

**ICANN
Transcription
CCWG Auction Proceeds call
Thursday, 16 August 2018 at 15:00 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-16aug18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p18nwnigpyg/>
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/cQZpBQ>
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Operator Your recording has started. You may now proceed.

Julie Bisland: Great, thank you so much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the CCWG New gTLD auction proceeds call held on Thursday, the 16th of August, 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no rollcall. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now.

I do show Remmy Nweke on audio only. Okay, hearing no more names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

And with this, I'll turn it back over to you, Erika Mann. Please begin.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, Julie. This is Erika. First point will be the question whether we have any updates concerning the conflict of interest declaration. I give you a second in case you need to reply. Okay, that seems to be not the case. And please be reminded you can, of course, always do this online or provide us with the - by email with any kind of information about this.

So then let's come to the next point which is the review of responses to proceeds by ICANN organization. These are the outstanding question which relate do the four mechanisms. So they will be given by some - by (Zavi) on the call. Thank you so much for this. And by (Sarah). (Sarah) is not going to be on the call today. But (Emily) will give the update and we have received (Sarah)'s response to those question which like indicate of Sam and (Zavi) as well which were identified as key questions by the small group if you remember which identified the different questions which shall be sent to - shall be answered by (Sarah), Sam and (Zavi). We are very happy Sam and (Zavi) that we have your review and very happy to listen to (Emily) about the update.

Give me just a quick section. Because I want to tell you something. We had a long call. The leadership team, this week on Tuesday, and we reviewed the time table which we still have in front of us.

And under those items which we need to finalize before we can draft a recommendation. And we will come back to this point. Just want to highlight a few points before we come into giving Sam and (Zavi) and (Emily) the floor. Just want to highlight a few points.

So the first one which we looked at is that we have very few calls before we will draft the draft recommendations. And we are planning to send to you on (unintelligible). This is pretty short.

So the second one, one of the key questions is going to be how do we rank the mechanism? And the four mechanisms which will talk about again today, I believe, and the leadership team believes, we have a pretty good understanding between us, what are the two first ones? And we believe it will be important for today that we come to some kind of conclusion how we rank these four mechanisms. Because this will have some impact on the draft and the way we will make the draft recommendations.

I'm just saying this right now. We don't need to discuss it now because we will have to - time to discuss it when we come to Point 6. Just indicating the importance about these two topics; time and the need to prepare the draft recommendations so that you can review them, and we can review them as a team as early as possible.

And then the need to come to a conclusion about the hierarchy of the mechanism. So which is the Number 1 and the Number 2 the Number 3 and the Number 4? And then ideally, we want to focus on two in particular, two mechanisms, the first two ones without neglecting the other two. But we will discuss those later. So just please keep this in mind. So that we have an understanding of what we need to achieve today.

So let me give the floor. Who wants to start first? Sam is it you or (Emily)? Do you want to give a short introduction into the point review of response and to the Point 3? And then we give the floor - is it Sam? Do you want to start right away, up? Who is it? Oh, (Zavi). You have to give me an indication how you want to handle it. Are you ready?

Samantha Eisner: Yes, hi Erika. This is Sam Eisner.

Erika Mann: Wonderful, thank you so much for being with us. I give you the floor now.

Samantha Eisner: No problem, and (Zavi)'s also on the line. So (Zavi) and I worked on the answers together. So we can provide an overview together and (Zavi) please interrupt or come in at any point. We figured that more helpful walking through each of the questions, it might be better just to give, kind of, the broader picture, because I think that there are many common themes in the questions. And therefore in our answers.

And so, one was a reminder about what it means for the board and the officers to hold a fiduciary duty. And it's something that will be held across any entity that participates in the auction proceeds grant making. So whether

there's activities that happen within ICANN or activities that happen within one or more external entities for helping ICANN with the disbursement and application evaluation process.

Each entity will have it's on fiduciary duties to the process. And we would expect at the ICANN level and the things that would trail down would be to make sure that those decisions are taken in the best interest of the organization. And really importantly that they're also done to uphold the principles that will come out of the CCWG.

And so, you know, a lot of the questions focused around governance aspects. And the governance really - the mechanisms don't drive the governance. The principles of making sure you have the right mechanism in place. You understand where independent needs to be in places of the evaluation. And where you don't need as much independence as much expertise for example on considering missions. Those are the things that will drive your governance framework more than the division of labor between a mechanism.

(Zavi), did you have anything you wanted to add to that, kind of, general overview that covers many of the questions?

(Zavi): No, thank you Sam. I think that's exactly right.

Samantha Eisner: And -

Erika Mann: (Zavi), this is Erika. Can I ask you something, in case somebody wants to come in with regard to a specific topic you are talking about? Are you fine that it will disrupt you as soon as you're finished a particular topic and we give somebody the floor?

Samantha Eisner: Yes, that's fine. We're available for questions however it suits the group.

Erika Mann: I just wanted to know, yes.

Samantha Eisner: So another big thing that we saw in the questions was about the role of the board. And I know that we have some board members on the call today, (Becky) and (Marin) are with us. And so if you have anything to add to this, please go ahead. But there are a number of questions that were about the expected addition to the load of the board based on the auction proceeds' work. And during some of the board's conversations about the auction proceeds, the board has made clear internally that it does not wish to take individual decisions on individual applications.

And so with that, the board is retaining its oversight role over the project and that's the role that we expect the board to take across ICANN's other operational activities. And so when the auction proceeds work comes into being after the recommendations have been approved, it will become a special operational activity. Yet an operation activity of ICANN.

And so we'd expect the board to sit in the same oversight role, taking on the role of receiving reports and briefings for management to make sure that things are progressing the way that they're supposed to be progressing. That management is addressing the risks appropriately and doing that.

But it's the same type of oversight role that we would see over any other project that ICANN is initiating and then running. And so there were some questions about how much the board would need to gain expertise and grant making and things specific to a grant experience. And so from the answer that we provided, we think that it's really just - it will be an additional load, but it'll be incremental and very similar to the other work that the board's done.

So with this (Zavi), (Becky) or (Martin) did you have any additional inputs that you wanted to give to the group on that?

(Becky): No, I think you said it perfectly. The board really does not intend to have any hands-on role with respect to any of decision making about allocating auction proceeds other than exercising our fiduciary obligations and oversight role.

Erika Mann: Okay, for the protocol this Erika and for the protocol this was (Becky). Thank you (Becky). Any further comment on this point with regard to the board? Something to add (Martin)? (Zavi)? (Martin) made comments in the chatroom, (unintelligible).

