require any external input for these?

Please feel free to come in if you think there's a different way in which we could tackle this or if you'd like to comment on the way in which we propose

to do it. The other point here is that in looking at the, in taking that high-level pass over all of those charter questions, what might come about is that it may be clear that there are actually some questions that aren't, the charter drafting team didn't cover or that there are additional questions that need to be thought about, that aren't covered in those charter questions.

So that certainly feels like a way to do it, is to break into the questions down and make sure we've, we have covered the entire landscape. There is one other point, and this is the point about external or specialist expertise, and how we deal with that. The question really is, do we have substantial input from anyone prior to commencing our work, and in addition to that, on any given question do we need external expertise?

Now on the first, at the first point, we have started to create that table again, a separate Google Doc which you'll be aware of, and that's now being shared with you, and is linked to in the right-hand side of the screen.

Yeah, which says, basically it's broken down into two areas. First of all some topics for which briefings should be foreseen or for which we could usefully obtain some briefings, and second, and this is the prospective individuals or organizations that could provide input. I think in the first case, it strikes me that we should have probably at the next meeting input from ICANN legal on legal and fiduciary constraints and alignment with ICANN's mission.

So I guess my proposal is to, that we deal with that up front. And the question to you is, well A, Do you accept that proposal? and B, Do we think there is anything else we should be reaching out to, anyone else to give us input very early on almost before we start to make our first high-level pass through the charter question? I see a hand up from Samantha Eisner, Sam, go ahead.

Samantha Eisner: Hi, Jonathan, this is Samantha Eisner from ICANN legal, and I heard you mention that it might be a good idea to have at the next meeting a presentation from ICANN legal. That's something I'd be really happy to do, however at the next meeting in two weeks' time I do not believe I will be able to attend due to some travel items that are coming up. So just wanted to flag that as the timing may not work, but I'm very happy to participate and make a presentation at the following meeting or whenever else that might be necessary.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks, I think we, my opinion is we should have that as soon as possible, but if the next meeting isn't practical, then perhaps the next one after that, and we can work with you offline to try and schedule that.

But thank you for being available to do so, and it does feel as though that's a sort of thresholding point, since it's kind of fundamental that the work must conform to those legal and fiduciary constraints. Alan Greenberg, go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'll point out the meeting after next is on the ninth of March, or would be on the ninth of March, which is when many of us will be traveling to Copenhagen, so we're probably going to have to work around that.

In terms of other advice, I don't think we need sort of real detailed information on how to do this kind of thing until we have a better idea of what we're trying to do. But if we could find someone who has played this kind of, you know, foundation and giving away money game, and try to understand some of the got you some of the problems that might be lurking there as we design something, that would be really useful, I don't know who that would be.

But having something like that early on almost in terms of the war stories or how things can go bad if we're not careful might be helpful as we start talking about how to structure this. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan, I mean to some extent that may be the kind of thing that was covered at least by in part the CC's experiences in dealing with, the CC registries in dealing with surplus funds that they generated and how they had to deal with it. I'm sure there's all sorts of other group, but they're certainly there.

The reason the CC's are attractive or at least were to me, and maybe it's time to at least circulate if we have anything recorded from what was presented in the genesis of this work was that the, you know the likelihood was that there was some overlap both in terms of the generation of the funds, though it's not strictly true, but also the potential scope of application.

But you're right, my original idea was perhaps that we got a series of inputs on a regular basis. I'm very open to how we bring additional expertise/war stories as you said to try and educate and inform the group so that we don't relearn anything that we don't have to. Elliot, go ahead.

Elliot Noss: Yeah, thanks. Two things. One, Samantha or possibly (Marika), you know, I think Samantha your travel constraints noted. I'm, and I think that, you know, you would be the best or right person to the legal and fiduciary constraints. But in terms of ICANN's mission I'm wondering if either or both of you might just be able to, you know this is pretty well trod ground, go back and find you know, a previous written statement, a video that you're comfortable with.

You know, it might be something that Goren or even (Fahdi) said in a public presentation that is not disputed or some written thing that Steve has put out previously. Mission is something that we've all been dealing with for, you know, pretty much you know, it's going on, it's getting close to 20 years now. And I'm wondering if there just might be, just to get us started here and you could always, you know, sort of fold, spindle and mutilate when you're back on the following meeting, but just throw something out that, you know, you guys at staff endorse as a statement of mission.

