

**ICANN
Transcription
CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds
Thursday, 27 July 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-27jul17-en.mp3> [\[audio.icann.org\]](https://audio.icann.org) Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p8tlt4fyef3/> Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/YGzwAw> The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Woman: Excuse me, recording has started.

Julie Bisland: Okay, great, thank you so much. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the CCWG new GTLD auction proceeds call held on the 27th of July, 2017. In the interest of time there will be no roll call, as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Role.

If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now? And I do have Xavier Calvez noted. Okay, hearing no more names.

So we'd like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I will now turn it back over to (Erika). Thank you.

(Erika): Thank you so much, Julie. Welcome to everybody and I see have quite many on the call, which is wonderful. It's in July, end of July and still so many on the call. I really do appreciate this.

The first item would be questions, typical, standard questions. Do we need anybody who wants to make an announcement update on the conflict of interest declaration? No? Okay, fine.

And please keep in mind, anytime you think a change is needed, please review it online and just be free totally to do it yourself.

Point 3, or let me do one before, because I'm pretty sure I will forget it. It's nothing totally serious, but Dietmar Stefitz worked with us from the beginning. He's not feeling very well but he doesn't want anybody to know this. And I would love to send him just a quick note in the name from all of us that we wish him all the best and hope to have him back very soon.

Just I'm pretty sure you all agree; I just wanted to let you know. And somebody doesn't agree, please let me know I should not do this, otherwise I go ahead, in the name of our group. Okay, thank you so much. I'm sure you feel comfortable with this.

Don't send him individual, only if you know him. He's really not feeling well so, but I'm sure - I know he would appreciate to hear from us. Okay, thanks so much.

With this to point - to topic three, which is the review to the responses to charter question seven and the discussion we need about the next step. For introduction, I hand over to Marika. She always has the best overview. And Marika, please just give us a short introduction where we are on charter question seven and what we have to discuss and to decide. And I see will have the slides coming up pretty soon. Marika, please, to you.

Marika Konings: Thanks (Erika), yes, I'm just pulling up the information from the survey. This is Marika.

(Erika): And I open it as well, yes.

Marika Konings: This is maybe as well - to briefly note, because as you may recall, during the last meeting we discussed both charter question four and charter question seven, but we're actually going to come back to charter question four during our next meeting, during which we'll also have an overview by (Savi Kordesh) on investment management at the request of some you as part of - when we discussed that question last time around.

So now looking at charter question seven, as you may recall, we reviewed this, had a short review during the last meeting, but relatively few responses were received, so we left the survey open for another week to allow for additional members and participants to respond.

As a brief reminder, this question deals with the issue of whether ICANN organization should oversee the solicitation and evaluation of proposals, or whether they should be delegated to another entity, or a new to be created entity.

So I think as you see now -- and hopefully you had a chance to review the results -- it does appear that a majority of responses is of the view that it should not be ICANN organization that is responsible for the solicitation as well as evaluation of the proposals.

Again, this is based on the responses that were received in response to the survey, which is a total of 18 members and participants that participated in this.

But if you can also look at - because then the question was broken into the question of whether it should be a newly to be created entity that would be

responsible for solicitation as well as evaluation of proposals, or whether an existing entity might be suitable or should be considered, there, the views were more split and almost evenly broken down between the responders.

So I guess the question is now how to move forward on this question. There was quite a number of comments have been submitted. One option obviously would be focusing now or honing in on the assumption that indeed it should not be ICANN the organization as such that would be directly responsible for the solicitation as well as evaluation of proposals.

But I'm actually looking at the question. Is it something that should be taken care of potentially through an existing entity or structure, or should it be a newly to be created structure?

And as a reminder as well, of course, just because ICANN the organizations will be directly responsible as part of legal and judiciary requirements that will, of course, always be the need and the responsibility of ICANN to be involved in some oversight function.

And then also linked to this question was the question of whether the ICANN community should be involved in the solicitation and evaluation of proposals and there, the strong majority was of the view that, yes, ICANN community volunteers should be involved in that process.

So I hope you all had a chance to look at the responses to the specific questions. Only the question is now, how do we move forward from these responses to agreement or preliminary agreement from the CCWD information to the specific question?

(Erika): Thank you Marika. Does somebody else have some comments? So what I think would be good as a next step -- but it's my - totally my opinion, which might help to shape your opinions as well -- what might be interesting to look into more closely into two scenarios.

So the one scenario would be the one which are the most favorite. So the independent - and I think we should - can go a step further now and can evaluate what this would mean to create such an independent entity, or to work with an existing independent entity.

The other option could be -- which is still closely connected to the first option - - would be to build an independent unit inside of ICANN, which would be shielded from everything else and would exist as long as the money would exist and this kind of fund would exist.

So maybe these two scenarios, one could evaluate more closely what it would mean in personnel, in money, this would need people required for etcetera, etcetera.

Then the other option for the - anyhow, and we need to evaluate how the money towing and the oversight from ICANN and the board will function. So the structure for both cases, we need to investigate as well. There are different scenarios possible, but one needs to look into it.

And then the establishment for the community -- the structure -- again, they're different scenarios. It could be a separate board. It could be an advisory board. It could be an advisory, whatever, structure. But we would have to clarify who comes in, in which cases.

Is it if - when there's a dispute which rises and the originally responsible structure would not be able to sort out the problem, would it be the (unintelligible) advisory? Maybe then the community could help in this case. Or what would the community actually do?

In a classical sense, where I have experienced, they typically would evaluate once a year what was done, the problems which arises, projects which couldn't be solved, or which have to be sent back, why were they sent back --

so the classical evaluation -- which is still close to an advisory rule as well -- and one could even combine advisory and evaluation.

So I think we have to go now a step further and since we know now what - we are clearer about what we want, we maybe want to work with two scenarios and have more sub questions. And then, really, when we have the upcoming calls with the expert and with (Savi) as well, we then can ask these questions more closely. I mean, can ask them how they actually did it and what they advise us to work with.

Okay, sorry for the long speech. We have Kavouss and Ching. Kavouss please. Kavouss, can you hear us?

Woman: I'm sorry, (Erika), he actually hasn't been - doesn't have audio yet. Maybe can we come back to him?

(Erika): Okay, then we go to Ching first and we come back to - in a second.

Ching Chiao: Thank you (Erika), this is Ching Chiao for the recording. I think it makes sense. I fully agree the two approaches that you just brought up. And then if we also considering the time factor -- meaning that we talked about this and we will talk about this once again maybe later -- is about whether it's a one time exercise or, I mean, or this one time exercise may last five to ten years or even more.