(Martin): Exactly no, just Sam said it perfectly and (Becky) already confirmed. So this is very clear for us. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Okay, and you have taken a decision about this. So this is a board decision with regard to this.

(Martin): It's a clear understanding at the board side at that this moment. So far, we've talked about things and we made sure that we understand each other. So to all those points, we are clear we have communicated the situation and (unintelligible).

Erika Mann: Thank you much (Martin). That's extremely helpful. Back to you Sam please.

Samantha Eisner: All right, I'm going to turn it over to (Zavi) to talk about some of the other questions.

(Zavi); Thank you, Sam. Can you hear me?

Samantha Eisner: Yes.

Erika Mann: Absolutely (Zavi).

(Zavi): Thank you. A couple questions related to the topic of the structure within ICANN for the model that rely on ICANN. And how would the work that

ICANN would carry out the structured in relation to a department or any other aspects of how ICANN is organized. Quickly on that topic, of course, this is much more an implementation topic and I would argue that the structure that ICANN will put in place internally does not matter to the extent that it should simply ensure that it's support adequately the objectives that the (unintelligible) will have set on the distribution of the grant making. And provide the most effective and efficient process thing and work.

With that said, just as an illustration of how ICANN is organized today, there's about 60 departments within ICANN. The department is simply a group of employees who work in a given function. The Department has an objective, a role and responsibilities and people are assigned to it. In addition, what also contributes to define a department is that there is an expected amount of expenses that the resources of that department are expected to incur to carry out their role. And that estimated amount of expenses is the budget that the department operates with. So that's the standard approach, nothing specific to ICANN in this case.

And it is presumed that one way or the other most likely a separate department may be needed to isolate the resources and help identify and gather the resources and the expenses associated with those resources that ICANN would be putting in place to support the CCWG. I think that we will need to, at the time of implementation when we identify the specific resources needed that may be already existing within the organization, that may contribute partially, part of their time only to the grand disbursement program. Or whether they are specific additional resources. We will need to evaluate the mechanisms of how we gather under one umbrella, one department those resources. But this is details. This is an implementation matter. And it will be at that time that we will more specifically look at that.

Regarding the resources, and how much - and how resources would be allocated to the program, two quick principles. As we all know, ICANN does not have the experience nor an existing activity of distributing grants.

Therefore, we do not have resources who are specially qualified for the purpose. But at the same time, we do have people who in prior organizations have carried out the same type of programs or similar grant distribution programs. So it's not that there's necessarily any experience. It's that there's not a currently a function organized in the organization to do so.

So having said that, what we would want to do like we have done for the (UTKLE) program, like we are doing for the (INF) functions at (unintelligible), we would want to leverage as much as possible the existing services and functions as that exist in the organization functions is that exist in the organization to minimize the specific costs additional costs incurred as a result of the program.

So leveraging a char for example, finance department procurement, legal, etc., we would want to ensure that the grant distribution program leverages of the existence of those functions that already established. So that it's only a very marginal resource requirement that is needed. And the extent of -

Erika Mann: (Zavi).

(Zavi): Yes.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Just a second. We do have a question which came in, in the meantime from Ching. And he might not be able to raise the question, but he's asking if there's a new department created whether this would trigger any kind of changes to ICANN's bylaws.

(Zavi): Thank you Erika. Thank you Ching. I don't see any reason why that would be the case. We create departments in quotes all the time, merge departments that I don't think that has any bearing on the bylaws. And if I'm wrong, Sam I'm sure will correct me.

Samantha Eisner: I don't any need to change the bylaws.

(Zavi): Thank you. And just to conclude on resources, I think that as we look at the implementation of the recommendations as adopted by the board, we will need to clearly identify what are the skills and experience that we think are required to be able to carry out the work. And then determine whether we have internally those resources in terms of skills and experience. And, of course, the last check is do we have the bandwidth?

So even if we would have someone who would be qualified for the job, does that person time or not to be able to carry out the work? And that's the other element, of course, that we will evaluate. And most, we will have evaluated that. Then of course all the costs triggered by the program corresponding to those resources that will be allocated to that department or structure for the purpose of ensuring that we have the comprehensive and clear and transparent allocation of costs. That then are going to be funded by the auction proceeds in that we would - my anticipation would be that we have an ongoing reporting of transparency of that expense. And the expenses that are located to the auction proceeds and the funding by the auction proceeds. And those of you who are a bit closer to the financial reporting that we do on an ongoing basis through the quality stakeholder calls, for example, where we have financial reporting all the time. I would expect a similar level of information provided on the option proceeds down the road.

I'll stop here and see if there's any other questions.

Erika Mann: (Zavi), give me a second. This is Erika. I'm going to check quickly with Ching and (Cabus). I see (Cabus) is waving his hand. (Cabus) is this related to a point Sam and (Zavi) discussed until now? Or is it a different question?

(Cabus): Yes, good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Yes, definitely always speaking on the point. I don't want to raise other issue. With what (Zavi) mentioned that expertise and time, they are two different things. If you have expertise, you don't have time could be a possibility of redistribution of the

task and provide those people who have timing, who have experience to put effort on this matter. And try to find those tasks which have been released from that person giving to someone else for the existing at the close or recruited. So I think you have to separate experience from the time. Thank you.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Thank you so much (Cabus). Who wants to answer? Sam or is it (Zavi)?

(Zavi); I'll take that Erika, if that's okay with you. (Cabus) is exactly right. Of course, if the resources identified in the organization that is qualified, we can always consider reallocating that person efforts towards the program. But there's a lot of HR management aspect that come into that. Is that the right thing for that person's development in career? We're talking about a temporary project for a hopefully finite amount of work for this program.

So there's a lot of other consideration than simply skills and time available that enter into allocating the resources within the organization. But I also want to emphasize for everyone on the call that at the end of the day it's the responsibility of the organization under the authority of the CU to just make sure that the resources that are required are available, competent and effective. And whether it's one or ten people who continue to it, it needs to be done in the most effective and the most cost-efficient manner. And that's what will happen whether it is one or two or the fractions of eight people. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Now then, (unintelligible) responding to a question I raised. But if you can talk, just do it right now.

Woman: Ericka (unintelligible).

Erika Mann: Wonderful, I can hear you fine.

