

ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi
Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG) on New gTLD Auction Proceeds
Working Group Part 2
Thursday, 02 November 2017 13:30 GST

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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. On page:

<https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Erika Mann: Okay, wonderful.

Welcome to our second meeting today. We had already one in the morning where we solemnly focused on the crescent how the future structure or as we call it mechanism can be designed.

It's still in an early phase. We collected many ideas, and so thankful for the good and high participation this morning. This was extremely helpful for us to get a better understanding how we can build such an entity and if it shall be an entity inside or outside of the ICANN organization.

So we will send - Marika and the team will send out the summary of our -- this morning -- discussion and the topics discussed/debated around as soon as possible, and then as we debated in the morning, we will continue to the discussion.

So in the afternoon, we have some other topics on the agenda because we can't see the agenda in the moment, I don't know why we can't pull it up. So the first is just a comment and short introduction on the stages of the work.

And then we would love to focus on outstanding items, the review of some of the examples we collected. So for those who are not familiar with it and who are joining us for the first time, these examples -- which are sent by participating members -- potential ideas what could be funded.

And these ideas are not sent because we see them as something that shall be funded or requested. These are just ideas where we would like to test against the mission statement if they would fall under such kind of provisions or not. So these are just test cases.

And I will hand this then over to Marika to explain where we are and what kind of examples we have already collected.

Then we had a team working on open and interoperable Internet definitions. You might wonder why we need this. This was just an introduction to one of our charter questions because we were worried if we don't have something like this -- like a kind of preamble -- the examiner in the future -- who will see all the projects coming in -- and some cases might be on borderline cases which relate to the mission statement but might be borderline cases. So we thought this might evaluate this in the future to understand and would guide them how to observe and evaluate a proposal.

And then we like to discuss the next steps for sharing these documents. And the next one is a recap of morning session which we hopefully will have a little bit of time. I already mentioned a few things but maybe we have a little bit time at the end of this session.

And then we like to do a review of work plan and the timetable and the confirmation of next steps.

With this, I think you all have time to hopefully everybody to join us and we can move forward with the Point 2, focus on outstanding items; Point A, Review of Examples.

Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Erika.

Erika Mann: (Unintelligible). Would like you like too?

Marika Konings: No, the problem - no. The problem is that we would try to convert the document in a form that we can uphold it. But for some reason, it completely messes up the table.

So what I've done is I've posted the link of the document that we'll be linking at in the Adobe Connect Room, so hopefully you can all follow along in that way.

To refresh your mind on this exercise, you may recall that we initially spent some time developing or reaching preliminary agreements on the objectives for fund allocation, so that we actually already completed a little while back.

But associated to that question was, of course, the description of some of those objectives as relatively general. So the idea was in order to ensure that there was a common understanding of what should be eligible under those objectives and what things as well would be explicitly not eligible for fund allocation, a number of examples were provided by CCWG and members and participants.

Some of those were provided through an initial survey that we ran; and others were later on added to the document that you see on the Google Doc link.

So the next step -- as part of that exercise -- was to look at, you know - as you know, there's a requirement for any fund allocation to be consistent with ICANN's mission.

So then the next steps was to, you know, take all these examples, go through those and make a determination from the perspective of the CCWG whether those examples are considered consistent with ICANN's mission as well as the objectives that the CCWG established as part of its initial work.

So thanks to those that, you know, participated and provided input into Google Doc, as you may recall, we did it in two stages. Some people provided initial input, and on the basis of that, staff made a conclusion or a proposed conclusion on the consistency of the example with ICANN's mission that you all, I think, saw at the last meeting.

It was clear that I think many of you hadn't had sufficient time to look at this, so additional time was made available for people to review this.

I think we only got a couple of more people that actually went into the Google Doc to provide their comments. You know, I look through those and at least it looked like most of those comments were consistent with the proposed conclusion that Staff had written up.

So I think we're probably currently at the question of where does the CCWG want to take this and next. Are you comfortable with the draft conclusion that the CCWG has come to? You know, I think we discussed as well at the previous meeting.

We may now be at a moment where it may be worth sharing both the proposed objectives as well as these examples with the ICANN Board and the Staff liaisons and obtain their input to make sure that, you know, we have an early check to make sure that views are aligned and there are no surprises at the end of the day between, you know, the views that the CCWG may have and the Board in this regard.

Is any additional time needed? I know that Daniel had some specific comments. I'm trying to see -- there at the end -- about the wording of the

conclusions. I think here you were considering whether we needed to be more specific about, you know, in service of the mission, I believe, instead of saying consistent. And again, I don't know if others have a chance to look at that and what the views are on that.

So I think we're basically at the stage where, you know, this document has gone around already quite a few times. It has been open for input already for quite a bit of time.

Is it at a stage where we can at least, you know, preliminary agree that this is a status that we're still comfortable with and so we have a clear list of examples which the CCWG would consider consistent with ICANN's mission? And as such, you know, potentially suitable for fund allocation and as well, a couple of examples where it's clear that it would not be considered consistent with ICANN's mission.

Erika Mann: Thank you Marika. Just a reminder, this list can stay in principle as an open list because there is no need to shut it down one day because it's only an example. It's only to test our understanding about what can potentially be funded in the future against our understanding of the mission statement.

So it's not more but it's important because it's internal guidance, and it can serve as the check-and-balances in particular talking to the Board because if we can't agree with the Board and if we can't agree with the management team -- in particular (Xaviay) and his team -- we might have differences. So we want to be certain.

These are test cases; not more. And there might be totally different test cases showing up in the future once we see the real projects coming in, so these are not guarantees that everything is discovered but they are important.

Daniel, you wanted to make a comment?

Daniel: Well just, yes, confirm that we're using different names for the relation to the ICANN mission like consistent with, relation with, direct relation with, in service of, align with. I think it doesn't help us to sort of categorize and prioritize.

So maybe we should first agree on maybe a distance from the actions of ICANN mission. You know, it says there are things that are clearly in the mission, there are things that are directly in service of the mission, and maybe they come before the things that are just aligned or consistent with the mission.

Erika Mann: Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika and just to respond. For now, indeed, there's no degradation in the consistency. I think the answer is basically standard to say it's either consistent or not consistent.

So Daniel makes a good point. Is it worth having a gradation of that consistency or is doesn't matter. If it's consistent in some way or another, that's enough.

And again, that's, you know, something that you (unintelligible).

Erika Mann: I think actually Daniel's point is a relevant one.

