

## ICANN Transcription CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds Thursday 20 September 2018 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds call on the Thursday, 20 September 2018 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ccwg-new-gtlds-auction-proceeds-20sep18-en.mp3> [audio.icann.org]

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p8a3z6g6nwm/>  
Attendance is on the wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/twiNBQ>

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

Coordinator: Recording is now started.

Julie Bisland: Great thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds call on Thursday, the 20th of September, 2018. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now? And I already have Ching noted.

Okay, hearing no names, I would like everyone 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. Please begin.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, Julie. Welcome, everyone. A few issues before I start with the topic point 2, just to let you know that we might experience some difficulties today. I'm in Frankfurt in a hotel and they are switching some of the systems, the Internet systems so I might have to go on a call just in case the internet. Second, Ching is having similar issues, he's still trying to get in Adobe. My Adobe is super slow so we are having all some difficult and so just to let you know, please don't be surprised if something is not working from our end.

And with this I come to point 2, the question if you have an update – somebody an update concerning our conflict of interest declarations? No? That's not the case, okay. Then let's move forward to point 3 of our agenda, which is going to be a discussion and a presentation about the – and you received this by email, it's the overview of input we received on the draft initial report.

We were extremely pleased to see that apparently that the first one was done quite well because there was not too much concern and not too many comments. There are two serious ones which we may need a little bit of more discussion but most of the other comments we have the feeling we can implement them easily. And I will ask Marika to guide you and will explain our proposal. Unfortunately we are not able to do it, I just see a completely scrambled text but I had reviewed it so I know what we are talking about, so please don't be concerned.

Therefore, Marika, are you able and ready to do the presentation?

Marika Konings: Yes, Erika. I am. This is Marika.

Erika Mann: And I will now open the document so that I know where we are but just be aware it takes very long on my end today, so Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Thank you, Erika. So what you currently see on the screen, and in a second I will sync the document so you can follow along with me, is the updated draft initial report that was circulated with the agenda on Tuesday I believe. So basically what staff has tried to do is to integrate the issues that were flagged by CCWG members in the report through the different comment boxes that you see. And for those where we felt we were able to address those in a fairly noncontroversial manner, we've gone ahead and made updates and changes which you see in redline.

So as such, the comments that, you know, appear that are not highlighted in yellow have been addressed at least from a staff's perspective, but of course we would welcome any input or concerns you may have in relation to how staff has addressed those comments.

So what remains in that regard, and that is probably the focus of the discussion today, are those comments highlighted in yellow. Those are either comments where, you know, we're not clear what was specifically intended, where you know, there may be further questions that the group needs to address or where staff has made a suggestion on how to approach it but before making that change we wanted to hear from you whether you believe that is indeed an appropriate way of doing so.

So if there are no questions about, you know, that general introduction and where we're at, I'll go ahead now and sync the document so you can actually see and follow along with me in relation to the issues that we're looking at.

And of course, you know, you may want to have the document also open on your own screen so you're actually to zoom in and read things more clearly.

So the first comment we're looking at relate to the description of Mechanism A, the internal ICANN department option. And Judith made a comment here that she noted that she has heard that there is also possibility of outsourcing, and I think this needs to be cleared up as it's written, this is not clear. Staff's response, or initial feedback here is that, you know, the question is this an implementation question? From our perspective it's not sure whether this is something that can be confirmed at this stage as it may depend on what expertise is internally available and what isn't.

You know, for example, you know, a specific type of audit may be needed and, you know, this may need to be outsourced. You know, is this maybe an issue that can be addressed by calling it out for something that, you know, needs to be further worked out during implementation? Or, you know, is there anything more specific that the group thinks can be provided with regards to outsourcing as it relates to Mechanism A.

So that's the question staff put forward. I see that Judith is on the call so I don't know if she wants to provide some initial feedback on, you know, whether making a note of this and indicating that this should potentially be dealt with during implementation addresses her perspective or whether there's something else that should happen here?

Erika Mann: Judith, this is Erika. Do you want to explore or are you fine that we just make a reference that this shall be explored either in the implementation phase or and of course like we give the example of the audit there are reasons why an outsourcing shall happen then it's up to the – to ICANN to pursue this. It would just be something you would be fine if you would extend the language

and cover this in such a way? Judith, in case you are talking, we can't hear you.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Erika, Alan has his hand up.

Judith Hellerstein: ...for the record.

Marika Konings: There's Judith.

Judith Hellerstein: I didn't catch most of it because I was on a train – I'm on a train. But I'll try to call in and get better audio. But that – if I can get some answers to the questions on what's – whether some items are going to be outsourced here or what is going to be outsourced or if anything is going to be outsourced that would also...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Yes. I mean, definitely audit will have to be outsourced because this has to be done by an auditing firm. And I believe we debated and discussed it in a very early phase. Alan, please, I see you have your hand raised.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you very much. Alan Greenberg speaking. I work on the assumption that ICANN or any organization can outsource pretty much anything, and outsourcing may mean hiring a contract programmer, a contract consultant or it may be outsourcing a function. You know, as an example, yes, financial audit has to be outsourced because it has to be done by a certified public accountant.

Auditing of projects may be outsourced, may not; may be done under contract. So I think we have to assume that almost anything might be outsourced and if we believe that something must not be outsourced, then I think we need to specify it. But that's standard business practices; you have to decide whether it's more practical based on the job to be done and the duration of the job whether you're going to outsource it to someone who does that professionally or whether you're going to bring it in house and have employees do it.

So I think that's standard business practices as we go along, and I'm not sure we can specify exactly at this point what should be outsourced or what could be outsourced. If there is something we don't want to be outsourced I think we have to be specific. But other than that I don't see how we're – how that's not an implementation detail and of course could even change over time. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes, this is Erika. I agree with you, Alan. I was feeling the same you did when you – when you're back and you can be understood better or just type if you would agree that we will find language will capture the discussion we just had and if you would agree to this or if you would object to it and you would want to approach it in a different way. Just give us a sign if you are fine with it or if you want to elaborate this topic further. You – it looks like you're still having difficulties. A quick note and I'll come back to you later. Just give me a sign when you are – when you can talk again when you feel you have a good connection.

