JULIE BISLAND

All right. Well, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the CCWG new gTLD Auction Proceeds call on Wednesday the 18th of March 2020. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room.

If you're only on the audio bridge could you please let yourself be known now? All right. I just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the transcription and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. With this, I'll turn it back over to you, Erika. You can begin.

ERIKA MANN:

Julie, thank you so much. Let me welcome you all first, and thank you for being in this complicated week, with us. It's such a difficult time, so I know it will be not easy for many of you to be able to continue to follow these kinds of calls, so thank you so much. Let me ask you quickly if there's any update you would like to make concerning the Conflict of Interest Declaration?

No? Not the case? Okay, then we have two items on the agenda today. So, the first is that we'd like to continue the review of the public comments we have received. We made good progress last time and we are very hopeful that we can hopefully finalize the rest of the comments which we received.

We have a few outstanding items which are leftover from the last call or where a reminder was sent to us that we have forgotten to include some of the points apparently for discussion. So we will come to these items at the very end but we would love to first continue the review of the outstanding comments, and then, at the very end, we would love to discuss with you the outstanding topics. I hope you can agree to this procedure.

Okay, then let's continue and let's pull up the first one. Emily, back to you, if you would be so kind as to put up the first item we have to discuss now. Emily, are you still there? Is anybody there?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Oh, there you are.

EMILY BARABAS: I'm just pulling up the document. One moment.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. So, what you should see here is the template for question number two, and we were partway through that on the last call. So, maybe just

as a refresher, we will go over what that question was, and then hop forward to the question that we're up to. So, question number two, for public comment. We have an open line. Thanks, Julie.

So, question number two was, "Do you have any concerns about the updates the CCWG has made as listed in section one above in response to the public comment forum? If yes, please specify what changes concern you and why."

The question is, essentially, based on the comments provided on this question, "Are there edits that should be made to the proposed final report?" You'll see here the sections that were updated and listed in the public comment forum. I won't go through those.

We left off at comment number four. We're going to come back to the ALAC comment around recommendation seven at the end of the call, which was something that we left open for further conclusion on this call.

Comment number four is from the Registries Stakeholder Group. The Registries Stakeholder Group says that they don't have any concerns about the updates that have been made. They appreciate some of the specific items updated in sections four and five, and also support the recommendations around the independent project evaluations panel.

So, the recommendation from leadership is that no additional action is needed here as they are, essentially, affirming what has been changed. Erika, I'll pass it back to you to see if there are any comments.

EN

ERIKA MANN:

I'm checking, Emily. I'm checking. There are no further comments, I believe. Give it just a quick second. Let me check, quickly, the participant … No, nobody is raising their hand, either, so let's continue, please.

EMILY BARABAS:

Thanks, Erika. Comment number five is from the BC. "The BC," the core of the question here, which I'm highlighting, "notes that the CCWG have already recognized that bylaws must be amended to eliminate requests for reconsideration and independent review panel from the available remedies to challenge grants. These are amendments to the fundamental bylaws which should require Empowered Community approval."

Maybe I'll pause here. This is an item that we had requested some input from ICANN legal to confirm whether the BC's understanding is accurate or whether there is something else that needs to be clarified. I don't know if that's something that we should speak to on this call or just wait for written follow-up on. So, Sam, I don't want to put you on the spot but if you do want to speak, please feel free to.

And then, the second part of the comment regarding risk management. They note that the report recommends that funds which are to be dispersed using the independent expert panel as evaluators may not be used for matters currently covered by the ICANN budget, so they're just reaffirming some of the text there. Sam says she'll follow up this week on that item. Thanks, Sam.

So, the leadership recommendation here is primarily to confirm the BC's notes regarding the bylaws amendments with ICANN legal, and we'll be closing the loop on that later this week. Although, Sam says that on this point she can confirm that the BC's statement is correct. Erika, I'll pass it back to you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Emily. Sam, are you able to say until when you can respond to it? I believe you're saying "this week." Do you mean this week? I assume you are in difficulties, too, because of all the corona stuff. Can you do it this week or are you more thinking about finishing it next week?

SAM EISNER: My goal is to get through any of the pending …

ERIKA MANN: Sam, at least I can't hear you. Sam? Julie, is it me or is it Sam who is having difficulty?

JULIE BISLAND: I think her audio is coming in.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I can hear you.

EN

ERIKA MANN: Okay.

JULIE BISLAND: Yeah. It's Sam who is having the trouble. I'll reach out to her.

ERIKA MANN: Okay. Let's continue. Sam, we'll come back to you a little bit later. We have understood that you're trying to do it this week but we would fully understand if you can't get it done until the end of the week. When you're back and when we can hear you again we can … Oh, you're writing. "I will respond by the end of this week, Friday." Okay. Thank you so much for this, Sam. Emily, let's take the next item.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. Comment number six is from the IPC. The IPC in its comment encouraged review of the proposed final report with the community at ICANN67. The leadership recommendation here was noting that, due to the remote nature of the meeting, the CCWG did not meet. The group may want to consider holding a webinar at the close of its work to share recommendations contained in the final report with the community. I'll pause there.

ERIKA MANN: Yep. Thanks so much, Emily. I'm just checking because I would love us to get through the whole text and all of the outstanding items today. So, if nobody wants to discuss this, I assume there is an agreement. Yeah. Just let's continue, Julie. I think we have an agreement, here.

EN

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. And I'm noting Anne's support for the webinar, there.

ERIKA MANN: Exactly. Thank you.

EMILY BARABAS: Comment number seven, NCSG. The NCSG has no concerns about the updates and the leadership recommends that no action is needed. Before I pause, I'll just note that the final two comments were considered to be out of scope and appeared to be submitted to the wrong public comment forum. These particular commenters were interested in the .com public comment forum that was also open at the same time and we passed those comments along to the appropriate [SAC] contact. So, any comments on the NCSG response?

ERIKA MANN: No, Emily. Just let's continue. If I see something I will alert you and if not, just let's continue. There is nothing in there. Nobody is raising a hand and there is nothing in the chatroom, either. "Okay webinar," we had an okay, but this we already passed, so just let's continue.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. Thanks, Erika. We're now onto the … Oh, I'm sorry. The response is to question number three. No, that was number one. Sorry.