- (Zavi): We do not need to get into the micromanagement of distinctly ICANN. I think we just talk overall at high-level arrangement, but not getting to this so much detail. You should limit to the ICANN to decide internally. Thank you.
- Erika Mann: Thank you so much. Marilyn please.
- Marilyn Cade: I appreciate my colleagues' comments. I'm not in agreement on behalf of (unintelligible). That's not in representing the (PSG), that's not something that I can agree to. To combat understanding that grant making, grant monitoring, grant follow up, grant accountability is a very different skillset and expertise than managing budget and allocating funds. So I just need to put that on the record. And I'm not (unintelligible) able to -
- (Zavi): Hello, Marilyn? I don't know if you can see in the chat, but we cannot hear you. You are very faint.
- Marilyn Cade: I'll type back in that, thanks.
- Erika Mann: This is Erika. Somebody please check connection. I have an echo. I have no problem in hearing (unintelligible). She's totally fine. Somebody please check what's going on. I get back to someone and to (Zavi) and other watch what Marilyn is typing, so I'm able to read it then, please. Back to you (Zavi).
- (Zavi): Thank you, Erika. I was done actually with the overall comments on this. Are there other more specific questions on the rest of the questions and answers.
- Erika Mann: Okay, this is Erika. We need the person coming in from Marilyn because she was raising two key points. Which I would love us to get answers from (Zavi) and from Sam. So I'm waiting until we have her reply and we can see her question. Hopefully I'm going to be able to read it. It's so small here. Always tricky with my eyes to be able to read this.

But anyhow, I'm waiting for Marilyn. Can somebody maybe from (Emily) or Smarika, can you (unintelligible)? Can one of you reach us please in the chatroom, the longer comment from Marilyn.

Smarika Kumar: This I Smarika. I'm happy to read Marilyn's comments. She says my comments are the CSG rep and I am not comfortable that ICANN staff decide whether there's an internal competence on grant making. It is a different skillset.

Erika Mann: (Zavi) and Sam, I happen to understand you saying this actually. This is Erika. But maybe you'll repeat this comment, because otherwise I would agree with Marilyn. This is a very specific skillset and you definitely would need to - in case it would be in house. Now if it's joined - if the mechanism we select as the Number 1 would be one joined with another entity who already has this experience, the situation would look different. But if it was completely in-house 100%, then I would agree that a special skillset is needed, and people probably would have to be hired. But I give it back to you to floor to make comments. And then I have afterwards (Alan). Please (Zavi) or Sam.

(Zavi): Thank you, Erika. I think it's very clear and I apologize if it wasn't actually what I said. That this grant making activity that ICANN doesn't do, therefore does not have, at least the experience internally. And the skillsets required are relatively specific to grant making. We have already internally some of the skills required to, for example, receiving and evaluating applications. But then as we could all discuss there was also grants - grant making specific activities even within evaluation and also in other aspects of the program that ICANN does not have any experience in, at least as an organization.

I was only mentioning the fact that we already know that some of the staff members within the organization have experience in grant making programs. And that we could potentially leverage that experience. I never said that would be sufficient, because we just don't know yet. And when we have a

better understanding of what the requirements are of the overall program and of the role that ICANN will play - that the ICANN org will play in that program. Then we can evaluate the skill and experience required and simply put it in place whether it's with internal or external resources that we don't already have. Thank you.

Erika Mann: That you (Zavi). This is Erika. Just a short comment from (Juan) as a reply to what Marilyn was saying so she is saying if you decide to make the - make (unintelligible), the operational staff from ICANN, I assume, shall be selected by the organization themselves. If this is stressed by Marilyn. Marilyn maybe you want to come back to this point. But I believe there was no disagreement from you, but you better mentioned it yourself.

Let me go to (Alan). (Alan) please.

(Alan): Thank you very much. I think we're going down into the weeds far more than we need to right now. You know, as (Vonda) says sure. If ICANN's going to hire someone or contract with someone, they're going to make the ultimate decisions. But that doesn't mean they don't use headhunters or some external agency to help them select the right person or identify what the qualifications are. I'd like to think that ICANN will be intelligent enough to do that without having to be explicitly told.

So I think we're worrying too much about the details. It's clear that we need the right expertise and the right place when we finally, you know, do this set up. Assuming we go in this direction. The other thing that we're ignoring is we have talked periodically about having some community involvement or some other involvement in doing the selection. It's not 100% clear at this point, at least not to me that it will be purely a staff function that we'll do all the evaluation and selection. There may be some level of community and put into this process, nothing that we have formally decided one way or another, I believe.

So yes, it's something that ICANN hasn't done, but ICANN periodically goes into all sorts of areas they haven't done. And typically they try to find the right resources. Now if we don't believe ICANN is competent enough to oversee this process. That's a different issue, but that's what we're implying by some of this discussion. And I really think we need to either come out and say we don't trust you, ICANN. We have to outsource it, because you're not, you know, we can't rely on you to do things professionally. Or we have to presume and try to put rules in place. So to make sure it will be done that way. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much (Alan). I'm just checking. (Cabus) is this an old hand and Marilyn is this an old hand? Okay, I see support from one that we are going to too deep. (Cabus), you're still up. Is it you want to say something? Okay, (Elliott) is saying ICANN can do this. (Wanda) is pretty much conforming and saying we are going - (Alan)'s position, we are going too much into detail. Okay, then let's conclude.

Let's see there's one topic that came up new, and this is the las tone which ICANN - wait, not totally new. We just got them before. We will park it for the moment. And this is the question, whether community will be allowed to make some input in judging proposals in the future. So we (Alan) if you agree we park this question and we will deal with it a bit later.

I can't ready what (Daniel) is saying. For the record, I have already said several times that ICANN is (unintelligible). Yes, (Daniel). I know you did this. And nobody said ICANN is not well equipped to doing this. So perfect.

Then let's move (Emily) back to you now and thank you so much again Sam and (Zavi). And let's go to (Emily). (Emily) please just guide us through the answers released from (Sarah). And for those who joined a little bit later, (Sara Berk) is not (unintelligible). Please (Emily).

(Emily): This is (Emily) (unintelligible). I'm hearing a bit of an echo. (Unintelligible) open line?

Erika Mann: Yes, me. I'm shutting it down now.

(Emily): Thanks. So I'm just pulling up now the response from (Sara Berk) the external consultant. So we sent her quite a few questions. I'll unsync this document. And there's a lot to digest here. So if you haven't gotten a chance to read through all of it. That's okay. And we'll provide a very high-level overview, but please do take the time to go through it in more detail because there's quite a lot of good information here and also quite a few case studies and examples she's provided that the group might find it interesting and helpful.

So like ICANN org, (Sarah), sort of, identified some themes to the questions that we provided and provided thematic responses that focused a bit on, sort of, the high level. So I'll run through what some of the questions were. And just talk very briefly about that - the themes that she identified.