Marika, I took a note about this topic so we can go back to it later, but just move forward for now.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks Erika. So I think based on the conversation staff can maybe go ahead and maybe create a little footnote to note that you know, further details

on what services if any, are to be outsourced are conversations that will happen in the implementation phase unless, and maybe through public comment there, there is specific input on, you know, what aspects should not be outsourced and maybe that is a way of, you know, obtaining further input on this question and to determine...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...more details need to be provided following the comments on the initial report.

Erika Mann: Marika, this is Erika. I would recommend to keep it a little bit – the footnote a bit more light touch. It's good to have it done in implementation phase but I don't believe go too much into details but just saying following ordinary business practices or something like this and making reference, for example, to the audit – the finance audit is always outsourced just to give an example when people are reading it.

Marika Konings: Okay yes, sounds good. I made a note of that as well. So this is Marika again. So the next item that's highlighted in yellow is a comment from Marilyn. I do know that Marilyn is not on the call so she may not be able to, you know, to provide input so I can definitely follow up after the meeting and make sure that she has a chance to review notes of this meeting as well as some of the suggested approaches for dealing with her input.

So her comments relates to the staffing and she knows that this needs to be explained, example given, any staff will have to be retained as contactors having an exit clause in the agreement limiting any ongoing financial liability when their contract is terminated, example given, the internal ICANN department is closed down. And I made a similar comment here I think as I

made to Judith that this seems to be an implementation issue and not necessarily details that will need to be specified as part of the initial report.

So again, maybe it's worth calling it out as a footnote just noting that those kind of details are to be worked out as part of the implementation process. I don't know if anyone here has any concern about that way of dealing with it?

Erika Mann: Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just to note that short of anything ICANN might agree to in an employment or a contract agreement, California has about the most liberal laws anywhere for terminating people based without a specific cause. So ICANN may...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...ICANN may volunteer to have commitments but other than that there are very few legislative ones.

Erika Mann: Yes, this is Erika. Agree. One other point, Marika, we may want to check the language again of this draft initial report if we have explained well enough sufficiently well enough the implementation phase. I know we have done it in the – at the very end but we may have to do it up front as well so my memory is not good enough and just to ensure that it's captured. So back to you, please.

Marika Konings: Okay thanks. I've taken note of that. So not to make you seasick but we'll scroll a bit further down. Here's another comment from Marilyn in relation to the start up process and the references there to minimal, she responded that at present both mechanisms A and B simply say "minimal." This does not



provide adequate information for the CCWG or the community or Board to make a fact-based assessment of the amount of time or startup costs for these two mechanisms.

And so staff's feedback is here, how can further information be obtained or are these details that are to be developed as part of the implementation process? Our understanding of the input provided in relation to the use of the word "minimal" is that basic support services such as HR, IT, or infrastructure you know, would already be in place and as such, you know, the cost of setting that up or starting that up are maybe minimal compared to, for example, the creation of an independent foundation. So we had understood the costs of minimal being more a reference or comparison to some of the other mechanisms. So again, the question is, you know, if how additional details can be provided in this regard and how the group can go about that.

Erika Mann: Yes, this is Erika. I don't see anybody else – I think Marilyn is right, we may want to clarify this here, not in the sense that we explain what minimal means but in the sense that we will have to say this has to be – there needs to be a discussion once implementation takes place and depending on if it's either A or B I would assume that the minimal would look a little bit different. But certainly it would have a different structure compared to C. So, yes, I think she's right; we need to give a little bit more flesh behind the word "minimal" and make a reference that this will have to be fleshed out at a later phase.

But you want to make sure that it's understood the minimal is definitely less than it would be on the assumption of the discussions we had concerning the Mechanism 3 and 4.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Erika. I can make a note of that. And just thinking out loud here, and I note I think that's something that's being done in the context of other efforts,

it may be worth kind of recommending to the Board that, you know, whatever mechanism they're going to consider for adoption that, you know, a feasibility assessment is carried out which presumably would include further details on the costs that will be involved so that, you know, before a final decision is taken there is at least a clearer picture of what the implications would be from a budget perspective.

Erika Mann: Yes, this is Erika. Good point. I agree. If somebody is not agreeing please type in the chat room or just disrupt us here. I can't see a hand raised so I assume that you agree with what we are saying. Okay, fine. Just continue, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Erika. So scrolling a bit further down – I think we have a line that dropped.

Erika Mann: Somebody's calling.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: I think we lost somebody – yes, for Julie to find the line.

Erika Mann: Ching, is it you? Ching? Ching?

Marika Konings: I think they found the line. Yes, it was Ching, so I'm guessing they're going to dial out back out to Ching. So the next comment on the list is another one from Judith in relation to Mechanism B, the ICANN plus external organization option. She notes, "In Mechanism 2 it is mentioned that some work will be given to the chosen donor advice fund. Could we mention what this work will be? In the ALAC discussions we had on this issue there was a difference of opinion on what will be outsourced. I think this needs to be clarified."

And our question here is, it would be helpful for the group then to identify what further details are needed at this stage. You know, we did add definition or a clarification on what a donor advised fund is and that provide some explanation about how the roles are divided on how that will work in practice. But if this is not sufficiently clear, or if the CCWG needs to provide further guidance here we're happy to hear your suggestions.

Erika Mann: This is Erika, Marika. I think Marika, similar to the point before I believe we want to make a – we want to explain that depending on the entity ICANN department is going to (unintelligible) or is working in close cooperation with depending on this entity, further evaluation then needs to be done. I believe it's much too early first of all we need to be clear we're making two recommendations here so we are recommending one – Recommendation 1 and 2, and then second concerning if the preference in the – what we received back from the initial report from the public comment period if the argument would be, and we would come to the conclusion in the end, that second is the preferred option I think it's the time to go – look more into detail.

I believe here we only need to say that of course depending on the chosen and selected entity, then further evaluation needs to be done and more precise cooperation structures will have to be worked out. I see something from John. Let me see if I can read it. It's so difficult to read here where – can you read this, Marika? There's one from Nadira and one from John.