EN

ERIKA MANN:	That's okay.
EMILY BARABAS:	There we go. Okay. So, here are the responses to question number three. Question number three is, "Is there any further information you think the CCWG should consider that it hasn't previously considered in order to finalize its report for submission to the chartering organization?" The question for the CCWG is, "Are there any additional edits to the report that are necessary as a result of these comments?"
	The first comment is from Sylvia Cadena. She says that she believes the discussions were comprehensive and provide clear guidance, and notes that it's important that the deliberations and recommendations are followed and that the implementation team and process does not modify the objectives and follows the guidelines and recommendations. The leadership recommends that no additional action is needed, here. I'll pause for just a moment. Okay. Seeing no comments.
ERIKA MANN:	Continue. I don't see …
EMILY BARABAS:	Comment number two is from the Registries Stakeholder Group. This focuses on recommendation eight. The Registries Stakeholder Group believes that the dispersion of auction proceeds should not exclude ICANN Org or its constituent parts as a potential beneficiary, and the leadership recommendation there is that the CCWG should review recommendation eight to ensure that the text is clear.

Here's recommendation eight, in the margins. It says, "The CCWG did not reach consensus to provide any specific recommendation on whether or not ICANN Org or its constituent parts could be a beneficiary of auction proceeds but it does recommend that for all applications the stipulated conditions and requirements, including legal and fiduciary requirements, need to be met.

And that should be read in combination with the response to trigger question ten, which provides additional context about that question regarding whether ICANN Org should be a potential beneficiary. We can bring up the text if it's useful.

ERIKA MANN: Emily, yes, I recommend to bring up the text. I mean, that's a topic we have discussed many times and I recommend we do not discuss it again because I believe we came to the conclusion with this text. What I like about the current format of the text is it leaves sufficient space for future evaluation in case, let's say, the future team and the future evaluators will receive projects which they will receive as being valuable to support.

So, we are not excluding anything but we are not framing the topic, either, which is at least—I'm forgetting the word—sometimes the best, if you have a conflict and you can't find an agreement so you let the future decide upon it. Let me have a look at the text again, the context. Yeah. Maybe you can read it again just to remind everyone, Emily. It makes it easier to understand the context.

EMILY BARABAS:	Sure. So, charter question ten is, "To what extent, and if so, how could ICANN the organization or a constituent part thereof be a beneficiary of some of the auction functions?" And the response to charter question ten: "ICANN the organization or a constituent part thereof could potentially be a beneficiary in either of two scenarios.

First, funds are used by ICANN Org distinct from the granting process, for example, to replenish the reserve fund, or second, funds are allocated through the granting process. In order for an SO/AC or some part thereof to be able to apply for auction proceeds, it would have to meet all of the application criteria and basic due diligence requirements used in the evaluation of any other applicant.

Considerations of self-dealing, private benefit, as well as conflict of interest would need to be taken into account in evaluating the application. The applicant would need to demonstrate that the proposed use of funds is separate from work that is already funded as part of ICANN's daily operation.

The CCWG anticipates that allocation of funds in this manner would be the exception rather than the rule. If ICANN Org were eligible to apply through the granting process under mechanisms A, B, or C, particular attention would need to be paid to maintaining division and recognition of responsibilities of staffing, budget, confidential information, and operations between the department responsible for proceeds allocation and other parts of the organization that may apply for funds.

From the perspective of mechanism C, based on input received from ICANN Org and the ICANN Board, ICANN would likely not be able to

apply for funds granted through a foundation developed to support ICANN's mission due to self-dealing concerns in the administration and oversight of foundations.

To the extent that ICANN is not an applicant for funds through the ICANN foundation but is instead among the intended beneficiaries of the applicant's use of the applied-for grant, each such situation would need to be investigated on the particular set of facts and circumstances to see if self-dealing or indirect self-dealing concerns arise.

Conflict of interest provisions would also become particularly important. See response to charter question five for additional information about conflict of interest provision. The CCWG considered input from the ICANN Board in relation to this charter question." And then, it lists recommendation eight, which I read earlier.

ERIKA MANN: Emily, I would recommend let's go back to the question you read earlier from ALAC so that we can take a decision now about this item. Can you go back?

EMILY BARABAS: Yep, one moment.

ERIKA MANN: Now we have the context, so now let's review a comment we received and then our recommendation.

EMILY BARABAS: One moment.

ERIKA MANN: Yep.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. So, going back to the ALAC comment?

ERIKA MANN: Yep.

EMILY BARABAS: There we go. The ALAC stated that they "do not believe ICANN Org should be able to participate in auction proceeds but that we are not as clear on whether one of the representative bodies within one of the ICANN constituencies, if they are legal entities in their own right, or whether an ALS, which exists in its own right as a legal entity, can submit a request, provided that all applications meet the stipulated conditions and requirements, including legal and fiduciary requirements."

As a reminder, the discussion there was that some members of the CCWG had stated that they believe that there should be additional text affirmatively stating that these entities should be eligible.

ERIKA MANN:	Are these entities eligible if they are legal entities and if they fulfill all of the other criteria which we have established? So, can we have a discussion about this topic? Is somebody from ALAC with us? Let me go and have a look.
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Yes.
ERIKA MANN:	Alan. I think Alan raised his hand first, so would you mind if I go quick to Alan, first?
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Fine.
ERIKA MANN:	Thank you. Alan, please.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. I'm giving you my personal opinion here, not necessarily the ALAC opinion. I don't see any rationale for saying that a constituent part of ICANN, which is not legally part of ICANN, could not apply. I mean, At-Large is made up of about 250 At-Large structures which are independent organizations in their own countries.
	The ICANN bylaws explicitly say that they cannot depend on ICANN for money so there is no regular fiduciary connection between the two, and

EN

I can't see a rationale for saying that this kind of group could not apply. Obviously, at the time of application, if there is some reason that it might be rejected, so be it.

The other part of ICANN that came into question is a group such as— and I'm not sure this is a good example but I'll use it—if the Intellectual Property Constituency or the Registries Stakeholder Group, for instance, is an independently chartered corporation and it clearly is independent of ICANN from a financial point of view, I'm presuming that they also could apply and have a valid project.

