

**ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Auction Proceeds
Thursday, 10 May 2018 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-10may18-en.mp3>

Attendance is on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/4A8FBQ>

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

Julie Bisland: All right thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the CCWG new gTLD Auction Proceeds call held on Thursday, the 10th of May 2018. Attendance for today's meeting will be taken by the WebEx room. And I see no one currently on the audio bridge only.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Please keep your phones and microphones on mute as well when not speaking to avoid any background noise. And with this I'll turn it back over to Erica Mann. Please begin.

Erica Mann: Thank you so much Julie. Hi everyone. I hope you are not in a country with holidays today but if you are wonderful to have you. So let's go to the number two on our agenda. First, if anybody wants to make an update concerning their conflicts of interest declaration? No, not the case, okay.

Then let's move to the, to Item 3 on our agenda. And we'd like to discuss two items. So first we'll be a review and the proposed edits to the preamble and then the second item is going to be the discussion about the project example which we worked on and which we need still some, a little bit of work.

I still here some noise so I wonder if somebody can mute their mic please?
Somebody is typing heavily. Okay let's hope this is gone. Marika and Julie can we
get up the slide for the preamble please so that we can see it?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Julie that is just moving the - to the review of board's the last document yes, perfect.
And just to note -- this is Marika -- just to note to facilitate your review as we know it's
not always easy to view documents in WebEx or move pages.

All the documents that we'll be looking at during today's call were shared or made in
this just prior to this meeting so please make sure that you have those handy if you
have difficulty reading or reviewing the documents here.

Erica Mann: Thank you so much Marika. So I don't know who has the time actually to evaluate the
preamble. If you remember it, our last call we had the discussion shall we continue to
work on the preamble or shall we drop it? (Unintelligible) continued to some degree
but (unintelligible) email and we have difference opinion.

I was more in favor of dropping it but I understand that people invested so much in it
and would rather prefer to keep it running. To be able to have a good outcome I think
it is really key and important that we have a little bit of more time now to evaluate it
because I when you look at it who participated in reshaping the current draft it was
(Sylvia) and (Danielle).

And I really would and Marilyn and I really would love us more of us to review the
document and see if they really feel happy with it.

So my idea is we don't talk too much about it today because it takes time away from
the survey and it's maybe not essential but to give us another week so until
Wednesday next week to review it again take the time and then to allow Marika and
staff to come up and send us back a consolidated draft which hopefully looks as
perfect as possible. Would this be something you can support? Let me see if I can
actually tie back to the screen of the WebEx.

Where's my WebEx screen gone? It's gone now? So please comment. In the meantime I search for WebEx. Whoever is in line Marika can you please monitor in the meantime until I find my WebEx screen?

Marika Konings: Erica, I don't see any hands up at the moment. I just note in the chat there's support from (Sylvia), important to get more comments and input from the CCWG and she supports the leadership continue to work on the preamble. And Marilyn also supports having one more week on the comments on the preamble and noted her chances for brief. And Alan also notes yes more time so I believe there's a - support for giving people until next Wednesday. And I would like to ask everyone -- and I can send out a reminder of course -- that the cut off time is Wednesday at 1800 UTC. That will allow staff than to produce a final version prior to our meeting next week.

Erica Mann: Thank you so much Marika. Okay I still haven't found my WebEx. It seems to be - I seem to be able to speak but it totally disappeared so I may have to log out again and then log in again. But let's in the meantime move to the, to B which was actually the review of the examples which we have selected many months ago and which underwent another evaluation and colleagues commented on it and placed proposed changes.

Again it wasn't much for the group than on the preamble who participated but I believe when I reviewed the document I believe it needs to be consolidated now because it's a mix of the lot of the (lesion) stuff up and some comments on the right side.

So in this case if you agree I would like to propose that the next step would be that Marika will actually send us back a consolidated version, a clean nicely looking consolidated version based on what we have done including comments as well in case it can't be included right away then in just separating the text from the comment part somebody made.

And then I see I would argue as soon as we have received this back from Marika then we should have again time until next week Wednesday again to review it. And then Marika would still have another day until the Thursday call to look at our reviews and the leadership team could have in a pre-call evaluate what was sent to us and make a recommendation to you.

So again I can't see the screen so Marika you will have to monitor the comments coming in also in case somebody wants to speak. I'm looking out right now so that you know I'm gone because I can't find the screen back and result the screen there is not much actually I can do without speaking. So Marika back to you. I'm looking out and I'm back as soon as possible.

Marika Konings: Thanks Erica. I don't see any hands up at the moment. This is Marika by the way. And just for your reference if you look at the bar below on your screen if you have the app there's a ball with a white green and blue. If you find that like that you may be able to get into WebEx there.

Erica Mann: Yes, yes I have it Marika. I tried this Marika.

Marika Konings: Oh.

Erica Mann: But it's only telling me video meetings made simple, try it free. So the - our, you know, the screen which I need to see where I can attest to what we are doing this is gone and I have a now a free advertisement which is nice but not what I wanted.

Marika Konings: I understand. And so this is Marika again. So the only comment I see at this point is from Sylvia who agrees that a consolidated version will be helpful to finalize the list and no other hands up at this stage.

Erica Mann: So I'm back. Can you hear me?

Marika Konings: Yes I can.

Erica Mann: Wonderful. It was actually much more interesting. It looked like I downloaded it already so it seems to be – I have the free advertisement but I still have the downloaded part which I wasn't even aware so I found it. Thanks so much. So if there are no further comments can we agree we received a consolidation – consolidated version back from Marika as soon as possible ideally until the end of this week and then we do have time to review it until Wednesday next week?