And the second point I do want to make, that you know in relation to the CC experience, you know, I've noted before, I've been on the CA committee since its inception, and I think the CC experience and I think we have others with that experience in the group, is fantastic around the how and what. But the CC experience and I've been saying this in all of the meetings previous on this, it's important to distinguish from what we're doing here because the CC experience necessarily is ongoing.

CCs are generating generally excess revenues every year as not-for-profits and have to deal with an ongoing way to distribute those funds. I think there's a chunk we can learn from and there's a chunk we need to importantly distinguish. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Elliot. So just to remind of two points, not specifically on the mission but certainly on legal and fiduciary constraints, there was a memo prepared that could easily be re-shared with this group, that was shared with the charter group and so that will lay some of the groundwork for what Sam is likely to say in any case, if indeed it is her presenting to us.

So that's worth being aware of, and as I said, we certainly got presentations from (nl uk), and one other, which registry escapes me, with their work on

dealing with excess funds and the kind of pitfalls and issues that they've dealt with in trying to set up some form of foundation or their experiences. So whilst those aren't all-encompassing, they certainly could be useful input to this group as we start out on this sort of journey of sort of working this out.

Peter Vergote next, (Peter), why don't you come in next?

Peter Vergote: Okay, thank you Jonathan. This is Peter Vergote from Godby, you mentioned the (unintelligible) of the experience and as many of our colleagues in the CC area, we also have, when in Godby, we have our fair share of experience, unlike what's currently going on in the CC world, where you have an ongoing kind of funding, we have worked with a model that is very close to the one that we see currently now, being an available fund, although we are not speaking about 230 million US dollar, of course, or four million euros, but the mechanics are the same.

You have a dedicated amount of money and you need to look for a mechanism to activate that funds and doing projects with it, whatever it's chosen to be by this and, by this working group and others. So I'm happy to share that information, that model, because I think that there are a number of important lessons to be learned.

The first lesson is, you need to think what you're going to do with your auction proceeds, and secondly if you choose for a mobile, you also need to calculate that a significant amount is going to be lost between brackets, to various handling costs. At least that is what we notice. It's not that, from that 230 million US dollars sitting there, that you're going to be able to spend every dollar directly in the projects that would be chosen.

So there are, concerning me, two important takeaways. I'm happy to provide more information and if there is interest from the group, I might contact the organization Close the Gap, with which we worked, to provide additional detail as well. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, (Peter). So one of the original ideas that I had and I'd be very open to this, still working with the group in this way, is, we had an ongoing program of content input. So just to say hypothetically our program of work over the next, over the months ahead was to systematically work through the charter questions, at least to the first high-level pass as discussed. But in principle we could have for instance a panel 15-minute input or 10-minute input at the beginning of each call which brought in someone with relevant expertise.

Because really there's sort of two ways of going about this. When anyone tries to get all of the expertise in up front, the challenge with that is of course that you're not quite sure what expertise you're going to need, what's relevant. Well you start off with the work but keep bringing in the expertise in parallel.

So that's something members of the group might like to think about and respond to as to, but I'd certainly be open to bringing in a regular stream of expertise to the extent we can get hold of and people are willing to present to the group of experience in related and connected areas. Now (unintelligible) go ahead.

Man: (Unintelligible)

Jonathan Robinson: And I certainly don't hear you yet, would you like to come in on the microphone? Okay, I'm not hearing you (unintelligible), so let's see if you can get your audios hooked up. I'll go to Alan, who's next in the queue.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. In looking at the chat and thinking about this, we have an interesting situation here. We are talking about an amount of money which is probably comparable, you know, assuming we spend it over four years or something like that. We don't want to make it a lifetime, and we don't want to give it all away in the first six months. But even if we do it over four years, we're looking at perhaps \$50 million a year. That's a very significant amount compared to real foundations and real things. Certainly the CCTLDs don't do anything near that magnitude.

At the same time, we are expecting this to be a one-time event and we don't have the benefits that some organizations do, of building up a track record and understanding how to do this by starting slow, knowing we're going on for a decade or two anyway. So I really think somehow we need to get a jump start when we start doing this so we don't either start very slow, because we're cautious, or don't make a lot of mistakes.