That one, I'm a little bit less sure of because they are an integral part of ICANN that are mentioned in the bylaws. But certainly, in the other case, a group that is somehow affiliated with ICANN in a very loose way, I can't see a rationale for saying they could not apply. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Judith, please. Judith, are you not on the …? We can't see you, can we?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I'm here but I'm not on video.

ERIKA MANN: Got you. That's why I'm not seeing you. Go ahead, please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: You'll see me as a picture.

ERIKA MANN: I see you now, yep. I couldn't see you a minute ago and now I have you. Yeah, please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I'm sorry about that.

ERIKA MANN: No, that's on my end, the problem. Please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, I agree with Alan on that. Many of the ALSes, as you said, are set independent legal entities, and so they should be allowed to apply but they should also have to go through the same process that everyone else goes through to apply.

The question, what I didn't understand is, as Alan raised, other constituencies that may be separate legal entities, they may not be able to apply, such as a larger … Like, the constituency vendors, like he mentioned Intellectual Property or others that are separate legal entities. I don't understand. That, I would like a better explanation on.

I see ALSes as being able to apply, and I think at least my concern was that ICANN Org itself should not be able to apply to it, but the ALSes that make that are within each RALO or within each of the groups, they should be able to apply. Thanks.

ERIKA MANN:	Thank you so much. We'll come back to this point, the distinction you made, but let me go first to Anne, I believe. Let me go back. I'm in the chatroom. Yeah. Anne, please.
ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:	Hello. Thank you, Erika. I think that, with respect to ICANN Org, probably we are okay as we are since, really, the funds cannot be used for anything that is in the ICANN Org budget. So, if ICANN Org were applying for a grant, that would mean that the grant funds would come into their budget, their current budget, so I don't see how they could actually do that.
	So, maybe that's not as express as it needs to be but I think it's already there. Outside of that, you have the fact that ICANN Org has reserved the right to use some of these funds before they're ever allocated in [tranch], as we say in French. So, that may be more of a theoretical issue than a real one.
	With respect to entities that are constituencies like the IPC, I'm not sure how the Implementation Review Team will define "legal entity." It's our understanding from the accountability work that the IPC and other constituencies are, essentially, these member-associations under California law, and maybe Sam could potentially say more about that. I don't know whether they do or don't constitute legal entities but, again, I think the question of what constitutes a legal entity is probably more of an Implementation Review Team question.
	I don't think there is a big danger by the fact that those entities are advisory or whatever to ICANN because, once again, they're not in

ICANN's budget. There is no money allocated to the IPC, for example, or the BC other than, I guess, travel and that kind of thing.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Thank you, Anne. Alan, is this a new hand or an old hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it's a new hand.

ERIKA MANN: Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm addressing Emily's question of "what needs to be changed?" I think our wording is clear enough and, yes, there is probably some potential for questions that will have to be resolved in edge cases, but I don't think we're going to cover every possible case in any case. So, I think what we have is fine. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Alan. I agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: The board was very clear that ICANN Org itself cannot apply, so I don't think we need any more debate on that.

EN

ERIKA MANN:	I agree. I think we have evaluated all of the scenarios. I still believe we have the formulation as open as possible so that the board will be part of a bigger project team. You remember, we had the discussion about the root zone update where ICANN would be part of a very broad and big project team. We wouldn't want, then, in such a case that ICANN Org would be excluded from it.
	So, that's why we have danced a little bit around the formulation to, in principle, say no, but in the case of something extremely valuable comes in and which covers many different project partners, it shouldn't be the situation that one partner, in this case ICANN Org, would automatically be excluded. But we have discussed it, I agree with you. I think we are fine.
	Sam, would you want to comment again? I know you've done this many times but would you like to comment again? Danko, I have seen you. I'll come to you in a second. Would you want to comment again on the question about entities and border-legal entities under Californian law? You've done this many times, but just in case, maybe, you are willing to do it just once again.
SAM EISNER:	Can you hear me now?
ERIKA MANN:	Yeah, much better.

EN

SAM EISNER: Great, thank you. So, there are ways for places to qualify as unincorporated associations under California law. I think that it's up to each entity that is applying to identify what jurisdiction it's formed under, what it claims is its jurisdictional basis, and how it can document that it is a legally formed entity. That will all be part of the due diligence so there is not much that I can say here that would grant any entity, just because it might touch ICANN or be through ICANN, that it's formally a legal entity.

I think each entity that is applying has that level of responsibility to do that due diligence upon itself before applying, and that will be something that we would expect to have as part of the due diligence within the process, in line with the responsibilities that ICANN ultimately has in how these funds are appropriately dispersed in line with its regulatory obligations.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Sam. That's exactly in accordance with what you said before. Thank you so much. Danko, please.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Well, I already raised my hand so maybe it wasn't needed but I just wanted to say thanks to Alan. Because I'm a short period of time in this team, maybe there are some things that I didn't fully get, but for me the board lecture was clear so there is prohibition of the structures that are legal entities participating.

	For me, as someone who is also dealing in finance, it is also very important that the budget process is not impaired or impacted by this. That's the reason why the board requested not to include activities or projects that are already covered by the ICANN's operational budget. But I do hope and believe that we agree the text is generally okay, so thank you, Erika. I wanted to support this. You seem to be muted.
JULIE BISLAND:	Hey, Erika. You're muted at this time.
ERIKA MANN:	Oh, apologies. I'm muted. I went through everything already. Okay. Apologies for this. So, I was just checking if somebody else wants to make a comment and I was just moving quick to the chatroom, checking if we have an agreement here. I believe we have an agreement that we keep the text.

I can't see anybody rejecting it and I believe the points from Judith and from Anne are covered, as well, so we should be fine. I'll just give a second in case somebody is opposing my summary. Otherwise, we'll just move forward. Okay. That's not the case. Emily, let's move forward. Thank you so much, everyone. |
| EMILY BARABAS: | Thanks, Erika. So, now we're going back to the review of question three. We just completed the Registries Stakeholder Group comment number two. Moving onto comment number three from the BC. The BC states that whichever mechanism is chosen, ICANN Org should ensure that the |

mechanism is maintained so that it can be reactivated if and when additional proceeds need to be allocated.

