

**ICANN
Transcription
CCWG Auction Proceeds
Thursday, 11 May 2017 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: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-11may17-en.mp3>

AC Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p5ovtulb0ei/>

Attendance located on Wiki page: [https://community.icann.org/x/1QLfAw\[community.icann.org\]](https://community.icann.org/x/1QLfAw[community.icann.org])

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

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Woman: Great, thank you (Iris). One moment. Well good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all. Welcome to the CCWG new GTLD auction proceeds call on the 11th of May, 2017 at 1400 UTC.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call. But for reference we do have 13 participants online. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you're only on the audio bridge today would you please let yourself be known now? Thank you, hearing no names.

I would also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn the call back over to Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: Thank you very much and thanks everybody to make the call this time. I know some of you are about to traveling back or you're on your way back from the GDD meeting in Madrid. Our - the chair what their coach - so (Erika)

so we just got a note from her that she sends her apology because of the probably the electricity outage in her neighborhood. So we will try to see if we can get her back in.

So for the time being I would, you know, try to help and lead the call. And then let's just get started. So as you can see from the Adobe room the proposed agenda. The format is pretty much like what we had previously. We also start, you know, with ask, you know, asking everybody to make sure that you have the updated DOI. So if anybody has a new DOI -- something changed during the you know, the course of this two weeks -- please that- this is a good time to make the update. And as always please use the mailing list to do so.

So I will pause here to see if anybody has an update. And I also see Marika you have your hand up. So Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just wanted to know -- because I have received some questions of (missed) from a number of working group members and participants -- and specifically in relation to question six. And how to respond there. So I just want to reiterate there, that for those that at this stage have you know, no knowledge or awareness that either their employer or the organization that they may represent is planning to apply they can state as such in the DOI.

And note as well that of course that may change over time. Because I know that several of you are in a situation where, you know, your groups may not have discussed this yet or may all depend on the framework or mechanism that is chosen at the end of the day. So I think what we're looking for and the thing that has been highlighted before as well is really a question about transparency.

So just, you know, basically just be up front about you know, if you are not aware of any intention just state that. But make sure and (lead) if that

intention changes -- or you become aware of new information that indicates that you group or employer is likely to imply - apply -- you know, please communicate that then to the list and make sure that your DOI is up to day.

Ching Chiao: That's great. And thanks for the reminder Marika. So as you just correctly pointed out the condition and the intention might change from time to time. So the purpose always that we ask about if there's any updates on the DOI it is you know, making sure the, you know, the transparency. And with the ongoing process as we are deciding the framework, the mechanism. So I think this is always helpful and useful that you can do so.

I see Carolina you have your hands up, please go ahead. Carolina? Can you hear us, or? I can - okay. In the Adobe room I can see that she's typing. No, Carolina so we couldn't hear you. We'll probably proceed while we're waiting. So I will suggest that Carolina for you if you can leave your remarks even if this is an update please leave the text in the Adobe room or send in to the group. That would be very helpful. So thanks very much.

Carolina Caeiro: Can you hear me now?

Ching Chiao: I can see somebody speaking. Carolina is that you?

Carolina Caeiro: Yes, this is me, sorry. Was just having trouble getting the audio set up. Can you hear me now?

Ching Chiao: Oh, that's great. Okay, please go ahead.

Carolina Caeiro: Yes, I just wanted to...

Ching Chiao: Yes.

Carolina Caeiro: ...share with the group an update on my DOI.

((Crosstalk))

Ching Chiao: Sure, go ahead. This is a good time to do so.

Carolina Caeiro: Okay, perfect. So essentially following the discussions in the last couple of weeks upon discussing with the organization that I represent -- I am with Lacnic, the Latin American and Caribbean Internet Address Registry -- we decided to update my DOI for question six.

We essentially changed my answer from yes to maybe. Essentially until mechanisms are established we cannot assert whether we will be applying for funding or not. So we've made that update to the DOI. So I just wanted to share that with the group.

Ching Chiao: Got it. Duly noted and thanks very much for letting us know. Okay, so point well noted. We will ask the staff to help update and if you can - we understand that the situation changed from yes to maybe. And I probably have one follow up question is would this require further explanation? Or probably we can, you know, talk to (Yousef) really on this but in any case thanks very much for letting us know.

Carolina Caeiro: Yes, absolutely.

Ching Chiao: Okay.

Carolina Caeiro: Well I actually send the DOI to Marika and (Terry) and it's already up on the website. So...

Ching Chiao: Got it, okay.

Carolina Caeiro: ...all said and done, I just wanted to let everybody know.

Ching Chiao: Thanks very much. It's really helpful. Okay. Okay, let's move on to the next item on the agenda, is the status for our response to the ICANN board letter that was sent - it was set to us approximately two months - two plus months ago. We spent some time working on it and I thank everybody who made the contribution to the letter.

And once again I think we are, you know, having everybody to comment on, you know, actually Marika's strat. And I think we, on -- myself and (Erika) -- we feel that the letter -- as you can see about a week ago we have a finalized version -- which is ready to be sent to the board. So I guess for this call is for us to have everybody maybe just to look at - have a final look.

So I will recommend that Marika could you please upload the letter to the Adobe room. Could you please do that? And then we can have everybody to probably to have a final look. I understand that while you're doing this I understand that the discussion that we had in, you know, at least the past few weeks is based on number one, the percentage on the cause. The cause -- the 5% -- that particular figure.

And I think we had quite an extensive discussion on being (unintelligible) at this moment. And I think we made that very clear in the board letter. And the other thing is also we just mentioned and discussed about the, you know, the DOI. How to make sure that there is quote unquote a more clear-cut on those who are making the work before designing the framework and for those who will be applying for the funds.

So I - and also think the practices that we've been using reflects in the board letter. So I guess it's just maybe we take the new few minutes just to making sure that everybody is on the same page. I understand that many of you have been reading this. So I guess we'll take another few minutes maybe for Marika just to help us to, you know, quickly walk through what's the finalized version kind of sound like.