So the first theme that she identified was about goals and objectives. We asked some pretty specific questions about dividing funds into baskets. And about opportunities for co-investment. And she took a step back and said, you know, these are questions that start with setting goals and objectives and deciding what we're trying to achieve here. And those goals and objectives will then drive strategy and the strategy will guide some of the specific decisions that will be made.

Specifically, you know, in the question of are there going to be buckets or categories of grants? This strategic question will guide those answers. And she talks through a few examples of how that works in some cases. For example the use of larger anchor grants, supplemented with smaller ancillary grants. But again, those are, sort of, strategic questions.

She talks a little a bit about co-investment and says that that's something that's possible through any of the mechanisms although the model might be slightly different and provides a few examples here. So that's something to take a quick look at.

And then she goes into governance and oversight. So we asked a number again of, sort of, specific questions to provide guidance on how governance frameworks work in different organizations. The roles of governance committees and oversight committees and other sorts of governance bodies. We ask questions about how closely ICANN or an organization like ICANN might need to be involved in a governance model under the different mechanisms. We asked for some guidance about safeguards and internal firewalls for cases where ICANN organization is a key player. So those are models 1 and 2. And we also asked some questions about conflicts of interest.

And she talked a bit about governance in general in organizations that do grant making. She talks about the differences between board governance and corporate governance. She talked about the role of the code of ethics and how that's connected to a human right assessment. And gave some resources on how human rights assessments can be done. And the role that they can play. She talked a little bit about conflict of interests and some of the standard requirements for a conflict of interest policy. And also discuss the importance of a culture of transparency and what that looks like.

She spoke a bit about, sort of, standard responsibilities. The role of senior management team and program officers. And, kind of, how those fit into risk management. Again, these are, sort of, best practices or standards not specific to our organization, but helpful to understand the broader picture.

And then she talks a little bit about, you know, sketching out potential ways that different kinds of oversight bodies could play role. Theoretically under the different mechanisms and provided some examples of what that looks like

in practice for other organizations. So next she provided a really helpful overview related to operations. So we had quite a few operational questions for her. About safeguards of the project oversight level about division of labor between ICANN organization and external entity about minimum grant size and guidelines for that, review mechanisms.

There's a question clarifying a response she previously provided about the cost of startup for mechanisms 1 and 2 where ICANN org would be in the lead. And then she responded to some questions about board competency, human rights assessments and sun setting. So all of those, she kind of, grouped under operations.

(Sarah) first provided a short overview of the, sort of, elements of a grant making cycle and reviews, standard process for different organizations that do grant making. That provides, sort of, a nice snapshot of some of the different elements. She talked about how the grant lifecycle established criteria and oversight to ensure transparency, accountability and good governance within an organization.

And then talked a little bit about the importance of compliance protocols and the fact that every organization that receives grant funds have to adhere to these requirements and those include things like IRS requirements, (BOFAC) requirements. It's the US Anti Chars and Finance Rules. And Sam is going to speak more to that later. And then some of the other requirements related to board oversight, conflict of interest, effectiveness, policy and financial transparency.

She then went into talking about protocols for grant agreements. And some of the key elements of that, that are standard. For example, a budget, payment requirements, and so forth. So that's, sort of, helpful as we think a little bit about, you know, standard process. And again, one of the interesting things about this document is that, you know, we focused a bit on the differences between the mechanism. But a lot of these elements that she's

talking about are common regardless of the model selected or the mechanism selected that there are, sort of, best practices that would exist and need to be implemented in some form regardless of the model.

She talks a little bit about minimum grant size. And says that a best practice is, again, just based on her experience, could be around \$50,000, US dollars. But again, that's something that's, sort of, guided by strategy. She talks a little bit about the role of the board and that, sort of, complements some of the discussion that came from grant - the ICANN org reposes as well. So those, sort of, complement each other quite a bit. But talks a little bit about some of the shared responsibilities there.

She talks a little bit about the different mechanisms and how the elements of the grant cycle could break down. So now at the bottom of Page 4, how the different elements of the grant cycle could break down under the different mechanisms. So how a responsibility could, sort of, be divided. And provides examples of how that would look in other organizations. So for example the Ford Foundation.

And then finally she talks a little bit about startup costs. And clarified a response that she had provided previously about why she had said that mechanisms 1 and 2 had relatively low startup costs, clarifying that outside counsel is not needed to establish a department. And while resources are necessary, the cost are more controlled in those areas.

And in terms of subsetting, she says essentially that strategic goals and objectives would ultimately define the sun setting period for the mechanism.

So I hope that that's helpful. Again, that's just a very brief run through and everyone is encouraged to review the responses in greater detail. And if there are follow up questions for (Sarah) she's happy to speak more to the responses she's provided, the input she's provided and clarify any answers there.

So I'll pause for a moment and see if there are questions. I see that (Cabus) has his hand up.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much (Emily). This is Ericka. Thank you so much for the overview. I know it can seem quite late and was a lot of work to review the document. I haven't had the time, so it's my first time as well. Like I would imagine for many of you. (Cabus), do you have a question, or do you want to make a comment? Or is this still your old hand?

(Cabus): Sorry, it was an old hand. I don't have anything else. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much (Cabus). Anybody else? I'll be totally fine with the reply. No further questions. If this the case, then I recommend if you to take on the month (Emily) said if you have some questions, please feel free to us and we can forward them to (Sarah) but otherwise I belief we have a good overview which we now need to evaluate.

I don't want to continue just discussion either with Sam or (Zavi) or (Emily). Then I would recommend we move to the next item on the agenda. I'm just watching briefly if somebody comes in at this stage with a question or a comment. I can't see anything.

Then let's move to the next item on the agenda which is the point, let me see if I can read. I'm really sorry about my - I have to get new contact lenses. And I'm working with old ones, which are not perfect at the stage I am in the moment.

So proposed next step to deliver draft recommendations as response to chat question. And development of initial report. That's where we are in the moment. So I will give the floor quickly to...

((Crosstalk))

Smarika Kumar: Erika...

Erika Mann: Yes? Did I miss something? Then go ahead Smarika. Go ahead.

Smarika Kumar: Yes, yes...

Erika Mann: Go ahead...

Smarika Kumar: ...there is actually an item as well as part of the questions, there were also a number of questions were - that were for the CCWG to provide input on. And I'm going to actually share...

Erika Mann: Okay.

Smarika Kumar: ...the document in that regard with the list. So I'm hoping that she will...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: So who is making the...