So if we weighed in this time factor, that could lead us to a more clear decision that a separate foundation may not, I mean, be needed, because once the exercise is done, we are done also with this new entity. So it could be somehow a waste or a duplicate effort if we create a new separate entity for the purpose.

So maybe -- back to your scenarios -- is that within ICANN a subgroup or committee within ICANN probably makes more sense if we weighed in the time factor. Thanks.

(Erika): Kavouss, are you online now? Kavouss?

Woman 1: I believe the operator's having some difficulty.

(Erika): Difficulties of getting him?

Woman 1: Yes, correct.

(Erika): Okay, okay, then we give him a second. I see something here from (Mark) where an existing entity should - yes, absolutely (Mark), I agree with you. That's part of the first option. Either build a new entity or work with an existing entity -- totally agree. Yes, so the first cluster would practically have two approaches -- completely new, or work with an existing entity. Yes, agree with you.

Would you want to comment on this? Do you have something you want to say, (Mark), or can you only type?

(Mark): No, I can talk as well.

(Erika): Wonderful, (Mark).

(Mark): My comment was more that if we use an existing entity, it could also be a number of existing entities.

(Erika): Yes, we'll make it maybe the oversight a bit more difficult, because then you might need more oversight structures and people. But you're right, it could be different entities as well. Agree. Good point. Yes, let's add that to the...

(Mark): I'm saying...

(Erika): Yes, let's add this to the list.

(Mark): Okay.

(Erika): So we would have - in the first, we would have built a new independent one, or use an existing one, or use multiple existing ones. And then the second would be, use an entity inside, or build an entity unit inside of ICANN. Yes.

Okay, is there anything else somebody would recommend which we should do, which we have missed in the discussion or the debate so far? (Sylvia), I see you. (Sylvia), please.

(Sylvia): Hello, can you hear me?

(Erika): Yes.

(Sylvia): Can you hear me?

(Erika): Yes, very nicely, (Sylvia).

(Sylvia): Thank you. I'm on the reconnect, using the app, so on my phone. So the operator is muting me, so thank you very much for your help.

Look, I think there are very good reasons - it's very different to evaluate the (unintelligible) that are received, rather than the outcome of those proposals, if they are accepted, right?

(Erika): Yes.

(Sylvia): So I think that if we - I mean, on the survey -- and I can reiterate now -- I don't see any issues with, let's say, like, hiring, let's say, right, an external

organization to conduct the solicitation of proposals, because that is basically, you know, like, online forms and submissions of paperwork and due diligence.

And there organizations that do that very professionally in the US, for example, or places in the world that can assist. And that is a big issue around transparency and how the application process works. And starting that from scratch can be very complicated. So there are a variety of organizations that can do that on the solicitation of proposals.

Then on the evaluation of proposals, I actually agree with (Mark) in that there could be a range of organizations. And Kavouss asked on the chat, "How many organizations are we talking about?" Well we don't know because we don't know what topics we are talking about.

There might be organizations that are - that have a lot of experience on the technical aspects and can be great to provide assessments about applications itself, while there are organizations that can support better other parts of - other types of proposals that are, you know, in a different subject matter.

It will be very difficult to find one single place that can deal with absolutely everything under the sun. I also have shared on the surveys that we have submitted so far a couple of options that I would like to reinforce now.

I think that there are opportunities, for example, to shed aside, one, a little bit of the money, to support projects, to support core activities from organizations that are not linked to project. And that's a different founding mechanism.

So in a similar way, for example, like the National Science Foundations gives grants that are based on a moral that is more unrestricted gifts. So those are like donations to organizations which work (unintelligible), right?

They could be nonprofit organizations that are - the organization is the one that is vetted; it's not a proposal. And because it is a core - it's core support, then reporting and all of that is different because it is not a beginning and an end that - in supporting organizations supports the fabric of which the internet is built on.

Very different will be that what will be the process to vet an organization (unintelligible) to vet a coalition of organizations that is working on a global project, for example.

So I think that although I've been very clear that I don't think we should fund absolutely everything under the sun, what I've been asking is, for the least of those mechanisms that are in line with the cycle three, you know, tax status so that we know what is there that we can use.

A lot of these questions that we keep asking ourselves about, you know, time and who has this and who has that are part of those mechanisms. (Unintelligible) (Donover), what is the name? (Donover) (unintelligible). If you look at, for example, the Tides Foundation, they have a list of those kinds of funds that they manage on behalf of all organizations. But I don't know if those are the ones that apply for what we're doing.

So I really think that we need at least of funding mechanisms that are legal funding mechanisms, that are in line with the policy, to be able to compare and say which ones are in line with what we're trying to do. Thank you.

(Erika): Thank you so much, (Sylvia), and that's very helpful. So let me maybe recommend the following. Maybe we can, Marika, maybe we can do something like we have a list of proposals we haven't discussed yet but which we want to consider -- like the one (Sylvia) made -- which I think it's a good one.

And this could be solved in the future about a kind of open tenure. You know, once we are there we could have three months or four months of kind of open tenure where we received the crest from organizations which work on the DNS and would ask for a grant which is not related to a specific project.

Then this would have to be decided if we want to do it. But we have already two things which we have to decide outside of the questions we are debating right now.

So do we want to have this organization independently created outside of ICANN or inside of ICANN? So this is a new one, which I think we park right now. So if you agree, we don't lose it, we don't drop it, we have to come back for it, but we park it. Like, we have to park another, which I don't think so. We might able to discuss today and maybe we should do it next week when we have the longer discussions about the financials (unintelligible) the request that was yet - not yet a formal request, but to help them to replenish the reserve fund.

I think this deserves specific attention and I want to park this as well. So we shouldn't confuse this with the structure we want to build. It's only confusing. So if you agree, we park these two questions and we will come back to them.

So I wonder if we have Kavouss with us now. And then there was one from - just I don't want to lose something here. Kavouss was asking if it should be - what are we talking about. But Kavouss, you can talk about your own point once you are on.

And somebody else, Valeria, you said something - there is a need to fletch out the advantage on disadvantages of both internal, external -- absolutely. We have to do this and we should do this maybe in a survey -- which we send out again -- buy maybe we ask this time maybe - how about we do it differently. We ask maybe (Sam) and (Savi) to fill out the first - maybe to give

us kind of their ideas, how they would approach it, and then we add our comments to what they do.

Would you agree to this? Okay, let me go forward and I watch the comments and I watch the comments coming in, in the meantime. Valeria, yes, you said yes.

