

**ICANN
Transcription
CCWG Auction Proceeds Call
Thursday, 21 September 2017 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-21sep17-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p5517zrzqyj/> Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/a2zwAw>

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

Woman: Right, Right. Thank you so much (Anderson). Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the Cross Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Procedures call on the 21st of September 2017. In the interest of time today there will be no roll call. We have quite a few participants online. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you are only on the Adobe audio bridge today would you please let yourself be known now?

Jonathan Robinson: Hi. It's Jonathan Robinson. I'm on the audio only for the moment.

Tony Harris: Tony Harris on the audio link.

Woman: Thank you.

Erika Mann: Erika Mann on the audio link.

Woman: Great. (Unintelligible) I know all of you. Okay and...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: (Unintelligible) is on the audio link as well or he's somewhere he mentioned something before.

Woman: Okay, great. Thanks Erika. We'll note that. And as a reminder to all participants 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. With this I will hand the meeting back over to Erika Mann.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. I have a miserable connection today so please let me know if you can understand me. I'm on the audio but it's miserable of the Internet connection, apologies for this. Welcome first and happy that we can have the call today. There are many colleagues missing members and participants today so we might get through the agenda quite quickly today. Let's try at least.

The next item Point 2 on the agenda is the declaration of interest. Anybody wants to make a comment here? No that's not the case. So then I have (unintelligible). I have to do an update and was checking to actually add my points on the Web site and the edit function did not work. So that's something we will have to check and see if it's just on my - didn't work on my end or it didn't work in principle.

So I have to make an update because my – not my company but a company that I work for Covington need to have a client who's engaged in one of the disputes. This is not related to my work in the - in this group. It's got nothing to do with it and got nothing to do with anything else I do but I want to make the update so that everybody is informed about this. So any questions with regard to this point?

Jonathan Robinson: Erika it's Jonathan just a quick point. I mean I actually buy some coincidence I updated my statement of interest recently. It wasn't a material update so I don't think it's substantial but I want to particularly draw attention

to the group on it. But it was more that I simply made it - have made minor edits to make it more current but to your point it was possible to edit this on the wiki so...

Erika Mann: Interesting.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...(unintelligible) you're aware of that.

Erika Mann: Thank you Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

Erika Mann: Wonder why I couldn't use the edit function. I will look at it again later again. Thank you so much. Anybody else? No okay. Then let's move on to Point 3.

Three - point three we have to cancel today because Xavier and some can't be with us. The board is meeting in Montevideo and the legal and the team of Xavier attending the board meeting so they can't be with us. Neither can be (Becky) and (Asha) today so apologies from their end. We will move this to the next meeting and then we can have a debate about a topic which we covered under Point 3.

So with this let's move to Point 4 which is the review of assessment of the example of fund allocation. And Marika she sent in her email -- I think it was Marika -- there was an attachment with all of the examples and we can see this now on the screen as well. Marika would you love to guide us through the example and explain what we already have captured and what we might think what is still missing there?

Marika Konings: Sure. This is Marika. So what you indeed see up on the screen in the Adobe Connect room is the latest version of a review of examples document that

was created as a Google document to allow all of you to provide input on this exercise. And as you may recall during the last meeting where we achieved preliminary agreement on the overall objective for fund allocation but it was also agreed that an important part of that exercise would be to go through the examples that had been identified in response to an earlier survey as well as any other examples of people may want to add to the list to get a sense of whether those examples in deed fit within ICANN's mission as well as the overall objectives that had been sent for fund allocation. Again as part - the objective of this exercise is to make sure there's a common understanding of what types of projects would be considered within scope and what types of projects wouldn't be considered in scope.

So what I did in this document I first pulled out the - ICANN's mission statement and to facilitate reference to that. And you'll see a column with A, B, C, D, E, F, G, et cetera. And similarly for the proposed objectives for fund allocation that was developed by the CCWG I gave those numbers so that as part of this exercise as CCWG members and participants are able to refer to those letters and numbers when reviewing at a different example and indicating, you know, which part of ICANN's mission or which part of the objectives specific projects would fall under.

So if you then look indeed at the table you see that each example in part of a specific row and for each of that example everyone has been requested to identify, you know, whether it's considered consistent with the ICANN bylaws and if so indicate with which part it seems consistent and similarly if being consistent with the post objectives and again highlighting which part of the objectives it's considered consistent with.

And then there's also a column for people that want to make notes or comments in that regard. And as noted as well in the introduction to the document it's also possible for people to indicate if they don't believe it's part or is consistent with ICANN bylaw or the objectives at the - and which preliminary agreement has been reached. So as you can see in this

document so far I believe it's only (Daniel) and (Vonda) that actually had gone in and made some comments. So I guess the question is, you know, do people need more time to review this and are people aligned with the input that (Daniel) has provided and what do you think is the best way to get through this exercise because it is important that there is a common understanding amongst the CCWG with regards to what is considered, you know, consistent and falling within scope.