Marika Konings: Yes, John notes, “We need to make that DAF is subject to the rules of the charity that owns it, which are unlikely to be the same as what we want.” And he also adds, “Also note that ICANN has no tax benefit from a DAF,” and so we can add that clarification.

And Nadira notes that these recommendations have to go for the other mechanisms. Nadira, I'm assuming that you mean that, you know, some of those details for other mechanisms will also need to be further worked out as part of a feasibility assessment or an implementation plan. Correct?

Erika Mann: And now I see Alan. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg. To expand a little bit on Judith's comment, when the ALAC folks were talking about this, there were some people, for instance, who envisioned that if we were to outsource part of the project, what we would outsource would be project evaluation, you know, project selection so that for instance, we could contract with someone in Africa to evaluate African projects.

And one could generalize that. And it wasn't clear from the way ICANN was – the way we had originally formulated it, that that's the part that we would outsource to, you know, multiple groups around the world and that was the source of Judith's comment, that we just need to be really clear if we are talking about outsourcing part of the overall project, what parts are we talking about because different people would envision that it would be optimal to outsource different parts of it. And I was just making sure – trying to make sure that we had clarity that we're – if we tick off the box saying we like this option, make sure we're all talking about the same thing. That's all. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. Alan. This is Erika. That's an important point. I'm glad you are explaining this again, so what we originally meant was to say that ICANN will select a fund or an – we're not an entity, doesn't have to a – it could be a foundation, somebody they like to work with, could be a donor fund, whatever it would be, it would be up to ICANN and of course to the – to

the follow up, CCWG, the implementation, the next implementation phase, we don't even know how this is going to look like, and to the Board to define what this fund will be or this foundation will be.

So this is what we originally – this will be outsourced to different entities, it has a different meaning. I believe we haven't discussed this, so I'm not sure if at this stage of the – of our work we can switch to multiple entities. I'm very doubtful there that we can do this because we haven't debated it so far. Marika, do you have a solution for this?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, but maybe it's a question that we want to ask as part of the initial report for people to weigh in if there are indeed specific views or guidance on how (unintelligible) should be divided or what the expectations are.

Erika Mann: Alan, is this a new hand raised?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it is a new hand. To be clear, I wasn't suggesting that we divide it a different way, I was just pointing out that we need to be crystal clear how we are proposing it to be divided. So if people vote for that option, we know they're all voting for the same thing. And that was my concern. Now if there are people who feel that subdivision is really, really wrong, and another subdivision is right, then they better make it clear and not just say I like subdividing or I like you know, Mechanism B. That's all I was saying, we need to be sufficiently clear so if people are opting for that mechanism they're all opting for the same thing and not envisioning something different in their minds.

Erika Mann: Yes, this is Erika, I agree. We need to clarify the language, good point. So I see – so Nadira is supporting you, Alan. Ching as well, the language needs to

be clarified. I would recommend we stick to the original ideas, two entities will, to some degree, merge or will build a partnership and then if these entities, so ICANN plus, decide in the future that they would like to subdivide part of the work I would argue we should leave it up to them to decide it in the future.

And since the community and we have a review clause included, will always be involved, and the Board I would have (unintelligible) that in case something would go wrong there would be a path to intervene and to inject some new ideas. So we need to clarify the language but we still to the original idea. Okay. I don't see anybody objecting to this. I see Vanda is typing something so I'm going to wait for Vanda.

Yes, so she's supporting this. Okay, Marika, back to you. Do you want to summarize what we discussed here because we had quite a debate about it so we have a good understanding how we want to proceed here?

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Erika. This is Marika. My takeaway was that the group will review the language that is currently there and determine what clarifications may need to be added to make sure people understand you know, what the division of labor is. I do note maybe with a redline some of that clarity is already there and there's of course in the description as well some more specificity about, you know, the parts that, you know, ICANN would manage and, you know, what the other organization would manage. But again, if there's further suggestions for how to clarify that we'll definitely look out for that.

Erika Mann: Yes, this is Erika. Marika, maybe I just make a practical recommendation, so I think it would be good if after this call if staff would review it, then the leadership would have a quick look at it and once we send out the new

language, then everybody has a chance to review it and can come back to us in case there's further clarification needed. I think that may be a quicker way in dealing with the topic.

Marika Konings: Yes, definitely. This is Marika. Yes, any updates we make will of course go out to the group for further review and consideration.

Erika Mann: Perfect. Thank you so much. Please

Marika Konings: So the next comment I'm hoping that we have Ching back on the line. Ching also made a comment here, and I think it goes a little bit to the same point as Judith made in relation to clarifying further the role of ICANN and the role of the DAF, so and he said as well that members of the CCWG may still have different levels of understanding of how this mechanism may work. So again, Ching may have as well specific input on how this can be further clarified.

He also asked a question on Mechanism B, "The fund transfer to DAF will be taken as a legal donation to the DAF. If so, how is it different from Mechanism D?" And I can give my view on that but, you know, the group may also have different perspectives on that but at least – and I think we may have lost Ching again.

Erika Mann: I believe it's your connection. Okay.

Marika Konings: But my understanding is that the difference at least in Mechanism B there's a shared responsibility between ICANN and an external organization while in Mechanism D it would kind of all be handed over to an external organization with ICANN just being responsible for the oversight. But again, if I got that wrong, I'm happy to stand corrected.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. I agree with you, Marika, that's the main difference. And of course in a partnership agreement Mechanism B the two partners will define how transfer is even made; there are so many variations and models possible I believe these two entities then will decide it. But I see from Julie she's saying Ching is disconnected. Ching, are you with us now? No he isn't. So I would say we move – we just continue to the next point, if nobody wants to raise a topic here and then we come back to it once Ching is with us.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks Erika.

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Ching, can you talk now?

Marika Konings: I think Ching is saying that he's just in the chat for now.