Smarika Kumar: ...basically...

Erika Mann: Perfect. Wonderful. Is it (Emily) or you who is making introduction to this document?

Smarika Kumar: (Emily).

Erika Mann: (Emily)? (Emily), go ahead.

(Emily Barrabas): Thanks Erika. This is (Emily Barrabas) from Staff again. I will just run through this very quickly. So we -- on our last call -- we went through a few

questions that might benefit from some additional discussion and input from CCWG members as we work toward the initial report.

And Staff has drafted some brief responses summarizing the input that was received. So I'll just go through those very briefly. On the last call we talked a little bit about where we're headed and whether we want to just recommend a single mechanism or do some sort of ranking or prioritization of the mechanisms in the report.

And Staff drafted a brief response based on the feedback we received that there's support for doing a ranking mechanism. And that initially -- in those discussions -- there was some support expressed for eliminating Mechanism Four.

The second question was about whether any additional work was needed in defining goals and objectives. And based on the input that we received it looks like at this point there is not additional need -- at this time -- for work-related setting goals and objectives, given that quite a bit of work has already done on that issue.

And also noting that there was one comment that was received about the goal of allowing grants to recipients in different countries. And again, we'll come back to that later in the agenda.

There was a question about what success looks like for this program. And the responses that we received from the group is that there may be different metrics that might be appropriate for different stages of the grant mechanism's life cycle. And that actually complements very well with (Sarah Bird)'s response where she talks about some of these specific elements of the like - life cycle.

And that complements a little bit what we have here. So this briefly just talks about some of the elements and where we might want to find that (tricks).

And then finally there was a question about whether the group at this point wanted to set principles about the appropriate level of overhead. And we didn't receive much feedback about that question.

So at this time the CCWG -- according to (these) responses -- is not yet recommended any principles. So that's a brief overview of this document. The full document is available on the Wiki for further review. And if anyone has questions or concerns, they're welcome to put those on the mailing list. Thanks.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. I'm waiting to see if somebody wants to comment on this document. Or raise a question. Just keep in mind, these are the replies we received back from CCWG members. And (Emily) just summarized them.

The document is still (open) so if you want to respond, do it but we'll have to conclude this process as soon as possible. Okay, no comment. I see (Manda) is saying it's a good document. (Elliot) has to leave. And someone else had to leave it earlier, (Umberto).

So then let's have a look at the next item on the agenda. And this was the one that I jumped to a little bit too early. Which is the Point Five. Or do we have another one there which I can't read again?

Smarika Kumar: Correct, Erika. This is Smarika...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: It looks like I can't read it again, so go ahead. Yes, next time I will have my new contact lenses. It will be fine, I promise. So Smarika, please.

Smarika Kumar: Yes. So Item Four is the impact of sanctions on fund allocation. Which is an update by Sam that follows some questions and conversations that happened on the mailing list a little while back.

Woman: Erika.

Erika Mann: Sam, this is Erika. Are you still with - can you...

Samantha Eisner: Yes.

Erika Mann: ...give an introduction to this one? Please.

Samantha Eisner: Sure. Again, this is Samantha Eisner from ICANN Legal. There were some conversations a couple weeks back regarding the impact of sanctions on the ability to fund certain applicants who might be from countries that are under sanction or might themselves be on a sanctions list.

And so I know I missed the last CCWG meeting where there was some conversation on it. I'm not sure how much - where the group wants to go with this conversation. I know we're running short on time.

One of the things I provided was -- during the jurisdiction work in Work Stream Two -- we had a large conversation on sanctions and the impact of OFAC -- or the Office of Foreign Asset Controls -- that's part of our US regulatory framework here. And so there's a lot of general information in that, which is why I've provided this.

And that's what's online. And (Emily), if you can remind me if it's been circulated to the group -- or if we can provide it to the group -- so that people can see it. I don't want to walk you through the presentation but I encourage you to take a look at it.

It answers some more general questions about what is OFAC, what does it mean to have to comply with OFAC, and the like. And so if you just turn briefly to the third page of that presentation, the Office of Foreign Asset Controls.

So when we're talking about sanctions in the US we're typically talking about sanctions that come out of this OFAC -- or Office of Foreign Assets Control -- process. And so this part of the Treasury Department administers and enforces economic sanctions. Primarily against countries, but it can also go to people who -- or specific businesses -- that are on the Specially Designated Nationals List, or the SDN List.

So we have a couple things that we check as we go through Compliance. But one of the things that's really important to remember is the US is not the only country that has systematic embargoes or sanctions. And so we have some examples here, such as Japan, UK, EU, Switzerland.

There are things that are coming into force in many places around the world. There - many of the sanctions across the world are overlapping. You'll find some differences. Some countries or entities might not be under sanction in one country but remain so in multiple other countries et cetera.

And so it's not just a matter of picking up and going someplace else to do work that might not be subject to sanctions. It's not really a practical possibility in today's environment. And so I encourage you to take a look through the rest of it.

The really big reason that it applies -- that ICANN takes this so seriously -- is that there are very heavy sanctions for ICANN. There are heavy penalties -- including both monetary as well as criminal penalties -- for not following the OFAC regulations. And by doing business or providing goods and services to people who are under sanction or to countries that are under sanction.

And so it's a - we take it very seriously. It's one of the key Compliance obligations of any company not only that's headquartered in the US but that does significant business in the US. OFAC can apply to anyone who has business connections in the US depending on how deep those run.

And so even if ICANN were to have picked up and gone someplace else -- that was one of the conversations that had happened during the transition and during the jurisdiction -- we still have such a deep web of contracts that we have. That even if ICANN were no longer headquartered in the US -- which isn't part of any current conversation -- but OFAC would likely still apply.

And so with that, I think it's - there's not really much more that we have to say on this from the ICANN side. Just we from ICANN wouldn't support the building of any program that was designed to try to get around compliance with the sanctions.

That's really a violation of ICANN's obligations under the law. It's a violation of the fiduciary duties of the officers and directors. And it's really not a feasible thing for us to do. So that's really where we stand.

So I don't know if there are questions that people want to present to me or we want to continue the conversation on the list. But however you'd like to proceed. But, you know.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much Sam. This is Erika. I don't see anybody who want to make a comment, so allow me to make a short one. First of all, thanks for the overview and the reminder that the jurisdiction CCW Work Group worked on this topic intensively. It's a good reminder we don't believe we have to repeat and have to look into this topic in particular.

And you're absolutely right. This is - these kinds of bans exist in many countries. And it is not recommendable for any entity, company or other kind of entity to try to find a way to circumvent it.