The leadership recommendation here is that the CCWG's scope is limited to this particular auction proceeds segment from the 2012 application round, and that the letter to the [triggering] organizations or board accompanying the report could include the BC's input. I'll pass it back to you, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Emily. So, our idea is that when we send forward the complete report we are going to mention different items. We have discussed this already, before. So, we would add this topic and would say, "This is one of the recommendations we received. It's not included in the report because our goal was to focus on the current auction proceeds round, but we want to draw your attention to the comment we received concerning this item from the BC."

I believe this would solve this particular item; wouldn't bring us in conflict with our goals, but wouldn't neglect, either, the point raised by the BC. Just checking with you all, here, if somebody wants to … Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I was a little bit confused by this comment. The phrase "reactivated" implies that all of the auction proceeds that we currently have will have been dispensed and then, suddenly, more money shows

up. I find that scenario rather unlikely given that it is going to be another year or two before we start giving out money.

There are likely to be other rounds for new gTLDs which might come up with additional auction money. I can't see the program dying and then being reactivated, and if it were to be there would be a whole financial analysis that would have to be done at that point.

So, I could easily imagine that more money materializes and just be put into the pot. The comment didn't make a lot of sense to me because of the "reactivated," but I think your answer is fine, anyway, and we can proceed.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Alan. Yeah. I made a similar comment in the leadership discussion which we had, very similar to you, but I believe it's not something which we need to discuss. It's not hurtful and I believe everybody will understand what is meant with the "reactivated." So, if you all agree that we can include this in the letter then we can move forward. Anne, please. Sorry, I didn't see you. Anne, are you talking? Are you on mute?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Oh, sorry. I just want to explain that, in discussions with the BC, the reason for this comment is because of the limited scope of the CCWG. In other words, whatever mechanism is established is suppost to be, as a goal, easy to sunset. And so, the BC comment relates to the fact that, if

for some reason we do sunset it, it's advisable to be able to reactivate it.

And so, I think it is a reasonable comment but it is certainly fine to just point it out the way that you've described, Erika. But the comment comes from the fact that we were not supposed to create a perpetual mechanism. Thanks.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Thank you so much. Totally understood. Thanks for the clarification. We will proceed and will include this in the letter. If we need to clarify it so that it's well-understood, we will come back to you, Anne, and then you can provide the correct language for the complete text, and so that the goal is well-understood. Okay. Emily, let's move forward.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. Comment number four was from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. They note that they have concerns that the proposed final report does not incorporate the feedback that their Registrar Stakeholder Group provided in the last public comment period, and they've resubmitted their comments on the initial report. Erika, I'm not necessarily going to go through all of their comments on the initial report.

ERIKA MANN: No, don't go through all of them, just the key points so that the key points are understood and why we haven't acknowledged them, just as a reminder why we haven't done it yet.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. So, they expressed general support for recommendations with qualifiers on recommendations eight, and also express support for recommendations three, four, six, nine, and ten. They make some points about community involvement. This is—again, just a reminder— text that was specifically about the initial report, so some changes to this text have been made since the final report was drafted.

They say that they strongly believe that a representative group from the ICANN community should be the group responsible for reviewing and approving grants under this program, and should also play a significant role in the follow-up review of the program.

They recommend the limited role of ICANN Org and they talk a little bit about specific mechanisms. On recommendation five, they state that they strongly discourage the CCWG from allowing any use of auction proceeds for ICANN Org or a constituent part thereof.

One recommendation eight, they do not feel it is appropriate for ICANN Org or a constituent part to make determinations regarding which underserved populations are in need and whether they think capacity building is needed. And then, we visit the importance of the role of the community. That is the high level of what they were looking at.

The leadership recommendation here is that the CCWG held extensive discussions on these points and the leadership team recommends that the CCWG does not reopen these issues. And as a reminder, the community members are not excluded from the evaluation panel but it's not in the recommendations that the panel is exclusively made of community members.

The second part of the leadership recommendation is that the report specifies that ICANN community members are not excluded from participation in the independent project applications evaluation panel of experts, provided they do not have a conflict of interest. I'll pass it back to you, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Emily. Yeah. I believe they had a lot of discussions about all of these items and hopefully we can put this to rest, now. Anne, is this a new hand, and Alan, too?

ALAN GREENBERG: Mine is.

ERIKA MANN: Okay. Anne? How about you?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I was just wondering, is there anybody on the call from RySG? I'm certainly not advocating reopening anything here.

EN

ERIKA MANN: I was checking. I can't see it but maybe Steph can review. I was just checking the same as you did. I can't see somebody on the call.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Oh, okay. Well, yeah, just pass it along to Alan and whatever comment he has.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Thank you. Alan. Alan, are you on mute? Alan?

JULIE BISLAND: I think he just lost audio, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Ah, okay. So, he is not muted.

JULIE BISLAND: He was on his end but now he has lost audio.

ERIKA MANN: Oh, okay. Let us give a second. Is there anybody else who would love, in the meantime, until we wait for Alan, to have a discussion about these topics or believes that the leadership recommendation is not a correct one? I believe we have discussed these items for such a long time. If we

EN

start again, it will just bring us to an endless discussion loop. Alan, are you back? Alan?

JULIE BISLAND: No, I still show he doesn't have audio.

ERIKA MANN: It's a noise which I hear. It seems to be Alan but it's just a noise. Alan, can you type? Can you type your comment? So, let me go to the [cross talk] room.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Erika, could I get in the queue?

ERIKA MANN: Sure. Yes, go ahead and say something. We wait for Alan, so please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Sure. I just wonder if some way to address this might be to just say that the definition of underserved populations would be a matter for the Implementation Review Team. There seems to be some concern about how underserved populations are defined. There is a lot of discussion going on with that in the community and I don't know who would address the RySG concerns to make sure that this is a topic that is addressed by IRT.

EN

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. I mean, their global definition is about what underserved regional [release] developing countries are, or whatever. I believe we have something included in the guidelines but maybe I'm wrong. We certainly can do this. We can put something in the guidelines saying, "That's a topic you will have to look into if you haven't because it's not the role of our work but it's something really [elementary], to do so." We can do this, absolutely.

Let me check, quickly, the chatroom. "Agree" from Vanda. I agree, Vanda, too. I think you agree for the "put in something in the guidelines." There is something from Emily: "This is currently included in the response for charter question six." Exactly. That was my memory. So, we have it included.