So I think that's our real challenge in how we organize this to cover the relatively unique situation we're in of a huge amount of money on a relative scale, but within expectation that it not last that long and therefore we don't have an ability of really starting slow and building an experience base. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan, let me go straight to Ching. Go ahead, Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Jonathan I'd like to just build the, I mean add some more based on what just, Alan just mentioned, and also point it out that, also want to clear, I mean actually to verify on what has been discussed on this potential CCTOD, you know, the learning from them. We talking about actually their experiences on handling the extraordinary funding, such as the auction of,

auction proceeds that we are dealing with in our case -- in this group -- you know, being assigned to deal with.

I mean the reason that I bring this up because I believe that CCTLD, the experience are primarily focusing on their operation though -- I mean surplus - - and how do they make best of use of the surplus of the operational income, and then for the, you know, the good of the community.

So I guess that's probably, I mean probably it's my own imagination -- and also assumption -- is that you have a certain percentage or you have certain areas of, you know, the work that you like to build on. So that's probably something easy that we can also learn from many of the - I mean the gTLDs.

I think we're talking about a case that, as Ed and others mentioned, this is a large sum of money. And I think the question lies in we've been discussing this, I mean, probably a couple of times, on whether it's a singular event or this will be an ongoing event for future auction -- I mean if there's any future auctions -- and then the learning from CCTLD, whether this would be a learning from their dealing with the large sum or the extraordinary income. So I'd like to point that out as well. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Ching. So I mean agreed; the analogy can be taken only so far. And what we may find is that to some extent that, well, almost certainly -- inevitably -- this is a unique set of circumstances and a unique fund.

But that doesn't mean there can't be many opportunities to learn from analysis -- which is I think (unintelligible).

Just seeing - that's right, your hand is up again and I heard some noise from a mic. It looks like your mic is now open, so let's see if you can come in now.

Unfortunately, we still don't have audio so that's something that you'll have to work on still. It does appear from the Adobe Room that your mic is live, but I'll (unintelligible). Okay.

All right, so that's really some discussion in and around how we weave in external and specialist expertise -- both on the really practical, legal and fiduciary constraints as well as some more broader experience.

Bear in mind, the stock (unintelligible) front view is available, and if you feel that in particular there's anything that should be added to that, that lift that we need at the outset, or you want to get someone on the list from the group should be contacting -- or potentially utilizing for external expertise -- please do contribute to that list.

I think - maybe someone from Staff can help me here. I think the standard mechanism is to work on Google Docs in something called Suggest Mode. And you edit the document in Suggest Mode, and then based on that suggestion, the document will be edited in any way that can be ultimately be accessed.

Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, to note that - this is Marika - yes to note that that is correct. The main reason why we have the Suggest Mode is to make sure that we are able to, you know, track who is making those suggestions. If there are further questions or follow-up, we're able to do that.

Someone in the Chat noted earlier that they were not able to access the document. What we also do, we do share the Word versions, and I can do that

today together -- when I circulate the notes in the Actions Items for those that do not access to Google Docs or prefer not to use it for whatever reason. Feel free to add it to the Word version and get that back to Staff, and we'll add it accordingly.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. Okay, (Detmon), did you want to come in with something? Maybe I'll take your mic off mute if you should like to speak.

Dietmar Stefitz: Now it's working?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Dietmar Stefitz: Does it work now? Yes; Dietmar Stefitz for the record.

I think we should not only talk about how we will be or told to be under which approach -- if we should talk a little bit to whom. It should go for which projects and for which - because then every model -- every (unintelligible) -- (unintelligible) model.

So for example, if we go on security and cyber security or stronger Internet or around these things, so these are the different models and different foundations I think. I think we should go in a parallel way; I don't know.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks. So that speaks relative to the kind of any constraints that should be placed on the scope. And to some extent, that will be covered by -- at least at the very highest level -- by the legal and foundationary and the relationship with ICANN's mission.

And then the question for the group after that is are there any other constraints? Should this - and I think, you know, some of the charter questions

speak to that. And so again, in terms of the mechanics and the systematic way of going through that charter, that's the point in which you then say, "Well, are there some questions that go in under any of there?" And that's what we've talked about doing.

So that's really the likely way of flushing those points out, I think.

Marc Gauw: Jonathan, can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, we hear you now. Go ahead.

Marc Gauw: Okay, I wasn't aware that you were mentioning my name, but this is Marc Gauw speaking. I have just two remarks on what we just discussed.

First of all, of the mission, if you look at equaled from the ICANN Mission, it's probably good at you also look to the Articles of Incorporation. Of course there are additional statements on what ICANN would do if ICANN would stop operating. And it's a little bit broader than just a mission statement.