It goes back to Marika and to the Leadership Team and then we make final recommendation and hopefully we can close down this chapter as well. In the case there's some differences opinion with the board hopefully we will have the board members next time so that we can then have an exchange with them about this topic in case there's a disagreement. Oh Marilyn please. I see – I hear you have your hand up please.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, Marilyn Cade speaking. I agree with the idea of a consolidated version but in my comments I also suggested that we not use a specific example. I think it's really almost biasing those who are reading when we say the Oxford Institute or another organization by name.

I'd prefer we just use a general reference to, you know, a reputable respected entity whether it's in the technical community or ads in the policy community so that where clearly indicating we are neutral about who applies. Thanks.

Erica Mann: This is Erica. Thank you Marilyn, yes absolutely. And I believe it's now in most cases deleted. I found one example where the bind still showed up even in this case a bind. We may have to do this. That's the reason I believe it's good for Marika to do the evaluation check that everything would be discussed and which might be not embedded yet as a recommendation and the text is coherent.

So I believe you are absolutely right, we have to do this and then we can review it again next week when, next week Wednesday we have another chance to review it in the Leadership Team and then on Thursday in our call. Somebody else? No?

Am I not seeing who's raising, maybe raising their hand? In support for Marilyn from (Merwin).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Erica Mann: Sorry, who is this? Okay. Okay then let's move to the next item which is the review of the survey. Marika would you be so kind to make the introduction?

Marika Konings: Sure. Thank you very much Erica. This is (unintelligible). And Julie, if we can move to the straw poll survey document.

And so as you know we ran a straw poll survey amongst the group to try and see, test the temperature in the room with regards to the support for the three mechanisms that have been identified.

Just prior to the meeting I shared a link which gives you access to the summary results of the survey but in order to facilitate the review of those and created the little spreadsheet that you see on the screen and which was also circulated on the mailing list which I've tried to summarize and basically add up the scoring for the different criteria for each of the mechanisms.

So as a reminder as part of our initial conversations where we started talking about, you know, what mechanism should be further explored we also had a conversation around, you know, what are the kinds of criteria that the group would want to use to measure or value the different mechanisms. So we tried to apply these as part of the survey and we asked you to rank each of the mechanisms for the different criteria.

So what you see up on the screen here is that scoring for each of those criteria. And as I said I – for all of those I basically added up the scoring to try and see what the total score for each of the mechanisms would be based on the criteria identified. And I have to say up front that, you know, all the criteria at the moment has been equally weighted.

There was a question in the survey that did ask about whether certain criteria should be weighted differently for example like giving a double scoring or maybe less weight. But at this state we haven't reached agreement around that. So this point in time this represents the scoring for each of the criteria equally weighted.

I also want to know that, you know, although and I want to thank everyone who participated, you know, we did have a relatively low response rate if you look at the overall membership of the CCWG. And we had only 39% of members participating with even a lower participation rate for participants of 17%.

So I think we do, the group will need to factor that in as it evaluate these results as, you know, a significant part of the group may not have spoken up. Of course that doesn't mean that they disagree with what has come out of the survey but I think it is

important to factor that in and maybe at some point have as well a conversation around how to engage these other members and participants in the conversations and as well the decision-making process.

So on the note you can see that although the scoring is, you know, fairly close there do seem to be two front runners if I can call them at this stage which is the mechanism number one and the mechanism number two. And then not far behind is mechanism number four and then further behind that one is mechanism number three.

So I think the question for the CCWG at this stage is I think first of all there's going to be the question does there need to be a different weighting? Should the criteria be valued in a different manner which obviously could result in a different outcome or different ranking?

And there were also some suggestions for other criteria that could potentially be considered as needing to be scored or valued against. So again if there are any aspects that are not covered or you believe needs to be separately factored that of course something to consider as well.

But then most importantly I think the question at this stage is does the outcome of the survey give the group a sense of comfort to make a determination or a decision whether it can move forward with, you know, one, two, three or maybe even all four of these mechanisms into the next phase of work in which we will start looking at the different charter questions and start answering those from the perspective of the mechanisms that you've identified as being ready to move to the next phase.

I do want to emphasize again that, you know, by – if you would decide to at this stage, you know, set aside, you know, one, two or three mechanisms that doesn't of course mean that those are discarded and can no longer be considered.

At this stage we're just looking at making a determination with which mechanisms you want to move forward in the next phase which as I said again will consist of starting to deep dive by answering the different charter questions that the CCWG has been given and starting to flush out the responses to those so the more wholesome

model would come out of that which would then be shared for public comment and input.

I think I'll leave it at that. I think I saw that there are a couple of hands up. I think Alan has his hand up and I also know that there are some suggestions and questions in the chat that Marilyn you may want to or sorry, that Erica you may want to address as well.

Erica Mann: Thank you Marika. I will do the – I will take the questions now and you have a little bit of time maybe there's a question if you review there's one from Marilyn. So to ask member whether they consulted with their spending organization or they're speaking as an individual on their own behalf yes that's important to do. Then there was one question from (John).

Let me see if I can find it again. Could we see the chart based on members versus participants? Responses is (unintelligible) be interesting to see if the results are consistent and then just to let you know that Ching and I did not participate simply because we just wanted to wait for your response and we didn't wanted to at the, two co-chairs to have an impact on this one in the moment.