And then the plan is for the leadership team -- once the call is concluded -- then we will sent it -- this version -- to the board. So I will ask actually to ask Marika to please help lead and then maybe to go through the letter quickly. Marika?

Marika Konings: Thanks Ching. So yes, what you see on the screen is the final version, the version that has been circulated on the mailing list following our last meeting. Which realize a large extent hasn't changed much.

As you may recall there was some discussion in relation to what you see here as bullet point three, the overhead question. And I think that the group landed there on a compromise where it's clearly indicated that a decision item that will require further conversation. But the board input will definitely be taken into account.

And I think that's also the general approach to the letter, where in many cases the CCWG has acknowledged the board input but notes that at this stage is of course too early to definitely determine where the CCWG will end up. So I think this is just the starting point of that conversation and definitely not the end of it. So as that - the hope is that this (unintelligible) incorporates all the feedback and input that we've received to date and the discussions we've had during the meeting.

And as Ching noted the leadership team is planning to send this shortly after this call to the board in response to the letter that was recieved early March.

Ching Chiao: Okay. Thank you Marika. So I guess I can see so for Carolina is that an old hand or it's a new hand?

Carolina Caeiro: Old hand, apologies.

Ching Chiao: Okay, thank you. So I guess what we will do is that is if there's no further views or comments I guess (for us) is that we will you know, actually just go

ahead and send the letter to the board. It's been a while so I think it's a, you know, it's a good timing for us to at least to have those points responded. And, you know, and thanks to the board for you know, sending this to us.

And I guess we will just move on and continue our work. So okay. Let's - I think we're good on this. So let's move on to the next agenda item. Which is to talk about the distribution of the work plan and the proposed approach of, you know, to dealing with the charter questions. I think in the very beginning of the working group, the meetings - and then we also reviewed this job work plan, I think various times.

The past - in the past two week we haven't received further notes or advises from the working group. So every time myself -- and also with Marika -- we're thinking that this is something that we should be able to let many of us going back to our own SOs and ACs, to let them know that this is the schedule and the milestones. So kind of to set the expectation for our perspective - respective, you know, SOs and ACs.

So let's probably once again just quickly go through this schedule and then I guess the - for you know, as I just described the plan is for us -- each individual member -- to take this back to the SOs and ACs. To have them to understand more about what's - what has happened and also what will be done in the schedule.

So I can - okay I can see from the chat talking about so I believe the letter. And (Rhonda) says also we (tuned) the letter. So but I think we would probably still ask Marika to maybe to help walk through the draft of work plan again. I mean and very briefly. And the - please. Please Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks Ching. So indeed what you see on the screen is then the draft, a work plan. And on the last page of that you have the proposed approach for dealing with the charter questions.

So the work plan itself follows the six steps that have been flagged as the main stages of work for the CCWG. So basically what we've done is assumed that a continuation of a call every two weeks. And against that we've mapped out the different phases. So we're currently in Phase One - the initial run through of questions.

Phase Two would be addressing those questions that have been identified as requiring a response. Or at least, you know, rough agreement around a response to the charter question to be able to move into Phase Three, which would be the compilation of a list of possible mechanisms that could be considered by the CCWG. Which would also include a potential consultation with some of the experts we've identified to make sure that the outline and identification of possible mechanisms is accurate.

Phase Four would then be looking at those mechanisms that have demonstrated that the most potential to meet some of the CCWG expectations as well as being in line with the legal and fiduciary constraints. And as well (for space) on some of those initial responses. And then do kind of a deep dive for that mechanism or those mechanisms that have been identified.

And answer each of the charter questions from the perspective of that mechanism. Which is then Phase Five. And at the end of Phase Five hopefully there would be a broad agreement or consensus around which is the mechanism that the group would like to recommend as part of its initial report. Which is the basically the conclusion then of Phase Six, which is the publication of the initial report.

At this stage that leads us to the end of this year. But -- as I've noted before - - it will all of course depend on how much time is needed for different phases. And course idea that if we're able to adapt the work plan as needed. I've also noted before that the end of year deadline is an artificial one. It's just a point

in time to work towards. At some point you can either decide that, you know, more time is needed and you may want to push out that timeline further.

Or you may decide that you want to speed up the pace and move from a two-week schedule to a weekly schedule. Or use sub teams or the different ways of course that could be considered. But we're basically working on this basis. As Ching noted it probably is a good point in time to reach out to the different chartering organizations now and share with them the work plan and the proposed approach so they're also kept up to date as to, you know, which direction the CCWG is going.

And Ching, if I may suggest that maybe it's helpful if I work with you and (Erika) to maybe draft a kind of - a little cover note for that outreach to the chartering organizations. And then we can at least ask each of the members to then share that with their respective groups. That may also create a bit more linkage between the leadership team and the different chartering organizations in that regard.

Ching Chiao: Yes, that's a great idea on the, you know, the cover note. That's a great idea. I think that will be helpful for the members here to, you know, to easily to communicate with their SOs and ACs. So, yes, thanks again. I do see there's questions on some - so (Judith) asked about whether there's a (face to face) schedule. We'll be talking about that but the short answer is yes. And it's not (here - I) - also I'm just trying to follow the chat stream.

Yes. To directly to outreach to the chartering organization be a good idea?

Yes. So basically the intention is, you know, as you can see from the schedule at least we are, you know, we're not letting - I mean be behind. We are on schedule, we're on our own schedule. I think it also offers some of the room to adjust whether the group feels that, you know, we - the work needs to be extended. Because of various, you know, and I mean reasons or factors weighed in in the future.

I - so I want to maybe to pause a little bit and see everybody feels if there's any other, you know, additional thoughts or consideration that needs to you know, build in into this schedule. I'll probably let everybody just to look at this kind of quickly go it over and then to move on to the next one. So.

