ICANN
Transcription
CCWG Auction Proceeds
Wednesday, 10 April 2019 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://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/policy/2019/audio/audio-ccwg-new-gtlds-auction-proceeds-10apr19-en.mp3 [gnso.icann.org]
Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p96d8cppsm8/?proto=true

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/rxZIBg

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

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thank you so much. Well welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Cross Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds call on the 10th of April, 2019.

In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you happen to be only on the audio bridge, would you please let yourself be known now?

Elliot Noss: Elliot's audio, shortly on the other.

Michelle DeSmyter::   Thank you, Elliot. We'll go ahead and note that.

Sebastien Bachollet: Sebastien Bachollet just on audio.

Michelle DeSmyter::   All right. Thank you. All right, and as a reminder to all participants, if you would please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to

avoid any background noise. With this I'll hand the meeting back over to Erika Mann. Please begin.

Erika Mann: Michelle, thank you so much. It's Erika on the call. Concerning the item on the agenda we are now with Point 2, welcome and then the question do you want to make any updates concerning the conflict of interest declaration? Not the case? Okay then let's move to Item 3, which is an update on the status of outstanding action items. Point A is FAO, Marika, remind me what this stands for.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks Erika. This is Marika. It's actually the FAQs, the frequently asked questions. So what staff is working on is to develop, you know, two standalone documents, one of which captures the input that has been received today from the ICANN Board through the different letters that they've shared with the group. And a second one relates to the legal and fiduciary requirements, you know, working closely with Sam and Xavier to, you know, review that information and make sure it's up to date and aligned with any input that has been provided.

So we hope that that will be a helpful reference tool for the group as you discuss the different items as, you know, in many areas input has been provided but it may be more difficult to track down if you have to, you know, go and find letters or different documents and we hope bringing this all together will facilitate that review but also help you identify any further questions you may have or any clarifications you are looking for. I think we're getting close on finalizing these so I'm hoping that we will be able to share those well in advance of the next meeting.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Thank you, Marika. Yes, indeed, we discussed this in Kobe, and I'm glad to hear that you continue working on it. Do you have an early draft which you can show us or if you rather prefer to finalize it and then show it to us so that we can have a discussion about it?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think we'd rather share the final draft because this is something, you know, we don't want to get wrong. So but as said, you know, we're working on getting this to the group as soon as possible. And of course, you know, the information is already there in the different documents, it's just a question of trying to put it all together into one document.

Erika Mann: Yes, thank you so much. It's Erika. It makes absolute sense. And I totally understand, it's an immense work and I'm pretty sure I'm talking for everybody here, extremely grateful for all the work you are doing. It's difficult to track all the documents and just to bring it in – related to the various topics into one document; it's not easy. So thank you so much for doing this.

                    Okay then let's have a look at the next item of the agenda which is actually comment to charter Question 2. And we had a small group working on this, developing draft language. And it was Marilyn, Elliot, Jonathan, Alan and Maureen. Who is going to introduce the topic from this group and make the recommendation for language? Elliot, are you going to do it or who is it? Elliot? I heard you were on the phone.

Elliot Noss: Sorry, I answered you – but – I answered you but with mute. Sorry.

Erika Mann: That's nice…

((Crosstalk))

Elliot Noss: I, you know, I would suggest that, Marilyn, if you're okay, that you should because, you know, she's picked up the pen…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Oh I didn't see…

Elliot Noss: …and done, you know, the best work and I don't want to like sort of…

((Crosstalk))

Elliot Noss: …and I don't want to talk over sort of her work.

Erika Mann: No, no, thank you so much. I didn't see Marilyn on the list. I was checking for her first and I didn't see her, that's why I asked you. Marilyn, are you with us?

Elliot Noss: So if not, then what I would say was I actually wanted to ask her off-list, so take this as a question, not a statement, and I just didn't get it done, if what she posted to the whole list was something that she intended as a kind of a draft for our discussions in the small group. It wasn't clear to me, you know, it felt like it might be but I wasn't sure that it was. And so I can tell you that other than what you guys saw there, we didn't get very far. Is that fair? I don't know if Jonathan's there, anyone else?

Erika Mann: Somebody else from the group willing to speak? Alan is saying he hasn't involved. Somebody wants to talk, please.

Elliot Noss: Yes, the – so when we talk about being involved there's been a small email thread that Marika was good enough to set up. But there was not any substantive work done in that email thread. So Alan, when you say "not involved" I mean, you were on that thread. That's the extent of what's gone on other than again, my question as to whether Marilyn's post was intended to be, you know, sort of towards that small group work or not.

So I think the best way to proceed, Erika, is to assume that we haven't done anything and, you know, with the caveat that Marilyn can, you know, sort of bring the, you know, the issue she raised on the list where, you know, I put out sort of an alternative formulation. But I think we'll talk about that in the course of our discussion today anyway.

Erika Mann: Yes, it's Erika. I have noticed the thread and so, Maureen, is it you who wants to talk? I hear somebody coming in but…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: This is you? Please.