You might want to in the next phase if you have another phase but we refrain from this one. Marilyn I believe you are next or no Alan please. Alan go.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. A few comments. I'll answer your question first, did we consult with our organizations? Within ALAC we did, but it was very clear that a brief synopsis of what all of this meant and, you know, the background we could not summarize the years' worth of meetings in a brief email. So a significant part of the conversation that ensued was not really focusing on these particular issues or if it was there was some lack of understanding.

So although consultation is, obviously is a good thing it's a really difficult thing for people who haven't been following this process and understand what all the buzzwords and the implications are.

And in terms of the comments in the bottom of the criteria I have a real issue that I don't know what some of those being. If you look for instance at role of community

members and then the second list multi-stakeholders, multi-stoke, stakeholder must take into account I don't know what – where - what involvement are people envisioning for the community or for the multi-stakeholder process? The only one that I can think of that applies on an ongoing basis is as part of an evaluation committee. And there's pluses and minuses to have in the community involved.

Number one, it's pretty heavy workload given that we're expecting a significant number of applications and the amount of money. You know, we're trying to give out almost a quarter of a billion dollars of money in the best case.

And experience says that people volunteer but are not necessarily willing to put as much time into it as it takes. And if you have people rotating we also have a consistency issue. So I'd really like to understand more what people mean by those statements.

And of course in virtually any of the options except the X, simply contracted out to an external foundation which is the lowest rated one there's no really, no real rules as to who could be on the evaluation panel so they all seem rather comparable. So I would really like to understand those to understand more what's going on here.

The other thing is the criteria of meeting legal and fiduciary requirements. I would've thought that's a given that we cannot select anything that we do not believe will meet the legal and ethical - legal and fiduciary requirements. So if any of those options do not allow us to meet it I don't think they do but if they did then they should be off the table all together. So I think we need more clarity what people want to see in terms of perhaps weighting things differently or even in evaluating some of these.

And my last comment is in terms of looking at the results from members only we have had problems in the past where people who are technically participants declare themselves to be members. So we really shouldn't use the self-declaration but use the identification of who it is which I think we ask for, although I don't remember for sure in making the determination of who's a member and who isn't. Thank you.

Erica Mann:

Thank you Alan. This is Erica. I will go to Marilyn in a second but I do have one question while taking Marilyn's. Alan maybe you could think about what you would actually need to be able to in particular from staff what you would need to be able to

reach out to your community to get the advice you might want to meet, you want to receive from your community.

So would this be a simple update about where we are? Would this be in summarizing the key question or whatever do you believe will be needed? I'll just leave this with you and then I come back to you later but let me go first to Marilyn now. Marilyn please?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks Erica, Marilyn speaking. I would just - Marilyn Cade speaking. I'll just reinforce the comment that Alan made. I have worked on a PowerPoint presentation for my own constituency because it's the member is someone from another constituency in the CSG.

And not having any overall presentation that can be used I've had to devote time to preparing such a briefing which means of course that it's subject to, you know, my own participation and understanding.

So I think that undoubtedly for our upcoming public event we're going to have such a standard PowerPoint presentation about the rationale for the CCWG, the length of time the group has been working, the fact there are X number of members, X number of participants, X number of observers and the four the models that are being examined what the pros and cons are and how they each fulfill the guidance that we may have received from the legal team, et cetera. So such standard presentation I think would be very helpful to all of us and then we can add in our own customized comments to educate our own community. So that's point number one.

Point number two is I think the response level particularly from members is – I'm going to say this into the transcript, it's abysmal. When one is appointed to take a seat particularly for those of us who come from communities where there's only one seat for three different groups there has to be over 90% attendance and 90% attention to the work that's done. And I feel like perhaps that's not being adhered to or understood about how important it is.

So I haven't seen to Alan's comment anyone saying they're a member with they're a participant but I have certainly seen participants trying to fill in gaps. And I think that's

an important thing to understand because we need to have this broad support as possible for the work that this CCWG is doing.

My final question is as I note most of the rest of the CCWGs have had travel plan funding for the members. But I know in the comments that Marika has noted that that's not the case with the CCWG and I'd just like to see clarity on that.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I can answer that. As far as I know travel funding has only been associated with the transition related CCWGs, so the CCWG stewardship and the CCWG accountability, they were tasked, you know, to deliver their work within a certain timeframe.

But I believe those need to be seen as the exception and not the rule. I'm not aware of any other CCWG that has had travel funding for members and/or participants.

Erica Mann: This is Erica. That's correct Marika. And when we started this working group I tried to receive funding for travel funding because I believe that we would be much better for us if we would have, you know, be able to spend two, three days together and just get the work done.

But this wasn't planned for this working group and so far we don't have the travel funding. So let's go to the point where – can I just get an overview if somebody else in the queue and wants to make a comment or raise a question?

Marika Konings: Yes Erica. So this is Marika. So we have (Sebastian) and then Alan. And in fact I can maybe interject because I just wanted to respond to some of the questions that Alan raised if you allow me.

Erica Mann: Sure, certainly.

Marika Konings: So on the question on the members and participants and I put that in the chat as well I actually double checked the responses in that regard. I think there was only one person who identified themselves as being a member while they were actually participant. So the numbers that you see in the response rate is the actual reflection of the responses with regard to members and participants.