I think as we've discussed before, you know, some of these examples may in the future provide guidance to those interested in applying of what, you know, would be considered consistent as well as, you know, what wouldn't be consistent. So I think that's where we're work currently at. So it would be good to get some feedback from the group how you think you want to complete this task and get it into a shape that everyone is comfortable and everyone is aligned with which examples are considered consistent and which ones aren't.

As noted before you also have the ability in this document to add additional examples that you think should be considered. So far only one has been added compared to what was in the original document and that is Number 15. But I said, you know, you have the ability to add additional examples that may be considered. So I...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Yes (unintelligible) familiar to you...

Marika Konings: Exactly.

Erika Mann: I don't know if you can see that just disrupting you because he's saying the problem part of the work and it needs more time so he requests more time. I wonder Marika because it's always very difficult in these calls to review these

documents. You have sent them in the Word document if I remember this right or internally?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's currently a Google Doc but I'm happy to circulate it as well as a Word document if people think that's easier.

Erika Mann: Yes, I'm just opening - this is Erika. I'm just opening right now. Yes it's a Word document, a Google document. So let me ask everybody are you all comfortable in using Google documents or do you prefer another kind of Word and like Word document because my feeling sometimes is that some members don't - or participants don't feel always comfortable in using Google documents provide both I see from Marilyn and some others are typing. Can we do this Marika or is it causing you a lot of more work?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm happy to send both the Google Doc link as well as a Word version of the latest document. It just may take a little bit more time for staff to integrate the two if, you know, many people fill in the doc and others in the Word documents but I think from a staff perspective that shouldn't be a major hurdle. If that makes it easier for the group we're happy to accommodate that.

Erika Mann: Yes some colleagues - this is Erika some colleagues seem to have difficulty with Google document. I think Kavouss and Marilyn. Okay so if it's possible and not causing too much work for you then I would appreciate it if you could do this.

So how do we want to carry this forward today because I think it would be good maybe to spend about half an hour if - or less maybe 15 minutes on this topic? Can you maybe point out to some of the examples Marika and just give some ideas of what we have received so far? I can do this as well but then I have to move to the Google document because it's impossible on the screen right now to scroll around. It's too difficult to read.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I just know that Kavouss has his hand up. You may want to go to him first.

Erika Mann: He has a hand up? Okay I was just moving to the document and then I lose the sight on the track of what is going on here. Kavouss please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Sorry hand is down okay.

Erika Mann: Okay, good. Hand is down, no other hands.

Marika Konings: Yes so this is Marika. And I know (Daniel)'s comment in the chat I was hoping that the instructions were clear. So basically everyone indeed can add it but it all will appear in the (unintelligible) line so we're able to see who is editing what. I did indicate that it would be helpful and (Daniel) has done that very well to add initials or a name to people that are adding comments. So it will be easier especially as more and more people maybe are filling this out to, you know, get an idea of, you know, who has made the comment and it will allow them as well for asking for further questions.

One thing that just occurred to me as well, you know, if people think it's easier to do it in a survey format, you know, that is something of course we could do as well. But it may give for less flexibility on providing input because as you know now in principle the first two columns the idea is that, you know, people are either, you know, say yes and then reference a specific number or letter or no. But as you know it as well at least noted from the comments that (Daniel) has provided in many cases it may not be that easy. And as you ask for I don't know how much value there is in going through the specific comments but one thing I did observe in (Daniel)'s comments is that he noted on several occasions may not be, you know, specifically called out in the mission but it's done in the service of it. So again maybe it's something to consider for the group is that sufficiently consistent if it's in service of if it doesn't fall specifically within what is currently in the mission? And again it's a question that I don't have an answer to.

Erika Mann: Yes.

Marika Konings: But that may be something the group needs to look at.

Erika Mann: This is Erika.

Marika Konings: And I know that...

Erika Mann: Maybe just to for colleagues who are opening the document you have to go to Page 3. And on Page 3 so ignore the other pages beforehand but then you in case you can open the document on Page 3 on the left side you do see the examples which were sent from colleagues. And then you have three columns to the right. So one is consistent with the section of ICANN bylaws and yet consistent with part of the proposed CCWG objectives for funds. So you have different rubrics and columns and then on the very right you have the possibility to add notes and comments. So in case you can work with the Google document that's a nice way of working and sending comments to us. In case you can't do it on the work document it's much more difficult then we will have to see how we can capture comments then.

Marika I'm not sure if the survey is working. Maybe we should leave it like it is but may be give a little bit more time as (Elliott) is saying, postpone the debate which we have for today send another reminder with the attached document so both in Google document and in Word document and remind colleagues just please to be so kind to add their comment and if they have examples as well because I don't think so it's helpful to have a discussion about the topic today. It seems to be too early. I see (Elliott) is raising his hand. (Elliott)?

(Elliott): So sorry, had to get off mute there. You can hear me okay?

Erika Mann: Yes.