I have to apologize. I can't see if somebody because I couldn't charge my computer. I left my battery somewhere and this is a strange charge of it to have on this Apple, so it's not compatible to the other one. So if you would be so kind to always signal to me if you'd like to speak as well because I can't see you otherwise. Oh, I'm getting help.

So he raises an important point which came up many times by other participants and members as well. And this is the gray area. So there are

clearly projects which will be sent to the evaluators in the future which are clearly inside the mission.

But then there will be some which are what I call borderline cases -- all cases which might serve ICANN's mission which have a different connotation.

The question is if we need to distinguish this already now. I probably would think it's good to state the differences that there such kind of differences exist and they will show up, but we probably don't have to define all of the areas because we will have another implementation phase much later -- closer to the end when the structure will be established.

We probably don't have to do this now, but we should take note of Daniel's point and we will have to decide if we will have to come back to this or not. I wouldn't go into a lengthy discussion about it, but I think it's important.

Marilyn, to the same point? Wonderful.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. It's Marilyn Cade speaking and good to see all of you who I've been seeing virtually. My apologies for missing this morning's session.

I do think words matter, Daniel, and I think what we ought to do is put all our words in a lineup and then look at them closely. And I'm just going to use an example.

In drafting binding recommendations or regulations, there's a big difference between could, should, may and must, right. And when I've encountered a lot of situations where lawyers could spend too much time afterward trying to figure out what the obligation is.

So if we could put our words in a row because I think, Erika, that that's a little different to me than, for instance, if something is consistent with the ICANN

mission or congruent to the ICANN mission. That's really really different than must adhere to the ICANN mission or should adhere.

And then I think we get into these - so I'm going to use a very concrete example. The Internet Governance Forum was created in 2006. We could have predicted at that time that perhaps that is congruent with ICANN's mission. But we couldn't have predicted at that time that there would be 107 national IGFs.

So that, you know, I think we do need to allow the kind of flexibility you're talking about.

Erika Mann: Yes I agree. So we took note of Daniel's comment and Marilyn's addition to it and we will find a way how to deal with it. It's definitely the topic has to come at the very end once the terms of reference for the evaluators will have to be defined.

But we will have a chat and we will try to define it and come back to you how we recommend to proceed on this topic.

Would you like? Please. Please always be so kind; I forget this as well. Just state your name at the beginning for the call.

(Wally Bacardi): This is (Wally Bacardi) for the record.

Yes, I wanted to ask this question before Daniel raised this issue. So I would like to just let this group be aware of words we are using; consistence, alignment or congruent as you have said.

So let us be clear about the way that we want to use so that people won't be confused. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. Just to be clear again, we are - this inside definition of ICANN's mission, everything which will align with ICANN's mission automatically, it's clear that the difficulty that we might have -- and we don't know this yet -- might be this project which are coming in which are important and relevant, and are supporting ICANN's missions but may not automatically be in the center of ICANN's mission.

And there we have to be a little bit more careful right now. So I just don't want to have a final discussion about this right now, but want to proceed carefully with regard to this topic. That's all.

(Audium), please.

(Audium Yeye): (Audium Yeye) speaking for the record.

I believe that the draft does mention clearly that projects that the fund must not be used to support projects that are inconsistent with open and interoperable Internet, so that we said that they are not supposed to be used with anything inconsistent with that.

The parts where Daniel is referring to are parts where we mentioned ICANN's mission and ICANN's community activities. And I think that's different; that's not the same.

You cannot say that we are using inconsistency here and then we are using other words there. We are using them in reference to other things. Thanks.

Marika Konings: (Audium), maybe you can clarify what you are exactly referring to because what we currently have in the document is input that different people have provided, and then these that people will have used different terminology and different ways of defining or linking with ICANN's mission.

But what we're currently focusing in on is the CCWG conclusion because basically, whatever we're going to share with the Board -- or whatever the next step is -- will be focused on that. Individual comments will be taken out. We will keep them on a record to show, you know, how we got there.

But I think what we are really now focusing on is the Draft CCWG Conclusion and indeed a conversation on now we use -- for that conclusion -- for each, you know, the exact same language for whether, you know, consistent or not-consistent.

And my understanding is that some are suggesting that maybe there should already be a degradation in that consistency. At this stage, while I think Erika is suggesting that, you know, maybe we don't need that yet, but it is something that at some point, you know, we may need, you know, to do.

(Audium Yeye): Apologies. I think that I am reading from an old version apparently.

Erika Mann: Don't you all worry because we have the conflict which is a bit typical. We have in-depth debate when we meet at the ICANN meetings and in between the calls. Typically, they're not automatically overlap of all the people who are present here now.

So we have to apologize for the confusion because we can't each time apparently explain, well, what we need from you.

So what we will do, we will resend this to all of you. And if the participants there, you like to receive this as well, just ensure that we have your email list. Happy to include you in the list as well so that you can review it.

This is just a list of examples which exist which was sent to us. So it's just a compilation of examples; it's nothing more. There's no edit language from our side. But as Daniel said, it's not, you know, the language used is not identical always.

Please.

Carolina Caeiro: Thank you Erika. This is Carolina for the record.

So if I understand correctly, the column that has the CWG conclusion was sort of written up by Marika and the Staff, right.

So my question there is I generally agree with all the conclusions. I had a question about a project Number 8. I'll just read it very quickly what it says.

The startup (unintelligible) grand to support (unintelligible) of low cost divides that combines open an open software solution. (Unintelligible) for connection issues in developing countries on that. So that's all I'll read.

And three people commented, we had a no, a yes, where there was align with the ICANN mission, and a maybe. And the conclusion was that this was not considered consistent with the ICANN mission.

So I'd like to know a little bit what the criteria was for you to decide whether, you know, the consensus was that it was within or not within ICANN's mission to draw that conclusion.

And a second thought related to that is I'm trying to understand the importance of this exercise. I think you explained sort of the purpose of (unintelligible) is, but I don't understand how binding this is for the process and, you know, how in sort of depth we should go looking at each one of these examples. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Let me take the second first and then I hand over to Marika.

You know, that's my personal view; every (unintelligible) on the mic. It is relevant because it will help future evaluators to judge certain cases. But

that's all. And I might help us as well as a team in coordination with management and the Board to identify gray areas where we don't either have a common understanding between us and where we have to continue to work on it in case there is a dispute.

The CCWG thinks it falls within the mission and shall be financed and the Board management says, "No, definitely not." So it helps us to clarify certain areas and this important.

But it's not relevant in the sense that we can work with it. It has no legal meaning. It has no - it's just operational. But in the common operational sense, it is important. So definitely I would say yes.

You want to come back on the - oh Ching, sorry.