And also too, the note that, you know, for example legal and fiduciary requirements will need to apply to all mechanisms. The way the questions were all phrased was and which one do you expect to be best equipped to meet legal or fiduciary requirements? You know, my interpretation of that is that in certain cases there may be more work required in order to be able to ensure that legal and fiduciary requirements are met. In other cases there may already be built-in mechanisms and as such that it may be easier. But again I think, you know, your point is noted that of course all of them would need to meet that requirement to think just for the purposes of the survey. In several case it was just a question asked, you know, which ones do you expect to be, you know, better equipped or where it's easier to have, to make something happen as part of the evaluation, going back to you Erica. So the queue is now (Sebastian), Alan and (Sylvia).

Erica Mann: This is Erica. Thank you Marika. (Sebastian) please.

(Sebastian): Yes thank you very much just first check if you can hear me okay?

Erica Mann: Yes perfectly fine (Sebastian).

(Sebastian): Okay thank you very much because I am in a place with low bandwidth and it's the day of in France as you suggest for some country at the beginning and thank you. I wanted to thank Alan who just underlined input from one member of his community and maybe a discussion within his community could be a good idea.

And I already think that there is two different question were raised. The first one is how way (unintelligible) when we, when it's written that it must be the question about legal and fiduciary requirements it's not that it's, are not to be fulfilled but it must be more important than other topic. I guess it's important to be to how differentiate those two elements. One is for how we weight and the other it's other criteria we need to rank.

I really think that discussion around those additional elements could be useful. At the same time I am very as other but very surprised with the low number of people to answer. And the fact that at the end there is now so much difference between the four criteria the four, it will be very, very difficult to find a consensus on that. I hope that Erica you will be able to guide us in that way but it will be difficult.

And finally I really think that we need to find a way to have more participation through the member. At the same time I understand as I am very often in conflict with other duties at the same time of the call it's not very easy. But for such a survey I think it could be very important that all the member at least answer to this. Thank you very much.

Erica Mann: This is Erica. Thank you so much (Sebastian). I will come back to your point because they overlap some comments made by Alan and by Marilyn so I will come back to it a bit later. Please check this chat room and for those who can do that the discussion between (John) and Marika concerning the different cohorts. And so Marika will come back to this a little bit later and I will monitor the chat just to ensure that nothing is forgotten here.

But I go back to Alan now. And then there was somebody else in the queue. And Marika please be so kind send me a quick update on Skype that I know who wants to speak. Alan next please. Alan are you with us?

Alan Greenberg: Can you hear me?

Erica Mann: Yes now we hear you.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I'd like to comment on the travel funding issue. I believe that if we chose to make a case for why we should have a day or two day dedicated meeting prior to a ICANN meeting that we should in fact go ahead with that regardless of what the original plans were. I, you know, clearly it's too late to do that for Panama and maybe in our overall schedule it's too late to do that for Barcelona because we plan to have something finished by then or close to it. But nevertheless if indeed we could make a good case I think we should go ahead and do it despite the fact that it wasn't previously planned and other CCWGs have not done that.

That being said looking at the attendance records for members at these teleconferences the average is something like 40% or 43% with some people being in the single digit attendance. And rarely are there more than 75 or something like that.

So given the amount of time that people have put into the teleconferences I don't think we'd have a very good case to make for why we should spend money to actually bring people to ICANN meetings or pay for an extra day given the lack of both focus and time people and put into it. Thank you.

Erica Mann: Thank you Alan, good point to consider and I would very much agree with it. So (Sylvia) please.

(Sylvia): (Unintelligible) it's (Sylvia) (unintelligible) here. Erica I just, you know, I just to comment on a couple of things that happened while we were reviewing the mechanisms and how to answer the survey with the (unintelligible) let's say.

And it said one of the questions that I was asked was like where is the proposal for each one of those mechanisms? So a lot of the questions are based on very detailed conversations that had happened in it's partly in, spread around different documents and are not based on a real proposal. So cost are not really addressed.

So there is a lot of comments on the or the points I guess on the survey are based more or less on assumptions really instead of a practical proposals that people could be comfortable to assess in scoring away or, you know, marked in a way that can put the balance into one of the four instead of the numbers that we can see on the screen.

One of the things that I believe is important to highlight is that this kind of mechanisms if you remove the word ICANN from mechanism one, two, three and four there are organizations out there doing exactly each and every one of those mechanisms and they are effective, cost efficient and they're doing (unintelligible) to engage their stakeholders and all of that.

So I don't really think that they – there will be differences of course but we could only judge those differences if we could at least have some scenarios that have a little bit more flesh on them.

And I - in terms of the low participation I think that a lot of the problems that many people may - are having is to engage with this conversation is could be really based on that, that the need of how this mechanism can actually work, for example the

information that many of the experts have been sharing with us and that is quite recent.

But as soon as you start listening to one or reading the comments that they put on those surveys or those questions that you can very, get excited let's say very easily about any of those mechanisms because they work. They work for them. They make them work.

And I think it's more important to focus on what is this for and the importance as someone mentioned before of effective selection and mechanisms, effective recommendations to the implementation team on how that will happen, how that selection, how that education would happen, things to watch for and take care of. And I think that even a month ago one of the conversations we had was about kind of not experimenting but in a way like kind of exploiting a little bit the money and say let's see which one works better when I think it was when we talked about small grants or larger grants to reserve a little bit of money to support the small grants program or so and I think there are many reasons why people are not engaged or clear on how to and also considering the many activities and that are happening at the moment.

I think that if you see the list the same people are participating in several groups. So I actually value any time that any of you can dedicate to this effort. I think that - I have said it before that this funding is - I see it like ICANN (unintelligible).