(Elliott): Great. So, you know, I do want to call out one feature of this exercise, you know, that I at least want us to be contemplating if not adjusting for. I do strongly believe and support that we are taking an approach where, you know, we're looking at conformity with mission as a gating item. I'm so I do think that's great.

It feels to me though, you know, just as, you know, my experience of going through this exercise was to open it up, see that it was a fairly significant body of work that I wanted to think about and then, you know, how can I put aside, you know, 90 minutes to 180 minutes, you know, an hour and a half to three hours to dig through it and, you know, give it sort of the time that it deserves and that (Daniel) has obviously put in? But one of the things I was struck by in looking at it was that this exercise by constraining it to conformity with mission, you know, we're almost impliedly, you know, sort of speaking positively of things that we might really not be supportive of other than the fact that they conform with mission.

So I feel like, you know, there almost needs to be on another variable here or another column where members can express some sort of qualitative or quantitative response to this type of work, you know, or to, you know, these are - some of these do certainly have overlap some of the examples but, you know, they do, you know, they kind of have a fair level of uniqueness. But I just but, you know, it felt like too empty an exercise without also taking the opportunity to let us weigh in on how we see this type of work not, you know, in terms of and value, in terms of desirability in a more general sense. You know, I know that anybody who has volunteered to invest this time and effort in this particular working group would certainly have some views around how they would like to see this money earmarked so I wanted to offer that. Thank you.

Erika Mann: This is Erika, thank you (Elliot). I think you're right I think we indeed need to add and maybe a column Marika which is just an open comment - an open

column. We'll have to think about the title because it's true there might be, you know, projects which can enter the mind of participants and members who know all about certain examples which are interesting for us but they might not want to put this into the columns because they're too narrow. They're are not related narrowly to the mission but they're still interesting for us even if we wouldn't take them as later on something, you know, where funds could be provided to. So that's an interesting point and I would agree we can have a discussion about it if somebody else would not support it. And then in addition I see comments which are Marika they are interesting for us.

So from (Daniel) and (Marilyn) and from (Hadia) they're saying that we might have to explain a little better how comments shall be provided. So (Marilyn) is saying the others should - use for names, no initials, no anonymous comment. And (Daniel) is saying we need some more guidance and (Hadia) again she's saying we need should use the Google Docs and not the survey.

So it might be the case that we do not receive sufficient comments because the - of the way I'm providing comments it's maybe not totally clear how it shall be done in a Google document. Since we want to continue to work with Google document is there may be something we can do to provide a short introduction either today or maybe next time better so we can prepare it?
Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes so this is Marika. As I noted in the chat that there is already a column for notes and comments so people do have the flexibility there to add anything they believe, you know, they cannot put into the other columns. You know, of course we can add another column and, you know, I may just have an idea what the heading should be. We can do that as well.

But, you know, I do know that then it will become very full with a lot of comments. So again, you know, if there's a clear indication of, you know, what a column would be for and, you know, we can add it. But I just want to caution you may be not to add to much there. And again in those comments

are not expected to limit you in any way of what you want to provide. And as well with regards to adding additional examples, you know, as said, you know, this document allows for that and there you may also indicate if you think they need - they're not consider consistent but, you know, for other reasons you would like to see them added to the list. Again there's nothing preventing you from doing that.

With regards to Word document, Google Doc or a survey thinking a bit more about it maybe the survey is actually a next best one. Indeed we have more people that have provided their input and their hopefully may be a clearer picture around, you know, whether people believe it's consistent or not, then maybe we can try to confirm those assumptions by means of a survey. So that may be a way of at a later stage, you know, confirming what may be the outcome.

Erika Mann: Yes. This is Erika. And then maybe we can think about how we can help colleagues to work with the Google document in case they're not familiar with it. Then we can think of about it how we can do this. (Elliott) would you see a time if we would keep the current format as Marika is recommending but we understand that examples can be added which not related to the mission statement in the - in a narrow sense and then you just put in the comments?

By the way if I look at the examples provided by (Daniel) and his comments he already did this in such a way. Like when you take the first example of a project, a coalition of organization working on remote participation tools and content receives a long term grant to support localization efforts. And then it continues the example and (Daniel) was again writing not part of the ICANN mission but in service of it and then he continues explaining it. Would you feel comfortable with this or would you insist that we need separate column?

(Elliott): Yes, I'm going for something a little bit different. You know, I put the comment in chat in response to Marika's. You know, I thought about using that column but I feel like that column was kind of, you know, could and should be used

for clarifications, questions, et cetera, you know, ways to kind of extend the example. You know, if the example was blue then yes and if the example was red then no. And I really think that there's that it's very important, you know, again to just reinforce a comment I made in chat to use this opportunity to not only see our collective view of conformance with mission but also to map that with desirability.