Okay, I will wait a little bit longer. We will not close this debate. But I think it might help us.

Kavouss, are you now operational? Wonderful, please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I am operational.

(Erika): Please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everybody. Yes, I think we are talking about some sort of consultation of the question now or the survey. On this survey the first question is, would we need to have internal or external and internal, external should be (unintelligible). What do we mean by internal and what do we mean by external and asking, you know, any of the two things -- disadvantage, advantage.

Then internally, we will ask the group, you have to decide how many entities we need before going to external debates or surveys. We can minimize the number of the entities. We should not have a very open number, because that would not be cost benefit. That would not be (unintelligible) so many numbers (unintelligible) minimum required number of entities.

And then we answer that, these number of entities, I don't think that we should go outside. We should, inside the group, decide how many entities we need -- five, two, ten (unintelligible). And then based on the surveys, we

go to the external selection board for a decision or internal decision and go on. Thank you.

(Erika): Kavouss, (Mark) is asking why do you believe that external - working with more than one entity would be more costly?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I am saying that if you do it externally and then externally you have many (unintelligible) externally having several entities or externally having one entity dealing with many subjects. So this is to be clear.

I have no problems to have one entity, several subjects, but there are difficulty to have several entities externally. It would be difficult to manage them. That is my question. Either there is understanding, or not clear. Thank you.

(Erika): I'm, yes, thank you so much, Kavouss. I'm like you, I'm a single entity person, but this is maybe because that's the experience I have. But what we will do, we will put these two points -- single entity, so outside - and we work with an outside entity, or we work with many outside entities.

Marika, this goes as well onto the question we will want to discuss what this would mean in financial and legal terms as well. Legal terms, I don't think it would make a big difference, but in - probably in financial terms.

So we want to have this as part of the debate with (Savi) as well so he can have a little bit of time. I know, (Savi), you are on the call, aren't you? Are you still with us, (Savi)? Okay, he probably isn't, so we will have to send him the question we are debating today for our next call.

Next one on the list is (Evan).

(Evan): Hi, thanks very much. Can you hear me okay?

(Erika): Yes, wonderful.

(Savi): Hi (Erika), this is (Savi), sorry to interrupt. I'm on the call. I just had to...

(Erika): Perfect, perfect. Thank you for letting us know. Wonderful. Back to you, (Evan).

(Evan): I think we're a little bit premature in the decision of one entity or multiple. I think we have to first get past the question of whether or not this is something that ICANN does internally or whether or not it's entrusted to external organizations.

(Erika): Correct. It's part of it, yes.

(Evan): And I had the fortune, actually, last year of having to work through grand proposals that were done -- in this case it was actually the World Bank -- that had a division that did the solicitation and they did the evaluation on behalf of multiple donors behind them, some of which were not even named.

And so what happened is, you have these donors that entrusted this organization to impartially and competently do the due diligence of applicants and then do a fair and unbiased evaluation based on the criteria they were given by these external organizations.

And the complexity and the skill necessary to do this is not something that is easily created. My concern at this point is that if ICANN were to get involved in doing this themselves, they could easily spend way more time creating the evaluation entity than actually executing the program.

This is something, you know, that is not going to be undertaken very many times. And like I say, this is a matter of real reinvention. There's a number of foundations that exist to do this, that exist to do the due diligence, to do the evaluation and most importantly, the solicitation.

ICANN has its circle of organizations that it knows to contact. You go to organizations like various foundations that exist to distribute money or groups like the World Bank, they already have massive networks of organizations that are monitoring their solicitations, so we don't have to create that network at all.

We know that if we're entrusting it in the hands of some of these organizations, they will be able to put those calls for proposals out into the greatest number of qualified applicants -- people that are actively monitoring it.

So I'm strongly advocating on behalf of an external entity, only because it's really, really easy to underestimate the complexity of doing this well -- for the solicitations, for the due diligence, for the expertise in putting this together. You know, and I also don't want to discount the issue of political bias.

When you're entrusting an external organization, you get to very finely define, you know, where oversight leaves off and meddling comes in. You don't want any opportunity of political influence in the evaluation criteria. You want to give the expertise, the expert body, here's the criteria, evaluate it fairly and in an unbiased way. And that way, since they're outside ICANN, there's less possibility of that process being gained or politically biased. Thank you.

(Erika): Yes, agree. I think you captured the essence of what we - where we should move forward quite well. So we will put this on the evaluation list with (Savi) and (Sam) as well and we will not drop the idea to have it done as one of the options in our in-house as well; you're absolutely right.

Next one is (Sebastian).

(Sebastian): If my sound is working correctly, I don't know.

(Erika): You are - I can hear you perfectly well. I hope everybody else does.

(Sebastian): Thank you very much (Erika). Yes, I think that (Evan) gave a very good summary of what we should take care. But one of the question is that when we talk about values organization maybe it's one way to not have one single set of criteria to deal with. And when we have the question about outside organization it could be that ICANN decide to set up an outside organization to do that, for example the foundation somewhere else in the world than in the US and to give this organization set up in ICANN all the money and they will do it or we can decide to - that ICANN will distribute money to actually existing organization, not one single.

Just to be clear about the image of course you can give that to one single entity whatever is a world bank I hope it will not be a US organization but that's my bias. But we can also decide that we need to find one organization in each region like we have (AIS) and it's not to say that we will give to those organization but to try to split the money from ICANN point of view. And then this a different organization will then so split the money to a project or other organization.

And I don't think we need to overcomplicate it what was – what will be the role of ICANN. I am not sure that we want to be sure that each penny are used in the right sense. We need to be confident that when we give the money we trust the people. If not we will spend not just few months or even a few years it will be very, very, very long. Meant to do in ICANN I think.

And of the last question is that I just want to be sure that it's in our bylaws that we (unintelligible) because we are always talking about ICANN must stay in its field and not do anything outside. Are we sure that it's something we can deal with and it's inside our possibility if not we will have to change the bylaws to be sure that we can do that. Thank you.

(Erika): Thank you (Sebastian). I think the – I mean I doubt that there will be a possibility to when you use the word distribute so just to hand out the money to another entity I doubt the current structure will allow this. There might be ways of achieving it but I'm – with the current structure I'm very doubtful. And it's maybe not even recommendable because you have a better control if the money stays with ICANN and only, you know, the money is used each time for the project it is allocated for.