So I think we see that are trying to participate (in the topic seriously). Some don't feel that empowered to comfortable or whatever the name is to voice their comments. But I think slowly we will get there.

The other question I wanted to make is that it's the same thing that has happened in previous surveys that the way the questions are asked allow people to stay in the middle.

And we need to be a little bit more forceful I guess on are you with this or are you with that. Because (it's) not been the comfortable ways, you know, call it that in the middle that make life very difficult when you try to balance out where the group consensus sits on or opinions or whatever you want to call it. Thank you.

Erica Mann: Erica. Thank you (Sylvia). I have a - we have a (clear) discussion today and I made a similar point to what some of you made in particular what (Sylvia) just said. Because when you look at these four scenarios, these four mechanism and models, which we have ahead of us, the outcome is pretty close. Yes, we can - definitely can identify that people favor most to have a model which stays connected to ICANN as closely as possible.

And so the model of complete independence is currently the less favorite one. But of course this might change once we see what this actually would mean in concrete terms.

So I do have a few questions to you and we will have to - I'd like to have you answers us back how you want us to proceed. So the first one came from (Maria) in saying can we really open this survey. Ching, I come - you want to go first or you - Ching...

((Crosstalk))

Ching Chiao: ...wait for your comments.

Woman: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Ching Chiao: ...and I'll jump in. Thank you.

Erica Mann: Thank you so much Ching. So the first is shall we open the survey. My idea would be to support it. I think it's a good recommendation. Maybe it's not exactly the same survey. We may want to modify something. But shall we open it?

So can I just get if somebody is against it, put it please in the chat room. And if you have no access, just wait a second - just interrupt and say I'm against it. Okay.

I assume we will reopen it and we will take another week at the least and be very careful and very prudent in moving forward. Marika is suggesting until next

Wednesday. Let's try under next Wednesday and let's see how far we go. So until next Wednesday - yes. I have seen Ching.

Thank you Marika. And (Jonathan). Okay. Let me just go through it and then I go to Ching and then I go to (Jonathan). So the second one would be are we already - so coming back to (Sylvia)'s point that she believes that because we - the alternatives are not clear enough and the consequences about the alternatives are not clear enough neither.

The question then to ask is do we need somebody else to work on this and taking these four mechanisms, giving us back in the most ideal scenario for these four scenarios we will put in front of them.

So this would have to be an expert like for example (Sara). I'm not saying we should give it to (Sara) because we had her as an independent advisor. But it would be either her or somebody like here where we tell them look, these are the - these are the conditions. This is the mission. This is the sunset period. We probably would have to give them the sunset period until when this shall run this mechanism.

And so please give us back how much would this cost, how many people would have to be (on it), et cetera, et cetera. So my question to you is are we already ready and do we want to see something being fleshed out like this or do we rather want to prefer to continue working only internally within our group or do we need a little bit more help from outside.

These are the two things, which I have right now, because I have another one, which would be but I believe we shall wait until - at least until the next round of questions we receive on the survey. I would have another one. Are we ready to narrow down the model to maybe two or do we want to continue to run with four models or with four mechanisms?

So (unintelligible) please put all the comments which you have concerning the questions. I just wait into the chat room and I go in the meantime to who was the next - I think it was Ching and then (Jonathan). Ching please.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Erica. This is Ching Chiao. I'm speaking just for myself. So once again, looking at the results, fully support the idea of reopening the survey and to allow people to weight in more.

And, you know, once again, just to look - take a closer look of the questions and also the - how, you know, the four scenarios, it seems that, you know, we should - still the group, ourselves, we should still focus on how to make recommendation eventually to the Board.

We should probably and probably - this is kind of a reminder to myself and also maybe to my colleague here is that are we going to - are we going to - I mean (if I may allow ICANN) to do all four different types of scenarios. I mean in our accommodation what is - what are the, you know, the final recommendations that we're going to, you know, give to the Board to consider?

I mean at the end of - at the end of the day are we going to allow the Board to try all four types or are we going to say - let's say we're going to recommend one or two and let them to - let them to decide.

The reason I bring this up is that that is when - I mean one year, two years, three years down the road we will eventually see which scenario would bring the most cost effective, most process effective and then we would go back to reexamine what has been discussed here. I mean or I should be - I mean over the last one and a half more years.

So I'm just saying that we should be more cautious about yes, we're going to still to do the survey but at the end of the day, it's that how we use the survey - I mean the results to make a recommendation. And that - I think that will be a more (unintelligible) for us. So yes, thank you for hearing (me out). Thank you.

Erica Mann: This is Erica. Thank you so much Ching. (Jonathan) please.

(Jonathan): Thanks Erica. I think I've covered it by my point in the chat was really back when you were talking about reopening. And I just wanted to make it clear that I felt that - I guess on balance I'm in support of opening it up.

But people will inevitably be somewhat influenced by what's already been said. But probably that's not enough I would think to argue against opening it up. It would be nice to get a little bit more input if possible. Thanks Erica.

Erica Mann: Thank you so much (Jonathan). I agree. I have the - this is Erica. I do have the same feeling. I will make a recommendation in a second. Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes. Thank you Erica. Just to note that as (Caroline) has suggested that it may be helpful to have the information (and be aware) the members voted, you know, prior to opening the survey. So I'm happy to immediately after the call to kind of create a second table that would only reflect the responses from the members to the CCWG and then after that open the survey so people have that information available.

And for the queue we have (Alan), Marilyn and (Sylvia). But just to note that some of those hands may be old. So you may need to double check whether they're in the queue or whether those are leftover hands.