You know, we do want to be efficient in how we're all using our time and effort in the time and political capital of the working group itself. You know, and I expect or would hope that this exercise, you know, would identify some small number of places where conformance with mission was unclear but the desirability from us collectively was very high. If those places don't exist that's great because then, you know, we have failing as it relates to mission. And if there are one or two of those places then that's where we can focus our efforts. And what I fear is going through a serial exercise where we spend a lot of time debating every category's conformance with mission when only some small number of them really matter to us as a group. I hope that made sense and happy to take any questions on that.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. This is Erika. I see some comments here from in the chat room which I can't read very well with my contact lenses, some from Marika. I think she's responding to your point (Elliott). I personally understand your point and I wonder if we can maybe take the section about notes and comments and reframe it so we don't have another fourth column. Let us think about it and maybe during the discussion now maybe you come up with an idea what the title should be for the section. And let me move to Kavouss. Kavouss please?

Kavouss Arasteh :Yes Erika. I think when we drafted mission in the WorkStream 1 at the beginning it was sufficiently many - contains many issues. But then based on some discussion we transferred some of them to the core value. So I don't think that we should limit ourselves only something in conformity with a mission we should also make reference to the core value. So not to limited

that one. That is number one. And number two perhaps that is to say we should not work on abstract. Let's put the idea and conform with the mission and if you at this meeting agree I think that as they are - the - probably the core value were applicable and then wait for the comments we receive then we will decide what is inside the mission or associated with the core value or is totally outside.

I have some difficulty if we do an allocation for something which totally outside the mission and core value and we do something so we are not opening some sort of generosity to something which does not belong to our work and our activity. So the first question is could you please ask the colleagues attending the meeting whether they agree to also make reference to the core value? Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you Kavouss. I think - thank you for your comments. I think - this is Erika. We're not stressing and (Elliott) was not saying yes searching. If I talk for him right now it's not searching for something which is outside. But there are broader, kind of broader line projects which might come up. We want to identify them to be clear about what we want to achieve.

So can we agree Kavouss you included all of us. Can we agree that we will find a way to either reframe the third column which we have in the moment on our document that - so we can capture these kind of examples and projects which have a broader line character and which we need to understand between us would they be eligible for in - for funding or not? This is just for us the - a theoretical exercise at this stage. So would you agree that we try either take the first column or find a different way in doing this?

Just in case you don't agree just either put something in the chat room or please raise your hand. No, okay that's not the case. Then I think Marika we have an understanding and we can test it and talk about it maybe how best to do it. And if (Elliott) can come up in the meantime with the title and help us to send something to us this would be great. Okay Marika do you want to

continue and maybe talk more about the examples or should we conclude the debate about this topic?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. It may be more productive if - and if people have the time to review the examples first and provide their input and then in the next meeting and I can try to indeed assess based on the input provided whether there's a kind of common view emerging and then it may be more useful to have the conversation around whether indeed that aligns with the perspective of the group or basically identify those examples where there's a clear divergence between views and see how that can be resolved.

One question I did have in the chat is what is a reasonable deadline to give to everyone because especially for go to use two formats it may take a bit of time for staff to integrate those two and especially as well if you expect us to make an assessment based on the input provided or kind of summary of that.

So I was just wondering whether our next meeting is scheduled for the 5th of October would it be reasonable to ask everyone to provide their input by the 2nd of October? Would that work for everyone?

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Marika how about we postpone this and do it the - in four weeks' time because my feeling is (policy) probably more time. We should certainly maybe have a quick look at what we received until next time and have a short debate about it but I would assume maybe we need to put more time to finalize this. So...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: ...when do we have the meeting after next time and is it...

Marika Konings: That would be the 19th of October.

Erika Mann: The 19th of October. I would feel more comfortable but let me ask colleagues what do you prefer? And do you think you're ready to have this added comments and example by next time for our next call and then sufficiently ahead of the deadline like Marika just recommended or do you rather prefer a month?

Tony Harris: Hello? Can I comment?

Erika Mann: Yes, anytime please.

Tony Harris: Yes Tony Harris. Just checking if I'm unmuted now. Yes I think the date of October 19 gives us a little more time to really get into the comments because I think a lot of us are rushing around right now.

Erika Mann: Yes this is Erika. I see some other comments similar comments. Kavouss recommends the 19th as well and (Marilyn) is saying similar to what I said but let's have an exchange about the topic. Next time I do agree and she's recommending to set the final date for the initial comments as well. Let's have the final date on the 19th and...

Marika Konings: Erika this is...

Erika Mann: ...hopefully we can then - yes please?

Marika Konings: Erika this is Marika. If the deadline is the 19th it wouldn't allow for any time for staff to actually pull together the comments. So if I can maybe suggest having a few days prior to the call they will actually help us synthesize the input and bring the different documents together. So if I could suggest maybe 15 or 16 and so that hopefully will give us than enough time to get everything ready for 19 of October meeting.

Erika Mann: Yes. This is Erika absolutely. I meant 19 for our exchange you're absolutely right. So what do you recommend the 15th or 14th?