And so while also you are looking at this I think at the beginning we've - in the beginning of the CCWG we did briefly talk about it is where, you know, is there a kind of a pressing timeline to get this done by the end of the year? Or would we be - it would be something else that we need to -- for example -- to extend the work a little bit just to make sure that, you know, we can be inclusive as much as possible. So I think -- based on this, at least to my own, you know, personal perspective -- is not - we're not really chasing a hard target.

And also we kind of we've already blend in some of the kind of the buffer here just to make sure that if we need more time or let's say if we need another call -- with the (unintelligible) and with the ICANN staff -- we are able - we should be able to do that. And if one -- wearing my ccNSO hat is that potentially -- and this is I think we've also discussed about maybe to have some showcase how some of the CCT would be around their non-profit or their non-profit projects.

We are also probably need to invite some of the experts in the non-profit org management and the operation to share their views. So I think there's still some ways that -- when the group start to evolve, then more intense work will have started -- we can always go back and look at if there's any change on the schedule needed. But for the time being -- for myself, I think we -- personally I think it's something that it's visible and we should take this opportunity and go back to send this back to our SO, ACs. So.

Okay so I do not see hands or but I do see some of the comments leave here. Let me try to - okay there's some questions on the - in terms of May. Yes, so all the questions - the charter questions as we are going through.

And will be going through some more shortly as we've always encouraged everybody to take some times maybe just five to ten minutes just to look at, you know, in particular maybe question one or three. Those legal questions. Those mechanism questions that you have with particular model in mind.

And it's always - this is will be very useful so that you can have the input at this stage. Okay, so if there's no further comments why don't we wrap this up. And I see for Marika you (leave the) notes. Then I think we will have this action items to be delivered after the call.

So okay, let's - why don't we just move on to the next item? Which is to talk about chapter question 11. Okay, so for those of you who've been following the discussion I think we've been running - going through those questions. We've put in in these kind of two baskets. And I think for question 11 this is the end of the legal basket. So I will hand it to Marika and please help, you know, with the discussion here. So Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks Ching. And yes, you're right. You're absolutely correct. This is the last question that we had in the legal basket. And then we move on to the more scope-related questions. So this is charter question 11 which reads "Should a review mechanism be put in place to address possible adjustments to the framework following the completion of the CCWG's work and implementation of the framework, should changes occur that affect the original recommendations? For example, changes to legal and fiduciary requirements and or changes to ICANN's missions?"

Some of the responses that were received and part of the Google Doc that is still available -- and again know this is a summary -- so for the full details please go to the link that you see here and review those responses. But as you can note most responses that indicate that a review mechanism would be helpful. As some noted as well that it may need depend on the actual mechanism that is chosen, that it may be easier or more difficult depending on what mechanism is chosen.

Some also commented on the fact that if anything is done that should be done in a very transparent way. Having potentially internal, external reviews available. Noting as well that it should be used to change the overall recommendations. For example, in relation to scope. That would need to go through a separate community process if it's deemed that that is an issue at stake.

Again -- obviously as well -- along the similar lines and pointing out that it would be important for the community to be involved in any kind of review mechanism. And someone also noted that it also could be a kind of a safety mechanism that would need to be built in to have kind of intermediate quality checks which could result in immediate corrections. For example, cancelling remaining grants.

So I think if you look at the comments that's probably on two different levels. One basically focusing on the overall, you know, is the mechanism working? Is there any steering that needs to be done? And if so, how does that need to happen or how can that happen. And then as well comments that are more specifically focusing on review of projects and what to do if (unintelligible) should be steering away from you know, the objectives that they specifically outline. Which should there be then a course correction mechanism in place?

So with regards to the order in which the questions need to be dealt with, this clearly seems to be one that's very dependent on the preferred framework or mechanism. I think as several already noted in their responses it's clearly linked to the mechanism chosen. What kind of review mechanism may be needed? And this is also clearly linked to legal and fiduciary requirements as well as potential audit requirements that may be in place.

And I may just remind you here that we've actually trying to work with (Savier) to have a briefing on audit requirements at a future CCWG meeting. So the

group will also have bit more clarity around what the requirements may be in that regard. Which of course also feed in (interview). So this is what I've got it from the input received on the Google Doc. Happy to hear additional comments or suggestions from those on the call.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Marika. Okay, so probably I can start. I had one question -- and maybe it's just, I'm just asking -- you know, I probably this also (list) to the answer of my previous input on question number one is that I can see some - I've already answered in terms of - in response to question number one about the mechanism, the framework.

So I get this question actually talks about the review mechanism. If there's anything to be changed. And in the mechanism -- in the framework -- should there be a review mechanism that goes along with it. So I guess this is something that, you know, that's to, you know, it's definitely very useful to actually to think about this.

So I actually personally I put this particular question under the sub-question of question number one. So because as I mentioned that there's some responses in the initial responses to question number one. Is about whether the mechanism should start with one model and then - and through some period it will be changed to another model.

An example would be the fund would be starting within ICANN and then eventually to be managed and operated outside of ICANN. So I mean obviously there's, you know, a change here. And I think this question is something that we also need to address. So many - I'll probably stop here and I can see (Erika) is just joining on. So it's good to have you back to the call.

Yes, it seems we have some interesting background noises here. So, I can see a few people joining the call. And for some reason I do - not able to scroll up and down my chat. So please I do apologize for not being able to

read out some of your comments and suggestions timely. But yes. But let me have a policy here and maybe just have everybody to maybe to think about this and before we're moving on to the first scope question.

Marika Konings: Ching this is Marika. As you're having issues with the chat maybe I can just at least note one of the questions that was raised.

Ching Chiao: Sure, please.

Marika Konings: Carolina asks whether are we to propose to the board a review mechanism? It needs - it seems the general agreement is that there should be one. And I responded to her, yes. That this question specifically asks if there should be a review mechanism. And at least from my perspective it would be within the (unintelligible) of the CCWG to -- in addition to that -- identify what the proposed criteria for such a review mechanism might be.