Erika Mann: Ching, are you okay that – with the explanation Marika gave? We will explain the context a little bit better and then we can review it all again together? Are you okay with this? Yes he is. Okay, so we will explain this point better, Marika, and we will be more specific and more clear about how these two entities will then have to define their working relationship and any transfer of money as well. Yes? Again, this is something which has to be defined once the entity has chosen; it's not something we can do now.

There are many variations and even legal considerations to take into consideration, nothing we can do now. But it's something which has to then be fleshed out in a later phase. It has to be clear the kind of partnership and so we have to look at the language so this is well understood when readers have to make their choices. Okay, Marika, back to you.



Marika Konings: Thanks, Erika. So scrolling further down, so the next comment highlighted in yellow relates to Mechanism C, the ICANN Foundation. Judith made a comment here, “Mechanism 3 people have said it will be hard to get a firm to do this and perhaps this could be clarified a bit. I know for me that was weighing on me in my decisions.” And our question is actually here, please clarify what is meant with “It will be hard to get a firm to do this” and we’re just wondering if maybe this was referring to Mechanism D as, you know, the Mechanism C is the creation of a new charitable structure. So maybe Judith can, if she’s still on the line or maybe she can type...

((Crosstalk))

Judith Hellerstein: Yes, yes sure.

Marika Konings: Go ahead.

Judith Hellerstein: This is Judith Hellerstein for the record. Yes, so I was told when we were looking – when we were reviewing these, someone had suggested that we’ll have difficulty finding – creating a foundation or finding someone to help us create this foundation. And so that’s what my thought – my point is reference so I didn’t understand why it would be difficult, someone said it would be.

Erika Mann: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. It’s Alan speaking. I suspect I’m the one who said what Judith is talking about but that was in reference to completely outsourcing the

function, not the foundation. The foundation is something we would build from scratch and, you know, we will populate it and build it according to our design so I don't think there's an issue of that. There may be an issue of cost and stuff, but the reference of could we find someone who would willingly take on the job was in reference – if I said it in any case – was in reference to completely outsourcing the function but dictating the details of how the money would be used and that's the one that I expressed concern as did I think Sara about actually finding someone to do that. I'm not sure that adds clarity or more confusion...

((Crosstalk))

Judith Hellerstein: Yes, no, I think that – yes, so I was confused what you had said, Alan. I thought you were talking about this option when you said that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, no.

Erika Mann: No. I think that's clear. This is Erika. I agree. That's one point which we might want to explain and I sent Marika, to the leadership team a quick note concerning the point that our Board, the way it was defined, was to define a structure which works for one up option (unintelligible). So typically when we discussed this very early, and we talked about the foundation, one of the concerns we raised was that a foundation typically is something which has – is open ended. There are not many foundations which are created with a limited period of time. The goal for a foundation is to have an open ended agenda.

So that's one of the reason which, you know, we said in one of our early discussions, a foundation to some degree is much more difficult for the goal which was given to us. So we might want to mention this here. I believe we

haven't mentioned it in the – if I remember the text correct, so we may want to check this. John please.

John Levine: Thank you. Two comments, one is I happen to be a trustee of the Internet Society. We just set up a foundation a few months ago and I can tell you administratively it is not difficult. However, defining the role of the foundation and how it's going to be run and who's going to staff it, we did it because it's suppose to last forever, but I totally agree with your comment that a short term foundation is – would be an unusual thing and it would be a great deal of overhead probably for relatively little benefit.

And one other thing is it occurs to me that Mechanisms B and D actually share the same difficulty of trying to outsource our work to a separate organization while maintaining complete control over it. And just as Alan was saying, trying to find an external organization that'll do all the work but follow our rules, we the donor advised fund has the exact same problem. I actually happen to have a small donor advised fund at a US foundation, and they've made it quite clear that they have rules about who they will give money to, and if I want to give money to – if I want to give money to somebody who fits in their rules, that's great; but if it doesn't fit in their rules I have no recourse, I have given them the money, you know, I can't get it back.

And in particular, American foundations are fairly reluctant to give money to foreign recipients. So I wouldn't totally rule out the DAF but before going ahead with it I would want to identify a specific – a recipient charity to manage it and make sure that the charity actually had rules that we could live with. And my guess is once we start to go down this road we will find there is no such charity and Option B is not actually practical. Thanks.

Erika Mann: Yes, thank you so much. I agree, John, it's a complicated – definitely a complicated issue. I worked as a Board member in one too and it was always difficult to decide between two entities. I agree. So maybe we have to even more cautious language here Marika, when we review the current text and just a clear – efficiently clear what this could mean and so we just select a very cautious language approach and not raise any expectation in hopes that this is an issue which is easily solvable.

And concerning the question Judith raised and clarified by Alan, I believe we have an understanding and we can now move forward. Do you want to summarize the point? Is it sufficiently clear, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Erika. So indeed I think Judith's comment has been addressed and I think based on John's comment and I think that also relates to this previous input, we need to add some clarification here that I think in relation to Option B that indeed, you know, finding an organization that, you know, would partner and be able to also take in the requirements that ICANN has, may not be – would need to be further explored whether that is indeed feasible. And I think that comes back again to a feasibility assessment being needed before any final decision is taken by the ICANN Board on this.

And I think similarly making a note somewhere again that may be in the introduction to this section, that highlights that, you know, the group is looking at kind of a one-off allocation or not a long term setting up of an organization or a mechanism so that would also need to be factored in as, you know, the different mechanisms are weighed, you know, what is feasible and reasonable and looking at the fact that this is you know, one off allocation.

Scrolling further down, the next comment I found here is from Marilyn in relation to Mechanism C. She notes, this relates to the startup cost of a

foundation where it's noted that there's time needed for IRS approval, legal fees to draft bylaws and agreements. And she notes "This comment is prejudicial and legal costs for drafting bylaws and agreements exist regardless of which mechanism is selected. More neutral language should be used here." And the question staff has asked here is, you know, are bylaws and agreements needed for Mechanism A if it's an ICANN department? You know, are bylaws needed for Mechanism B if the other organization is already set up and in place?