Marika Konings: Yes 15th would be ideal so then on the Monday we have at least everything that has been provided by the deadline.

Erika Mann: Perfect. Okay so let's do the 15th. I'm watching chat room so only in the case you believe that's too tight then please send your comment. Otherwise we agree on the 15th. Any other comments with regard to this point? Yes Marilyn we can - this is Erika again we can have a short exchange about what we received at our next call. But we stick for the deadline on the 15th now.

Okay perfect. Then let's move to the next item on our agenda. And that's Point 5 review of the latest definition and description of open Internet concept. You remember this was the debate we had now many times and we again we had two other Google Document. Many colleagues contributed to this so thank you so much.

And I would recommend that we have a quick discussion about it. I tried to add some comments this morning. I'm not sure, actually, if you can see it because I had some difficulties with Google today and it wasn't working very well. I tested it with Marika and Marika couldn't see it. I then went back and redid it but I'm still not sure if you all can see it.

So why don't we have...

Marika Konings: Erika?

Erika Mann: Yes please?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I've been kicked out of Adobe Connect, so if I can maybe ask Michelle -- if she hasn't done so yet -- to upload the latest version and open the Internet definition.

Erika Mann: I'm just going back and seeing if it's still not there.

So I would say we have a quick exchange. So the main comments we really see -- which are relevant content-wise -- to discuss what the concern raised by Marilyn -- and last time by Alan as well -- saying that the concept of Open Internet -- particular the word open -- is maybe not the best word we should select for this kind of preamble because it's a term which is occupied in public quite often with the net-neutrality debate.

I had a little bit different opinion about it maybe because I felt that the concept of Open Internet changed over the history so many times and it has so many different connotations.

But I understand this concern and I don't think that we want to have an endless debate about if the word Open Internet is the best one or if we should look for another one.

What we wanted to capture was the idea -- and this is the back, again, reference to Point A is raised many times -- to understand that there might be projects which relate to the mission but the relation to the mission is not (unintelligible) all this clear.

And so then to allow the future evaluators -- not us right now because we understand what we are talking about -- but there might be evaluators in the future who will not automatically have the context and the full context to what ICANN is doing. They might need some guidance and some help.

So we wanted -- in this preamble -- to provide some kind of guidance in the sense that we try to embed ICANN and ICANN's mission into the border context of the Internet ecosystem. So this is what we were trying to do. And there we are.

So we will have to find a response. How do we want to introduce the topic about - in the preamble? I tried this time a different way as you can see. I

took the mission statement, and just the first part of the mission statement.
And from there then I moved to the border Internet context.

I'm not sure if this is helping us much, but it might be a way of providing an
easier access and avoiding debating the topic about Open Internet. So
summons please colleagues.

Kavouss Arasteh: Erika, sorry. I am disconnected from Internet. Can I talk?

Erika Mann: Yes, we can hear you.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, sorry. I think it is very I would say dangerous to talk about Open Internet
in this group because it is very, very sensitive topic. So I fully agree with you
that we could inject the ideas in some sort of description in the preamble that
what we aiming are to do rather than going to the definition or even
description of Open Internet because it is much beyond the scope of our
activity.

So I see a little bit of difficulty that this group or this CCWG get involved in
that issue where they are type of a matter related entire Internet community.
So I am favor of preamble and I'm in favor of doing something which says
what we expected to do rather than defining any term for the matters that we
are dealing with; so avoiding the term Open in particular or Internet -- Open
Internet.

Just we say what we are looking for to cover a little bit more than the mission
of the ICANN and more Internet oriented or Internet objective oriented. So
this is my view.

Sorry that I was disconnected from the Internet. I couldn't ask for the floor
before. Thank you.

Erika Mann: That's a very (unintelligible). Thank you so much Kavouss.

I'm looking at the chat rooms. So Marilyn is saying, "Focus on mission." Yes, she supports Kavouss, yes. So we go - Maureen as well.

I sense this before that, of course, many colleagues don't feel comfortable with the term Open Internet, and I'm fine dropping it. (Elliott), it's much more yours to you will have to come back mainly and defend it. But have a look first what I tried to do to help us all and maybe you like it.

So I can read it maybe the first three paragraphs because then I didn't change much afterwards. So what I edit, I took out the first preamble now the tradition or mission statement.

"The mission of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers "ICANN" is to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems as described in this Section," and then comes to the link to the ICANN Mission and Bylaws.

And then comes the what we already had captured. The purpose of this preamble is therefore to suggest or to offer guidance for this election of projects in areas that are relevant to and that support ICANN's mission.

The funds shall be able to support projects that support (unintelligible) back to the Open Internet culture, we have to see if we want to leave it and related to ICANN's ecosystem and mission statement.

And then the third paragraph would be within the CCWG auction proceeds, many members and participants believe it is helpful to relate the mission of ICANN to the Board or Internet to provide guidance for the auction proceeds funds application and selections wholesale for the use of the auction proceeds -- auction proceeds funds.