And I think as I already (noted), you know, we're hearing some of your comments. It seems that at least initial thinking is that, you know, there should be a review mechanism in place that is able to make adjustments. But there may be a need to kind of identify how those adjustments could then be taken effect. So for example, if there are concerns about the scope.

It seems that some are suggesting that if changes need to be made to the scope it should be a community process that is involved in that. Well, probably. On the other hand the comments in relation to the more quality check related review presumably that is something that, you know, would be within the mechanism to do it. There's not necessarily a community process needed to identify if a project is not meeting the expectations.

And, you know, funding may need to be cut or some kind of penalties may need to be put in place. So again, I think that there is already some information here. But as Carolina noted it does seem -- from at least those responses received -- that there is general support that some kind of review

mechanism should be in place. Again noting that of course at the end of the day the exact nature of that may be dependent of the mechanism chosen.

Ching Chiao: Yes. It should be something that's interesting to discuss further down the road is that which would come first. Let's say we've been knowing, been informing that the fund -- once allocated -- the audit processes will kind of chase down to the - to those was using to receiving the funds. So I think there is -- you put it here in the template -- is that there's audit requirements. And I - we also question about this how the review mechanism will work.

So I guess that will be something very interesting to discuss, you know, down the road. But I will - we'll probably leave the, you know, some room for, you know, further thoughts. But it's always been very good to - just to, you know, think about some, you know, something here.

But I can see Carolina you were typing something? Right, thanks for - yes, so Carolina was saying that once this mechanism is selected should brainstorm possible scenarios, you know, what would trigger the review mechanism and propose alternatives.

And even actually to myself even if the mechanism maybe have some loopholes or doesn't work well, what would be a remedy? Or what would be - as you suggest here -- what would trigger a review and even further a change to an alternative framework? So okay. So I have Carolina, so please go ahead.

Carolina Caeiro: Hi there. No, sorry, I just wanted to say perhaps we should add a sub-question to question 11 where we already begin to sort of brainstorm options. It seems -- unless anyone else has the different opinion -- that the general agreement is (unintelligible) of review mechanisms.

So perhaps if it is get people thinking we can add a sub-question about you know, what mechanisms, you know, we should put in place. What review

mechanisms, and maybe already should have begin brainstorming what possible scenarios would trigger that review mechanism.

So I think it would be - I think it this sort of putting the questions in the Google Doc and letting people sort of, you know, write down ideas and brainstorm is working really well. So perhaps it's worthwhile adding that sub-question and you know, already start getting comments on that. That's (just what I posted) there.

Ching Chiao: Yes. That's a great suggestion. Yes, I think the important part -- and do we agree -- is what would trigger. And you know, the review ones I think many organizations (for) profit or not-for-profit the present review mechanism can be - I mean adopted either using many of the review mechanism that we've been using in the ICANN world. From, you know, from the independent ones to even from, you know, kind of, you know, to a check mark one. Or, you know, or kind of a scoring system.

You know, we can leave that to, you know, definitely leave that, you know, further discussion. But that's very useful. Well thanks very much. Okay. I can see (Adam) is typing, so. Let's wait for a bit. All right, so (Adam) was talking about some of the triggers are pretty clear. Time, money, disburse, and (unintelligible) from project reviews or audits. That's agreed by (Erika).

Okay. I guess the question -- if you look at again -- is to look at the review mechanism that will be put in place to address possible adjustments to the framework. So I would like to maybe to take one step back is to -- maybe we need a further qualification on this -- is whether this is some mechanism that the group decided. And the board -- the ICANN board -- approves it.

But something went wrong and then some - this review mechanism will help us to make it make something right. So I guess that's where talking about here. Is it's instead of talking about in the individual projects. So I'm pretty sure everyone is clear but I want to - just want to make sure that we are on

the same page here. Okay, I - so (Monel) is saying that she agree with (Alan) but sorry I'm - my chat window just, you know, just is just gone.

So I'm sorry I wouldn't - yes, so (Monel) is saying that it's a compilation. Maybe some may be clear now, some may dependent on the mechanism selected. Yes. I'd also agree with that. So (Erika) was mentioning plus with my experience some slow take off because of the narrow definition of the mission statement guiding our work as of now. So (Alan), please.

(Alan): Yes, thank you. I think the issue that (Erika) just raised is probably the largest one, which might cause us to have to rethink what this working group is deciding. You know, that is we're not able to give away the money because we've kept things too narrow.

But other than that, you know, this isn't NASA where we have to compile detailed plans of what happens in each eventuality. If indeed we are doing something so wrong that review and audits, you know, something says we really have to rethink what we were planning because otherwise we're going to waste the money one way or another. I'm not sure we can plan that ahead of time. Or designate exactly, you know, what the mechanism's going to be to fix the problem.

I think the community's going to have to get involved. Clearly if we change the ground rules -- which this group spends a year and a half creating -- then yes I think the community's going to have to get involved. That's almost a no-brainer. But other than that I think what we have here is a good outline for what we have to produce in the final report. But I don't think we're going to be able to go into real details of exactly how do we handle each eventuality. Thank you.

Ching Chiao: Thank you (Alan). I think that's point well made. And many of the ICANN - probably, you know, some maybe you can - we have the same feeling is that we've been witnessing and even participating lots of ICANN review.

Its own review can be triggered simply by time, maybe a year or two. And then it can be done within the ICANN community itself or there could be a third party to be hired and to actually to do the job. And then the goal is to simply - once the framework is being decided and then it could be just to making sure that the framework, the machine would run well. Instead of, you know, not (hitting) down and to do something drastically different.

So, but I - yes but I think we all agree that there could be a scenario so leads to what (Erika) suggested, could be a narrower start. But things may, you know, go somehow actually differently at the end result. Okay.

So I guess - okay so I see - so I can see (Olga) is typing. So maybe we'll spend another minute or two, then we'll move on to question number two, the charter question number two. So (Olga) says she's leaving. So thank you, (Olga), for being with us. So okay.