The mission is mainly focusing on DNS obviously, while the Articles of Incorporation also give room to doing more things with the ICANN funds -- just a reminder.

The other thing on expertise, I would assume that there's also a lot of expertise in this working group. If I may speak for myself, we (unintelligible) are running for 20 years donations to projects which improve the Internet. So if there's (unintelligible) needed, we work and more are willing to do that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Mark). So on both those points, one, I think given where we were headed, having initially laid down the sort of legal and fiduciary constraints, I

think my opinion -- and I'm sensing it's shared by others -- is that it would be very useful to get additional input from organizations such as yours as to your experience of dealing with the funds -- and these allocation of funds that you've had -- because I think, simply, that exposure to the real life everyday in dealing with that kind of thing will help us in terms of structuring the work we do.

To your point on Articles omission, I suppose there are really two different points. One is what are -- if you like -- what is the view of ICANN Legal as to our hard constraints? Where would we be in breach of articles, bylaws, California law -- whatever governing constraints there are -- where would we be in breach if we acted? You know, what do we have to do to remain consistent with those?

And then further than that -- from the group's point of view -- is there anything else in the Articles or Bylaws or anywhere else that we might want to be aware of. So it's a good point to raise.

And one is that if you like a hard constraint and one which might be something that the group wants to put additional thought and effort into. And I can see how we can do that as we work through the charter questions.

Yes, I'll go back and have a look at the Chat window, yes, because my Chat window has frozen so I wasn't tracking this as closely. But again, if I have missed something material that's - and, you know, I see comments from people like Becky knowing particularly individuals -- Evan who has direct (unintelligible).

Anyone who feels that they can, it would be very good to get the names -- either suggested names -- and if you feel you can facilitate some engagement

with an individual organization with the group, any sort of networking capability like that would be very helpful. And so that would be great.

All right, I'll try and keep up with what's going on in the Chat, but feel free -- either Ching as co-Chair -- to nudge me if you feel I've missed something -- or ICANN Staff -- or anyone who wants to raise their hand, please do so.

(Unintelligible) to try and capture that then, then what it feels like that the plan is, is hatch out the calendar-style work plan. Within that, we'll systematically go through the charter questions and break down a few sub questions under each one and see if there are supplementary or sub questions. Try and identify if there are any particular areas where we need external input, and of course, get out any initial answers.

In parallel with that, invite and bring in external expertise into the group on a regular basis.

There's one other key point here is as we go through these charter questions, one or more of them may be fundamental. They may fundamentally alter whether the group goes one way or another.

So I guess that's one other thing we have to do is see if there are any particularly thresh holding questions that determine whether the group goes in a certain direction or not. So it may be worth -- as part of that first pass -- even taking a very simplistic view and putting the charter questions into a priority one or two -- in terms of when we deal with them. Or indeed, if there's one or more of them that are actually overarching and really need to be dealt up front.

So as you cast your eyes other those -- and as we start to work through them -- that could be something to think about in particular. And if anyone has got any suggestions on that, that would be helpful.

So then one of the - then moving onto the agenda, just thinking through this, the next area, one of the other things is in addition to reaching out to perspective external expertise and input, one of the other areas is whether or not we go back to the SOs and ACs and how we communicate with the chartering organizations.

What Ching and I have talked about doing is providing an initial blog and simply just giving an update in the near-term as to that the work has commenced, this is the structure and the nature of the work, and this is what we intend to do.

Now what some groups have done in the past is actually put the charter questions potentially back out to the chartering organizations.

My concern with that, and I think our concern with that, is if we're not careful, we'll generate a whole lot of other work that's not synchronized with the work of the group.

So the suggestion is rather than put all the charter questions out and say, "Look, do you have any specific input," is to indicate the way in which we're working and encourage anyone from within the chartering organizations to sign up to the group as a participate if indeed they want to contribute to those answers.

And so I think the essence of the proposed blog will be to say we've kicked up the work, this is how we're working, this is our mechanism, and please do

keep an eye on the work. And if you want to actively engage, sign up as a participant because it's open to everyone. And just remind people that it is available to join.

Are there any other key points that anyone would like to see in any form of communication or outreach? Is there anything else that feels vital at this stage?

I guess we could also include in that if anyone within the chartering organizations -- or their broader reach -- has got specific expertise in relationship to this work, we'd like them to make themselves known to the group. That could be an additional point.