We can review it in this context, Emily, and maybe you can have a quick … And can pull out, direct, question six, the text, if you are able to do it, and then we can see what we already have included. Yeah. Okay. I'll give Emily a second. I wonder in the meantime if Alan is with us? No. Okay. So, let's go to charter question six so that we can see the context of what we have already written. Emily, please. Are you able to read it?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Erika. The response is somewhat long, but maybe I'll start going through the key parts.

ERIKA MANN: Take the key parts.

EMILY BARABAS: The key parts, yeah. So, charter question six was, "Should any priority or preference be given to organizations from developing economies, projects implemented in such regions and/or under-represented groups?" And the response is, "The CCWG has identified three objectives for the new gTLD Auction Proceeds fund allocation, one of which focuses on underserved populations."

So, the first bullet is to benefit the development, distribution, evolution and structures/projects that support the internet's unique identifier systems. The second is to benefit capacity building and underserved populations, and third, to benefit the open and inter-operable Internet.

Other than ensuring that all three goals must support ICANN's mission, the CCWG does not have specific guidance on how these three objectives should be prioritized or translated into specific program elements, such as selection criteria for funding applicants, although further consideration could be given to weighing certain criteria to indicate priority.

Depending on the design of the funding allocation mechanism, the objective of benefitting capacity building and underserved populations could be met in different ways. And then, some examples are provided.

And then it states, "This issue will need to be considered further in the implementation phase. The CCWG acknowledges that successfully reaching target populations and projects will be an ongoing process that may require programmatic adjustments over time," and then talks about the reviews and the process of readjustments, and talks a little bit

about the potential of basketing of funds and how that might play into this objective, and notes that "mechanisms A, B, and C allow for the allocation of grants internationally, consistent with the principle on Global and Diversity Values provided by the ICANN Board.

And then, there is recommendation 11 which states, "As one of the objectives of the new gTLD Auction Proceeds fund allocation is to contribute to projects that support capacity building and underserved populations, consideration about how this objective can be achieved should be given further consideration during the implementation phase.

The CCWG does not have a particular preference about how to achieve the objective but provided guidance for the implementation phase, see hereunder. The CCWG notes that auction proceeds must be used in a manner that supports ICANN's mission."

And the guidance for the implementation phase states, "During the implementation phase, further consideration needs to be given to how to contribute to projects that support capacity building and underserved populations, also in conjunction with other objectives that have been recommended by the CCWG. In addition to enabling projects that support capacity building and underserved populations, attention should also be given to facilitating receipt of applications from diverse geographic regions and communities as well as how to support applications from diverse backgrounds.

Further work will also need to be undertaken as part of the implementation phase on how to define underserved populations, as well as the guidance that is to be provided to the Independent Project

Applications Evaluation Panel to help inform a determination of which regions qualify as underserved regions and in which areas capacity building may be specifically needed."

ERIKA MANN: I think that's fine, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: And then basketing is discussed a bit more. So, it's definitely discussed that further work is needed in the implementation phase.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. I think we covered, really, all of the concerns because we had so intensive discussions about this item, and we were very clear for them. You'll remember, how careful we were in bringing, really, all these points together. So, in saying, "This is something you have to evaluate, that's something you have to look into, but we're not giving you precise recommendations because it depends on so many factors. So, you need, first, to have them make an [inaudible] decided, then you have to continue the work on the project design and then, when you come to this item, you will have to evaluate practically the topics which we have put in the guidelines and in our report," so they then will have this text and can review it. And I believe we touched on everything. I don't believe anything is missing here. But if you believe I might be overlooking something, then just please let me know.

Alan is making a point, a different one. So, let me just finish this discussion here that we just started then I'll come back to your point, Alan, in a second.

So are you fine, Anne? Because you mentioned that maybe it would be good to put a reference in. Are you okay with the text which we have already included? I believe it covers all of the items which you mentioned and which the group is concerned about. Anne, are you with us? Have we lost you too? Are you on mute?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Sorry. Yeah, I probably just think that what we should do is make a cross-reference when we are in the box where we're noting our work with respect to the RySG comment. We should probably just say that we have addressed the things that they say that we have not addressed. In other words, we should note that, in relation to underserved populations, that's been addressed, and the answer to chartered question six. And I just don't like leaving hanging out there, having them say that the questions haven't been addressed without noting where they've been addressed, just quickly with a cross-reference. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Good point. We will do this. Absolutely. That's relatively easy, too. Thank you so much for this. And now, let's come back to Alan's point. Let me read what he was writing: "My comment was going to be that my recollection was that the board explicitly said that the selection panel should not be a community group, although individual members could be from the community but not be there representing them."

Exactly. That was the advice we had from the board and the majority from our team had the same opinion, so there was no division, actually, in my opinion. You're absolutely right.

So, I believe we have the correct text and we will have to note, maybe, in our reply to them, why we came to this conclusion. So, let me go back, if we have somebody raising a hand. That's not the point. So, Emily, I believe we have an understanding. We will note how much we already have included from their point so that they don't feel frustrated that we are overlooking their recommendation.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. That makes sense. We'll add that into the template with specific references to the text where those items are addressed. The next comment is—

ERIKA MANN: And to seem like a community. We are not excluding the community, we're just not making it a community panel. But community members can participate as their individual capacity as an expert, just not representing a particular group.

EMILY BARABAS: [inaudible].

EN

ERIKA MANN: Want to notice. Yeah. Thank you so much.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. Comment number five from the IPC. So, the core of this comment is that the IPC believes that the CCWG Auction Proceeds should either obtain authorization to conduct a feasibility study or make, as implementation guidance, a piece of implementation guidance that a feasibility study should be completed.

So, this is in relation to the comments or the text on page 12, in which it currently states that the board may do a feasibility assessment regarding the options for the different mechanisms, and this is saying that it should be more of a recommendation or implementation guidance. So, perhaps it would be helpful for me to pull up that relevant section of the report? And just before this call, will the leadership team discuss how to proceed with that. Although, I see Anne's hand is up, so she may want to clarify on the point she raised up her hand for.