Ching Chiao: Actually, Marilyn.

Erika Mann: Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks; Marilyn Cade speaking.

I think it's important for another reason and that is I think from what I've seen on the list and reading all of your SOIs -- and I have read them -- many people in the group have not been directly in setting up a not-for-profit organization or running one, or having to look at the legal compliance of a foundation, et cetera.

There are people here who have been, but I think this exercise helps us as a community to think through where there's commonality of thinking about what we as a community can see as a useful to do to support ICANN and the purpose for which this is.

So while it's not binding, I think it is helping us to build an identity and a consensus and an understanding. And I think it's also incredibly informative in that it's teasing out some areas of what may be misunderstandings like making sure that there's a thorough examination that everybody can understand of what legal implications might be of taking one structure over another.

So for that reason, I think it's very, very useful.

Erika Mann: Shall I take Ching or you want to go first? Do you want talk (unintelligible)?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just wanted to respond to Carolina, and thank you for pointing this one out because this one, indeed, was one of the ones where it was quite mixed because indeed there are the two columns, there is a no and two yeses, but there's also a kind of question mark in the third column. So this is one of the ones where indeed it wasn't clear one or the other ways.

So it would be good to have a conversation around, you know, which category you want to put it at this stage.

And as I said and as I think Erika noted as well, it's not intended that once we now put something there that that cannot change because, again, I think the idea would be as well to share it back to the Board based on which, you know, forward conversation may need to happen.

So if there's a clear sense that that one should move to the other category, it's definitely something that can be done.

Erika Mann: Ching please.

Ching Chiao: Yes I'll be quick. This is Ching Chiao. I think what is being discussed here is - as you've already said -- it's not written in stone so things can be discussed.

So for this case in particular, the example -- for example for myself -- if I can have this example 20 second or 23, adding some of my thoughts and making a new example. And then, you know, going through kind of the exercise.

I think that's something we could probably do and that helps, you know, moving things along. So I just wanted to point that out.

Carolina Caeiro: This is Carolina for the record.

So I think given the ideas for this to go to the Board, I feel that there are a number of examples on which there was very strong agreement. Perhaps we can take the ones the staff had a hard time deciding whether they were supposed to go to one side or the other, you know, and be discussing in greater detail and before we include that in a communiqué to the Board.

The reason why I raised Example #8 is because I could think of a project that, you know, likely had funded through the (Frita Program) that would kind of fit with that description and that in my view would support perhaps somewhat indirectly the (DNF). So I feel that, you know, arguments can be made for the inclusion of that example.

But perhaps for the sake of time, that can be taken back to the list for discussion. Thank you.

Erika Mann: I think we keep the recommendation thing we agree on. Marika, we agree we keep the list open. Feel free to send us more examples but please review the existing list as well. Put it in (unintelligible). So please help us all to get a better understanding how you view this and how your particular community sees this.

I don't think that we want to send this as an official letter -- at least this would be my understanding -- to the Board. We don't want to have the Board debating this endlessly and looking into it; there's no need to.

But it's good we will definitely - we have the Board members with us, so we assume that the Board members would take this back, and whatever they find the time, have an informal discussion within the Board about. There need not be a Board decision also.

I don't think that we want this, but you will have a debate about this. We have (Xaviay) with us. I see Sally in the back and probably more from management. They all will listen and will help us in case they think there's something going on which is completely totally guiding us in the wrong direction.

So I trust in the cooperation between us. And so far, I think we work quite well very together.

So, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika.

So what I can do is ahead of the next meeting indeed, send a document out again and maybe highlight in yellow those examples where it was kind of, you know, one way or the other. And that may then allow everyone maybe to focus on those specifically and either have a discussion around, indeed, should that be changed, or I think as Ching suggested, maybe focus on how to rewrite an example in such a way that it is clearly in the one category or the other.

What we may need to do is pull the document out and just have the conclusion document instead of taking out that there's some issue I think with the table. And I don't know if it's because of the edits or incompatibility between the Google Doc and the word. But if we incorporate it all with all the comments, part of the table disappears.

Or we keep the Google Doc links so people can look at the other comments, but maybe we can then just focus on the conclusion part and have a discussion around that.

Erika Mann: Erika Mann. I hope this is helpful for you. In just looking around, can we agree to work like this, yes? So we keep the list open. Marika will send in the next communication around the, again, the link and the references and will mark those which have not a clear common answer.

I'm looking at the participants all in the back. Some of you might participate in our twice monthly discussion.

Can you follow us and do you receive the information? Or is there something which is missing for you? Can - will they get the emails?

Marika Konings: Only if they're (unintelligible).

Erika Mann: Only is they're exactly. So you might not.

But we have everything on the Wiki?

Marika Konings: Maybe it's (unintelligible). So this is Marika. Yes, for anyone that's interested here to either just follow the conversations, you can subscribe to the mailing list as an observer, or you can become a participant and then you're also invited and expected to participate in calls.

There's also - the mailing list is probably archived, so if you just want to check from time to time, you can just go there yourself. And as well, the Wiki is the workspace for the CCWG. So all the materials that are being discussed -- all the information in relation to the relevant meetings -- are posted there.

We've also started developing a regular newsletter which we push out to the different communities for those that on occasion you want to check in where things stand. So there's plenty of information available.

Ching Chiao: So just very quickly here. So I think we'll be making sure that the document sent out with the Google Doc format and also the Word format because the Google Doc is not very, you know, useful sometimes.

Erika Mann: Yes, you always get both formats because some can work only in Google and some can only work in Word documents, so we are providing you with the two formats.

Yes, please.

(Richard Shier): Yes, (Richard Shier) from (Sira) for the record.

I apologize if this topic has been discussed before. I wasn't in the meeting this morning and I haven't been following the discussion that closely.

But I'm curious and I totally appreciate the need for caution and due-diligence in figuring out what we do with this significant amount of cash that's available to us.

But I'm wondering is there any exposure to the notion that ICANN now has \$230 some-odd million surplus in their books. That this may turn to the California courts and they look at ICANN's status as a not-for-profit organization. And all of a sudden decide, "Oh you guys have got way too much money in the bank, you've got way too much surplus. You don't qualify as a California not-for-profit corporation." And all these funds could potentially be taxed.

So I'm wondering if that's been considered. And is there something that the organization should be doing independently to ensure that the money

somehow gets set aside while we look at all the different possibilities of what it could be used for so that it's protected from that kind of a situation.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much for raising this question. And yes, it has been discussed and we are very careful about having the right fiduciary and legal restraints in place.