So thanks for that support in terms of getting the chartering organizations -- then participants. As I said, my concern is if we just simply throw the charter questions out and ask for answers, we'll end up with a whole lot of administrative work trying to collate all of that back again.

All right, so really the next steps in terms of developing the work plan will be to map up the forthcoming meetings and identify particular topics and/or charter questions that will be dealt with at each of these meetings. And we'll work with that and we'll obviously have to update that as we go as a sort of project plan, so that feels like the right way to do it.

And then thinking ahead to that meeting in, you know, Item 5 on the agenda -- the face-to-face or, you know, to some extent, in person meeting at ICANN 58 -- there seems to be quite a lot of positive responses about having the meeting at that time. And so hopefully, many of you will be able to attend and be there. We've got to just make sure that the scheduling doesn't cause any clashes.

And currently, I don't believe there are any plans for this group to separately update the GNSO, ccNSO, or any of the other charting organizations.

But the policy group typically writes a briefing ahead of the ICANN meeting, and I expect they'll include something on this work, so that you can expect.

And as Marika said there in the Chat, we seem to have close to 100% response for joining up and also - or seeing that there will be a brief (unintelligible) policy.

So our next meeting has been scheduled for two weeks from now. And I hope we'll get into the substance on one or more of these charter questions and the sub questions and so on, and start to pick these apart properly. And perhaps we won't have expert input from ICANN Legal.

It may be that we can try and do that ahead of the ICANN meeting and squeeze in a meeting which is specifically for external input. I think if we have one two weeks from the 23rd of February, it's very close to the travel time for the ICANN meeting. So it may be that we'll try and put one in between times -- which I think looks like around the 2nd of March. So look out for a note on that and I think we may try and go ahead with one on the 2nd of March for some external input.

I just want to make one other remark on the AOB -- and give you all a chance if anyone else would like to make any remarks on the AOB -- one other remark about my position as co-Chair and what's going on.

In my view -- and I know this may not be shared by all of you although some commented online -- there is something unique about the Chair's role where

you are expected to have a particular form of impartiality and neutrality in terms of doing this kind of work.

Many of us -- in fact all of us in one way or another -- typically tend to have some form of interest, and that's meant to be flushed out -- in this case -- by the Declaration of Interest and the Statement of Interest.

And I know when we did the work on the Charter Team, there was some temptation to try and screw that down tighter, if you like, to try and make it even more stronger the issues in and around conflict of interest.

And those of us on the Charter Team on balance felt quite strongly that the way in which the ICANN existed -- and by definition -- many of us have an interest of some sort. We are here because we have an interest. So in no way is my action intended to suggest that anyone with an interest should be precluded from participating in any case.

It was specifically that some very specific points, in this case, in that the company I'm very closely associated with is strongly associated with this ICANN auction, has a particular issue around the funding -- which happens to be a majority funding. So there's a unique set of circumstances here. And in no way would I like to see this impact on anyone else.

And as you saw from some of the responses, many people feel that I should be in a position to participate. And I think, you know, my current intention is to participate in the group and simply not to be chairing the group. So I hope that this will not make any of you -- who may have had similar or in a related interest -- feel that this in some way compromises you. It wasn't intended to do that nor should it do that. We all have particular interests, and provided

we're upfront about them, there's no reason why we shouldn't participate in these things.

So those are my thoughts there. Does anyone else have any other remarks or points or comments they'd like to make under AOB?

(Maelyn), please go ahead. Hi (Maelyn), we don't hear you right now. Let's just see if you can get some audio through that microphone. Is your audio actually switched on? Sometimes I find I haven't actually got my audio switched on.

And you'll see Marika's comment in the Chat on the lower-left to activate the microphone and use the speaker icon in the top-left. Yes, try to activate it, (Maelyn), by clicking on that icon and connecting audio.

Any other comments? Anyone else while (Maelyn) sees if she can get her audio sorted out? Any other comments or questions about the nature of the work, the work program, any other concerns or points?

Alan Greenberg, go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I just wanted to make a comment on your last comment.

I've worked with Jonathan for a good number of years and closely relatively recently. And without casting dispersions on whoever will be named to replace him, I think we are losing a lot. I understand completely why this is happening, why he's chosen to do this, but I consider it rather unfortunate, and just wanted to go on record saying that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Alan; appreciate that.

Go ahead (Unintelligible).