Let's assume you have a separate entity, the separate entity would evaluate a project and would then would give it's okay. And then the request would go for the allocation to the ICANN practically so - to Xavier's department. And it would be drawn from the special line - well it's in the moment with a special investor. And it would be then taken from it and would be given to this project.

I think this is maybe gives the board more oversight and I doubt the board will be able to (debar) it from this structure. But we will have the debate next week and I hope you will be on the call in two weeks actually (Sebastian) when we will discuss all the financial scenarios with Xavier. And then we – you should ask this question again. We took note of it but I think we should come back to it again. Kavouss is this a new hand or an old one?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, it is a new one.

(Erika): Please go on.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, my comment would be first I take the words from (Sebastian) we should not overcomplicate the issue. This is first point. Second point when we talk about external or internal the same discussions on different outfits when we had this PTI issue was that – carries out and we have externally do it internally do it primarily something like being associated over the subsidy of the ICANN an organization.

So we should not forget that, that possibility also exist that, that organization or the entity be established associated with our (unintelligible) because legally inside and operationally outside. So this is something that we should try to get examples of the previous experience that we have and use them and see whether there is any other organizations or any other experience outside the ICANN that's similar but not identical work. But for external we should not be total external because we have discussed that in the PTI external totally have so many difficulties of - and connection with ICANN. But something maybe similar to the PTI (unintelligible) our organization (unintelligible) associated with ICANN.

But legally, and external and operationally – sorry legally and internal operationally externally that (unintelligible). But this always come up after the survey. So the only thing is that the survey should be the question total clear what we looking for. And we should not tell all other companies that we're talking about the regions and so on and so forth. This sort of regional are going to be – I don't think that we should leave it here.

The issue is much more than that. We should put into the expertise into the - and competency other than the regional office or unregional. I am not against or in favor of any organization or any entity from any part of the board. They need to be expertise and to (unintelligible) the competency that's all. Thank you.

(Erika): Yes absolutely Kavouss, a good addition to what (Sebastian) raised. So yes I can't see anybody else in the moment. So shall we maybe do the following because I just

Marika Konings: (Erika).

(Erika): Yes sorry who's there?

Marika Konings: (Erika), this is Marika.

(Erika): Marika please.

Marika Konings: (Sebastian) still has a hand up. And then I am in the queue.

(Erika): Oh it's a new hand. Apologies (Sebastian). I thought it's an old hand. Go ahead (Sebastian).

(Sebastian): Yes, but Marika was before. Just, I want to just to...

(Erika): Oh I (unintelligible) with a hand, strange.

(Sebastian): Because she has...

(Erika): Go ahead (Sebastian). I believe you.

(Sebastian): But I wanted to give you an image yes we want to control and everybody will want to control but just take make the parallel between the money we have and we want to distribute and the IP addresses distributed by IANA. Do we – do ICANN or IANA control what (unintelligible) we see or (unintelligible) is doing with the IP addresses distributed by IANA or by ICANN, I'm not sure. And maybe it could be a good parallel that we want to do with the money. It's we give to people we trust and they will do the job. Thank you.

(Erika): Yes Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm actually just looking for some guidance on where to go next because...

(Erika): So then maybe summarize what I have in mind and then you will?

Marika Konings: Sure.

(Erika): Or you want to go first?

Marika Konings: No, no, you go ahead and then I can see if that makes...

(Erika): If it makes sense, exactly. Just be straight it might not make sense. So I think what we want to do and what I think we should do we should actually ask in particular summing Xavier but practically their departments but to - but practically come back to us with a kind of concept how these various things we discuss today the various structures would look like from their point of view, so from the legal point of view and from the financial point of view. Because each time I assume they will be designed and look very differently. So internal structure new unit inside of ICANN what would it mean,? Can be a role concept but I think we do need some kind of concept.

Second externally, and so a new built entity, small one like new fronts are built which only focuses on this particular work, nothing else, just this work. And then working with outside entities which already exist. Now the last one I would say the third option can be even connected to the first two options. So I don't think for the last option would be the third one would be exclusive. So you could argue even if you have an inside unit this could still work with outside entities. And if you have an outside unit a new front which is built single for the purpose to disperse the money could still work with entities. And this was that mentioned many times in the chat room.

So what this – I think this would capture what we would want to see from coming back if so I mean Xavier agree they can manage to do this come back to us with some ideas from their side which we then can evaluate and can add comment to. So back to you Marika. And then of course all the different points which were debated we would put in as questions to Xavier and (Sam) as well. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks (Erika). And that does actually help. And I would actually probably ask Xavier and (Sam) to comment on whether that is something

indeed that is feasible and as well with the timeframe we would need for doing so, so we can decide when they group can come back to that question. The only question I had in that regard is that the survey did show a clear preference for exploring the external option. But I understand from you that you still want to look at the internal to ICANN option as well. Did I understand that?

(Erika): Yes. I would just want to have it as a concept. I think we shouldn't drop it totally because I think it just helps us even if you go for the external part it helps us to understand the differences of sometimes important here once you design something new. I think it helps you to understand what the opposite model would actually mean. Even if you neglect it, it is still I think helpful. And do we have (Sam) on the call as well?

(Sam): Yes, I am here.

(Erika): Oh wonderful (Sam). Can we – sorry to put you in straight into a situation to respond to something like this. Can you do it?

(Sam): Yes, I think, you know, starting off probably pretty light and kind of a strawman concept we've got a lot of effort in building in...

(Erika): Yes.

(Sam): ...detail that would require research. But I think we can do those three kind of sketch out concepts.

(Erika): Yes, I would like this.

(Sam): Yes.

(Erika): And may be some Xavier some numbers. I mean we – I think we all understand we are still in the quite early phase so - but just some ideas, you

know, what you think it would mean in budgetary terms. (Sam), Xavier are you there?

(Sam): Yes...

((Crosstalk))

(Erika): Answer my question.

(Sam): Yes, I don't know if he's on the call but, you know, I definitely work with him on a...

((Crosstalk))

(Sam): ...I think the budget – oh there you are.

Xavier Calvez: Sorry. Sorry to having dropped it. I understand and we will be able to work on that with (Sam). I want to be really careful (Erika) with the notion of offering numbers. It's a - at this stage without having the objectives of the funds, the mechanisms and (unintelligible) it would be a very speculative, normative, high level uncommitting type of exercise. But that's why we can proceed with that under those - that understanding basically.

(Erika): Yes. And the sub questions which we receive today that we can group them related to these three different baskets practically or three different environments, yes I agree. You have to be very light. And I don't think that we expect from you precise numbers. But let's assume I can do something which might help you. And maybe somebody in the group can do this as well. Maybe reach out to friends you know. I know some so because I've worked with many friends.