But (Xaviay), please why don't you comment on this one.

(Xaviay): Thank you for the question. And just adding on to what Erika just said, it's a very important consideration that has been evaluated for a little while now.

In the very upfront in the process for all the good reasons that you've raised as part of your question, just to elaborate a little bit further, the status of the organization is -- in the respect of the status of the organization in relation to auction proceeds considering the amount that we're talking about -- is all driven by the respect of the mission including the tax status of the organization of an exempted entity.

So the respect of the mission and how the therefore uses the funds for the public benefit that is defined in the mission is the key criteria that enables ICANN to deal with this amount of funds.

The fact that it creates an excess from a financial standpoint -- and I'm a little biased in looking at it that way -- is not an issue from a tax standpoint or from a status standpoint as long as the funds are managed and handled in accordance with the mission. Thank you.

Erika Mann: If you have further questions on this topic, feel free to come to us afterwards and I can give you some guidance where you can find information so you have the complete overview.

But can we conclude this topic here now -- the first one? Yes? Okay good, wonderful.

Then let's move to Point B -- Open and Interoperable Internet Definition. I'd like to hand this over to the working group who was working on this one.

I just - Marika sent around this morning a white version and a clear version and one that's wet edits. I just turned around one sentence because I thought it looked better and more easy for somebody from the outside to understand the introduction and remarks if the one sentence would be turned around.

Who is doing the introduction? Jonathan, is it you? Who is it from the team?

Marilyn, I'm open. It's up to you to decide.

Marilyn Cade: No, if someone else could do it. I mean I did make the last edits but I'm not looking at it right at the moment; I have to pull it up.

Okay, if you can pull it up, I can look at it.

Erika Mann: Can we get this up and can we see it?

Marilyn Cade: Yes, yes.

Erika Mann: You have don't you? Can we just show it?

Marilyn Cade: Marika could do it and then I could just offer comments. Marika, could you and then I'll just explain anything.

Marika Konings: Thanks Marilyn. So this is Marika.

So again, to close (sic) places into a context, as part of the development of the objectives for fund allocation, it has a reference to open and interoperable Internet.

So one of the discussions the CCWG then had was, well, it would be good to provide a bit of guidance around what is meant with that. And that's why a small drafting team started looking at that description.

And I think from a relatively lengthy description, I think it now has been turned down to, you know, it's very straightforward and general overview and what is meant with that. And I think we're trying to get it up on the screen. I have to fill time for it to come up.

But it was also sent to the mailing list earlier today. So if you go to your respective inboxes, you should be able to see it there as well.

I don't know what is most useful -- to focus on the changes or - you want to explain it? Okay. Erika is coming to the rescue.

Erika Mann: I just need to see it. That's the problem because we can't see anything on the screen and my computer is still, yes, it's getting slowly loaded. Apologies for this that we can't see everything today.

So just a reminder, it's a preamble -- which is very important. We came up to this idea of the preamble where we're starting to debate what would be the scenario in the future when evaluators have to look at the bylaws and they have to look at the description and they'll need some guidance, again, back to the case if there are areas which are a bit more complicated to decide, so projects which are coming in which not always have made a clear reference to the mission statement, but are relevant and important and are key.

So this was in the idea of why don't we do a preamble at least to have some kind of guidance for evaluators.

And this is the preamble and a small group worked on it. So shall we read it maybe just to get an agreement? Because I would love to close this chapter because it is such a - it continues and goes on and on.

Why don't I just read it because sometimes even in reading, it helps all of us to get the feeling; does it sound good or does it sound completely crazy? So just let me read it; it's short.

Marilyn Cade: Erika, could I suggest you might read it one paragraph at a time and then maybe we can close that we accept a paragraph at a time?

Erika Mann: Yes we can do that but then just keep in mind, if you see (unintelligible) too many differences, what I prefer is to give it back to the group and let them continue to work on it because we don't want to spend our whole time on defining a preamble. So we just get an understanding of what we like and what we don't like, and then it goes back to the group.

Okay, so the purpose of this preamble is to offer overarching guidance for the application and selection of projects for which auction proceeds fund in the future funds may be allocated.

Scream if there's something you don't like, please scream.

Group: (Unintelligible).

Erika Mann: Projects are required. Next one. Projects are required to be in alignment with any criteria needed to maintain ICANN's use of tax exempt status, and therefore must be in areas that are relevant to and support ICANN's mission statement and core principles.

ICANN's mission statement will therefore set the key perimeters for the fund application and selection processes. Processes we have to add.

Members and participants of the cross-community working group auction proceeds -- CCWG AP -- believe nevertheless that it is helpful to the broader Internet context to put into consideration.

Being this is maybe not perfect, I would definitely recommend an English speaker (unintelligible) to the very end.

Jonathan - or you are English speaker -- the two of you. What did you miss here?

Woman: We changed it.

Erika Mann: (Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: It wasn't offered to me, but I certainly could take a red pen to that.

Erika Mann: Okay but the context is fine. You agree?

Woman: Yes.

Erika Mann: Perfect.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, for the record it's...

Erika Mann: Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Jonathan Robinson. I'm very happy to give this a proof and edit at the end if that's helpful -- just as a second pair of eyes not to suggest that anyone hasn't done a good job. But I'm very happy just to proof it at the end.

Erika Mann: Wonderful. I like this. Please.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here; just curious. It says set (unintelligible) perimeters for fund application and selection. What about the disbursement of funds and the actual usage of the funds. Should that be added or this is contemplated and done specifically?

Erika Mann: So don't write immediately. Wait a second, Marika.

What does it add if we talk about disbursement here in this context? ICANN's mission statement will therefore set the key perimeters for the fund applications, selection processes, and there you would love to add disbursement?

Edmon Chung: I thought it might be more complete if it includes the actual usage of the funds that is sent out to whoever.

Erika Mann: I'm not sure because...

Edmon Chung: Because (unintelligible).

Erika Mann: ...if you do the selection processes in line with the mission statement, then it's logical that the disbursement must be done as well. Isn't it?

Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you; Marilyn Cade speaking. I'm not sure at this paragraph. I think we're talking about the role of the mission statement. I don't think we're actually talking about the mechanism at this point, and I'm not sure we would be talking about the mission statement of ICANN and devising distribution mechanism at this point -- right now.

I looked at it as we're talking about how the mission statement should describe -- should guide -- the use of the funds and the selection processes for those who would distribute them.

Erika Mann: (Xaviay)?