Erica Mann: Thank you Marika. I will check. (Alan), are you still with us or have you left us already?

(Alan): That was an old hand. Sorry.

Erica Mann: Okay. (Sylvia). Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. It's Marilyn. I posted in the chat my comment and that is in addition to posting how the members voted, please post their attendance record.

Erica Mann: Thank you Marilyn. (Mary).

(Mary): (Hello). Can you hear me?

Erica Mann: Yes, we do.

(Mary): Okay. All right. Thank you. I've listened carefully to conversation (on this call) and looking at the result of the survey and comparing it with attendance, if we do trend

analysis of attendance of the members and the participants. I'm not sure even if we will pull it we will get greater number attending.

So for me I think we should - before reopening we should look at the (unintelligible) internal and external. That's what I can see played out very well because it would be Number 1, Number 2 in the option, Option 1 and 2.

Then Option 1 and 2 are (all) internal. Option 3 and 4 are external bringing (unintelligible) if you do it over again to have (feeling) about what members and participants think about. Having this internally or having it external people play a role in the process.

So I am not too sure that we will have a new or more people participate moving forward with reopening. So a trend analysis of attendance of the call and also the response to this call. I think they are almost the same. So my suggestion is why don't we look at what we have now; then look at (responding) between internal and external and we move ahead. Thank you.

Erica Mann: Thank you so much (Mary). Do we have somebody else in the queue Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No. No new hands (at this time).

Erica Mann: Okay. Then let me just summarize maybe briefly what we have to do next. And then Marika I would appreciate if you would translate it into to dos, which we have to do for our - until our next meeting.

Just one quick question in response to what (Mary) said. I would love us to caution a little bit against the - with the internal or external. Just to give you one example.

A foundation can be internal too. Coming from Germany, in Germany many of the small and medium size companies for example they build their own foundation. And these kind of foundations they are closely connected to the company.

They sometimes even share resources. But having a foundation allows them to have a little bit more independence from the company. So they have a bit more freedom in

taking on goals, which an organization might not do. And they are more independent from the perspective of a, you know, what a CEO might want to do.

So they are closely connected but they do have some independence. Doesn't need to be really an external model or foundation. And by the way, even a foundation can have sunset periods. It's not tested frequently but it can be done.

And then I see (Alan) is saying yes. That's my - it's my argument as well. A foundation has often significant (tax) benefits, which is good for - either for profit company but can be quite good for non-profit companies as well. So just keep this in mind (Mary). So but I agree with you. The last model would be an outsource model but with oversight of course from ICANN.

So let me just summarize briefly what I understood what we want to do. So until next Wednesday we will reopen the survey and we will keep it untouched; so no changes. It will be the current model without any changes. But it allows everybody to participate again. (Alan), (by the way), I see you have to leave.

So unchanged until next week Wednesday and then we can review it and Marika will have the time to prepare it. Somebody wants to come in. No. Okay.

So in the meantime we will have to check a few other topics. And this would be - but we can do this next week, discuss this. And Marika, if you would be so kind maybe to put your thoughts how - into this how best to do this.

So one would be once we have evaluated the survey next week, the second review, are we ready to narrow down the models or do we want to continue with these four models, the four mechanisms?

The second question would be do we want to hand either the four or in case we narrow it down to two or three, do we want to ask an external expert to put more flesh behind it in concrete numbers and timetables, et cetera, et cetera? So these are the two questions that I have on my list. Marika, could you please just summarize the points of what our to dos are and in case I've forgotten something please add it.

Marika Konings: Thanks Erica. This is Marika. So I noted this as action items. First of all for staff to create the scores based on members only but noting the conversation I'm wondering whether there's more value in doing that once we have everyone - well, after next Wednesday once the survey has closed again and hopefully we have had some additional members providing input.

So maybe there's more value in producing that overview at that stage unless people believe it's important to see that now as well. And then our next action item is to reopen the survey to allow for other - for additional responses. That can maybe be in combination with a reminder coming from the chairs to members and participants of the working group to participate in the survey.

And I think that's the specific action items associated with the survey and knowing the items that you would like to see on next week's agenda, which I've also noted.

Erica Mann: Thank you Marika. And then there's a point from (Mary) asking whether the chair and (Alan) can explain the topics mentioned concerning the foundation. Yes. We can put this in an email. Certainly (Mary). Just reviewing it, we forgot something. (Sylvia) asked for reminders from staff in case somebody has forgotten to answer. Marika, I'm sure you can do this, yes?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Erica Mann: Okay. These are the points. Okay. Good. We have an understanding about how we want to proceed and please think about these two points, which I mentioned.

Are we ready next week to narrow the list down to two examples, two mechanisms or do we want to keep on the running list of four? And do we need to get advice from an outside expert, which I believe we should, in creating real scenarios concerning these model, which we prefer and these mechanisms, which we prefer and continue to investigate?

So Marika, do you still want to talk a bit about the charter questions? And if you do, please be reminded that some of our members and participants may not have participated in the - when the group defined the charter questions. So a short explanation about what we have done there would be appreciated.

Marika Konings: Sure Erica. This is Marika. And one thing in relation to the previous conversation and that's actually something we discussed in our pre-conversation, it may also be worth for Erica and/or (Ching) to maybe reach out to the Board liaisons and they didn't participate in the survey probably for obvious reasons.