The mission statement is therefore the key perimeter for the fund application and selection process.

I think we have to clear this. This is a little bit maybe too many references to mission statement; one is enough. And it's a little bit heavy in language as well. But this needs to be done by an English speaker to review this and to ensure that it's a bit more elegant than it is right now.

But maybe we can get an understanding from you all if you would feel comfortable with (unintelligible) and that you agree that we have to work on the concept of Open Internet.

I think, (Elliott), please be so kind and maybe speak up again if you want to defend it. But I think we understand the concept, but we might have to select a different word to avoid the sensitivities some colleagues are referring to.

(Elliott), it's off again. (Unintelligible).

(Elliott): Sorry, yes, I have to get it off mute so I have to dig up the phone.

Erika Mann: Can you do it?

(Elliott): Yes, yes.

Erika Mann: Thank you.

(Elliott): So I do want to, you know, I'm going to get a little bit of chat in back channel and, you know, I understand that Kavouss is not on Chat. So, you know, I would like to better understand, you know, what the sensitivity is. You know, as someone has mentioned, for example, net-neutrality to me -- which, you know, rather than type back to them in Chat, you know, I would say that very specific things -- particularly like net neutrality.

You know, network neutrality, as an example with, you know, sort of a small end, is a pretty simple concept of common carriage in a public resource. Net Neutrality -- capital N's -- in a U.S. specific context is very political and driven with meeting. And I don't in any way conflate Open Internet with Net Neutrality - with, you know, capital N, Net Neutrality.

And frankly, you know, a small N -- net neutrality -- is a very small subset of what Open Internet means.

I do want to make sure that I'm hearing people who are uncomfortable with this. You know, I mean Kavouss said, "very very sensitive." You know, this shouts very simple to me. And so I really am genuinely interested in understanding what is very sensitive and, you know, maybe it will help me to either respond better or to, you know, sort of see, you know, that it is.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. I see Marilyn and then maybe Kavouss, you can prepare yourself to make a comment later.

Marilyn, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: May I talk please?

Erika Mann: Let me check, Kavouss, with Marilyn. Marilyn? Go ahead Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I understand and I'm sorry I am not in the Chat that some colleagues want to refer to network neutrality with a lowercase N.

But perhaps we should start with a description of something and toward anything that something which could be referred as and didn't put it in (unintelligible) and network neutrality -- not to be confused with an uppercase Network Neutrality -- which was a political. And even in the previous conversation, it was under discussion for many months or so.

I have no difficulty to also refer to that, but I have difficulty to define Open Internet -- the words Open Internet -- because of insensitivity. But neutrality with lowercase N and inverted comma as a description, (unintelligible) which could be referred to as network neutrality with lowercase N. Just put it for test by the people to see whether we should receive more comments on that.
Thank you.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Thank you, Kavouss.

Marilyn, are you ready to talk now? I see your hand. Marilyn, are you having difficulty?

Marilyn Cade: Can you hear me?

Erika Mann: Yes, I hear you now.

Marilyn Cade: Hello? Yes, yes, thanks.

I'll support Kavouss's suggestion. Look. Put it out there in the world. I will just say that Open Internet -- all by itself -- and I, you know, ICANN is not about the open Internet. ICANN is about the open and interoperable Internet.

An Open Internet is a different term than what we believe in and what we built from 1998 forward. And I'm going to be insistent that we adhere to our core mission and understand what that means. It has lots of possibility because the open and interoperable Internet, the single root -- not multiple root -- are what we adhere to.

So I think Kavouss has provided an idea. Put it out there. It's Open and Interoperable Internet, but I'm just going to say when you search and I'm going to use a corporate name, but when you search on any search engine on Open Internet, you get net neutrality.

So, you know, please understand. You might want to change the world, but if everybody else thinks your world is spelled differently than what you proposed, I know what it takes to change a brand. I changed brands when I was in the corporate sector.

Our brand is the Open Interoperable ICANN brand. We're not the Open Internet. Thanks. And thank you so much for letting me speak.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Thank you, Marilyn. Marilyn, maybe just to keep in mind what we wanted to do in this preamble and this introduction to connect ICANN and ICANN mission and ICANN history to the broader Internet.

So our why in approaching it -- at the beginning before you joined us -- was thinking the term Open Internet would sufficiently capture the broader Internet concept. So it wasn't a way of describing what ICANN is doing; but it was actually guiding us to the bigger Internet picture.

So I understand and I think we all understand your concern and the concern from many others. So we will try to find a different way and use the Open Interoperable Internet.

I see Daniel is making the comment we should (unintelligible). I have no problem with it.

Would this help? Everybody, can I ask you if you would feel comfortable if we would use Open Interoperable Internet? Would you feel comfortable if we would use this instead of just Open Internet?