You know, is IRS approval needed for Mechanism A and B? And again, at least I don't know the answers to these questions so it would be helpful if someone could clarify, you know, what the response is because that may then help us clarify this language as needed and either repeat the language that's in here for the other mechanisms or at least apply those parts that are applicable to Mechanisms A and B.

Alan.

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: I'm on mute, I was talking, I'm on mute.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. Maybe I'm missing something...

Erika Mann: Apologies. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. It's Alan Greenberg speaking. Maybe I'm missing something but if we're using the existing organization or we are contracting with someone else, I don't see why bylaws would have to be changed. Now we may have to write all sorts of procedures and rules about how we're doing

this, but I don't see any way in which this would require IRS approval or bylaw changes. The whole concept we're talking about is this whole thing has to be within ICANN's current bylaws. So maybe I'm missing something but I don't see any need at all unless we have been badly misinformed going along the way.

Erika Mann: Yes, this is Erika. I'm with you, Alan. And I overlooked this; I haven't seen this. I think this will – I don't think so in any of the mechanisms we would select bylaws would have to be changed, maybe with the exception of the last one, maybe some additions would be needed because and to some degree if you totally outsource what is currently part of the funding and it would be totally outsourced to a separate entity, there might be some changes needed, but I'm very doubtful here.

So I would maybe we change this and talk more instead of bylaws on processes. But have some reserved so we can ask some directly if she believes – and Becky is typing something, Becky, if you want to talk just please feel free. So I'm looking to Becky and to Sam. Do you want to make a comment here, the two of you?

Becky Burr: I'm not sure – can you hear me?

Erika Mann: Yes.

Becky Burr: Oh great. I think one issue that has surfaced is of course every action that ICANN Board and Org takes is subject to the accountability mechanism, which is – means reconsideration, and independent review and those things. And depending on the setup, we do have some concerns that, you know, individual challenges to I applied for a grant but I didn't get it and therefore the Board failed to respect the bylaws or to live by ICANN's commitments

and core values when it, you know, approved the, you know, when it confirmed – when it fulfilled its fiduciary obligations and confirmed that the processes were followed. So, you know, that's the concern.

Now, it may be that there are ways to cabin this, but ICANN community has demonstrated a significant creativity in using those processes. And the Board is not saying at this point the funds shouldn't, you know, that the accountability mechanisms shouldn't apply but we do have significant concern about using a great deal of the fund itself in these accountability mechanisms. Typically in a grant providing situation, there are, you know, simple disclaimers that basically say the decisions of the grant making body are final and not challengeable.

We think that would be difficult to sustain given the ICANN Bylaws. So that's the concern that we have in this one particular area.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Understood, Becky. Sam, do you want to add a point? Are you – or is it all covered with the – what Becky just said?

Samantha Eisner: I think Becky's raised all the points I'd raise at this time.

Erika Mann: Perfect. So we will do a redrafting here. So I think the key point is in principle if the oversight really lies with ICANN and the Board then typically there is no change needed in bylaws, but then concerning the point (unintelligible) C depending again how such kind of outsourcing would happen the oversight would need more – we do following what Becky just said, we do a redrafting here and since we are recommending A and B, we don't give detail but I think we need to explain this better here, this topic.

And just go ahead and summarize the point, Marika, so that we can all agree it's well understood by everybody, please.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. This is Marika. I'm not really sure if I've understood what needs to be changed here because we started our talking I think about the startup costs and what I understood Becky talking about is the accountability mechanisms and if how they should apply, you know, to the mechanism that is chosen and fund allocation.

So the question I actually added in the chat was, you know, is that a question that should be called out in the initial report because I don't think we really reference that anywhere or, you know, whether the group wants to make a recommendation on that, I don't know, as it hasn't really been discussed I don't know if the group is ready for that but whether it should be called out that may be an area that needs to be further considered and input is welcome on that. But again, I may have misunderstood what changes you were referring to.

Erika Mann: Yes, I think you misunderstood this point, but let's go back. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. What I understood from what Becky said is it is conceivable that a bylaw change might be needed to make sure that the actions we take in regard to these funds are not subject to the reconsideration processes and the other accountability mechanisms. So that's what I understood that there might be a bylaw change that would be required because of the desire to exclude and reduce our liabilities on these things.

Erika Mann: Yes, in particular the liability for the Board, fiduciary liability. Yes, and she's confirming it, Becky, I see she's giving you support, Alan. Okay, Marika, is this sufficiently clear, so we would – I would – I believe this point, setup



costs, we take out on any particular, it's not a reference to one particular mechanism but it's a general one. So we will have to find a different place for it.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. What I've suggested that under A and B we make clear as well that there may be legal fees involved to draft – to modify bylaws and agreements, so there's at least, you know, those costs are the same and then the only difference in startup costs relates to the IRS approval.

Erika Mann: Yes. And put in might so keep it sufficient...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Erika Mann: ...flexible here. Perfect. Can we agree on this one here? Yes, no further comments here, nothing in the chat room. Please continue, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Erika. This is Marika again. Just to flag here, because I know that was the subject to a number of comments in relation to the objectives of fund allocation as well as the preamble. So staff has created a new section here which we attempt to explain a little bit more detail the work that the group did here and called out some of the elements of the preamble, so just encourage everyone to have a look at that and see if that addresses the comments that were made and if not of course, you know, feel free to suggest any kind of modifications or edits to this.

Scrolling further along, I think we're moving into the next section.

Erika Mann: Wait for a second, please. This is Erika. Marika, wait just a second. Can we stay...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Erika Mann: ...just for a second with this point? Have we included now, because I can't read it and I sent the comment in quite late, have we included now the agreement which we have received – achieved with the Board that we have the understanding that the project when they are going to be evaluated, the understanding is that they have to be in service of ICANN mission. Have we just included in this particular chapter or in any other chapter now?

Marika Konings: It's being referenced – this is Marika – it's being referenced that in the text that must be in service. It's not specifically called out that this was an agreement between the Board and the CCWG.