So I think we once again this - we'll always have a chance, you know, during the intersession just between the calls we can please to have more input and thoughts to question - not only this one but the previous one. So let's move on to question number two. So, Marika, could you load up question number two template? Thank you. Yes, okay. So please go ahead, Marika, so for - to lead us through this question number two. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Ching. This is Marika. So now we're starting - the questions have been identified as more scope-related questions and this one in particular has been identified already in earlier conversations as likely one of the gating factors or one of the gating questions, one that will need to be addressed or at least kind of a tentative agreement on the response to this question before we can actually help to move into some of the next stages of the work.

So the question reads, "As part of this framework, what will be the limitations of fund allocation, factoring in that the funds need to be used in line with

ICANN's mission while at the same time recognizing the diversity of communities that ICANN serves? This should include recommendations on how to - whether the proposed use is aligned with ICANN's mission. Furthermore, consideration is expected to be given to what safeguards, if any, need to be in place."

So here we've got quite some input, and I'll release the document so you can all see the comments. We received quite some input from those that responded to the Google Document. So the first comments notes that the CCWGs should start by describing the various criteria we collectively have in mind as far this judging if a given project is worth the funding by this new DNS agency.

And then a number of criteria have been identified. So, again, that's a potential approach the CCWG could consider in answering this question are there a number of criteria the group can agree on that would need to be followed, again, of course taking into account ICANN's mission and limitations in that regard.

It notes then as well that once the CCWG has developed a list of criteria, these can then be grouped, followed by an evaluation and prioritization efforts that would then ultimately define the goals of the granting agency or, I guess in a broader term, the mechanism that is chosen.

Someone then notes as well that if funding was to be allocated to support the free community that ICANN serves, some generic criteria might apply but there should be room to add more requirements that are subject matter specific. This person notes that funding should be allocated to benefit the Internet but not in a generic way but closely aligned with ICANN's mission to improve the stability, security, and global interoperability of the Internet.

And again another person, again, along the same line noting that it should be very clear criteria for the basis of the selection of the projects. Again,

someone notes here that the assumption that there would be consensus that should be - the funds should be used for the sake of the Internet and not only would this reasoning be fit in ICANN's own mission but the current Internet is slated for explosive growth of cyber crime, cyber warfare, et cetera. And the person notes that there's an urgent need to come up with new solutions in that person's perspective can be built for a relatively modest sum of money.

Someone else also notes that the funds should be used to strengthen the Internet as a whole but especially for the DNS and for a strong awareness program of all TLDs, which should start with education. And the person here notes a number of examples of what that could look like, also noting that the group should not forget the multicultural and language diversity, which is always a big handicap and costly.

And as I noted here as well, this is one of the questions that has been identified as needing to be addressed before commencing work on phase three, as the scope and limitations of funding allocation will likely have a determining impact on the response of the charter question as well as determining what mechanism might be most viable to meet the criteria identified as part of this charter question.

One of the sub questions that was already identified as part of an earlier conversation as well but it shouldn't only focus on the limitations but also focus on the broader objective or scope of funding allocation. And some of the expertise that is required here is of course knowledge concerning ICANN's mission as well as legal and fiduciary requirements that apply that obviously also have an impact on the notion of, you know, what might be within scope and what may be outside of the limitations.

So that's what I had noted and I'm happy to open the floor to other input or comments or suggestions. And, again, that may also include, you know, what may be the best way for actually tackling this charter question. We're

currently gathering more initial thoughts, but as noted, this is identified as a gating question.

Some have noted that or suggested that maybe we should start with a list of criteria and then see if there's a way to work down that list to a list that everyone can agree on and also note that - make sure that it's in line with ICANN's mission and legal and fiduciary requirements and, you know, what is the best way to go about that or another suggestion for how the group may tackle this specific charter question.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Marika. So I can see Alan and (Asha), you have your hands up. So I guess, Marika, you brought up something that's very worthy, you know, to think about once again as to how to tackle the initial responses that we received so far, what would be the best way to, you know, to have more inputs or even to evaluate what would be something right to do at least to put together a good response at this stage. So let's move from - to Alan first. Yes, Alan? Thank you.

(Alan): Thank you. What strikes me as missing here is a measure of the magnitude of allowable grants, that is how large will we consider and perhaps how small will we consider just to make sure overhead doesn't exceed the benefits of the grant itself. And I don't - I can't really recall if that's a subject of another charter question or should that be part of this one. A question for Marika, I guess.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Alan. Probably as a follow on -- I know, (Asha), you have your hand up -- but maybe a follow on to this, are you talking about I mean an amount here or maybe like the letter that (James) sent (unintelligible) maybe kind of a percentage of the revenue or a overall form a percentage being allocated to let's say one individual organization to receive the funds, so maybe that's also something we can tackle here. But without answering this now, let's talk about more. Let's move to (Asha). Please, (Asha)?

(Asha): Thank you, Ching. Can you hear me?

Ching Chiao: Yes, loud and clear. Go ahead.

(Asha): Okay great. Thank you very much. So I just wanted to make a comment about this particular question, charter question. So I do enjoy - pardon me, I do agree with what was said in the chat about the good start being to define the objectives to the funding. That really is I think a fundamental thing, a fundamental requirement, something that's very important and would kind of help the progress of the CCWG.

And in light of that, I would like to suggest that the relationship between the proposed users for the funds and the mission, that's something that could be highlighted. So for example, proposals that may come in later on for applying for grants, they should include a statement - they could include a statement showing the relationship between they're applying for and the mission. And that would actually help with this, help ensure that we are in line with the mission.

Another quick comment I wanted to make in light of Alan's comment, I don't think it's in this question, it might be in another, so - but I agree with what Alan just mentioned because if we're going to have too many small grants, I shouldn't say too many, but if there's going to be a large number of small grants, then your overheads will increase significantly. So that may be a question that the CCWG wishes to consider. I think it's a very good point that Alan just brought up. I'll end here. Thank you.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, (Asha). I think that's a very good point made about a kind of a potential topic on the size of funds granted. So I think, yes, we're making roads here. So I have (Mark) here. (Mark)? (Mark), it seems that you are on mute. Can you hear us?