So just reach out to them. Give them the number and say it's a 200 million fund. It – there very – it's likely exist. You have to give them a kind of

timeframe otherwise they can't work. Let's say maybe five years just to give them some idea how many people do you think would be – if you would do it how many people would work on this just to have a rough idea?

I can send out the question to somebody in the fund and just get some numbers back and maybe some two – one or two others can do this as well because I'm pretty sure you all know somebody. Just send them a question. Ask them this question so that we got some kind of ideas back. Will this help you Xavier just so that you are a little bit clearer about what you are dealing with? I see (Marcus) to – Xavier say it's too premature. Okay, not knowing the objectives.

Do we need to know the objectives for this one for this question Xavier? Yes, yes (Mark) you're right if 5%, 10% we can work with this. Okay good. So keep it superlight, just maybe compare inside and outside. So maybe not - and to go – don't go into the numbers. Look into the are there different legal requirements? Are there different monitoring requirements? I'm sure there are. Are there different oversight mechanisms? And just look into these questions and ignore the funding for the moment. I don't think that we have agreement on this one. Good.

Marika Konings: (Erika)...

(Erika): Kavouss is - yes?

Marika Konings: ...(unintelligible) his hands up.

(Erika): Yes, yes I see Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, so I – maybe I was not clear. I think there is no absolute external and absolute internal beneficial. We have similar not identical, similar survey a study under the transition of the mailing. And we have many (unintelligible) and finally after a lot of discussions they come up with the idea that it should

be sort of the hybrid. That means legally, internal, financially external but not totally external from legal and financial, now totally internal from legal and financial. So hybrid is also an option for the issue. This is something that we need to take into account, has many advantages. And there has been a lot of the studies of the two consulting legal organization or legal entity outside the ICANN for the transition of the IANA function and come up after three months or four months of discussions to this hybrid systems. So this hybrid also is (unintelligible)...

(Erika): Yes.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...and (unintelligible).

(Erika): Yes, I agree with you. And even...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

(Erika): ...yes even if you would have an outside or internal you would still go for a kind of hybrid structure.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

(Erika): I think you're absolutely right. Thank you for making this point.

Kavouss Arasteh: I have another question to you...

(Erika): Yes?

Kavouss Arasteh: ...(Erika) is that the – a (kink) of the cost of this entity this reestablished entity in terms of or external or hybrid what is the cost of that to the fund of the – the money that you have? Is it yes how much it cost? Is it a big organization? How much is the invoice ICANN for doing this job? It is beneficial. And that is something that's really important to teach.

Having multiple organizations and multiple entities so various things. If you think of these are not free of choice. These are not yet strategies. This is something that costs they invoice for that because they engage the people. And these people they are expert. They are cost people and so on. So we have to think of not create something that at the end of each (unintelligible) that you have half of that goes to the cost of organization and only half remains for the action that we need. This is something very important we have to think of. Thank you.

(Erika): Thank you so much Kavouss. I think that's understood. But just imagine one thing where you could for example we could come to the idea, you know, where we would say we want to invest more in developing countries. And this would go – you would want to work with a particular organization which already has experience. So there could be a logic to it. But I think your point is well taken as we have noted it. (Sylvia) please?

(Sylvia): And thank you (Erika). Look I think there – I'm a little confused about what then a logical idea is then behind trying to separate all these questions that we have from the survey and the charter questions that we have been not the task to work on. If for a conference call we are going to address portions of these conversations that we're suppose or are supposed to be addressed or a separate question. So these – this screams about the percentage, and the overhead, and the cost and all of that that's a separate charter question that we have another survey and another call to deal with. So this one I mean I'm...

(Erika): Yes, yes (Sylvia) you're right. We're not discussing this right now.

(Sylvia): The only way that we can make progress on these conversations is that if we can use the surveys and the input that has been provided to kind of steer the conversation forward. And if you go and you hear the transcripts, you know, you read the transcripts and you hear the recordings from the previous calls

we are going, you know, jumping up and down different questions. And it's very difficult to feel that we are moving forward.

So Marika has done a great job of trying to organize us to the mind maps and share that information across. And we have the answers from all the people on the surveys. And I find a lot of concern so let's say like guidelines that are emerging of that. And I am really concerned that if we keep jumping up and down different questions we are never going to be able to move forward. So I encourage the group to yes there are a bunch of things of these elephants that we will need to discuss but that was the way - that was the reason behind. And it's (leading) all the questions on the charter questions like that, you know, so that we can, you know, slowly move around and discuss issues but with a certain focus.

So I think it's important that we try to focus on Questions 7 and then try to figure out what - how we can move ahead of this one? And then we'll see eventually we will come to the issues around the percentages and all of that and those comments will be noted. But I really (unintelligible) the point of order at the moment. And I don't think I mean if we are chairing and asking organizations for input then we can do it between calls and then use that input in the surveys that we set forward and share information on the list.

I don't think, you know, generating contacting external organizations out of the blue and asking for these kinds of questions can actually generate a lot of expectations that might be hard to deal with. So I think it's important that we keep the process as organized, and following the charter questions, and trying to focus on the surveys and the input that the community has given us. Thank you for (that).

(Erika): Thank you (Sylvia). I think it's well understood. And it's good to keep us focused I agree with you. I haven't seen us departing so much with the exception of few comments and points maybe but I'm glad you made this point. (Evan) you want to come back. Is this – it's a new hand isn't it?

(Evan): Yes I – yes. I want to support (Sylvia). I think it's premature to actually start talking to external organizations. I think there's a number of questions we have to resolve internally first and specifically the one of internal or external. One thing that has not been talked about yet is that what is the cost of actually creating this entity internally to do the evaluation and then to do it well enough? The cost of this I think has the potential of being substantial.

I mean there were comments earlier about, you know, what is going to be the cost of an external entity? An external entity will have a fairly fixed cost as a percentage of the total fund being administered. This is not out of the ordinary. Where there's an overhead that is charged by the evaluating organization as part of their fee for administering the criteria for the fund whereas if ICANN were to get into this in its own it is a totally unknown cost. Is it – it is a total, you know, a separate budget needs to be created for this, a separate, you know, perhaps some new staff have to be hired simply for the purposes of doing this work.