Erika Mann: Maybe we do – if the Board agrees, something you might want to comment on now, we can put this in a footnote or we can skip it completely. I would rather prefer to have it in a footnote so then we have the historical context as well included but some kind of preference not to do it please let us know.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. We can probably pull that because I think that was in one of the Board letters so we can probably pull out the quote from there in relation...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: It was a Board letter.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Erika Mann: Correct.

Marika Konings: Okay so I've made a note of that. Do you want me to continue?

Erika Mann: Please. It's Erika. Please, yes.

Marika Konings: Yes. Scrolling ahead, so that gets us into the section on preliminary recommendations and responses to the charter questions. There are a couple of items that we updated here in response to the response to suggestions from the group. So again, if there's any concern with the changes that we made or any further edits that you suggest to address those comments, of course happy to hear those.

So the next comment here is in relation to the reference on funds are used by the ICANN organization, distinct from the granting process, for example, to replenish the reserve funds. And this relates to charter question 10, "To what extent and if so how could ICANN the organization or constituent part thereof be the beneficiary if some of the auction funds?"

And so there are two comments here in relation to this specific sentence, one from Judith and that was reserve funding, "I agree with Maureen and for the document had stated that the use of auction funds to replenish the reserve fund is a bad idea. I understand that others think otherwise but it will not look good and is a poor operation decision. If others insist upon it, we need to institute a required amount of less than 10%."

And Maureen notes, "Second to last bullet point is still a sore point, using auction proceeds to replenish reserve funds and not something specific makes auction proceeds appear as fundraising for ICANN operations." So I think the question here from staff is, you know, what changes if any, need to be made in relation to this bullet point?

Erika Mann: Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes two things.

Erika Mann: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. I hope you can hear me. I didn't read this section as being in relation to auction funds because it might be hard to construe auction funds as a project that would be applied for. I presumed that if the Board decides, and there was a public comment to try to assess overall community input on this, that we use some of these auction funds for building up the reserve.

That might be through another mechanism, not a supplying to the whoever it is that's evaluating projects. I read this section as being could ICANN or part – constituent parts of ICANN apply for do-good projects, that is projects in the same line as we've been talking about all along but could we be recipients? So as an example, could At Large apply to do something, you know, in Africa or something like that.

Or conceivably could ICANN itself apply to do something in regard to the root server system that would be deemed to be something of benefit? So I didn't read this is an auction related thing; I presumed that if we were going to do auctions it would be done through another mechanism not to try to frame the – I'm sorry, if the reserve – if we do the reserve it's not going to be framed as this is a project for the benefit of the Internet users, but would be – would use some other mechanism to access the funds. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, Alan. Maureen please. Maureen, you might be on mute.

Maureen Hilyard: Thank you. Sorry, I was just unmuting myself. I just wanted to clarify the comment I made is that I think that it was just a general funding of the reserve as opposed to being more specific and as Alan has mentioned, you know, a worthwhile project or something like that would probably be more appropriate than just, you know, sort of granting for example to replenish the reserve fund. That was just the point that I wanted to make. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes. Thank you so much, Maureen and Alan. This is Erika. We have actually, if you remember, we had two discussions on this topic. So one was actually a discussion about the replenishment and the second one was then we moved more to the – Alan framed it now, can ICANN or a constituency participate in a larger project through such an approach would be able to receive funding? And we had an understanding here between us that this would be something we would favor.

We never discussed that much Option A, shall there be a complete replenishment of the – or part replenishment of the reserve fund. And so far I don't know what your options are here. We definitely need to capture the second point, Marika, because I believe we haven't captured it here.

And then the either be raised as a question here and ask the public what the public is thinking and the community thinking about this and we keep the two point captures or we just drop the first point and only talk about the second option in allowing ICANN and the constituencies to participate in projects and then have some kind of relief. This wouldn't help the reserve fund but it would at least allow ICANN to define bigger projects which they couldn't otherwise finance through the existing reserve fund.

Alan, you are typing something which I can't read again so, Marika, please be so kind and look at the chat room and please read it.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Thanks, Erika. Alan notes that Becky's input in this might be useful. Judith then stated, "I think it's worthwhile. A project could go through the same mechanism as all projects." And Alan then responds, "Judith, yes, unless ICANN is forbidden to apply which is the issue here I thought." And I noted the point in response to I think a comment you made, I believe that the reserve fund conversation was or is subject to a separate conversation so I'm not really sure how appropriate it would be to – for this group to also start asking about it if it's already being dealt with somewhere else. But again, it's up to you – to the group to decide.

Erika Mann: Yes, no I agree. Let me have a look again on the language. But we are mentioning the reserve fund here, ICANN the organization or a constituent part thereof could potentially be a beneficiary in either of two scenarios. And then the first one reference to the reserve fund; and the second one – I can't see the second bullet point.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So I think it separates out – and sorry, it covers the two pages. The first point I think kind of – explains I think the scenario that Alan described where, you know, part of the auction proceeds may be used to replenish the reserve funds before it's actually moved into, you know, the mechanism to allocate funding. And the second one I think discusses or describes more, and I'll scroll a little bit down, indeed the way in which ICANN or constituent parts could benefit from the funds through the granting process so whereby an SO or AC or subpart thereof may be able to apply for auction proceeds.

Erika Mann: Yes, this is Erika. I think the second point is clear; the first one we may have to redefine the language a bit more because this would be something which would happen, it's outside of our scope, it's a different discussion, so we explain this here more, the debate which is going on elsewhere and it wouldn't be that funds would be then moved to the reserve fund but it would be the money currently – the auction proceeds money allocated in a separate budget which would then be – a certain amount would go into the reserve fund. So we have to clarify language here, give a better explanation what we are talking here about, make clear it's a separate discussion and make a reference here where it is debated and a footnote and so focus primarily on the second bullet point.

Just checking if everybody agrees with this approach. Somebody is coming in. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks, Erika. I have two – one point and one question. Actually I think the way you framed it or the way the draft report frames it is not bad here; it gives two scenarios that then could be commented on by respondents to the draft report. When you talk about the separate conversation, is the conversation outside of this working group? Is that the work that's going on dealing with the reserve funds completely independent of this working group? Or is there – where is that separate conversation? I just want to track where that is.