(Xaviay): I see Edmon's point, but I think -- as Erika was saying that if since we're talking here about the principles if there was consistency with the mission in the evaluation in some then the disbursements needs to comply with the valuation and the criteria that granted the applicant receiving the funds. So I think this is more a matter of compliance of the disbursements that to the application will be complying with the mission at the end of the day.

Edmon Chung: Edmon here, quickly respond. I guess the and just imagining a situation where and a project for example part of it is could be doesn't, you know, get the fund from this and part of the expenses may not fall under then, you know, that then adding that will cover that potential case or do we really say that a project all of its expenses must fall within right? I mean that's the case where why I'm bringing this up. But if we think that the selection process itself already covers as mentioned then come you know, then we're good.

Erika Mann: I think we can come back to this point when we have to talk about the -- if we will do this even in this group. I'm not even sure this is our -- if this is part of our role I would -- we would have to check this. But this is probably something we have to do much later to the end look into how expenses are covered. So I wouldn't put this in here yet.

All right just let me move on. We have please so Xavier you want to come back to the same point? Okay please.

Owen DeLong: Owen DeLong. Before we get too far down the road of potentially making an edit I don't think we want to make I believe selection process singular is correct. I think we only want one process by which things are selected so it will be used multiple times to select multiple things.

Erika Mann: That's why you need English speaker. Thank you. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: I don't – I suspect you don't want to get into detailed wordsmithing here but my thought was that parameters is maybe not the right word because really the mission statement sets the goals for applications. It – you know, there's going to be a whole pile of parameters here. So the mission statement is the goal of the applications for funding. But I'll send those in comments.

Erika Mann: Okay. This will help the Working Group then to review it again. Wonderful, thank you so much. Xavier?

Xavier Calvez: Thank you Erika. And I'm happy to also provide some edits offline afterwards in the details but two points. We are making a point here about US tax exempt status and then as a result compliance with ICANN's mission. For clarity it may be useful to for everyone to understand that the tax status that is tax exempt for the organization is the result of the mission being a nonprofit one?

And so the tax status is not the driver. The mission is the driver. The tax statuses is exempt as a consequence of having a nonprofit mission. So maybe the wording of that second paragraph at the top can be slightly amended to reflect one versus the other because it feels slightly backwards or it could be misunderstood as being backwards here. And I think the mission is the important statement that drives then the fact that we have a tax exempt status.

And one of the consequences of not adhering to mission would be to lose potentially the tax status. But there would be other consequences as well. So that's one comment. I'm happy to offer an editing with that and Sam Eisner and I can take a crack at that.

The second comment is about the wording fund that is at the beginning of the third paragraph here. And the fact that it's in quotes may suggest that it's...

Erika Mann: Can we wait because we're coming to this point now?

Xavier Calvez: Sorry.

Erika Mann: Let me - let us conclude first the second paragraph and then we come to this point. Okay I think we have an understanding here. This go - everything yes, yes, yes goes back to the drafting team all comments provided and then we will have another look at it. And but then let's agree that we will concluded it on ideally at our next call coming up in two weeks I think. So let me read the third paragraph and I'm coming now to the points Xavier raised.

The fund must not be used to support projects that are inconsistent with an open and interoperable Internet. The concept of open and interoperable Internet can be described from many angles -- technological, business, political social and cultural and may have different meanings in different communities. The preamble does not provide a definitive description as the Internet continues to evolve at every level.

Woman 1: Thank you Erika. Minus, minus make you plus. The fund – why don't we see the fund must be used to support projects that are consistent with an open – I think it's two minus minus makes it a little bit complicated. The fund must be used to support projects that are consistent with an open and interoperable Internet. What do you think?

Erika Mann: I'm fine with it either way. It's Erika but please?

(Dan Russ): Yes this is (Dan Russ) again. And my point is a follow-up to this and a follow-up to another query that was raised earlier about which one of the two we should be using. Just in - just as a preference I like this one instead of the not inconsistent.

Erika Mann: Noted. Thank you so much. Xavier?

Xavier Calvez: Yes thank you. And coming back to my point about the word fund and also in quotes it seems to describe an aggregate that's governed by specific policy my point being I think we need to be careful to keep a strong difference between the auction proceeds which is the vocabulary that we've been using so far versus a fund that would be governed under ICANN's governance mechanisms for example administration of it is the reserve fund.

The reserve fund is a defined fund. It's governed by an investment policy and so on. The auction proceeds are completely different from that perspective. They are – there's cash that's invested in an account. It's not a governed fund that receives – that has received yet defined and border defined governance. So I feel it may create a bit of confusion possibly to have those quotes and use the word fund. And I thought that the vocabulary that we've been using so far of auction proceeds was very explicit and was also allowing to keep it very separate from other funds. So I'm offering that amendment.

Marilyn Cade: If I could just...

Erika Mann: Yes?

Marilyn Cade: ...explain -- it's Marilyn -- why I did that because I made that change. You suffer from the problem of having a lazy typist. So...

Xavier Calvez: I'll help you then.

Marilyn Cade: No, no. I'll help myself. I'll go back and replace that with auction proceeds. There was no other reason. We're done.

Erika Mann: Jonathan please?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Jonathan Robinson for the record just to briefly support that and I hear it's done anyway. But I think the other thing that that does is it very uniquely constrains this as it's meant to be on the auction proceeds but

nevertheless doesn't mean that the mechanism couldn't be used should this turn into a fund by whatever means in future. So for the purposes of this work it's very tight. It's on the auction proceeds. That doesn't stop us designing a more universal mechanism. Thanks.

Xavier Calvez: Anyways (unintelligible) yes. I recommend to revise that paragraph and the next one because what I believe is you're trying to - you say the fund must be used with an open and interoperate our Internet. But then you go and try and define what that is and at the end you say, "Well, I don't know. We are not defining it." And the second one you go back and say, "Wait but wait it's, you know, the technical part is the one that makes it more important in this. So when I come back when I follow it through really I don't know what interoperable is except that it must be (unintelligible) with it, just a macro view of this. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes thank you so much. I had the same feeling a little bit when I – it's Erika Mann – when I read it this morning again. So we might want to consider if it's consistent what we are writing. But this is something the drafting team I would prefer the drafting team first after our discussion today takes all the notes and reviews it if it's really consistent. And even with the auction proceeds, couldn't even say option proceed fund. And then in the future you could decide once we know is it going to be a fund will the fund be called option proceeds fund for example -- whatever so we then can come back to Xavier's point as well. Just keep this all in mind all the comments go back to the drafting team I would recommend and then we would have a – receive but different – another draft back.

Would you like to make a comment or is you mic just on? Oh is it (Judith) or who is it? Okay nobody okay. Then let's just continue. Let me read...