I – and for that reason Marika I'm going to suggest that this is a question I think that needs to be answered very earlier on in the process that before we can start to get too far we need to know even from a matter of cost is this is something that ICANN is going to do or is it something that ICANN is going to have an evaluation process to work with external entities? I honestly think this is going to be one of the first questions that needs to be answered before we can with any real assurance start moving down other paths. So I would sort of make the case and push back that I don't think that the option of internal or external should remain on the table for too long that there needs to be some kind of closure to that decision. Thanks.

(Erika): Yes, I agree. That was the reason why I asked you all whether we should not give this – these two questions back to (Sam) and to Xavier to evaluate it. And then to come back to us with a clearer understanding what it would mean for them. And it included in my eyes - so (Sylvia) my point was not to related

to the – how much it would cost overall but it was just related internal or external. But I understand to your point and we don't have to go into this and ask this question right now to Xavier. We can do it at a later stage.

But I think (Evan) is right this is my point why I think it would be good to have a clearer understanding about the factors we have to look into. And we need to get this from (Sam) and from Xavier. So my question back if we have an agreement here I will give it to - back to Marika maybe to summarize the point so that we have an understanding. And we already have an okay from (Sam) and from Xavier. So Marika would you be able to summarize these points we just discussed and then we have a clear idea what we want to do?

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. What I have noted as an action item is the next step would be to ask ICANN's finance and legal to provide their input on the different options that have been discussed during today's meeting one of which is the internal structure and new unit within ICANN and then externally a newly to be built entity and would only focus on this work or externally working with already existing entities knowing that the latter option could also be in combination with the other two options. And then , you know, as part as notes it is spelled out as well that an important question in that regard is the cost that might be associated with creating such an internal structure and the question of whether input can be provided on that as well. That is at least what I've heard and think where the group landed.

(Erika): Yes. If you do not agree just please either write in the chat or raise your hand or if you want to add something to the action list.

Xavier Calvez: This is Xavier. I'm fine with that (Erika), thank you.

(Erika): I give it a second. Just wait. Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes Marika just mentioned external and internal. I think we have also talked about the third option the hybrid. Thank you.

(Erika): Yes, it's clear we put the – I think the hybrid is a - it's a sub version of if we go for external. We always will have to go for a kind of hybrid because the monitoring and the evaluation will obviously have to be done very lightly by ICANN. So but anyhow it's understood. Okay, no other point no comments fine...

(Evan): Sorry.

(Erika): ...a green.

(Evan): Sorry.

(Erika): Perfect. (Evan), you have another point or...

(Evan): Well no it's a confusion because I hear the term hybrid talked about a lot and I really have no idea what people are talking about when they say hybrid? I mean there's certain things that have to be done by an organization. Either this is done within ICANN or it's not. I mean it's taken for granted that ICANN and its community will be presenting and creating the evaluation criteria - That it will have a hand in managing things. But before people start talking around the concept of hybrid I'd like to be a little more specific about what that means because - You know - does it mean that 10% is done externally? Or that 10% is done internally? And-

Male 2: No. I don't think so. No.

(Evan): - we're talking to -

Woman: (Unintelligible) go ahead.

(Erika): I see. I see. You triggered a new debate. So I have Stephanie and Kavouss. Probably to this particular point. If we can focus on right now. Stephanie please.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. I was going to type it in the chat. But I'm afraid - I seem to be having trouble typing in chat. Stephanie Perrin for the record. My point was about the hybrid nature of this. (Evan) did say a couple of comments ago that we had no idea what (cost) if we were to outsource this basically. I think that it's quite possible to split up various roles and things. Things that have - Depending on the advice that we get from legal and (unintelligible) about what we have to do ourselves as an organization and what we can delegate.

There's a lot of work involved in evaluating these proposals. Particularly if we decide to do a few big ones and a lot of little ones. I see a lot of support in the (probing) data for helping capacitating developments and developing countries. And that sort of thing. Those might be smaller contracts - You know.

So until we - It's a chicken and egg problem until we decide how we want to - Which kind of projects we want to fund. We really don't know what kind of mechanisms we need help with and whether it all gets outsourced or whether we can outsource a certain amount of the evaluation of tasks.

So I'd certainly like to keep the hybrid model on the table and explore - get some legal advice on just exactly what particular functions we can split out and seek contract help with it. Because I'm sure that's quite doable -- getting (unintelligible) contract.

(Erika): Thank you so much Stephanie. That's very helpful. And I think you're right it might help when - once some (unintelligible) sit down and do the review of the questions we debated today and the structures we discussed maybe to look already to the potential possibilities to let certain work done by other entities. What Kavouss and you refer to as "hybrid options".

So if this is possible already it might be a bit too early to do this right now. We might have to decide about different aspects first before they can do it. But if it is possible it will certainly help us in our debate. But we have a principle in understanding and we have an agreement from some (unintelligible). Thank you so much both of you for doing this.

Can we get a time table from you? Can you do this in - until the next call? Or do we have already too much work we need to discuss on the next call and shall we schedule it in four weeks' time? What do you think is feasible? (Sam), (unintelligible)? Marika? (Sam) do you have an idea? Two weeks' time or right at four weeks' time?

(Sam): Realistically just given some August schedules - Four weeks is probably more realistic.

(Erika): Perfect. Yes. Let's work this at four weeks. Because I think we already have so much to discuss next week. On our next call not next week. But at our next call. Kavouss can we keep it at this? Can we - Or is it - I think we have understood your - Yes. Go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: There is something. The gentleman who spoke - Who (unintelligible). Hybrid does not mean present day (unintelligible) or down outside (unintelligible). Hybrid means from legal and financial because whatever we created would be under the overall ICANN organization. It must comply with certain rules and procedures and course of action and so on and so forth.

So what the people have done for the conditions of the (unintelligible) in the second report talking about how this organization - How this legal relation with ICANN. How this entity has financial relations with ICANN. So this is the sort of the things right here that (unintelligible). Hybrid means that we have an entity or entities which have legally inside ICANN and financially outside ICANN to have its independent. And so for that is the meaning of the hybrid.

It's not percentage. I know you might think you are not right about that but as a possible (unintelligible). Not (unintelligible) because (unintelligible) doesn't leave with (unintelligible). So it should be similar to making an organization or an entity which is (subsided) to the ICANN through this sort of thing legally with ICANN. Financially outside the ICANN to maintain the conflicts of interest and so on.

So there is this situation that's already calculated in the one complete three months of study. So it maybe (unintelligible) will look at that one and please not talk about percentage of the work internally. This is not (unintelligible) misunderstood.