(Mark): Yes. Can you hear me now? Can you hear me? Hello?

Ching Chiao: Yes, we can hear you, (Mark). Go ahead.

(Mark): Okay. Yes I tend to disagree with it. It's the other way around. We (unintelligible) have experience with very small grants for the last 20 years which are in the order of between 5,000 and, say, 50,000, and it's amazing how much you can still do with such small amounts of money. And if you would use a lot of existing infrastructure to disburse this money, then you don't necessarily need more overhead than with large grants.

Ching Chiao: Okay. Thank you, (Mark). That's a point well-made and I can see some in the chat room also talked about it's not a problem but it will be a streamlined process for processing them. So I can see that - (Asha), is that an old hand or a new hand?

(Asha): It's an old hand. I'll bring it down. Thank you.

Ching Chiao: Okay. So then I'll go to - (Mark) are you - okay. Then I'll go to Alan. Alan, please.

(Alan): Yes thank you. I don't think we should really be having the substantive discussion here right now, just outlining what the questions are. I mean in terms of things like small grants, they may be really effective, as (Mark) has just said, but you need to make sure you're procedure you design you do not go through the same process for evaluation and review as you would for a \$10 million grant. So it's a matter of matching the process to the function. But I don't think, you know, I think we need to just identify what the issues are, not come to the conclusions here.

Ching Chiao: Sounds good. Thank you, Alan, for this - for the reminder and notes. So yes, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to note and I also put in the chat, and Alan raised the question here, is this the place to discuss this issue or are there other charter questions.

And I pointed out that charter question four is actually next on our agenda, so we may even get to that today, asked the questions about, you know, what aspects should be considered to define the timeframe, if any, for the funds allocation mechanism to operate as well as disbursement of funds, the example, given the timeframe for the operation of this new mechanism may provide the opportunity for long-term support or for funding to be raised in tranches linked to milestone achievements, singular or multiple disbursement. So it may also be an item that comes up as part of that conversation.

Ching Chiao: Great. Okay. Yes I have (Asha) in the chat room said the - her point to raise will be good if we also include a statement showing the relationship with the missions. I think that's, you know, that's noted and that's something - yes, a proposal request for funding. Okay. Noted. Yes I can see (Erika) and (Wanda) typing.

Yes would it be something that's - let me try to scroll through my - would it be something that's also useful because of the members - I mean the nature of the CCWG, so would these be something that's useful, since we're talking about in the very beginning of the, you know, trying to kind of bring the answers to this question, would it be something that's useful to have an exercise for each members that maybe take sometimes and, you know, speak to your SO and ACs and to make sure that personally we are answering the scope questions?

And secondly, is the SO/AC representing names, numbers and, you know, the benefits of users and nonprofit and for-profit, you know, are the organizations, you know, perhaps this is also useful that, you know, each individual member can start to, you know, to outreach to your organization and have their input or at least we can, you know, have you to represent the

SO and ACs to have something that's well, you know, planned and also well thought. So I'm just thinking that would be something useful to have an exercise like that.

And I can see in the chat that (Erika) says that the importance to define the objectives which is spent on time to think about this, I'm not sure our current chartering questions already looking into this. So (Erika) you are asking Marika for this. And, thank you, (Wanda) for sending questions to the At Large.

Yes, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. In response to (Erika)'s question, I think it needed something we identified. I would probably fit on the need at this specific question, even though it's spelled out, but as we've noted, this is why we're going through the exercise that we can identify sub-questions or clarifying questions, so I think this is clearly one where, you know, the overall objective is important to be addressed. So I think there was a suggestion that it should be part of this conversation on limitations and it would nicely fit with that.

Ching Chiao: Right. Okay. And I have maybe some other thoughts but normally I'd hold it here but if nobody is bringing up - my, you know, the follow-up questions on reading these initial responses is are, you know, whether we should include everything here or this needs to go through kind of a yes, no, or maybe if we have let's say 20 criteria, so objectives here, whether it's kind of a voting saying that this is good, the groups have full support or the group have no support.

How do we decide whether some of the criteria are staying or some of the criteria we might not include here because of those criteria or objectives are not in line with the ICANN mission? So what would be a way to decide this? So I think that's also something we should talk about in the future.

I have in the chat room (unintelligible) she thinks that - sorry, thinks the fund objectives should fall obviously with ICANN mission but the response that (Erika) gave is still need to define objectives more clearly. That's for sure. Marika, is that an old hand or a new hand?

Marika Konings: No, it's a new hand actually. This is Marika. So...

Ching Chiao: Okay go ahead.

Marika Konings: A potential suggestion might be, as several have noted, you know, is there a way to start, you know, progressing on some of these questions and if this one has been clearly identified as one where further discussion needed, you know, would it be worth it to put out a survey question where we basically say, look, this is, you know, ICANN's mission, you know, it's been clear from the legal and fiduciary requirements that there needs to be clear link between funding allocation and ICANN's mission, so, you know, from your perspective please write down what you believe should be the objectives of fund allocation.

And maybe that at least would give us some input when we finish our run through of all the charter questions and we start, you know, diving deeper into some of those questions that need to be answered, and maybe then we at least have as a starting point and it gives already people then some time to start thinking about that because we can leave of course that survey open until we actually start with our more in-depth deliberations.

Ching Chiao: Sure. Yes I very much like the idea. I think that's more inclusive. I think at this stage we need to have, you know, more input just to be more inclusive at this stage. I see - yes, go ahead, Alan. You have your hand up.

(Alan): Thank you. I have a real concern about starting to get too specific. I suspect we're going to end up with some very imaginative and useful projects being proposed where the claim can be made that they are in support of the

mission and certainly not against the mission, which as our charter proposed it, that we're not thinking of today. So I think we need to be really, really careful about not putting in constraints that will stop innovation.