Woman 2: Erika?

Erika Mann: Sorry?

Woman 2: No, just to finalize this paragraph for non-English person we agree that the draft team will take into consideration the positive way and the comments that we get. Okay thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. To help the drafting team along I'm trying to keep up with some of the changes that are generally being agreed so I'll give back to the drafting team a draft that should already factor in some of the feedback.

(Xaviay): (Unintelligible).

Erika Mann: (Unintelligible).

(Xaviay): Just for the benefit of the participant here so I think the draft here is being put together from pieces of comments from - I mean the members. So I think your comment work very well for us in taking back and then just try to kind of reorg and making sure that you know, it reads properly. Thank you.

Erika Mann: So then let's continue. No comes the however paragraph. So this follows from the definition of the fund and the open and interoperable in Internet, the way that's defined in the paragraph before and then comes the however. However, the CCWG believes that at a technical level the IP routing and numbering system, the domain name system, the root server system as well as the development of open standards have historically served an open interoperable Internet because of the opportunities they have provided to participate, innovate and compete without impediment, long sentence might have to be shortened but anything totally against it please?

Marilyn Cade: It's a Marilyn Cade speaking. I have a – and we might as well deal with this now because otherwise I'm going to make this comment everywhere. Am I misunderstanding that this is a lower case I here? Is this a lower case i?

Erika Mann: A lower what?

Marilyn Cade: Is it Internet with a lowercase i?

Erika Mann: No this is an intellectual dispute.

Marilyn Cade: No, no, no, no, no.

Erika Mann: Can we get an agreement...

Marilyn Cade: No, no.

Erika Mann: ...Internet with Capital I or with lower case i?

Marilyn Cade: No Erika...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: ...it's not an intellectual dispute.

Erika Mann: No, no not...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: So within ICANN many years ago we had a really big fight about the issuance of alternate (nits). And regardless of how anyone else right said I believe within ICANN the community at that time took a decision that we support a single authoritative root and a single Internet. And I'm looking at Olga and others who were around then.

Erika Mann: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: It's not a question of following the preference of some published – some copywriter or publisher in Europe. It's not an intellectual dispute. It implies that there is a single authoritative Internet that ICANN supports. And it's really critical because otherwise you're basically saying there can be...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: ...multiple...

Erika Mann: It's Erika. I have no issue. I'm pretty sure we get agreement quickly that we have Internet written with a capital I. Anybody opposes? No wonderful. On this topic please?

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. Sorry to slow things down but Marilyn's point should be documented on the ICANN Web site somewhere because I just had to fight myself over this issue. Chicago Manual of Style needs to be told. Thanks.

Erika Mann: We can make a side note about this and can review it. It's a good point. Please?

Woman 3: I have a question about a sentence that was erased from this paragraph. It reads at this technical level the operating principles are interpret - operatively - I can't say that, interoperability openness, standard based business (unintelligible) scalability. Can you address why there was erased?

Erika Mann: Simply because it comes at the again when you scroll down later it will the same context will come up again. Just to avoid duplication when you scroll down to the very end you will see it is there again. And even if it's more complete so...

Woman 3: All right thank you.

Erika Mann: But read it again. Maybe it's needed to have it inside twice. Sometimes it's still important to have something twice mentioned. So can – are we fine with this one, no major – no, no major objections? Oh please. Sorry.

Owen DeLong: Owen DeLong. So the more I read these two paragraphs the more that what they say to me is we have to use the funds to support projects that are consistent with an open and interoperable Internet. I'm fine with that. We don't know what that is and we kind of think we have a vague idea what it has been and these are the buzzwords that we want apply to that. I'm not so fine with that.

Erika Mann: Would you be – it's Erika Mann. Would you be so kind to explain why?

Owen DeLong I think if you're going to have a preamble to a document that describes what you want to provide funding for you shouldn't start with saying we have a name for it, we don't know what it is and we only have a vague buzzword idea of what it has been. I'm not sure how to go into more depth explaining what I mean by that but it, you know, seems pretty complete.

Erika Mann: Yes coming – it's Erika. Coming back to the point why we did this this was whole the idea to frame for potential evaluators in the future gray areas. So we will take back your point and you raise a similar one. I think I'm going to give this back to the drafting team and see either if they can clarify it or if we may have to leave the reference out. So (Nadia) can you make a point? It's a reflection point. It's not a to do or change but it's a reflection point. Please.

(Nadia): (Nadia) speaking for the record. I believe the intention of the document was to say that we are not providing a definition for open and interoperable Internet but we are providing a definition in relation to ICANN mission. So it's not an absolute definition for the term. It's rather a definition related to what ICANN does. If the document does not give this meaning then maybe we need to reword it. However that's my understanding of what's intended of this - of these two paragraphs.

Erika Mann: Please (Martin)?

(Carlina): Yes I think I agree with that that was the original intention. Perhaps we could change the wording to something like for the purpose of this fund distribution...

Erika Mann: Say your name.

(Carlina): This is (Carlina) for the record, the meaning of, you know, and interoperable and open Internet if such and such and such. So we're not providing a definition that we want I don't know to be used in economic papers but we're saying that this is – these are going to be the guiding principles for applying for this fund. That could be a solution.

Erika Mann: Okay (Martin) please.

(Martin): Yes sorry for not having followed many other meetings that led to this paragraph. In our bylaws it says you meant having the capacity and ability to coordinate DNS at the overall level and for the maintenance of a single interoperable Internet. This is a slightly different explanation. I don't see what these words add. And I'd love to have somebody off-line or maybe if there's a simple answer right now explain to me why we needed it. But off-line is fine too.

Erika Mann: I don't think so. There was an understanding to depart from this definition. It was just to have a more simple language. But it might be a good idea to go back to this definition. And I give this back again to the drafting team please to consider this and see if this would help us all in finding common ground with regard to this preamble. So would you be so kind please to do this Marika? This is to do you can note...

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

Erika Mann: ...so we go back to the – wonderful. Thank you so much. And let's conclude this paragraph, no other topic on this paragraph? Perfect.

So then we move on and now comes the if I'm not mistaken this is the final paragraph. So therefore the CCWG consider the following to be important guidelines to applicant seeking auction proceeds funding. Point 1 be aligned with ICANN's mission and core principles. Second support ICANN's community activities and consensus building processes. Third, create social and economic values for an open and interoperable Internet that will create benefits for the Internet community. And final, support an Internet in brackets the network of networks that is stable, scalable, agile, secure, sustainable and ultimately equitable, supports open access, future oriented developments and permissionless innovation and open standard for the benefit of Internet users worldwide.