(Erika): Yes. But you triggered a good debate. So we will keep your point in mind. Which is - always needs to be done. Whatever I can have to keep this in mind. And the second we have a different understanding about what hybrid is we can - Which we - I don't want to go back now but I think it is understood and we can review this debate once we have to respond from (Sam) and from (Xavier). So let's finalize this topic point because otherwise we can't move forward.

I think it helped us immensely to move forward to - with framing our topics. Point four, Marika. Have you responds to survey on objectives on funds, allocation and discuss next step.

Marika Konings: Yes. Thanks (Erika). This is Marika. So I'll pull up the mind map that I shared ahead of the meeting. You also have the link. I also shared the link to the detailed survey responses. So of course you're all encouraged to review those details. And apologies in advanced for not having been able to group more of them examples of them together. But as the survey closed late last night and there were quite a few responses that came in. Which of course that is a very good thing. I was only able to pull everything into the mind map.

So what you see on the mind map is basically a reorganization of the original objectives that were identified according to the score that they achieved in the ranking. As one were asked to rank the different objectives from one to seven. This represents an overall score that is calculated based on that ranking. And then underneath each of those objectives you'll find the examples that the respondents have provided and that -- from their perspective -- represent a project which would fit on that overall objective and would also meet the - Or would also be consistent with ICANNs mission as - You know - One of their requirements for fund allocation.

What the table doesn't include is - You know - we also asked the question for everyone to identify - for the examples of that they had identified how it was deemed in consistency with ICANNs mission. But it seems most people actually filled that in explaining - You know - the benefits of the project and why it would be a good idea. So that is probably an area where more work will need to be undertaken to review with the consistency and how a determination is made whether or not an example is consistent with ICANNs mission.

I also know that - You know - there are quite a few ideas or suggestions that are probably duplicative as some of them are very high level. So again more detail may be needed to make that assessment. There are a couple that are - do go into great detail. So hopefully those provide a good platform for the group to make an assessment of consistency.

And of course now the next question will be for the group as well based on the ranking and the scoring and whether there is a way to potentially reduce the number of overall objectives or consolidate and also look -- for example - You know -- if there were a need to reword or explain some of these overall objectives in further detail. And the one example there might be there's one that refers to the open internet and it may be necessary to actually define what is meant with the open internet to be able to really determine what to look for or shoot for underneath that.

So this is what you currently see in front of you. I do realize that most of you probably had very little time to review this in detail. So Erica I don't know if you want to have a conversation now around how to take this to the next level.

(Erika): I have two questions. Yes. To you actually. One question to you and then one question to the group. So one to you. Could we evaluate because I'm happy to work with you on this one and the rest of the team - your team. Could we put - Would we be able to group these replies we have received? So to say like we built six clusters or ten clusters. Could we work on this and just group them together?

So let's say there are - One goes into a more technical area and another one are related to capacity building. Another one are related to an abroad sense - To developing countries. Could we do this? Just big clusters?

Marika Konings: Yes this would work. Yes I think so. If you look at - In each of the objectives there are -

(Erika): Yes I'm looking at some. Yes. There I see it. Yes.

Marika Konings: Yes. I think one thing to consider as well is there is potential overlap where certain projects could fall probably onto several headings. And one thing - Like looking at the overall objectives -- and again this is just - You know - Looking through it and my personal thinking -- and whether it would be in considerations for the group to look at what is currently identified as the -- number one -- as the kind of overarching objective and where some of the others might be subcategories or sub priority to be able to say and this is the overall objective and within that these are some of the priority areas that are identified.

Because -- for example -- focusing on development and evolution and distribution of the internet - You could consider that - You know - capacity building might be a top category of that. So that may be a potential way of approaching and considering this further.

(Erika): I think we should do this. And then we should keep the list the way you have it. But maybe we should do a review. I'm happy to work with you on this one. Giving back to our group here - To our members. So that we can then have a debate. Because I'm just wondering maybe out of this could come a kind of cluster we see where we would then in the future want to say - You know - 20% goes into this cluster and 30% into this cluster. I don't know. I'm just guessing in the moment.

But it could help us doing such kind of framing. So if you agree -- or if nobody disagrees -- with what I just said I think Marika - And I'll work with you Marika on this one so you're not always alone on doing immense work. And then we can send it back and (unintelligible) as well and everybody else can give it back to this group for review.

The other one is the open internet. And there I think Marika and I - We need all of your help. Because I think the open internet is - When you look at it they have connected to the mission's statement - It's a bit - A very broad topic. So I think we would need from all of you a little bit of guidance and maybe to review the concept of open internet. And maybe send us back some ideas how you would frame it in relation to the (DNS) and our mission's statement.

It could be that you would say all project - concrete project - technical project would have to have an open surf component. Could be one understanding of open internet. It could be different other ideas so I think we would appreciate it if we would get some ideas and feedback from you on how you would frame the concept of open internet within our environment and mission's statement.

Marika Konings: (Erika) this is Marika.

(Erika): Yes.

Marika Konings: Yes I just want to answer a question in the chat from (Mark). Yes and just so you know it's correct. What is here in the mind map is indeed a distilled version that's focused on the scoring of the objective as well as the examples identified. The survey contains much more input and in certain cases in these where someone already mentioned the certain example and just repeated that I didn't necessarily include that.

So of course you're all encouraged as well to review the full results. A number of people also provided additional comments. And as I noted with regards to linking it to the mission some did indeed refer back to ICANN's mission. But many focused more on benefits of the project itself. So again it's probably why we need to look back and see if we can just go from there.

But again it may be easier as well once we've done the clustering or grouping together of some of these concepts that maybe you're able to - You know - translate those into more general description of an example. And that may make it easier then as well to link it back. So I hope that explains.

(Erika): Yes. Valid. That's exactly the point what we discussed. Because some ideas overlap to we want to build these kinds of clusters. And then see if we agree with these clusters. And Judith you have some great ideas. We have seen them. So if others have more understanding about how we can frame the open internet into our environment this would be helpful just for our own understanding we could at least point to the list which we have in front of us. So we have a clearer understanding.

Wait. Any other comment? Ching?

Ching Chiao: (Erika) this is Ching. Yes. Thank you. This is Ching Chiao for the recording. I think - So I probably should raise it here and speaking as a representative

from (CCNSO) is that I like the format for the survey. So in the beginning we get to read again about ICANNs missions. So that's why I schedule - And I see one of the things that we really need to - A clear - You know - A - You know - Understanding from a (CCTOB) point of view is that whether the promotion of the (CCTOB) fits into the mission that we are talking about here.