Erika Mann: Yes this is Erika. If my understanding is still correct, but please object to it in particular Board members, it would be a decision the Board would take in cooperation with the chair of the SO and AC and their communities. And then it would practically bypass this working group. But please, Becky, or Maarten, or somebody else who wants to comment on this. This is my

understanding about it. I haven't seen any recent debate so I'm sure if this is still the – my words are still reflecting the current situation. Becky, do you want to comment on it?

Becky Burr: Just repeat your – I'm sorry, I was distracted, could you just repeat your understanding so I can...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: My understanding what I remember from what Cherine was telling me was that this would be a discussion the Board would have with the SO and AC chair and they would take a decision about it and it would be then something which you would – and there was the report which you issued. So I don't know where the status is about the report concerning this item, so you would have to tell me. But it is definitely...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Yes. Go ahead.

Becky Burr: Go ahead. If there's somebody else who knows the answer to that question? Okay, we think that you are right, Erika. Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Maybe – Becky, maybe we should check again. You check maybe with Cherine and Chris if our understanding is correct so that we have a good framing – phrasing here about this topic. We don't want to go too much into details but we definitely want to capture the status quo. Jonathan, is this something you can support?



Jonathan Robinson: Thanks for coming back to me, Erika. I'm not, I mean, I understand this – that separate conversation and I don't think that precludes this group from having the wording that currently exists there. So I'm slightly still confused by you know, how these two – to me it doesn't seem that they can't coexist. This group can have an opinion as to whether ICANN the organization can or cannot and under what terms they might be able to apply for the auction funds; and ICANN organization or Board or Board in conjunction with SO/ACs can in parallel consider how they might work on replenishing the reserve fund by whatever means. Although frankly, if it is to use these auction funds I think it would be perhaps more complicated if this group hadn't offered anything and there was a completely independent track that considered something this group wasn't considering. But I may be missing a subtlety here.

Erika Mann: No, no you're not missing anything. We have an in depth discussion about this topic; you're not missing anything. You're absolutely correct. My point is more how do we want to phrase it because I believe we can't just state it as a fact and ask people for opinion without saying that there is a separate discussion going on.

So that's why I'm saying we should make a footnote where we just make a reference where else this topic is debated because otherwise we raise expectations, we raise, you know, many people to comment on something just because they're getting angry without them noticing that there is a more complex environment related to this point. I'm not saying we should take it out, we just should make a footnote and give some – a little bit more explanation to it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks, Erika. And then in that case I think I understand you clearly and it seems to me that's a very logical way to deal with it. This group expresses its opinion in line 839 onwards; others in commenting on the draft report may well have a view and you've for completeness put a reference to the fact that this isn't the only place where – the reserve fund by way of the auction funds being discussed and make reference to it. I think that's complete and logical. Thanks.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much and thank you so much for wording this so nicely. Alan and then I will read the comments from Xavier and from Becky. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. If I think about how would we go about having ICANN apply for our auction funds through the project process, we would have to write a completely different set of rules for such an application. First of all, the concept of the evaluation group saying, no, we don't think so, and putting that decision in a small group of people whose expertise is in development projects, is sort of mind boggling.

Second of all, we were talking about a large enough amount of money that we would allocate it according to our normal rule in tranches probably. Moreover there would have to be evaluations after the fact of was the money used well? So if we try to fit the auction proceeds into as a project we are going to almost have to write a separate set of rules for it. So I just don't see the merits of going down that path but that's maybe just me. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Erika, we cannot hear you if you're speaking.

Erika Mann: I was on mute. Can you hear me?

Marika Konings: We can hear you now. Yes.

Erika Mann: Oh funny, I was on mute. Okay. So I said I think we have a – I believe we have an understanding between us. Marika, what we shall do is to do a first – to do a drafting based on what we discussed here and then I give you the floor in a second to summarize it and then we will send – we will resend any how this – the review of what we discussed today to the full group and then we can have another feedback and see if it captured the language well. And in the meantime, Becky can just check and to be certain that we captured the footnote which will provide the language was captured well. So back to you, Marika. Please summarize and move forward.

Marika Konings: Yes. Thanks, Erika. So there's agreement indeed to add a footnote here that links to the ongoing conversations that are taking place separately and of course everyone is welcome to provide additional input if they have – if that doesn't sufficiently clarify the situation. So then scrolling further down...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Yes, and we may want to capture the point – just to be for – it's Erika again – for – to be complete we want to capture the point Alan made. We don't need to explore it too much but we want to – we want to say that any decision about this would fall in the different rules and would not be taken by any entity outside of ICANN because this would be a call ICANN and ICANN constituency decisions if this would ever be taken. So we have to capture this as well.

Marika Konings: Okay thanks, Erika. And noted. So that does lead into in the same – under the same charter questions, the preliminary recommendation that we have here in brackets, or well, there is no recommendation but a question for the CCWG whether or not the group is read to make a recommendation in this regard in

relation to this question whether ICANN or a part thereof should be able to apply for auction proceeds or whether you just want to call this out as an area where you would like further input as part of the comment period so you're able to make a determination on that after that.

And both Maureen and Judith made a comment here noting that Maureen says that “I agree that the applicant would need to demonstrate that the proposed use for funds is separate from work that’s already funded as part of ICANN's daily operations.” And Judith notes, “I also agree with Maureen on her comments, the applicant would need to demonstrate that the proposed use for funds is separate from work that’s already funded by – as part of ICANN's daily operations.”

So the question here is, you know, is there more specific – is anything more specific you want to note here with regards to preliminary recommendation or do you want to leave this as an open question for which you would like community input as part of the initial report?

Erika Mann: It’s Erika. I’m checking if somebody wants to make a comment? My feeling is to leave it for the community and to put it forward as a question but I want to see what somebody else – typing. I can't read what Judith is saying. Vanda is typing. I would leave it for the community. Judith is saying – writing a separate – I can't read it, Marika, I’m sorry. It is so scrambled here where I am, I can't read it, sorry. Please.