Daniel said yes. Sorry, Manal said, "No, not for me." Ching, yes, Ching is saying something similar. "What I said and what I thought would be trying to find." (Elliott) is saying, "It's more not less." Ching made a reference to (unintelligible). Maureen is supporting and go with Open and Interoperable. So we have different comments here.

Maybe - I wonder if we should do the following because I think it might be difficult to continue to work together in this working group on the document. Maybe we can do now the following, and I want to ask you this. Maybe we should build a small drafting -- a tiny drafting team -- based on our discussion on the draft text which we have in front of us.

So we would ask this tiny -- maybe three people -- drafting team to prepare for us for next time. Again, ideally, two days ahead or three days ahead of our next call, a new document. Would you feel comfortable with this?

Kavouss Arasteh: Erika?

Erika Mann: Yes please. Is it Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, it is me. Yes, I'm comfortable. But the only thing I want to say, I have no problem to introduce the term Interoperable beginning of the Internet, and before that Open.

But we have to mention that this is a description, but not a definition. And it is limited to the scope of activity of CCWG, new gTLD auction; it does not go beyond that. We do not want to generalize that with the entire community and so on and so forth.

So within the scope of our activity or there's a context of our activity, we have to have this sort of description. And I don't call them definition. And we limit its application only within the scope of our work, but not outside that.

And I agree with your little suggestion to have a small group of people putting their thought together and to see to what (unintelligible). But it should be mentioned, it is written the activities and the scope of work of this scope limited application but not outside that. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you Kavouss; this is Erika.

So how can we take this forward? Do you want to send us - can I get maybe three people who would love to work on this. I'm happy to join you, but we definitely need one English speaker because it must sound well and good as well.

(Elliott), do you want to come into this group? Okay, we have an okay from (Elliott). How else would love to (unintelligible)?

Marilyn, maybe because you are the opponent of Jonathan. Jonathan, can we get you in as well? Jonathan, yes.

Marilyn, an idea in writing. No, I didn't mean you are an opponent; that is not what I meant. Sorry, that is sometimes the German thinking in English. Sorry about this. You know me well Marilyn, you know I wouldn't - I'm not even thinking that.

One more? Marilyn, there she is. Is this a yes, Marilyn?

Okay, anybody else or are we all fine with these three? It would be (Elliott), Jonathan and Marilyn. Okay, all done.

Marika? Any other points we have to raise with regard to this text? We will send it again to you. It will be attached in the notes which you will receive from today. And then if you have difficulties with Google Documents, please let us know. Please be so kind so that we can help you in sending you maybe the text in a different version.

Okay, Jonathan, Erika, important to frame the (unintelligible) so that the drafting team is tightly clearly scoped.

I would say this is the preamble, Jonathan. So the preamble would capture the spirit of the connecting -- and defining to some degree -- guiding future evaluators to help them to understand the evaluation of project which comes to them -- which may not be all this automatically and framed in such a way that they will connect it automatically to the mission statement.

So we must assume that there will be projects which are important for ICANN and relate to ICANN mission statement. But they might not automatically be framed in such a way that evaluators will always understand this in the right way.

This was the basic idea when we started talking about the preamble. So to help this kind of evaluators to then be able to go back to those groups -- which one is asking for -- funds and saying, "Would you be able to define your project idea in the following way?"

So this was the original idea, but maybe there is somebody who would be able to define this scope of this for the drafting team in clearer words than I am doing it right now.

Marika, would you want to try it?

Marika Konings: Sorry, Erika; this is Marika. I'm not really sure what you are asking me to do.

Erika Mann: Jonathan asked the question that we need to define the scope for the drafting team in clear words. And I was giving a background why we came to the idea to have the preamble, but this was maybe not sufficient for Jonathan and for Marilyn and for (Elliott) to go back and do their redrafting of the preamble.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. So why this is originally linking to is that the term Open Internet is currently referenced in the preliminary draft of the objectives. So I

understand that and we're probably going to change at least as a reference to that. So this is basically the explanation of what is considered part of that.

And my understanding is that the drafting team is now tasked to take the latest version of that draft and, you know, review the comments that have been provided as well as the input during this call and develop a kind of final proposed version for the group to review prior to the next meeting. At least that's my understanding of the question for the DT.

Erika Mann: Thank you Marika; this is Erika. Jonathan, Marilyn, (Elliott), are you clear what to do? Okay, Jonathan, I hope the yes is relating to what I just asked.

Okay, if there is no further, we can have an exchange - if it's not fully clear, we can have an exchange afterwards.

I don't see new comments being put in this Chat Room; no hands raised. Okay, then let's move to the next item on our agenda which is find, find, find and fix the view update work plan.

Marika, can I hand it over to you please?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Let me just pull that up. Together with the agenda, we circulated an updated version of the work plan. As you may recall, this work plan was developed at the start of (unintelligible) and outlined a proposed timeframe for working through the different phases that have been identified as part of the approach of the CCWG for dealing with the charter questions.