ERIKA MANN: Just go forward, and then I take Alan once we have seen all the paper and all the comments related to it. And then, I'll go to Alan. And Anne, I believe, is up as well.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. So, looking at page 12 of the report. We have existing text which states, "In considering these recommendations, the CCWG anticipates that the ICANN Board may conduct a feasibility assessment in which it provides further details on these aspects so that the board can take an

informed decision about supporting the most appropriate mechanism, and these aspects are the elements and considerations regarding the different mechanisms. Such an assessment will have to factor in that it concerns a limited time mechanism with the ability to sunset as the CCWG is recommending against creating a perpetual mechanism."

So that's the existing text, and I'll pass it back to you. I just wanted to note that the leadership team took a look at the structure of this report to see if there's a place where we could incorporate this into the recommendation, and noted that, potentially, on page 19 in response to charter question one, we have recommendation one which is about the flexion of the mechanisms and that, potentially, we could add into recommendation one that the CCWG recommends a feasibility assessment is conducted by the board. I'll pass it back to you, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Emily. And just a reminder, why the feasibility assessment or study might make sense is because if we recommend to the board to make an [assessment] then, of course, there is a judgment that will have to be made. If we just were to be able to recommend one, it would be much easier and, very likely, a feasibility study or assessment wouldn't make sense, but once you put forward two, really the situation is a little bit different.

And it's a bit different for the board, too, because the board will have to justify why they want to do it, because we haven't given them a complete justification for a single mechanism. So, let me have a look. I

believe Alan and Anne, or Anne and Alan. I don't know who goes first. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anne was first, please.

ERIKA MANN: Anne was first. Thank you. Anne, I assume you are on mute.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Am I off now? Hi. I just wanted to say that I appreciate leadership's time to discuss this, and I agree with the leadership recommendation, and I can say that I have touched base with the BC on this. I have also noticed the SSAC comment and I think the suggested change to the recommendation is appropriate and would support that. So, thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Anne. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm afraid I disagree. Mandating that the Board must do a feasibility study—and as Sam noted, feasibility may be the wrong word anyway—says that we're adding another probably six to eight months to this process to contract with someone external who's able to do this kind of thing, to do the report, and then produce the report and then have it analyzed.

If the board feels there is a fiduciary requirement, that things are vague enough that it needs an external evaluation, either an evaluation or feasibility study, then the board will do it. They're not going to go charge ahead if they don't feel comfortable with the plan.

On the other hand, if the board does feel comfortable with the plan, we should not be mandating an extra huge amount of work after we've spent three years doing this. I just see it's foolish. I trust the board to make a reasonable decision at the time and not waste ICANN money on, or the auction proceeds money, doing a study if it's not necessary, and I trust them to do it if they feel it is necessary. Mandating it, I think, is inappropriate. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, Alan. I made a similar point in the leadership discussion but was then convinced by other comments I had received that it might be good to put in something and to change the current language. So, I believe, Emily, we haven't said "must" what we want to propose but we have said, as a recommendation, "strongly recommend." And if you don't want to put in the "strongly" we can do "I would recommend." We can just put in recommend instead of saying even "strongly."

So maybe, Emily, you can clarify the correct language. And let me look in the meantime. I believe just in the chat room I saw something popping up from Rudi, "Not sure why there's a need to mandate a study." So, agree. Alan, "Let's get it right." Anne, "Just do it fast. It would not be mandating." No, not the idea is mandating. That is not the point. Believe

EN

it's just a recommendation. And then from Emily, yeah, she echoes what I said, or I echoed what she said, "strongly encourages." So, it's totally right. We shouldn't mandate what the ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Erika. My hand is in. And if you could give me the floor when you finish.

ERIKA MANN: I will give you the floor. I was just reading quickly in the chat room so everybody has seen it in case they can't. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. By the way, you're breaking up quite badly. I would suggest that if we do want to make this stronger that we say, "We recommend the board consider doing a feasibility study."

Once we've made a recommendation the board has to accept it or not, and I feel much better giving the board some discretion. But if we want to give a positive statement, to say they must consider it, and then do what they believe is the right thing, I'm happy with that. I do not feel comfortable making a hard recommendation that the board do a study but I'm happy to recommend they should consider doing a study. Thank you. That may not satisfy the people who what to see it, but thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you. I agree. Thank you so much, Alan. Anne, would you be okay with this?

EN

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Hi. I think that it doesn't go as far as the public comments are stressing in relation to the need for that type of study. I think we might be better off, then, as a compromise, lodging it as implementation guidance rather than a recommendation because I think you take the teeth out of it if you just say, "Well, our recommendation is that you consider," which is just a "don't do it if you don't want to."

The public comments from IPC, BC, and the SSAC are to the effect that this recommendation should be taken more seriously than that. I kind of differ on the idea that this is going to take eight months to do. I think our own experience, for example, with respect to the Name Collision Analysis Project was that the contractor on that project was able to deliver a first draft and study one within two or three months.

And I think it's important because we have the different mechanisms and because ICANN itself has said, "Guys, we really don't know the cost associated with these choices." They've actually said that in board comments, and that's why this becomes more important. So, I guess my suggested compromise to counter Alan's would be to take it out of the hard recommendation, per se, and put it in as implementation guidance.

ERIKA MANN: I have some concerns with putting it in the implementation guidance because, from a purely logical, procedural point, it makes no sense, because the board will have to take first the decision which kind of mechanism they believe shall be the one, because we put forward two.

And then, the implementation kicks in, the implementation team, and then the guidance becomes valuable and relevant. So, to put this practically at the end, this makes, in my eyes, no real sense because you want to have an "if you want to do it at all you would want to have it as a guidance for the board decision."

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Well, that makes perfect sense, Erika. I see exactly what you're saying there. I'd have to go back to look at this; agree with the leadership recommendation and maybe say that we're still searching for the right words.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. [It's true.] And I think if we say something like "encourage," "strongly encourage," I think it is something the board will not neglect. The board will understand our concern. But at the same time, we should understand as well, if the board comes to a conclusion, that based on our decision they can value their own decision.

I think we should accept this, too, instead of putting too many constraints on, which are the concerns of Alan and many others because it will just postpone it and the outcome will not change much compared to what we already have.

EMILY BARABAS: Well in this regard, if I may, quickly, I would compromise, too, the suggested language "strongly encourage the board," but not just "consider," just "strongly encourage the board to conduct."