Taking on the discussion we had before we might again want to review this so it is in coherence with the paragraph before and the philosophy which we're practically taking from the mission statement I have - yes and then followed by - I have Olga please.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Olga Cavalli for the record. What exactly means consensus building processes?

Erika Mann: Oh (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Could you repeat?

Olga Cavalli: To be supported by the following could be important guidelines to applicants seeking not for profits. How can that be supported?

Erika Mann: Can I get this back to the drafting team?

Olga Cavalli: I'm not saying it's wrong. I would like...

Erika Mann: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: ...clarification.

Marilyn Cade: So I came in only five meetings ago. And I joined the drafting team and I've ended up trying to clean up – sorry, trying to align certain terms like the word open Internet which in some areas of the world means net neutrality, not open Internet. So some of this I can't comment on. I need somebody who was here before. But when I read it I'll tell you what I interpreted to mean that the processes that ICANN uses to develop consensus in the community which might be bottom-up consultation, creating broader awareness of activities that are going on at ICANN or policy issues that are underway I sort of lumped in my mind all of that under this. But I was not here when the language was offered but that's how I interpreted it.

Erika Mann: Keep in mind - it's Erika. We received many comments. So the first draft I did many, many months ago. And I just put all the comments together and then we – this was a basis to work on the documents and the document still continues. So we can – I have a similar concern which you had about the second bullet point but it doesn't matter really because it might be not (concliture) for again keep in mind that's for evaluators to understand how they shall judge future projects. So it might be still fine. We have – I had – yes please?

(Nadia): (Nadia) speaking for the record. I'm actually not sure that we should actually put guidelines to applicants. I feel that this is out of our scope. We should be putting guidelines for the application and selection of project, guidelines but we should not be addressing the applicants directly. This is out of the scope of this whole group.

(Xaviay): (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: (Unintelligible)...

(Nadia): Yes.

Erika Mann: ...that's an interesting point you are raising because it's true we are stretching approach here and be talking directly - not directly to applicant but we give guidelines. Okay so point we have to take into...

(Nadia): And I think that's what we had at the beginning and someone may be suggested that and it was (pushed).

Erika Mann: Could be. We can review all the previous changes. We have noted the – we have noted your concern about it. Let me go back. I think I had you next and then I come over to this side please.

(Xaviay): So first what she said that we should be talking about applications and potential grants rather than applicants because some of these bullet points actually don't make sense for applicants. I don't know how an applicant could be aligned with ICANN's mission for example but an application certainly can or a project certainly can.

I think given this paragraph the best remedy for the problems that I expressed with the previous two paragraphs is to simply preserve the first paragraph of the fund must not be used to support blah, blah, blah and at the end of that sentence and delete everything in – that remains in those two paragraphs.

Erika Mann: I'm moving over here and just for you I give you a sign I still have three undecided and then I have to go back to Xavier and then I come to you.

(Xaviay): Okay.

Erika Mann: Yes please?

(Sean): All right so this is (Sean) for the record. I didn't know we are removed from the top paragraph. And if I recall I think I made a comment about that on the list as well. The first one was I was wondering why we had to repeat the (unintelligible). I thought probably the DNS was sufficient to cover that as well.

The second comment I made then was within the root server itself. And I was saying that of course it should be obvious that we are referring to the (unintelligible) roots. What I was also saying that I hope it does not imply that alternate roots should be covered in this. So I was wondering whether we should better write it in a way that explained that we are referring to the one root and not supporting projects for alternate roots?

The thought point is in relation to the last sentence we – the top bullet already suggests that removing worldwide. And like it looks like we have somehow introduced it to the last one. (Unintelligible) social media social and economic values blah, blah, blah we removed worldwide from Internet community. I will just let Internet community. But that in that last sentence we have now introduced Internet users worldwide. So it looks like we'll – we need to reconcile that at that point. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. I think we have all the notes taken about this one. Okay. Let me check that I haven't forgotten anyone here. Yes I have you. Don't - I have you.

Yes I know. I have him as well but I want to be in the right order. So let me go first to the - is it you? And then I go over to you and I go to Edmon.

(Juls Halovine): This is (Juls Halovine) for the transcript record. I actually happen to like that second paragraph the fund must not be used. It was – comes to the heart of the crux of what we've been working on when we first started it when people had their sections. And I think that's a very important paragraph to show what really is at the heart of why we're working on this definition of open Internet. It – I mean if you want to delete the other stuff but I mean that paragraph that fund must not be use I think is a crucial paragraph and a key paragraph to this whole definition.

Erika Mann: It's Erika. Can you help us? What is the key paragraph?

(Juls Halovine): The one that says the fund must not be used to support projects that are inconsistent.

Erika Mann: All right that's what I (unintelligible) heard. So you're going back to the previous one we have noticed it. But we are already one further down so the last paragraph (unintelligible) noted it. I just wanted to make sure that I understood it. (Unintelligible) taking notes. You will all get a (unintelligible).

(Xaviay): Thank you (unintelligible). From the last bullets I (unintelligible) in the last one I think it's very clear that it's what it supports. And (unintelligible) in the first bullet that's a very (unintelligible) and was very (unintelligible). So I (unintelligible) the third bullet in the third bullet I would incorporate somehow in this (unintelligible). Thank you.

Erika Mann: Let me go first to Edmon then yes I have you and then I come to you. I hope I have the right order and I want to get the final to Xavier and then I would love to conclude the discussion at (unintelligible).

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Edmon Chung here. Three items on the last paragraph one (unintelligible) Olga said I guess the second bullet the only thing probably of concern is to make sure that projects that might be critical of ICANN, you know, may be clarified in ICANN is not something that we are permit because

it's in a way supportive. So right now is its I don't know whether there is any change needed but make sure that they understand that the projects are critical of ICANN may still be okay. I think that's important.

Second item the a.k.a. network of networks seems a little bit out of place. But I'm not sure why we have to have that so just probably suggest striking it out unless there is a particular reason. And then the third items are the last words, well last phrase worldwide. We want to make sure that this doesn't bar projects that focus on may be local projects from being able to apply. I guess we want to make sure that, you know, not every project needs to solve the world's problem in a way. So I guess those three things.

Yes. Thank you so much. Would you all be so kind to state your name at the very beginning? It's easy to forget. I do make the same mistake all the time. So would you please be so kind please?