Because reading from - You know - from the text is that the focus is primarily is for the - You know - is for the (GTOB) parts. So I think maybe it's - For some of us it's working with the staff and - You know - actually figuring out - You know - What's there for the (CCTOB) here. And I think -- first of all -- it's trying to get understanding and is that once again maybe it makes - It - You know - It fits within the open internet part or something else. I'll try to bring up this point. Thank you.

(Erika): Yes. A good point. Marika would you feel comfortable if we keep this list open and would receive new topics like the one Ching is raising or the clarification or ideas about the open internet could be understood from Judith? Could we just add these comments in the - To the list which we already have?

Marika Konings: It wouldn't work. It would probably be easier if people just send it by email in specific response to maybe the mind map instead of there. Because I think if we start adding it to the survey we end up going back and forth and maybe you could -

(Erika): That's a good point.

Marika Konings: And I don't know either if it's worth doing that after we've had a chance to look at the clusters. Because again I think the idea of the clusters would be as well to - You know - Generalize some of the terminology. Which may potentially address - Change the question. Of course if it doesn't that needs to be recognized and addressed.

(Erika): Yes. Let's do it like this. Let's do the clusters. But we notice the comments raised and the chat already today. And then we present the clusters to this group. And then we can see what is missing and how we want them to proceed. If we want to do an extended survey based on the clusters or if we can sort this out doing the discussion which we will have.

Perfect. I like this. That's a good one Marika. Thank you so much. Anybody else on this topic? No? Okay. Point five. I think point five is just the - is just a reminder that we still would love to receive from you more questions for our external experts. And looking back to some of the discussions we had today maybe these are some discussions you want to actually debate with the external experts. Like for example the internal/external because I'm pretty sure that's not the first time asked to an organization, "Did you prefer to handle it internally or did you prefer to build - To have your own structure built? Or did you just attach it to an already existing structure?"

So if you could just maybe review the topics which were important for you today and then maybe put them into this Google list. We have a common Google document where you can all add your questions. This would be fantastic. Maybe - Marika maybe what we should do - Because you will send out the summary later of our taking points today. Maybe we can attach again the link to the Google document?

Marika Konings: Yes. (Erika) this is Marika. Yes. Definitely. So the link is also in the agenda we circulated. And if I can go one minute back to the-

((Crosstalk))

(Erika): As much as you want.

Marika Konings: Thank you. Because one thing we didn't discuss or consider yet whether we're already at a stage where we want to discard certain objectives. And we may not be able to decide that now. But of course that would also help focus

the work. And I think in the scoring we can see there's a - You know - clear support for - I think the top four. And then it seems to dwindle down. So at some point I think the WG will need to need to consider - You know - are some of the other objectives still relevant? Do they need to be specifically called out or -- again as I mentioned before -- maybe there is a way where you have an overall objective under which you identify a number of priority areas.

But of course doesn't necessarily exclude - You know - Some of the other topics that are identified. And I said - You know - some of those other topics are - will be general major so as much they still fit within some of the objectives identified. So I just wanted to highlight and flag that. And of course if people want to comment on that they're more than welcome to.

(Erika): Yes. You're right. So it's not just the clustering which we need to look into but the objectives as well. And we already have a - Kind of a hit list of objectives. You're absolutely right. Maybe we can highlight them in the - Once we do the cluster maybe we can highlight these top objectives as well again.

Marika Konings: Yes.

(Erika): I think there's something coming in. Kavouss. My (unintelligible) divided. Questions to be answers. Internal. External. Kavouss we had a discussion about it that we'd like to invite external experts and that we'd have a discussion with them. How they built their own foundation. So this is a discussion with expert which have undertaken a similar exercise. So that we can get from them some advice to be able to do this.

We can't ask them all the questions we are debating internally because we are such a special group and focus. And such a special environment. You can't assume that an expert that is working on -- like for example the Gates Foundation on methane or somebody else who is working on other issues --

they will not automatically understand what we do. So we need a bit of clarity about what we want to ask.

And we like to send some of these questions ahead of the call to these experts so that when we have the call we can really focus on the key issues and they understand actually what we want to hear from them. Because otherwise they are a little bit lost with our - You know - Topics. Is there something else which we have to go look into? (Unintelligible)? Are you supporting (unintelligible)?

I don't think for there's something else which I have overlooked here. Yes. Surveys are saying it's a way to encourage members to participate. Yes. Okay. I think we are pretty much done. If there's no other topic which you want to raise. Marika just for an understanding - What is the time table we have now scheduled for the calls with the external expert? Do we already have a time table in understanding when we want to do this?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think we originally identified for such a call to potentially take place at the end of August. But I think it looks at this stage also looking at the questions that some will work and need extra identify specific questions. And more specifically looking at - You know - which are questions that need to be answered now before we move into the next phase.

So it may be worth encouraging everyone to look at the table as it currently stands and also factor in the conversation we had today and on the previous call. Look at and see the questions that we've identified as requiring a response before we move into the next phase. And focus on those specific questions. So that then I think we can identify which ones of those need to be addressed now and how to move them forward.

Because I think those are discussed and maybe it's worth sending some of those out through email first and then have a follow up conversation when initial responses are back. So we don't have a set time table yet. It looks like

it's something that requires a bit more work. But hopefully we can flush some of that out soon. And then identify and do the steps to be taken to get to that conversation.

(Erika): Okay. Thank you. So we are more thinking about September probably.

Marika Konings: Yes. I would believe so.

(Erika): Good. Okay. Let's review this. We can review this together and then make a proposal. Any other points? We have one from Mark. Mark is wondering whether we received the reply from our board to our letter. We haven't. But I don't think that we expected one. And we were practically not asking for one. But I see we have two board members here. Asha and Becky. Would you want to comment on this one? I'm not sure if they hear us. Asha? Becky?

No? Okay. It's late in Asia. So she might not be able to hear. So I don't know. Oh. There she is. She can't speak. Asha. Yes. No comment for now. Okay. Mark we can come back to this point but we didn't actually expect a letter. And I had a short meeting with Steve at our last meeting and I don't think so there was a need to reply. But we will follow up on this one just to get an understanding. I agree with you.

So last item is point six on the agenda. Confirm next steps and our next meeting. So our net call is on the 10th of August. Again at (14 UDC). Thanks so much everybody. And we've finished the call for today. Bye bye to everybody.

Marika Konings: Thanks all. Bye.

(Erika): Bye.

Woman: Thanks everyone. Today's meeting is adjourned. Operator could you please disconnect all lines. And to everyone have a great day.

Woman: Okay. Yes. Bye bye.

END