So what you see on the screen is basically a work plan that tries to reflect the reality of where we're currently at. We've taken a bit more time on Phase 2 which we're still at and where we probably still need a bit more time and, you know, and again, it probably requires already another update as we've already pushed one of the items out to the meeting on the 5th of October - or even the meeting after. Sorry, the meeting on the 19th of October.

So again, we probably even need to push things a little bit further out. And as noted before, this is a proposed work plan. There's no external timeline that is driving this work although I do understand people are keen to move forward. But of course it all depends on, you know, the time everyone is able to make available to work through some of the actions that come out of these meetings.

And as we discussed before as well, if at some point in time the group believes that a quicker pace needs to be taken, you always have the ability to, you know, schedule more calls or add additional time. But again, with other activities ongoing, that may be a challenge as well.

So where this currently leads us, and you may recall that originally the objective was to have an initial report by the end of this year, this has now been pushed out to ICANN 61 in March of next year. And the hope is that by that time, the group would be in a position to finalize its initial report so it could be published shortly after that meeting.

As I said, this is, again, dependent of course on the progress that is made on the different meetings and hear from staff perspective. We're happy to keep on (unintelligible) this work plan on a kind of ongoing basis dependent on the progress that is being made on the different items that need to be covered before moving into the next phase.

What I did add as well, on the last page is this kind of summary of which questions are expected to be addressed in which stages so that gives you an idea of the work that's expected to be covered in the different stages and gives you a clear idea of different times that may be needed to go through that.

So (unintelligible) question is if (unintelligible) affordable with this updated work plan and are there any further updates that need to be made. Any comments or questions?

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Maybe, Marika, you want to mention again, as well, the meeting which we have planned -- the two sessions in Abu Dhabi -- just as a reminder and that we would want to reach out to (Felice) as well in (unintelligible) to let us know who is going to participate and who is going to be on the call.

Marika Konings: Yes Erika, and this is Marika. Sorry, good point.

We currently have two meetings scheduled at ICANN 60 on Thursday. The first meeting would be from 10:30 to 12:00, and the second slot would be from 1:00 to 2:30.

We are cognoscente of the fact that there will be other sessions that will be running in parallel specifically to cross-community discussion sessions that have been scheduled at those same times. So the proposal is that we send out a Doodle Poll to the group to get a sense of who will be able to attend those meetings so that the leadership team can make an assessment of whether there's sufficient participation to go ahead with the two meetings or potentially consider cancelling one of the two and, you know, the one that could potentially use more internal work between Staff and the new sub-team on moving some things forward.

Erika Mann: Thank you Marika; this is Erika. Yes, I saw Marilyn; I saw you.

And you may have seen that we now extended the work plan to March 23 for publishing the report for public comment. If you remember, we had hoped to do this by the end of the year, but it's impossible. So we are now working with an extended work plan.

Therefore, it's an important that you please be so kind to review the different phases we identified and you can see these phases in the work plan so that you let us know if you think this is realistic. Or if you believe -- like Marika hinted -- that we need to have additional meetings. But please be so kind and review this.

Marilyn, please.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Erika, Marilyn Cade speaking. Look, I'm trying to think about the best way to say this. I'm going to be very blunt.

Why would we hold both of our sessions on the same day? And by the way, on the day when most people are kind of in the wrap-up mode, can I ask the Staff to please consider looking for a slot much earlier so we have two slots on different days. I think that's really important.

I would just say I will not be available at all on a single day. I have other obligations. I am looking at this list. I might even be able to identify the other obligations of some of these people.

But let's try to spread this please, Staff, across more than one day.

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Marilyn, we will not be able to do this. We tested all possible options and this is not going to work. So we have to work the season. We shouldn't request up to do this. There's no need.

We have done this and Staff tried this before. So let us be happy that we have these two slots and we will work (unintelligible). We are fully aware that they're not ideal, but we want to keep them.

The (unintelligible) is already before us so that we might use one slot just for the leadership group and for whoever can join just to work on internal work which we have to do and slotting and checking that we haven't forgotten anything from past debates because they're the topics which we came up and we might have forgotten some of the points. So we want to use the slot for internal review. And the second one will then be used for the traditional meeting.

So please be so kind and understand there's nothing we can do anymore. We want to have a meeting in March for the next and have the ICANN meeting, and hopefully we will be able to then to - we're trying to do it ahead of the time. But we have to see if we get the budget together and everything that is needed. So please be so kind and understand it.

Good. Any other points in relation to the work plan? No? Okay, thank you so much.

Then I think the only - any other point? Something else you would love to raise? No?

Okay, then the last item on the agenda is to confirm the next step and now our next meeting which is on 5th of October at 14 UTC.

Thank you so much everybody and let's get back to the team to discuss please. Hello? Have I lost you all?

Woman: I'm still here. Thank you, Erika.

Erika Mann: Thank you. Can we conclude the session?

Woman: Yes. Thank you, Erika.

Today's meeting has adjourned. Operator, please stop the recording for us and disconnect all remaining lines.

END