Dietmar Stefitz: Yes, Dietmar Stefitz. I just wanted to ask if there are any possibility maybe that we have in between the two ICANN conferences of Copenhagen and Johannesburg, a special small conference which deals with this. So there we could bring it to the SO, so everyone together -- the experts and everything -- and then we could advance very, very, very faster than if we (unintelligible) the way we are going.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi (Detmon). That was the point I was referring to much earlier in the meeting when we were talking about the prospect of a face-to-face.

At this point, there is no budget to do that. I mean practically, what that would mean, is something like this. I'm not saying this is the only model, but for argument's sake, that would involve saying to the members, you know, ICANN might need to then pay for travel and some assistance for the members and the Staff and the facilitation. So it's likely to be quite a sizeable outlay to do something like that.

If people feel very strongly at some point that that's the case, we need to come together and talk through that and make a motivation for why that's the case.

I suspect at this point in the proceedings, it might be hard to be persuasive about that when we're just getting things off the ground. But I'm open-minded to it. And if others feel strongly -- if there's some momentum behind that -- we need to get a group -- perhaps a subgroup -- thinking about that and the case for and the timing for a prospective face-to-face meeting.

But right now, there's no plan and no budget for such a meeting.

Dietmar Stefitz: Okay thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, Ching, your hand is up next. Go ahead.

Ching Chiao: Yes Jonathan. So the more I hear - this is Ching Chiao. So the more I hear from various comments on meeting face-to-face, it actually goes back to - I would like to, firstly, by saying that really thankful for those who've made the comments and participate on the surveys, and also make the inputs on the Google Docs.

And you take that - if we take that effort beyond which means that - so inviting those who have already made the contribution, and then potentially they can bring their expertise and knowledges, just make it, for example, make it one or two days of the workshop, then people can share - I mean share their experiences, their, you know, I mean the know-how of setting up fronts and running the front. I can see a great value that bring people under one roof -- or maybe a couple of days -- and that could really create good chemistry. I mean people here to contribute, I think bring very good causes and want to make sure that this fund is being used and in good hands.

So I think taking that good will -- if we can leverage that -- that could be really beneficial. And I think that would be something, you know, I mean ICANN should be able to execute very easily. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Maybe this is something we need to just keep in the background and be aware of over the next few weeks. When we get together and actually meet where many of us will be present in Copenhagen, we can touch on this a little more -- perhaps even have some informal conversations about the appetite for this.

I know there's quite a lot of sensitivity around cost at ICANN given the way the cost spiraled out of proportion for the transition work. But I don't think we're anywhere near proposing that sort of thing; it's really just making sure that there's consideration here to this.

Sebastian?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, thank you Jonathan. I am not pushing for or against a face-to-face meeting. But just to be sure that we know when is the deadline request budget for next fiscal year because if we wait too long, I guess we will have to wait one year before any sort of face-to-face meeting -- if we want to have one.

And you need the co-Chair to take that into consideration I think. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, that's a good point. And you'll see -- those of you -- some of you may see Asha Hemrajani's comment. Asha, I think, chaired the Finance Committee. I hope I've got that right, Asha on the Board, and will be familiar with both the budget cycle and then the content of the ICANN Budget.

And you're right, Sebastien, obviously, from your own experience on that Board, and the issue cycle is quite long.

So if it hasn't already been cast, the budget is being currently cast at present for so-called FY18 -- which really runs from the middle of this year to the middle of next year. So we really are, as Sebastien said, looking at a kind of 18 months window where there is no funding set aside -- unless some other magically lever is pulled.

And John, rightly, you know, raised the question, "Where does such funding come from?" Is this independent of, you know, is any work?

I mean I think one of the points -- at some point was made -- that certainly ICANN wouldn't expect to fund any overheads associated with setting up of a mechanism. Anything should come out of this. So if you took a nominal percentage, let's say 5% of funds were required to administer. I'm not familiar with the typical administration levels -- five, ten, one, two -- whatever it is -- or any costs over and above the normal ICANN support costs to be, you know, derived from the auction funds of ICANN's operating budget. It's a good question.

Yes and Marika points out in the Chat that this is perhaps premature. I mean it's an interesting discussion and it's worth thinking about, and it's timely given the budget cycle, but we really do need to map out a course of activity.