But it may be worth reaching out to them to get an indication on whether or not any of the mechanisms the group is considering rather that represents any kind of red flag because that may also then help the group in its discussions next week in trying to see if it's possible to narrow down the list of mechanisms on which you would do a deep dive because if there are any mechanisms that, you know, the Board considers a no go for whatever reason, it may be helpful to know that as you consider next steps.

So as Erica noted and as we pointed out, the next...

Erica Mann: Marika...

((Crosstalk))

Erica Mann: Sorry for interrupting you. Just one quick point before we go to the charter question. I was reminded by (Sebastian) about a point (Alan) raised - (eventually) have to put to our action point. This is the - actually Marilyn and (Alan) raised it and (Sebastian) supported it.

It's the point about preparing material for our members that they can use for explaining what we are doing to have slide decks they can actually use. I know we have a basic version already done, which I used at one of the presentations at our last ICANN meeting.

Maybe we can review it Marika and then just send the last version around and see if people are happy with it or if they need a few other points to be included. Is this possible for you or is this too much work for you to do in the near future.

Marika Konings: Yes. So this is Marika. So I think what we can do at this stage is re-circulate those presentation materials because I think they are pretty much still aligned with where we're at.

And I can maybe also point you to the latest version of the newsletter, which was I think circulated - published last week as it also should provide a very good overview and hopefully digest the whole format for your respective groups on what the group has been doing, where we're currently at and what the next expected steps are.

So maybe it's helpful if I just re-circulate that to the list and then they can all have a look at that and see if that meets your expectations or whether there's anything further that needs to be done.

Of course having said that, you know, it's clear that, you know, for the Panama meeting we'll of course need to update those materials in line with where the conversation is at at that point in time. And specifically focus as well on what we hope to get out of the conversation there.

But that's probably something we can do, you know, over the next couple of weeks once we've gone through, you know, the different questions that you just flagged there Erica.

Erica Mann: Thanks so much Marika. Please go ahead and please give the introduction to the - what we need to do concerning the charter questions. And I answered some other questions in the meantime in the chat room. Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes. Thanks Erica. So as noted before, basically the next phase of our work would consist of starting to answer different charter questions that were assigned to this group as part of its charter for a response.

As some of you may recall, we did initially start out by looking at all the charter questions to make a kind of determination, you know, which questions would need to be answered or agreed upon before even being able to start looking at the different mechanisms and which charter questions were specific to the mechanism chosen and as such would need to be responded to from the perspective of that mechanism.

And there's actually a page on our Wiki workspace and I'm happy to share that as well as part of the notes. So for those of you that may have joined later in the working group deliberations have a chance to look at that. Because you will see there we (actually formed) I think almost all of the charter questions.

We developed a kind of template in which we captured notes and the conversation, some of the thinking as well as a number of surveys that we carried out for some of the questions; in particular those for which it was deemed a response or at least a preliminary agreement was needed before being able to deep dive into the charter questions.

And you'll also see, again, some of those were also part of the survey. You see those preliminary agreements noted on that Wiki page. So hopefully that provides you with enough context with regards to, you know, the questions that now need to be answered for each of the charter questions.

And I know there, you know, it is for example possible that the answer may be the same, you know, regardless of the mechanism. But in certain cases it may differ.

So again, I think there's a lot of helpful input in the template because it captures some of the original or early thinking of CCWG members and participants in relation to each of these questions, which will hopefully then inform the deliberations as we go forward, you know, once you've decided on whether or not you're able to narrow down the list of mechanisms to less than four because of course it's also partly from a workload - that perspective if you have to do it for all four mechanisms.

That will of course take more time than if you do it for a more limited set of mechanisms. But of course that is fully dependent on whether there's an indication that, you know, one or two or three of the mechanisms are at least desirable and as such it's not worth starting the deep dive now but focus instead on one or two mechanisms.

And as we noted before, that of course doesn't mean that the other mechanisms are completely off the table. There's always the ability for the CCWG to come back and after you've done your deep dive to come to the conclusion that the mechanism that

you initially thought was the most promising or more suitable to deliver on the criteria that were set that maybe at the end it didn't turn out to be that way.

And maybe partly as well if you should decide to get more expert advice in that regard in fleshing out some of those mechanisms. There's always of course the ability to come back to some of the others. But again, that will probably be a conversation or decision you will be able to hopefully make during next week's meeting.

Erica Mann: Thank you Marika. Just maybe to remind you why we are bringing up this discussion. The point is that once we have decided about the way we want to carry the mechanisms forward and explore what other kind of information we need.

So independently we choose just one mechanism or two or three or four. We will have to test them against the charter question just to see have we covered everything. What kind of evaluations will show up concerning the different mechanisms? And what kind of further advice we may need? And if we do, from whom do we need such kind of advice?

So we need to test the original charter questions against these four or if there are less, then against the less mechanisms. So this is the point we like to make.

And I would recommend Marika that in the summary, which we sent out from our today's call, we attach - make an attachment to the - a link to the charter questions so that it's easier for members and for participants to define these questions as quickly as possible.

So I don't see anybody else. If somebody else in the room - somebody else wants to make a comment or raise a question. No.

(Sebastian): Yes. (Sebastian) speaking.

Erica Mann: (Sebastian) please.

(Sebastian): Yes. As a matter of fact what you just said - we had some (questions) survey about, sorry, the charter. And it's still what we think. And I don't see and it's not a (critical

thing) but any feedback on that maybe could be useful to have those inputs for next week call. If I remember well, we had two questions of that - two or three. I don't - thank you.