The purpose of this funding is not just to do things that ICANN would do in its own budget but to widen the scope to the extent allowable by the mission. So we need to be really careful about not adding constraints that aren't there because we haven't thought of the kind of things. Thank you.

Ching Chiao: Noted okay. Point well made (Alan). And I can see some (unintelligible) being input in the schedule. Also I'll agree with what (Alan) has proposed and I think yes, this is an exercise to help all of us here to make sure that we are - so we are familiar with the questions and kind of build up this kind of logic in terms of using the, you know, the mechanisms themselves and also for the (unintelligible). I mean, that's the whole purpose of having once again this conversation and this exercise. Yes so I can see (Stephanie) agree with (unintelligible). Yes the fear of confining ourselves too much but thinking about the objective helps shape the conversation and working going forward, yes.

Yes, I - yes. So basically, I mean, we shouldn't - as (Alan) correctly pointed out we shouldn't limit ourselves. We shouldn't, you know, put too many constrains at this point. But once again I like the idea maybe we can start with some of the survey questions and help to start - at least begin to shape the answers and shape to kind of putting things down, something kind of real for further deliberation. So I think that would be something useful to do. I can see (Stephanie) agree with the approach and okay.

So in - so in general I can see - sorry I'm just slipping over the schedule. So Erika was saying that the point raised by (Alan), instead of defining identifying objectives we would like to run a few scenarios on (unintelligible). But what we would consider that would be conveyed by the mission and whatnot, indeed we should support mission-driven innovation process.

So I think definitely that something can be done with the ICANN box then we'll give it to them to that particular box but this is something that we're designating to do something that's, you know, beneficial to a brother kind of - brother community. So that's definitely not too - for - so not to forget that. Okay.

In the schedule was - there is discussion about a couple of scenarios. In - some of us in many other working groups, we also be using the approach of having several strawman scenarios. Let's say it's this particular mechanism and we have this objectives to be achieved then this approach is also, I mean, once again used by many other, I mean, working group which we can make a reference to.

Okay so Erika was defining the scenarios and - for the survey are both possible. Big funds typically have very few objectives but allow this objectives to be modified by scenarios or - and/or the applications. Okay. That's a good point.

We - probably you can feel that as we start to, you know, this probably (unintelligible) question is much kind of heavier than the legal question, legal and traditionally questions. So probably we would spend a little bit more time staying at this - if people feel that we should keep this conversation going I can definitely do that. I can see on the agenda we still have another (unintelligible) question but let's see people still have - yes I can see people still typing. So let's maybe spend a few minutes while we have another two items on the agenda. But I'd like to give people's - maybe to have some further inputs on this one. Okay.

So Asha was saying that it would be good to start the conversation going on the objectives first even though there will be just a few and that's a great point. So kind of a simpler start and at least we have, you know, kind of an

exercise going on and see whether the mechanism plus the objectives would work for the team.

But plus I would like, you know, just maybe just to make sure that, you know, once again this is kind of a heavier, you know, thoughts and questions that we do - go through that. So just to make sure that we - even, I mean, this is - as everybody - my - should - or should, I mean, agree this is fundamentally important to the group. I'd just like to remind everybody that this could lead us, you know, to, I mean, the, I mean, probably the last thing we should do is to make it kind of an open-ended exercise. So just a very friendly word of caution here.

Yes so (Alan) was saying the objective one, the good things and things might not get done if we aren't here. That's a good point too.

Yes so it was just trying to scroll things up and (Stephanie) was saying that it's important I think remember small projects will have more modest scopes than I think she was saying than large ones. So (unintelligible) and size may differentiate the objectives. The process will be iterative. Her own experience, more projects have really important multiplier effects. They allow organizations to trial a project, educate an existing project through necessary research on the issues, et cetera. So I think that's a good point - a very good point made.

Okay. So how do we feel here? So Marika - so and also Erika, we could maybe to have a pass here and then we move on to question number four or is people feeling okay that we spend a little bit more time on this one and then we leave question for - till the next time. I don't see hands here so if - okay. So (Alan) and Asha, you're typing. I will just wait.

But probably if we're - let's maybe just sit on the thoughts and have a look at this - well first we will have another two weeks here. So maybe I - we - I - so I still have question number four. So why don't we just load up - let's just have

it wrap up here so I - yes. So I think that's something that we have pretty good discussion here at least to start with. Why don't we load up - yes I can see (Mike), you're loading up question number four. Let's have a quick look and so Marika please go ahead in on the question number four.

Marika Konings: Thanks Ching and as I know that we have just limited time available we can maybe indeed go...

Ching Chiao: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...quickly through this and then put it back on the agenda...

Ching Chiao: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...for the next meeting in case people want to add a comment or issues. So charter question four and (Remmy) referred to it earlier on (unintelligible) that the timeframe for the question is what aspect should be considered to define a timeframe if any for the funds allocation mechanism to operate as well as the disbursements of funds? For example given the timeframe for the operation of this new mechanism may provide opportunity for long term support or for funding to be released in trenches linked to milestone achievements, single or multiple disbursements.

And I know as well this was actually one of the conversations I think that was taking place on the mailing list but at some point very early on and I think some of those comments have actually even - have been captured here.

So first comment here refers to the way this is done for the European Commission Framework Program where there's a broader strategic plan and then there are several calls throughout the certain period of time which each have a given focus. So it's not - every call is not the same but it's focused on different objectives and priority which then run over a three to a five-year

period for the framework after which then it moves framework and may be defined.

(Unintelligible) knows that this is a singular opportunity both in scope and in nature. While there may be other opportunities for ICANN to actively dispense and money they're not currently part of the process and I have a great fear of institutionalizing an ICANN charity. CCWG is looking at a singular event which is auction excess in the first round of open applications ever. Any structure the CCWG creates should naturally sunset as issued in form both the setup and the rules for disbursement and productively simplifies both.