So, you know, it might be that we can roughly sketch out a work plan that even goes so far as to extend right to the end of the current financial period -- in other words June 18. So we look at a kind of, you know, very rough, obviously it will be much finer detail upfront, but some key milestones between now and the end of the next financial year, and that may be sufficient to complete the work of the group.

But we could think about something like that and see whether or how that starts to look as a map of activity.

Yes, (Maelyn), I can. Let me go back to your previous input then and make sure we capture that. Let me just go back to (Maelyn's) (unintelligible) here.

Sebastien Bachollet: Sebastien Bachollet. May I add something about the question of the budget for face-to-face meeting?

Jonathan Robinson: Sure, go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. The budget for next year -- starting in June -- we have not yet (unintelligible). And it's still time to have input. I know that it's not anything like that is requested in the current budget proposal, but there's still time to make some additional requests, and (unintelligible) vote for the budget.

I guess we can have some input. I don't know if we will succeed, but at least we can try because if not, we have to wait for however the budget or one year more. So I think it is possibly to do it quite quickly -- as Alan says in his comments, "We need to have the discussion quick," if we want to have one. If we don't, we don't need to discuss. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so a couple of points there that - just making sure that there is some comment in the Chat about - including from Asha, the point about the budget request would need to come from SOs and ACs or an appropriate mechanism in any case, so it's useful to discuss the possible requirements of the group.

But I guess the real practical process is that the group would go back to the chartering organizations and indicate that it felt that the group had fundamental reason to require additional financial support -- whether that was for external expertise or face-to-face meeting or whatever the case is, and would need to make that motivation for it.

I'm conscience that (Maelyn) was unable to come in on the microphone. And just to make her point and make sure that she was - I think the essence of her point was that we needed to be good on and effective on tracking mechanisms,

and need to institute a process that we design, and institute will need to have appropriate tracking mechanisms to make sure that the proposed outcomes are actually met of any use of the funds.

And more than that, that we could perhaps use some form of unique Internet technology for, you know, tracking competent use of funds and perhaps agreed to it, and so on. So that's an interesting point. And it is covered in the Chat but I promised I would read that out.

Okay Alan, your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. I was going to point out that it's been made quite clear in the charter that ICANN will not be bearing the cost of distributing the funds; it's going to have to come out of the funds.

And I think it is not unreasonable to say if there are explicit costs associated with this process of building the process of the CCWG, that they also could come out of the funds. That's a discussion we could have.

And I think to have that discussion we really need an estimate from Staff of what a face-to-face meeting cost. Typically a face-to-face meeting costs a one-day hotel and per diem for people who choose to accept it, and travel for a small number of people who would not otherwise be at that meeting. You know, presumably co-Chairs or may be other critical leaders of the group.

So I think if we had an estimate of that, that's a discussion we could have in this group. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks. And then Marika has put a sort of very sort of ballpark figure in the Chat there that, typically, one might expect to spend that kind of

money -- \$100,000 to get together a face-to-face meeting of the group with travel and hotel and so on.

Alan Greenberg: Which I'll note is 0.05% I think.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, okay, good.

Look, I think we ran slightly over the top of the hour. I think that was a useful Chat and it's very helpful to get this kind of flow going. So I certainly don't want to monopolize from the Chair, and that was useful to have a little bit of more informal discussion around the different topics through the AOB section.

But I think there's a reasonably clear plan. I think it will start to crystallize as we work, and look very much forward to picking that up.

So I think we'll try and commit to publishing a draft plan by the time we meet next. And do remember to get your Statement of Interest and/or Declaration of Interest tidied up because we don't want to be pushing people into a sort of observe status for that reason.

And also remember there's the assessment of skills and expertise to come in, so I'll try and prompt you by the mailing list to get involved in these various areas so that it's reasonably done both at the meetings and in between perhaps.

So I think with that, that's probably enough for now. And I note that there's some comment in the Chat there about responding to the scope and authority of this group with respect to potentially spending the money. And it's interesting it's worth being aware of the scope of this group which is various

(unintelligible) recommendations for mechanism of processes to disperse the funds -- so with, obviously, ICANN Staff help.

So thanks everyone. I think that's a productive second meeting. I know we're getting up to speed as we start to work together and get to know one another and the likely proposed working mechanisms.

So see you all in two weeks time, and of course, on the email list in between times. Thanks again.

Man: Thank you, bye.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. This meeting has been adjourned.

Woman: Thank you all.

Michelle DeSmyter: Operator, please stop the recording. Have a great rest of your day everyone.

END