EN

ERIKA MANN: Got you. Yeah. Alan. Alan, please, and then Sarah. Alan, are you on mute?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. That was an old hand but I am happy with that wording.

ERIKA MANN: Okay, Sarah?

SARAH DEUTSCH: Hi. I thought it might be useful to point out what the board said in the public comment period, which is, "Upon receipt, the board will review the recommendations in line with the board principles and will rely upon ICANN Org in appropriate collaboration with the implementation shepherds from the CCWG-AP on the details needed to work to provide feasibility information or other implications for both mechanisms.

                               This will be provided to the ICANN Board so that it can carefully consider and make an informed decision upon the eventual mechanism." So that language, I think, is pretty well-drafted to leave that kind of flexibility that folks on the call are discussing. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much for bringing this up, Sarah. Absolutely right. I think we have the flexibility and if we can agree to "strongly encourage," I believe … And then, we will reference the recommendation from the

board, in footnotes, anyhow, so it should be easy, then, to be understood in the correct way. Let me just check again. No new hands. Chat room. I believe we have an agreement, Emily. Emily?

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, Erika. So, shall we move on, then, to the next comment?

ERIKA MANN: Yes, please.

EMILY BARABAS: Okay. This is comment number five. Oh, I'm sorry. We just completed comment number five from the IPC. The next comment is comment number six from the ICANN Board. The board notes appreciation of the inclusion of principles included from board correspondence and also notes some of the footnotes that were added mentioning board feedback on basketing of goals as well as Annex C, and then provides some input on recommendation 13, which focuses on review of the mechanism.

The board welcomes the updated recommendations including the board's previous input. It encourages the CCWG to further highlight the annual reviews as lean check-ins on the process. The board expects that eventual process to support all board principles, in particular those related to due diligence, preservation of resources, etc. And then, the Board also notes that the term "reviews" in ICANN nomenclature is used elsewhere, and encourages the CCWG to consider alternative

expressions of these processes if possible or add additional clarification so that it's separate from ICANN's organizational and specific reviews.

And finally, the Board asks the CCWG to consider adding guidance to the implementation team that any review processes need to be cognizant of existing community deadlines, workloads, and the ongoing review cycles. The leadership recommendation here is to ensure that recommendations embedded in the annexes are sufficiently clear, that they will be understood as guidelines or quasi-guidelines for the implementation team.

Second, to include the board principles in such a lean annual review, so essentially to mention these board principles in the discussion of the annual review. And finally, to check that the language used for the review and evaluation processes is sufficiently clear. Erika, I'll pass it back to you.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Thank you so much. I think these are, again, all topics that we have debated before, and we were clear, for example about the language of reviews, that we want to be careful with language and sometimes more use the language about evaluation. So, that's something that, when we do the review, I would recommend that we just put this in there as a reminder when we do the final review of the final report.

We will just check that we super careful with language, and then we should have a call once the staff has done and the leadership has done

the complete review of all the final, final text. We will send it to you and then we just need one more call just to check that nothing is forgotten.

So, I don't think there is a particular item we have to do right now, here, but let me check. No hand raised. Nothing. Whoops. Why can't I open the chat room? Funny. Here it is. Yeah. Okay. So, I think we can continue, Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Erika. Comment number seven was from the NCSG. The NCSG states that "there needs to be representation diversity in decision making involved with the appointment of an existing organization, as in mechanism C or B. The leadership response is that this comment appears to be beyond the scope of the CCWG's work as it seems to be talking about decisions for swapping partner organizations under some of the mechanisms." I'll pass back to you, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. Thank you so much. I believe that's a decision we really don't have to talk about because, in all organizations which will be selected, they will have their own principles. To have diversity, it's a very common standard. I can't see that ICANN would twin efforts with any organization that wouldn't do this.

So far, I'm not really concerned about this topic and I don't believe we have to put in the guidelines something just to remind the transition team to be careful about this point. In particular, because it relates to C and B, so we don't even know which mechanism is, in the end, selected.

It's either A and B, certainly not C. So, I believe we don't have to do anything here but let me check. Alan, is it you?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Thank you very much. I think I agree with what you're saying but I do want to make a comment. I don't quite understand why we need to consider diversity in selecting the mechanism, the organization for B and C. However, when I read this the first time, I thought they were talking about diversity in selecting the group that will be making the project selections, and I don't think they are but that's what I thought it meant.

And it dawns on me that I think we need to verify in our recommendation of the independent group, that we be very explicit that the independent group that will be doing the project selection be one that is well-versed in dealing with these kinds of applications from a very diverse community and from around the world.

So, we may already have said that somewhere, I'm not sure, but I'd like to go back and check to make sure that when we talk about this independent group, we are explicit that it be a group that can handle a very diverse set of applicants and a diverse set of needs around the world.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much. No, you're right. I believe we have done this because I remember we had a longer discussion about it. I would be surprised if we haven't captured this in the language but we definitely

should check it, you're right. So, Emily, we need to put this on the list when we do the review, that this item is expressed well, and I think we will have a common agreement here. We just need to ensure it's in the language included.

We can check this by e-mail and send a recommendation around for the language. But here, I believe they're talking about something else. I believe they are really talking about there needs to be representation diversity in decision making involved with the appointment of the existing organization as mechanism C and B. So, I believe they are more concerned, if ICANN is twinning work with somebody else, then the counter-partner shall have sufficient representation. That's how I understood it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Erika, I agree with you. I think our response is correct. I was just noting that it twigged something else that I think we need to check. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: You're right. Totally right. Totally correct. Anne, and then I go and check the chat room. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thank you, Erika. I think my recollection regarding Accountability Work Stream 2 work is that the Human Rights Framework which comes into effect into the bylaws when that framework is adopted in Work Stream 2 really covers, I think, the board's obligations in this regard, and I think it's something that we may want to check with Samantha because I

don't think we can add requirements or detract from requirements that exist within ICANN's bylaws or core values.

So, I think it's important that we cross-check this with the Human Rights Framework that the board is already going to be obligated to operate under, and maybe, perhaps, refer to that, because I don't think we want to be redefining or micromanaging the Board's obligation with respect to diversity and human rights. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: No. I agree with you, Anne, but here, it's not a board decision. So, it will be, if they will be selected, they then will cooperate. This new entity inside of ICANN org will twin efforts with a different entity, then both will have to follow their obligation, and then, in the contractual arrangement, both sides will have to come to an agreement in case they have a division of opinions about certain topics.