Erica Mann: This is Erica. (Sebastian), I'm not totally sure what you have in mind when you say the - yes, please.

(Sebastian): There are questions saying that if we are still supporting this part of the charter and there were something (unintelligible) to us as if we still support or not. You don't remember those questions. Wait a second. I will find it here.

Okay. There were something like preliminary CCWG agreement concerning charter question Number 4 of the CCWG focus is on the (unintelligible) so on and so forth. And the question was I still support this, sorry, preliminary CCWG agreement. I no longer support this.

And there were two of them. I don't know if ICANN staff and (unintelligible) get enough answer. But it will be interesting to know what the people thought about that. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Erica Mann: Yes. Yes. You are clear. I had totally forgotten this. But Marika signals me in the Skype chat we're in that she totally (has them views). So Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes. Thanks Erica. And this is Marika. So yes, those survey questions were definitely included. And you can find them as well on the - the responses to that on the link we circulated. We didn't include it for discussion in this week's meeting to focus on the mechanism conversation.

But as we start moving into the next phase of work and definitely we'll need to come back to these. And again, I don't know if responses will change based on additional responses that we may get to the survey. But for now, at least the two preliminary agreements that were put up still seem to receive, you know, a large majority of support from those that responded to the survey.

But again, if that - based on addition response, this may change. And it is something that the CCWG will need to look at when you start focusing again on the charter questions.

Erica Mann: Thank you so much Marika. So with that, I believe we can come to an end. Marika, do we have another point on our agenda? I can't see the agenda anymore.

Marika Konings: Yes we do. And maybe Julie can go into...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...our agenda slide. Next item is ICANN62 meeting planning. And I can keep that brief if you like.

Erica Mann: Yes. Please be so kind.

Marika Konings: Yes. Thanks Erica. So this is Marika again. So with regards to ICANN62 and meeting planning, I think as we discussed earlier, a request was put in for a high interest topic section on the topic of auction proceeds.

And, you know, at that stage we were hoping or aiming for an initial report prior to the Panama meeting. And seeing that the timeline is slipping, I'm not sure if that is still a feasible goal.

But hopefully at a minimum we'll be able to share either initial draft or at least initial draft recommendations or a very detailed update on where the group is at and hopefully identify some specific questions that you want community input or feedback on that will hopefully lead up to a publication of an initial report and the associated public comments formed shortly after the ICANN meeting.

So that high interest topic session is currently scheduled for Wednesday, the 27th of June from 3:15 to 4:45. I do know that I think this is not an un-conflicted slot so there may be other meetings that will be scheduled opposite it. But again, we hope that there will be sufficient interest there to track good attendance and as we noted before, we'll need to of course prepare the session accordingly.

In addition to that, we've also requested a meeting of the group itself. That meeting would be scheduled for immediately following the high interest topic session. So from 5:00 to 6:30 also on Wednesday the 27th of June.

And I do note for the record that that would be opposite an update that is being provided by the CCWG Accountability on their final report as we're in a very short meeting there. There are very few options that are available to have such a meeting.

The idea being having that immediately after the session, it would allow the group to immediately consider some of the input received and hopefully assist in working towards finalizing the recommendations and initial report.

So this is all tentative at this stage. I believe the timing of the high interest topic session is pretty firm. And, you know, (as per) (Steve), that has been considered by the SO/AC Planning Committee with regards to the meeting of the CCWG. That is a request that has been put in so that is subject to change pending the finalization of the schedule. But of course we can keep you up to date should there be any changes to that. And that's all I have.

Erica Mann: Thank you Marika. This is Erica. Thanks for the great work in achieving this. I know how much time and effort was needed. And I'm very grateful that you invested in getting this done and I've very grateful as well for all of the chairs of the SO and ACs who supported it. Thank you so much.

Comments? Can you all agree with the planning for the Panama meeting? Marilyn is saying yes. She's happy about having the - oh God, this is moving so fast. Marilyn, what are you saying actually? Can you perhaps do a doodle for what will be the attendance in person?

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. It's Marilyn Erica. I was just explaining - I was just saying congratulations. It's fantastic. We have a high level slot. Even if we haven't resolved everything, we need community input on the status but also can the staff do a doodle on who's going to be there in person because that would be very helpful as well.

Erica Mann: Thank you Marilyn. This was helpful. And what I wanted to read is the chat room was just running away. Somebody else who wants to make a comment? Are you all

happy with this? (Judith) is saying that she lost my audio. (Judith), can you hear me again?

Woman: I can hear you Erica. So it may be an issue on (Judith).

Erica Mann: On (Judith)'s side.

(Judith): I hear you now but I lost the question that you had.

Erica Mann: It's all solved. Marilyn repeated it. So we are fine. Somebody else who wants to raise a question concerning Panama? Okay. Wonderful. So Marika, we just move forward. And as soon as we have (unintelligible) update is needed, just be so kind of send it around so that everybody is informed. Thank you so much for this.

And then with this, we come to our last point, which is the - our next meeting on Thursday, 17 of May at 2 o'clock UTC. And just to remind all of us that we try to get as much work done by email because (Sylvia) just alerted me and alerted all of us that she is actually having to call at a very, very bad time very late at night for her; actually early in the morning.

So maybe if we can get more done, there will be a time where we can actually maybe be able to decrease the calls again. In the meantime, thank you so much. Have a wonderful day. And back to Julie.

Julie Bisland: Thanks Erica. Thank you everyone for joining today. The meeting has been adjourned. You can disconnect your lines and...

END