(Unintelligible) in principle they agree with the previous comment. It points out that it also (unintelligible) regarding the future, you know, there may be other rounds and there may be additional auctions, you know, any such auction may have proceeds a dozen natives for similar use as the first one and the person then knows that and if that would all happen, you know, this process may be applicable again. So but at the same time knowing as well that what the CCWG should not - should require that we - should not require that everything would start over again and would need to be reinvented.

And someone knows here as well that the funds were to be allocated through partnerships that support a free community that ICANN serves across all regions. That should be desirable. Having a medium and long term perspective should be desirable to get it organized in the way the desirable impact can be reached, to give time for supportive projects, organizations to deliver and reach our goals. That should plan for a minimum of ten years and that should allow for the opportunity but it also the current political/economical/global changes to settle and probably address questions about stability.

Someone here suggests as well having three calls separated in time, dividing the amount of money into three groups as called out in ICANN's mission. So names, numbers and protocol such standards.

And here someone points out as well that granting money to the right projects could be very a time-consuming effort since not only granting money but also selecting projects and monitoring milestones and results.

And here someone notes (unintelligible) we discussed previously and as such, you know, maybe funds should be limited to a maximum of 50 to 100K per project based on an average project grant of appropriate - approximately 50K. There's clearly a lot of work to do and that maps out then of course again a sort of timeframe and it would take 25 organizations five years to sub-grant the whole fund if this line of thinking would be followed. And the person notes as well this is one of the reasons not to have the complete auction procedures first by just one new central ICANN organization.

I know here as well that I think is a result of our earlier survey this question was flagged as a gating question, that it needs to be addressed early on and so to likely determine the response to some of the other charter questions as well as the term and what - which mechanism may be most suitable. So that's all I have.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Marika. And I think to myself, I mean, I'm reading through this one again I think the responses I think here, you know, in - probably it's very - I think it's - some of the ideas are probably (unintelligible) than the ideas being brought up in other answers to the questions. So it deals with the ins and the outs, whether the ins or the money coming from is just one time or there would be future opportunity to receive the fund. Whether this CCWG to, you know, deal with this at once or should this be, you know, future usage for this mechanism, you know, the CCWG mechanism.

And this disbursement of the fund there is couple suggestions here including some of the extensive ones, some of the - kind of a simplified ones making couple of calls and to have the money allocated to couple groups. Some are more complicated, some are simpler.

So yes, I mean, for, you know, question like this I - so, I mean, I'm just, I mean, who, I mean, just looking at the answer so maybe, I mean, members have fields of example to this particular initial response whether we're kind of comfortable with - let's maybe this - for time being this kind of reach to a level of - that we are kind of to agree with that and then some of the answers - some of the initial response with for example the - that with the previous one it feels like we are - there's some more exercise to be done.

So I'm just putting out this kind of thought here and just to - at some point of time at the later stage we will probably - the staff and, I mean, the team probably we could decide which the initial response needs to be addressed. Maybe spend a little bit more time and present both the previous one and (unintelligible) survey or some scenario or some simple objectives to run through an exercise to kind of build up the kind of something that we can help us to shape the answers.

So let me stop here and see if others have further thoughts. I understand that we have only five minutes left but let (unintelligible) pause here for a little bit because see (Judith) is typing, so.

Okay so yes, I mean, I think, I mean, we're reaching to the 90-minute limit. So once again we would have some other, you know, two weeks to work through the questions and to give further inputs. Why don't we - let's say let's pause here. It seems to me that for this particular initial response there's some concrete - more than relatively concrete ideas here that we probably can, you know, give it a try and see how this would fit in into the design of the mechanism. But why don't we just maybe just leave it as it is and then let's move on to the last items which is about ICANN 59.

And so Marika, I can see that we have a date here. So would you like to maybe to explain a little bit?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So the leadership team put forward a request through the GNSO counsel membership for a time on the agenda at ICANN - at 59 in Johannesburg which is the policy forum. And it's currently tentatively scheduled as part of the GNSO schedule on Tuesday, 27th of June from 1:30 to 3 o'clock in the afternoon local time. As always of course remote participation will be available for those that are not able to attend in person and I think (unintelligible) actually checked but of course we'll need to bill it into our workplan as well. That is one of the meetings that is part of the overall schedule.

Sorry I do know that it's still tentative. I think that's - well my personal perspective a good chance that it will remain there but as I think we've noted before it is a four-day meeting so there are a lot of competing priorities but hopefully there's not going to be a reserve before the CCWG auction proceeds. And yes Asha, it's a Tuesday, 27th of June in the afternoon.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Marika. So I - do you know that when would be kind of being the confirmed? Because I know everybody's planning. Some of us, you know, are able to travel to join this - the - sort of this (unintelligible) meeting which is shorter. But do you have some thought, some idea as when can you be confirmed for the session?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm hoping that the GNSO counsel is meeting next week and the agenda is one of the items that - one of the - the meeting agenda is one of the items on the agenda so my assumption is that, you know, if no objections or meetings are identified that have priorities it would stay in that slot. But I'll follow up with the counsel leadership to make sure that we got a firm date by when we can, you know, confirm to all of you that that is the time and the date for the meeting.

Ching Chiao: Got it. Okay that's much appreciated. Okay. So okay so we'll wait for your further notes and then - so people can plan around, you know, the dates. But thanks again for the - making this work and - so basically I think we're reaching to the 90 minutes limit. So the next meeting schedule, you know, two weeks from now would be May the 25th. (Sue) had to 1400 UTC so I guess we should then - so (Mark) was saying that this one would be a (unintelligible) day, a holiday but yes. Fully noted but once again - so we will still, you know, go on and then make sure that - please make yourself available to - for the meeting. So on (unintelligible) thanks everybody for join in. Thank you. Goodbye now.

Woman: Bye bye. Thank you Ching.

Man: Thanks.

Woman: (Unintelligible) bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thank you. Again the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines.

END