Marika Konings: I think Judith’s comment actually relates to the previous conversation because it refers to writing a separate set of rules might be a good idea and will make things very transparent. And I think that – if I didn't misunderstand I think that was in response to earlier conversations. And Maureen has just noted as well that she’s also happy to take it to the (unintelligible), she’s okay with that.

Erika Mann: Okay. It's Erika. I don't see anybody else making a comment or raising their hand. Judith is writing. But my feeling is we have an understanding we put this forward as a – to the community which I actually like. Yes, Judith as well, so let's move forward, Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay thanks, Erika. So we'll update this reflect that at this stage the CCWG is not putting forward any specific recommendation in relation to this charter question but that it's looking for input from the community in order to make a – to be able to make a determination. Okay, scrolling further down, again, here are some redline changes that addresses a comment that people provided. I think that already actually takes us to towards the end of the document. I think there were a couple of additional changes that we made to the examples document based on feedback that was received. Oh, here we go, this is actually another question I have.

This is the – well Annex D which we've I think now renamed from preamble to guidance for proposal review and selection on the recommendation of Daniel. Actually going through it I noticed that – and again it cuts over two pages – that a part in here appears to be a duplication from what was rewritten later on which appears here at the bottom. I suspect it may be the result of we had several redline versions that we were working on and I suspect that this part here stayed in by mistake so my proposal is to remove this and leave the rewritten part which is the more elaborate bullets that follow underneath.

So again, I think, you know, people can have a look at that and if that's incorrect, you know, please let us know. But if not we'll go ahead and remove the part highlighted in red which is a duplication of what appears a bit further down in the same document or in the same section.

Erika Mann: Yes, if it's a duplication just take it out. I mean, you can see this better as we can see it right now. And I don't remember it when I reviewed it; I haven't actually noticed it. So yes, just do it and we can review it and in case somebody has a different opinion we can change it again.

Marika Konings: Okay. Thanks. And then I just scrolling to the end of the document, but I think here again we made some updates and some changes based on the comments but they didn't seem to rise to the level of requiring further conversation so I think that is all the comments that we flagged, so, you know, we've taken extensive note of the further changes that need to be made so our proposal is that we'll go ahead and apply those changes and then, you know, circulate it again to the group so you have another opportunity to review and make sure that the changes that we've applied reflect our conversation today and if not, of course, you're more than welcome to suggest any further edits that need to be applied. So I think that's all for the initial report, Erika.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, Marika. And thank you so much and team, Emily and Joke for this excellent work. I know how much work it is and you already have so much to do in many different working groups, so thank you for this great work. We have – we need to discuss the next item, I don't believe anybody wants to raise a topic but I wait for a second just to see if somebody wants to raise a topic which is not covered yet or you feel is missing in the document. Now this seems to be not the case, Marika.

So we can move to the next item which would be the Point 4 and we need to determine how we will deal with remaining issues and we can combine it with Point 5 is the question how we want to – do we need to schedule another call or can we handle the rest by email or shall we have another call in two weeks time? Marika, back to you.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. I think it's actually probably more for the group. Based on the input and conversation today it doesn't look like we have any major outstanding items. You know, what we can maybe propose is that we go ahead and schedule the call for in two weeks time so at least we have a placeholder but, you know, after we push out the report we'll put as well a kind of firm deadline by which we expect people to, you know, provide further comments and then basically based on that maybe the leadership team can make an assessment on whether or not that call is needed.

As said, based on input today, it may not be necessary and maybe any, you know, remaining edits can be resolved on the mailing list. You know, one thing we note as well...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...because of course – oh yes?

Erika Mann: No, no, just one question related to it, my understanding is that we have the 8th of October as the day where we want to issue the report. Is this correct?

Marika Konings: Yes that's the target date for the – like the latest date for which we would like to publish it.

Erika Mann: Exactly. So which leaves us from now until – how much time do we have actually? So I really don't want to – want to ensure that we really stay within this set timetable. Today is the 21st so we do...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: So meeting in two weeks – yes, so meeting on the 4th of October which still fits within that deadline so in the two weeks’ timeframe. And...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Yes, apologize for disrupting you. I can't see much and I can't follow the discussion all too well today from this place I am. So yes, I think this would work, 4th of October just in case – just that we have a review in case we need it and in case we have finalized everything and no serious topics come up until then we can actually cancel then the call. I see Alan. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I must have been working with Marika for far too long because she said exactly what I was going to say, schedule a meeting, have a placeholder in case we need it. I would add, however, that we don't need to be afraid of – if we only have one or two items that need to be discussed, you know, saying it's only going to be a 30-minute meeting, so we don't have to fill up the hour and a half if we don't need it but I think it's a wise move to have it allocated in our calendars just in case. We don't want to miss the deadline of the 8th.

Erika Mann: Exactly. Yes, no we don't have to have a discussion for 1.5 hour, I totally agree. Okay, perfect. Marika, the point you wanted to raise? I disrupted you.

Marika Konings: No, thanks, Erika. No the only thing I wanted to mention I think we called out in one of the comments as well, in parallel we can also start working on the public comment announcement because I think there was some input as well to note that, you know, it is important there that we're very clear on you know, what this is about and what we're asking for. So that's also something we can share with the group for input to make sure that, you know, everyone's aligned with when this – this goes out for public comment, you know, people



are comfortable with the way to communicate it and announced as well as of course the report itself.

Erika Mann: It's Erika. That's perfect, Marika. What is the- how much time do you need to revise the document?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think the changes are pretty straightforward so I'm hoping that, you know, at the latest by the end of this week we'll be able to circulate it.

Erika Mann: Perfect. Thank you so much. Okay, this just leaves me to thank you all. Thank you, Marika and team in particular. And we schedule another meeting, another call on 4th of October but please – in the case we don't need it we will cancel the call. Wishing you all the very best and talk to you soon. Thank you so much. Back to you, Julie.

Julie Bisland: Thank you so much, Erika. Today's meeting has been adjourned. You can disconnect your lines and enjoy the rest of your day or night. Thank you.

END