Having (said it), there were some particular questions raised by (Sylvia). She's not on the call today. And she argued that in some countries -- like she

made a reference to Australia -- sometimes these kind of bans exempt certain areas and certain topics.

So I am - I wonder if we should -- Smarika and (Emily) -- we should send this document explicitly to (Sylvia) just to allow her to have a quick look at it? And then maybe we can provide a kind of comment.

And I wonder what you would think about this, Sam, like saying if you do the draft recommendation in case the US OFAC, there is not a specific ban. Or the ban is drafted in such a way that the certain topic exempted then of course in case this would apply to the ICANN environment.

This would be looked into. I don't think that we have to say much more. I just wonder if you would feel comfortable with this, or if you would say it's completely impossible? Sam, I see you raised your hand. Please.

Samantha Eisner: Sure. So this is Sam again for the record. One of the pages -- that didn't render correctly on the PDF that's here but (Emily) has circulated the link to the original presentation -- talked about the possibility of exemptions and areas where it might not apply.

So that's also something that exists in the US too. We're not aware of any sort of wholesale exemptions or process that would apply to the grant-making arena that ICANN - or that the CCWG is considering.

There are potential license programs that you can try to apply for, but there's no guarantee for licenses. So you know, we have the same - a similar concept in the US.

But there's nothing that you could do to compel the Treasury Department -- or the other Departments that it works in conjunction with -- in order to require them to provide a - either a specific license -- which would be applied to a

specific entity -- or to provide a general license, which actually requires regulatory modification to do that.

And so there - we would have no guarantee that we could do that. But that sort of concept clearly exists here. But I think the presentation gives a little bit more background and we could provide some more answers to it.

But I would discourage the CCWG from building any sort of recommendation that's based upon the possibility of getting a license. Because there's a lot of cost involved in trying to apply for a license. Particularly at the general license level.

And when you talk about a general license -- which is actually a regulatory change -- there's no - there's - it could take a limitless amount of time and a limitless amount of money to get no impact for that time or money. And so I wouldn't base any recommendations on the potential of getting some sort of exemption written in. I'll turn back to you, Erika.

Erika Mann: Thank you Sam. This is Erika. Understood. I wasn't proposing this, totally agree with you. I'm pretty sure what I can see from comments here -- the little I can see and can read -- I don't see any disagreement.

So I assume we have a broad understanding here as well, which is wonderful. And we can translate the topics we've just discussed, we can translate them into draft recommendations. Somebody who wants to come in right now? Somebody I can't see? Okay.

(John) is saying we spend too much time. (John), we need to do this. It's awful to spend the time at the very end. It's better to do it now, before we do the drafting of the recommendations. Instead of having difficulties afterwards. But I take your point. I think we are - can come to an end on this topic as well. Okay, thanks so much Sam. And Smarika, on this one.

And then let's move to the next item on the agenda. Can we - do we have a document here? So we are moving now to the proposed next step to develop a draft recommendation. Responses to - the final responses to Charter questions which are still outstanding and the development of the initial report.

And as I mentioned to you, we had a long discussion on Tuesday on the leadership team. And we discussed the scenarios which we have available. And we like to make a proposal to you which would help us to make the - make a draft recommendation -- set of draft recommendations -- as early as possible. Ideally submitting it to you by September 13.

The first point would be actually the question Are we ready right now, in this team -- in this group -- today? Are we ready to make an interim proposal about the mechanism and the ranking about the mechanism? Because I believe we've discussed this many times.

We have heard very, very little support for example for the first mechanism, which would be a totally outsourced model. We have some support for the third, which would be a foundation. But not much (neither). An ICANN foundation, not much support neither.

But we have quite strong support for the first model -- the first mechanism to insource it -- and the second, to have a joint venture between ICANN and another entity. So we would love to come to an understanding today between us, which we then will still have to consolidate.

And you will have to reach out to your respective group and have a - have Smarika talking about the time table. Which - how much time we will have available to do this in a minute. But we would love you to - that we come to a conclusion today.

Concerning the time table, there's one other point we'd love for you to consider. We believe we don't need a consensus call ahead of the - before

we've published the draft recommendation. We don't believe we need it. Quite the opposite.

We believe -- like some other working groups have done this before -- it would be much better to wait until we have received all the comments from the public comment period. And then it would be much better to review our draft recommendations and then to schedule the time for a consensus call.

So there is not even the need now to come to an absolute understanding about the first two mechanisms. But at least some valid points which would argue for - to - for a hierarchy for a ranking. So I'd just love to hear your opinions. Can you agree on this approach?

And can we get an understanding between us today that we focus our main attention on the first two mechanisms? We will not neglect the other two, which are - so that we have in the total presenting in the draft recommendations four mechanisms. But we will not elaborate on the last two in all detail. Not as we do for the first two.

But we will explain the work we have done, how we have evaluated them, why we believe they are not the most appropriate ones for this particular project, et cetera, et cetera. So we are not recommending to not present it and not to talk about it, but not as the recommendation we want to make for moving these projects forward.

Marilyn, please. Do you want to talk, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Yes. I'm hoping I can be heard better now?

(Emily): Much better, Marilyn, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Very quickly, again I am representing the CSG as our voting member. I would support - I don't think that we can continue to support spending any time on (unintelligible) Number Four.

There's been a lot of comments. I would even think we need to justify why we're no longer considering it. We just say "There's been discussion", examples of why it is not appropriate could be listed, but I think we would like to see an elaboration on One, Two, and Three. Thanks.

Erika Mann: Marilyn, would you be able just to repeat? (Hear) the last point you make a recommendation.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. I put it in the chat. We would like to confirm, we would like to explore One, Two, and Three but not Four. Move Four into a Here's why we're not continuing to explore Four, no more work period. But explore One, Two, and Three.

Erika Mann: Wonderful, thank you so much. This is Erika. Thank you so much. Anybody else? (Eulid) is saying "Fine, perfect." (Manda) is saying "My preference would be Two, but I can agree with One as well." That is what I can see. Okay.

If there's no further -- give us a second -- if there's no disagreement, we will focus on the first three. Can we -- just getting an understanding -- is there further support for the Model Three? Does somebody else want to argue in favor of keeping Number Three as a priority in the list as well?

Okay, I can't see it. So for the moment we will do the following when we come and talk about the next point...

(Alan): Erika...

Erika Mann: Yes?

(Alan): ...Erika, it's (Alan). Could we - instead of just saying Option Three could you put out in words what you're talking about to make sure everyone's on the same page?