And then, ICANN Org can always withdraw this entity of ICANN org which will be responsible in twinning with another entity, but then can withdraw from the commitment and will continue to negotiate with another partner.

And I agree. The values which are core to this entity will have to be preserved. Maybe that's a point. Maybe we should check whether the values of this entity or kind of language like this shall be added somewhere, and then it covers all of the topics across the board and we don't have to focus on a particular point. And this might help us.

So, like the point Alan raised, we have to check it, have we covered diversity and these topics well? We do a check, have we covered the diversity and the value portfolio of ICANN? Yeah. Maybe that's helping us. Alan, is that you? Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Just a quick follow up. I think, again, there may be an existing obligation when Work Stream 2 is implemented for ICANN and contracting with third parties to follow this type of guideline as defined in the Human Rights Framework. I think that's something that we need to understand, if that is the governing principle, then maybe Samantha can help us understand that.

ERIKA MANN: Sure, we can ask Sam, but I believe it's not a problem because I do this contractual stuff all the time. Because you have two partners; they negotiate and both come with their value set, and they either agree or they don't agree. And if they don't agree you search for another partner, if you want to cooperate with another partner. I'm not sure if we, as our team … Because that is something which is part of the core value set of ICANN and the board.

They will not negotiate and make an arrangement with somebody if they don't follow these kinds of principles, but we can certainly add something if it makes you more comfortable. Let me see, Sam, do we have still with you? In the meantime, we go to Judith, just to hear what Judith wants to say. Judith, please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. Erika, I agree with you. But I also want to call attention, especially as we said in our ALAC comment that in mechanism A they're going to be outsourcing it to another group, too. So, if Anne is correct, then it should also be the existing organization in all three mechanisms, because if all three mechanisms are going to be having an independent group evaluating then it should relate to all three, and not just to two of them. And so, I was wondering whether we should just say "all mechanisms," or how do we deal with this? Thank you. But I agree with what you said, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much. I see your point. You were saying—it's a point Alan raised many times which is totally correct—even under mechanism A, which would be an ICANN in-house body, even then ICANN could work with a separate entity for particular purposes, and then the same obligation would apply. Yes. So, let's see. Maybe we can find a good text where we put this into. Sam, any comment from you into our discussion concerning this item? Let me check if Sam's—

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I agree that any mechanism will actually, in fact, be governed by the Human Rights Framework once it's implemented in Work Stream 2, and she has made the point better than I made it, actually. It will apply across the board, I believe, but then I don't want to give an opinion that's a legal opinion. So, thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. That's my feeling too. Sam, are you with us? Let me see. I get a note here somewhere now, so let me check it. Here comes Anne. Close Skype. That's something else, Emily. Yeah. Let's see. We discussed this. Let me see if I find back, now, to our discussion. Now I lost you. The same happened, unfortunately, before, because I went to Skype, and now I lost you.

EMILY BARABAS: Erika, while you get back on maybe we can go to Judith. It looks like she has her hand up. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Now, now, I don't have...

ERIKA MANN: No. You did both ready, Emily. I'm not sure if I can get up again because we had the same problem before. I am. I made it this time. Wonderful. So, I believe we have an agreement. In principle, we believe that the whole value set from ICANN will have to be respected when ICANN is negotiating with another entity—it doesn't matter if it's A, B, or C—and we will do a review if we want to put a reference in somewhere.

                      Just a very light touch, and concerning diversity as well, when we do the review, Emily. The staff first, and then we will review in the leadership before it goes to the full team. We just have to ensure that we haven't forgotten this. So, just put this in as an action item.

EMILY BARABAS:	Okay. Thanks, Erika. So, we do have one more comment left.
ERIKA MANN:	We have four minutes left time, or do we have two full hours today?
EMILY BARABAS:	We have 90 minutes. I was noting that the last comment on this page was off-topic and meant for a different public comment period, so we don't need to review that. We do have one more page of responses for the final question to go through. Do you want to just pause here and look at the timeline, and then we can decide where to go from here?
ERIKA MANN:	Yeah. Let's just have a look at it. Let's have a look at the timeline, and then we need to have another call. Or we can do it. If the topics are easy we can do it by email. Otherwise, we need to schedule another call.
EMILY BARABAS:	Okay. We tentatively have a call scheduled for next week but maybe the leadership team can take that offline and make a recommendation looking at the final responses to the questions.
ERIKA MANN:	Yes.

EMILY BARABAS:	Okay. So, for the timeline, and this will just take a moment. Apologies. So, we're now at March 18th, here. We've tentatively said that there are a couple of additional slots if there are further and necessary discussions. Although, the leadership team will, I think, take back what we have so far in terms of agreements and see if it might be possible to propose some edits, first, and resolve them, I think, over email, or whether additional calls are needed, but we have those as placeholders in case they are.
	And as a note, the target date for publishing the final report with any updates is April 15th, and a survey, confirmation of results of the survey, and the goal is still May for finalizing the report and submitting to chartering organization. So, that's basically the same timeline that we've been showing the last couple of meetings. So, I think that's it, and I'll turn it back over to you, Erika.
ERIKA MANN:	Thank you so much. Just let me do a very quick check. Is everybody okay with the call next week? Can you all manage this under the current conditions? Mine are saying, "Fine." We've got yes, practically, back from more or less everyone. So, let's schedule it for next week, and then hopefully we are done next week. Okay. Everybody, thank you so much. Take all good care. Be careful out in the real world. The internet world is currently much better than the real world, so be careful. Wash your hands. Wash your hands and see you next week. Back to you, Emily.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Yeah. Keep safe. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Erika, you are in charge.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Happy birthday, Judith.

ERIKA MANN: Judith, do you have a birthday? Oh my god. We should send you a cake. Maybe flowers, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. I know. I can't even go out really.

ERIKA MANN: That's so sad. See you soon. Take good care.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay.

EN

ERIKA MANN: Emily, back to you. Bye-bye.

EMILY BARABAS: Thank you, Erika. Thanks, every for joining. This meeting is adjourned. Have a good rest of your day.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Happy birthday.

ERIKA MANN: Yes. Happy birthday. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]