(Xaviay): (Unintelligible). Thank you. My comments actually (unintelligible) to the third paragraph so just in line with what you talked about. I think we need to be more clearer about the DNS the – we need to embellish that part properly. Really that paragraph itself should be may be bulleted enough to just say at technical level then the IP route and numbering systems two, should maybe be domain name systems because when it's to clearly says that the DNS is a kind of a radical structure so just to (so that) all the DNS operators maybe start from the root server system operators should be to the next one until it's the third one just in (unintelligible) structure. We need to be to step that part clearly for everybody to understand. Thank you.

Erika Mann: We have ten minutes so I'm very grateful for this debate but just let us keep this all in mind. Olga and then I go over to you. I've not you forgotten Xavier. Olga please.

Olga Cavalli: Olga Cavalli here. The last bullet support and then it becomes a series of objectives. I'm not an English-speaking person but it's my second language.

Support the Internet, stable, scalable, agile, secure, sustainable, equitable supports, open access. And then it comes to support open access, future oriented development. But you changed from objectives to concrete things. That is kind of weird. And then what is permissionless innovation? Why don't we say just innovation, open standards? And I would like to support what Edmon said about the worldwide Internet users just Internet. And it could be worldwide for community for small place thank you.

Erika Mann: You have the point.

Edmon Chung: Well I hate to reopen this but I really don't like the emphasis on domain name system here. I think we should talk – be talking about the name and identifier system however it's implemented.

Erika Mann: I think I have forgotten you. You're very much earlier, apologies.

(Mary Doma): Thanks. (Mary Doma) is my name. And other expressed some of the issues. For non-English-speaking you make it too difficult for us to follow and I get can we just do a small last sentence or up there and then you can do below the line and explain all of that so that we can then be encouraged to. So where you start a sentence before you end it you have forgotten what you have started reading.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. I think that's – it's Erika. It's a good point. So we need to if when you review at the drafting team when you do the presentation please ensure it's easy understandable as well. If – I mean we have another review to read it but it would be nice if you keep this in mind.

Marilyn Cade: It's a Marilyn Cade. I have a question as a member of the drafting team. So does that mean that the instructions to the drafting team are different than the last instructions which all you can do is fix a few small things because...

Erika Mann: I would say so.

Marilyn Cade: Okay because...

Erika Mann: I would say take these...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Erika Mann: ...what you heard today take this into consideration. Marika typed everything so we have all the comments and then give us a draft back that you feel it's comprehensive and captures the mood of the two days of the comments because we have I think an excellent overview and then give that back to us and we send it around for a final round with one more option to comment but then it's over I would say. I mean there's never anything over the ICANN but let's say let's predict – give us a deadline that it's somewhat over and then hopefully we can conclude this chapter. Let me – I'll come back to you in a second. I have Xavier first and then on this point okay please.

(Sitim Vander): No just to pay attention the drafts - (Sitim Vander) for the record. The draft team must pay attention because when you translate you can change completely the meaning.

Erika Mann: Xavier please.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. Just to the point on - this is Xavier Calvez. On this paragraph some of its elements repeats but sometimes inconsistently some things that have been saved at the top. So maybe there is a way for the drafting team to look at this paragraph, eliminate what is already said above and keep what is not yet so that it complements it.

My second point may become irrelevant if you do that is that the first dash in this last paragraph says be aligned with ICANN missions and core principles. And it's preceded by important guidelines. It's not a guideline that the

applications, successful applications would be aligned by with ICANN submission. It's a requirement.

So the wording of guideline suggest that it's optional and it stops. So the – I think for the drafting team I think it's important to keep in mind and is actually correctly stated above which is why I was saying maybe there's redundancy's here that create confusion and if you remove it it will be more clear.

Erika Mann: Okay thank you all. Thank you so much. I think it was a worthwhile exercise and it shows how important it is to work together instead of doing this by emails. And there's always somebody not involved and hopefully we have a good team and a good group and discussion today. So I just want to get a quick understanding who is going to work on this drafting team. Is it the – it will be – it's Marilyn, Jonathan, Olga, (Nadia), who else? That's it?

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: And I...

Erika Mann: (Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: ...Xavier agreed to be our monitor.

Erika Mann: Okay. And would you be able - when is our next meeting? Our next meeting is on 16th of November. Is this reasonable for you or is it too short? Do you need more time?

Woman: Yes.

Erika Mann: It's reasonable? Okay. So we will have it back on the hopefully the last final draft for one more review and then yes please I've seen you (Daniel). Give me a second.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, I need to look at Marika before I say that that that two week is reasonable?

Erika Mann: Is this reasonable for you?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Erika Mann: You're done.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm going to send out after this meeting the notes and the updated version.

Erika Mann: It's Erika. (Daniel) please?

(Daniel Russ): Just related to the deadline I think it would be good to allow one day so that we can review the document before the call so like 15 days or 16.

Erika Mann: Yes it's Erika. We – I'm pretty sure this is possible to have it one day earlier so that you have enough time to review it and not just under call. I do agree.

Okay I would – we have to skip the Point 3 which was the recap of the morning session. I don't think that's needed. You all participated. We will send again the email with the summary of what was debated. Wait a second - what was debated and there's no recap possible. It was such a long debate. But we will send it by email. We have taken all the notes which were taken on the whiteboards. They are already on an email. You will see this in a document what was said and so you have a pretty good overview. And then we will take it up and then our next call so it's not forgotten we will debate it again. And on the review of the work plan I don't think that we can do it today can we?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Erika Mann: It takes too much time? Okay so we have to postpone it as well to our next call. And the last item on the agenda Point 5 is the confirmation of the our next step and next meeting which is Thursday, November 16 at the user time 14 UTC. With this thank you so much. Thanks everybody for participating and looking forward to receive a new document. Thanks so much.

Marilyn Cade: Erika? Erika? I'm really sorry to put you on the spot but can I have a small point of order? Is it your birthday today?

Woman: Sorry.

Marilyn Cade: Boy am I in trouble.

(Sasha): Erika may I have one last word for (Sasha) here over here. Yes, I just wanted to say...

Erika Mann: (Unintelligible) right for the last word please.

(Sasha): Yes. I just wanted to say thank you to everyone. I've been very gratified to be part of this CCWG as the board liaison. I've enjoyed working with all of you and I will continue to be part of the CCWG if I'm welcome. But as a – thank you. And I look forward to working with all of you and I leave you in the capable hands of my colleague (Martin) so thank you so much.

Erika Mann: (Sasha) thank you so much for your support and your constant work with us. And I wish you -- I think we all do -- the best and happy to hear that you will stay with us which is wonderful. (Martin) welcome on the team and you will have not an easy job I can tell you.

(Martin): Yes.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much.

END