Erika Mann: Absolutely. Thank you so much (Alan). So Option Three would be the ICANN Foundation. So we are talking about four options, and we are eliminating the last one. So let me repeat.

The first one is ICANN In-house. The second one is ICANN - a joint venture with another entity. The third one is ICANN Foundation. And the fourth one is the outsourcing model. So my - the leadership team, we were hoping we can focus on One and Two, In-house and Joint Venture.

Marilyn is saying we want to keep Option Three -- ICANN Foundation -- as an option or preference included. And so - and then the point would be we can exclude -- at the way it looks right now -- Option Four, which would be the outsourcing model. You want to come back on this one, (Alan)?

(Alan): Yes, please. I would support accepting the leadership proposal and deleting Three and Four. We have been talking about this forever. Perhaps we want to take a straw poll of the room right now and then send out an email to confirm for those who aren't, but I think it's time that we need to move on. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you (Alan). Smarika, are we ready to take a straw poll? Or are too many missing and we better wait and do the (reconfirmation) by email? In a survey?

Smarika Kumar: Yes, thanks Erika. This is Smarika. Staff's thinking in this regard was to do a very short survey that will basically just list the four mechanisms, ask everyone to rank them in their one to four preference, and add an additional

comment box asking people to identify which were the main criteria they used to come to that decision so we can also document that into the initial report.

And that would also allow us then to kind of track who has provided input. And again also look at, you know, making sure that members are providing input as of course at the end of the day is a formal - if a formal consensus call is needed, you know, their views of course need to be reflected.

So the idea will be to circulate that you know, relatively shortly after this call (And that would) be a very straightforward survey so we're able to document the views of the group. And hopefully -- or possibly -- that will then confirm what has been discussed just now of eliminating Three and Four and focusing the responses to the Charter questions on One and Two.

As I noted in the chat, of course that does not mean that, you know, we will not mention that the group considered four mechanisms, you know, in the report. We do describe deliberations and the different elements that have been discussed. So that definitely will be mentioned. But once it goes to preliminary recommendations it would then focus on those two mechanisms.

Erika Mann: Smarika -- this is Erika -- can you remind me what is the time table we have in mind for the survey?

Smarika Kumar: Let me just pull up another slide that we did in which we tried to outline -- let me see where that is, I think it's this one -- remaining meetings as well as a timing of the different steps. And as soon as that comes up I can take the group through that.

(And) suddenly on my end PC. So I think basically the - can others already see what's on the screen? And it's only my screen that's - I don't know, here it comes up. Sorry about that. So as said you know, we're having the meeting today. And the idea would be to launch the poll you know, relatively shortly after the meeting. Maybe tomorrow or early next week.

Basically give everyone some time to review the input that has been received, because that may you know, help as well as form ranking and decisions. Ask for input by the 27th. Then there would be a next meeting -- on the 30th of August -- in which the group would review the survey responses.

And hopefully confirm that the next steps -- as we've discussed during this meeting -- are confirmed through the survey. And you know, we can move forward with the development of the initial report. And then the idea would be based on that confirmation.

Staff would be able to hopefully share a first draft of the initial report in time for the meeting on the 13th of September. And we would basically walk you through the structure and approach followed by CCWG review. We would schedule a meeting (unintelligible) on the 27th.

And I think following that -- you know, depending on the feedback input received -- we would need to determine how many additional meetings might be needed. And then the hope is that at the latest by the 8th of October it would be possible to publish the initial report for public comments.

Followed by discussions and presentations at ICANN 63. So that is the proposed timeline.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. I hope this sounds reasonable to everybody. We are pushing the agenda a little bit. But we have to because otherwise the - we are concerned that we can't deliver and publish the draft report ahead of Barcelona. And this is what we need to do.

We have a bit of flexibility, but not really much. So we had foreseen originally to publish it on I believe it was the First of October. And we have two other

options, which would be the 5th and you see mentioned here the 8th. But we can't push it much further.

So this is the deadline which we have available. So for the topic we just had about the survey, these give you I believe enough time until August 27 to reply to the survey. And then we have a well-documented survey and just - instead of just taking a straw poll right now. Which we could of course do.

But the question is there's some members missing. And the question is how can we justify later when we have to publish the - when we have to republish the draft recommendations. There are two other items - I see Marilyn. Marilyn, please. Is it on this topic?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Marilyn speaking. Normally I would only need seven to ten days to poll the three constituencies. But August seems to be the bottom of the ocean for availability. No access, no information, travel, vacations, et cetera.

Could we have a soft extension to the 2nd of September by exception? For those who advised that they can't get a response during August. It's just extremely difficult due to holidays in Europe and also in the United States.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Somebody has their mic open. Okay. I will say yes, Marilyn. I don't see a problem there as long as we can try for - to meet the 27th August deadline.

If there is a soft extension -- as you call it -- for some, I believe that's still fine. And we can - we are still able to meet the deadline to come out with the - as early as possible with the first draft initial report. We should be able.

And I believe Smarika is -- correct me if I'm wrong -- this is fine. Because I believe we have already achieved today an understanding that we are eliminating Option Four, so there are only three on the table. And I will say

maybe a 70% understanding that Option One and Two are the front runners, then followed by Option Three.

So I believe Staff can work based on the agreement we achieved today and the discussion we had in the past can do the draft recommendation. And if we then have a soft reply coming back around the 2nd or the 3rd I believe this is going to be fine. Smarika, going back to you. Is this okay?

Smarika Kumar: Yes, this is Smarika. Yes, that is okay, of course. You know, we can start work on the assumption of, you know, support for the first two mechanisms and discarding Number Three and Four for now. But of course if the results of the survey then turn out to be different and, you know, that would affect the time line. So I just want to note that.

But you know, on the basis of what was discussed today Staff can get to work and start working on you know, developing draft responses and (ending) the initial report.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much Smarika. This is Erika. And the final confirmation we need and support we need from you is that you allow Staff and the leadership team to do the first set of draft recommendations and the initial report.

So the way it will work, Staff already started working on it. And we - as soon as we at the leadership team will receive the very, very first (unintelligible) draft report we will start reviewing it. And will send comments back as the leadership to Staff.

And then we want to send to you the first draft initial report for your review on September 13. Is this something you can support? We have to work like this because Staff is -- in the moment -- overloaded with a lot of work. So they need a little bit of space and support as well to be able to get this fully done.

Is this something you can support? And I'm only watching if somebody is completely against it. Either raise your hand or please put in a comment.

Kavouss Arasteh: Erika?

Erika Mann: Yes, please. Whoever it is, please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, this is Kavouss. I'm sorry, I'm disconnected by - from the internet. I support your suggestion. I don't think that I - that there is any way to oppose to that because there is no alternative. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you Kavouss. It's still nice that you make this comment. So if there are no comments -- further comments -- I believe we have an understanding and we can move...

Smarika Kumar: Erika?

Erika Mann: ...forward. Let's...

Smarika Kumar: Erika?

Erika Mann: Yes, go ahead. Whoever it is. Smarika, is it you?

Smarika Kumar: Yes, it's Smarika. I just wanted to respond to a question in the chat from Marilyn in relation to the block schedule. Just to provide a quick update to the group on that.

We did submit a request for a high-interest topic session on this topic and to be able to present the initial report to the community. If I recall well I think there were - there are 13 other topics suggested as well for three slots. And the SO AC Chairs and (SGCB) voted on those proposals.

And unfortunately the one auction proceeds didn't meet it - make it to the top three. So there will not be a high-interest topic or cross-community session. However, having said that Staff has requested a time as part of the GNSO schedule. And I believe it's currently for Monday from 1:30 to 3 that we can then hopefully repurpose to present and discuss the report with the community.

And of course we'll do our best as well to promote that to all the groups. And in addition, you know, there's of course always the opportunity to organize a webinar prior to the meeting so there is an opportunity for the group to present and share its report and recommendations.

Erika Mann: Thank you Smarika. And we'll just come to this point in Point Six. You're absolutely right. Marilyn, I see you want to make a comment?

Marilyn Cade: I do. I'm sort of jumping up and down. I...

Erika Mann: Fine.

Marilyn Cade: ...think I'm really sorry that the SO AC Chairs did not support a high-level interest session. We've done so much work and this is a very valued item that deserves very broad attendance from the CCNSO, the GAC, and not just the GNSO but also the SSAC, et cetera. The ALAC.

I'm - I just want to ask that -- and Smarika just a clarifying question -- if we're looking at Day One or Day Two -- before the high level sessions are started -- there are outreach and capacity building time slots. But we would need to be sure that all of the participating organizations -- I'm going to miss somebody, GAC, SSAC, ALAC, GNSO, CCNSO -- that all of them have put on this schedule very early so that they're able to attend.

And so we're not just meeting with ourselves, but we are engaging with the broader community in a room that is suitable for such engagement. So can

we just go back to maybe a little more information from you about your you know, sort of the alternative that we're being offered? Which I think you said is 1:30 to 3 p.m. on maybe Monday. But I thought you mention (SO).

And that's just not adequate. And I just want to clarify how important it is to have the rest of the community engaged.

Smarika Kumar: I can -- this is Smarika -- I can respond to that question. And unfortunately the way the schedule works is that, you know, requests are submitted. SO AC leaders make a decision. And, you know, if a session doesn't meet the threshold there's - (it's) not in the top.

There's no, you know, high interest topic or cross-community time allocated to it. So it then falls to individual groups to make time available in their respective schedules. As said, you know, we've requested the GNSO to do so. And we have a slot identified.

Again, that's not confirmed. There's still further discussions. So I think at least that's, you know, how far Staff can take it. Of course, that doesn't prevent, you know, any of you to work with your respective groups and (unintelligible) now that that is a slot that's currently being considered for this discussion.

So all groups can factor it into their planning. And hopefully you know, dedicate the time that is needed to it. But of course we cannot force anyone to show up and come and listen, you know, regardless of, you know, how important the topic is.

Erika Mann: Smarika, you - Marilyn, you want to come back?

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, I do. Thank you Smarika. I think the best idea is for all of us to take this time slot and market it so to speak -- or to communicate it so to speak --

to our respective sending organizations and ask if we can then prioritize attendance.

I'm just going to - I see that (Judith) has suggested it works for (unintelligible) participation. Yes, but I think it's very, very challenging. We all have to recognize that the new participants are rarely really able to effectively participate in what is otherwise face to face meeting.

And the other comment I'm going to make to you -- (Najira) -- is I don't support our just sending the co-chairs to visit the various groups. They get 15 minutes, that's not a robust discussion. This is a town hall kind of consultation that we need to have.

So I like the idea we've designated a time slot. I'm just asking all of us to think about how we support making it an effective engagement for the community. Having a webinar ahead of time, that's still not going to get the kind of in-depth discussion. I'm not saying don't do the webinar ahead of time. But I am saying let's try to do both.

Erika Mann: Thank you Smarika and Marilyn. This - somebody has their mic open. Okay, thank you. I agree with you. And the leadership team I believe we were quite disappointed about the outcome as well. And we were hoping we would have a high-interest session. Unfortunately, that's the way it played out.

So I - let's focus on the recommendation to bring the attention to all of the SO and ACs to understand what we are doing. That we are coming to an end. And that the process will be publicly - very little give opportunity to ICANN insiders at this stage at least to have further input.

So I believe we have to do this, agree with you. We will do a new search and update of the new (search), which we will send out as soon as possible. And will send to you as well -- to all of you -- so that you can send it to your respective groups as well.

We (already) sent a note to the GNSO and (Ching) has sent one as - to the CCNSO. So I believe we have to do everything possible to ensure it becomes a real and truly -- kind of as you called it -- kind of broader group meeting so that we can really can have an informed debate in Barcelona. Town hall ideally. But already if all of the SO and ACs would have somebody present it would be great.

So having said this, I believe the last item on our agenda is only to confirm the last meeting - the next meeting -- not the last meeting but the next meeting -- which is on August 30, three zero. And at the same time.

We apologize for the one-hour delay for our call but we couldn't change it because of the - because of another working group which has now taken priority. And so we had to (change) our time table. But we don't have so many calls scheduled anymore ahead of Barcelona.

And after Barcelona, once we - the public comment period is over we can reflect upon the time and can look for a solution which fits all of you. Okay. I hope I haven't forgotten anything. Smarika, is there something outstanding which I missed?

Smarika Kumar: This is Smarika. No, not from my perspective. Thanks Erika.

Erika Mann: Okay. Thank you so much. Then I wish you a good day, good evening, good morning. And we will send you the survey as quick as possible. Thank you so much. Have a good day.

Samantha Eisner: Bye-bye everybody.

Erika Mann: Bye-bye.

Julie Bisland: Thanks Erika. Thank you. Thanks everyone. (Nikki), you can end the recordings. And everyone else, go enjoy the rest of your day or night. Thank you.

END