Maureen Hilyard: I just had my hand up. But I agree with what Elliot has said. We haven't – you know, we haven't actually made any sort of like formal statement as yet. I think that what's been (coming), I mean, it was originally sort of like commenting on Number 4, which was to do with universal acceptance.

And what we've come up with and Marilyn has sort of like expanded on it without us, you know, sort of like getting the – an overall statement on it was just that the, you know, relation to the UA and others is that if there are projects that are already funded it really depends on whether the fund, you know, what the (unintelligible) what has been achieved from the project that is actually being funded and what (unintelligible). Sorry.

Erika Mann: Maureen, we are losing you.

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Okay, you're back.

Maureen Hilyard: Yes, so that, you know, and we haven't actually sort of like consolidated a statement as yet. But there has been discussion on, you know, like what is appropriate and what isn't appropriate as far as making application by projects that have previously been funded by ICANN. So we're still working on that one. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Okay, it's Erika. I believe we take it from the agenda. I see that Marika made a longer comment in the chat room. Marika, please just repeat it because many are not going to be able to see what you posted here.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. This is Marika. I just wanted to remind especially the small team because, indeed, you know, some of the conversation seems to have, you know, gone probably broader than what the small team was asked to do because the specific action item coming out of Kobe was to review the example list as well as the guidelines that are included in the annex and consider whether additional language should be added to reflect this notion of what was discussed in Kobe that, you know, evaluators may need to differentiate between what is in this regular operational budget and what has been funded on a more exceptional basis.

But this will be a determination that needs to be made by the evaluators in line with the legal and fiduciary requirements. So that was the specific ask. And I know as well, you know, that the Board also provided specific input in relation to this topic which I think was also included in the email that Erika sent in response to that thread. So, you know, hopefully that will help focus that discussion and the small team can make a determination on whether or not any additional language needs to be added to reflect that notion.

Erika Mann: Thank you. Thank you, Marika. Alan and Elliot and then I believe we can shut down this discussion and get the work back to the small group and hope that we have a language until our next meeting. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Two comments, one on process, one on substance. In terms of process, email is fine but if we really want to come to closure where some of us have varying opinions I think we need to have a small meeting scheduled. In terms of the substance, my personal view has always been we don't want the words we write here to limit really good projects for some arbitrary reason where there's no real – real reason to limit it.

So, you know, the fact universal acceptance was mentioned, the fact that ICANN has a budget for universal acceptance should not mean that we reject a universal acceptance project which is not the kind of thing that ICANN ever funded just because the words happen to match. And, you know, the same is true for, you know, whether, you know, it's requested through an ICANN entity.

But these things need to be discussed and we need to come up with a recommendation. But we really don't want to eliminate good projects for arbitrary reasons that don't match to some real substantive reason. Thank you. At least that's my position.

Erika Mann: Yes. It's Erika. Elliot, please.

Elliot Noss: Yes, I do want to make sure that the broader group understands the comments that I made on the list talking about, you know, where I think – and I think – it's just a, you know, I think Marilyn's position is a valid one. You know, I'm not arguing for right or wrong, I'm arguing for what I believe, you know, to be most appropriate.

But you know, I think that we can take – the simplest expression would be we can, you know, we can take the ICANN mission as the thing that – as the thing that, you know, is – what defines what the project should be, what the project should be. Or we can take the ICANN mission as something that limits or, you know, provides a, you know, a guardrail to what the project should be.

And I really, you know, want to push everyone to think about this statement, you know, the sentence that I put out, you know, is the purpose of the auction proceeds, you know, to benefit ICANN or to benefit the Internet? And I don't think that, you know, Alan and Marilyn and I and, you know, Jonathan and Maureen, you know, are going to be able to, you know, all we'll be going back and forth on is that point really. And so I think, you know, we've got to have a

clear, you know, sort of sense of the room in order to be able to effect this well. Does that make sense?

Erika Mann: It depends, Elliot. It's Erika. I think what we want to avoid is the discussion we already had in the past. I don't think we should try to duplicate the debate we had at the beginning, the question about Internet or ICANN. I believe we steered the course where we said we want to finance projects which fall within the remit of ICANN with an open understanding that if projects come in which are supported, a broad – a broader range of topics which relate to a broader – broader understanding of ICANN, the future evaluators should evaluate it and should not exclude it.

But it should be still supportive of ICANN's mission. That's why we went on this exercise in drawing up these examples just to gauge our common understanding about what we want to achieve. I believe the real…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Yes, go ahead, Elliot.

Elliot Noss: I just was going to say I still feel like, you know, you've said recreate the earlier discussion. I would say I walked out of the earlier discussion feeling like that the temperature of the room or what most people were saying was, you know, they did think that we should be supporting projects that benefitted the Internet within the constraints of ICANN's mission. And that's very different for me than what you just said. So…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: I have a – yes…

((Crosstalk))

Elliot Noss: You're right and I'd love, you know, like let's test that. If you're right, you're right, you know, and that's what most people want. You know, then let's test that, then I'll back off. But I don't feel like that's what I experienced in this group.

Erika Mann: Elliot, and it might be – it's Erika – it might be just – might be just a difference of words because I mean, there's an overlap between what ICANN is doing and what is relevant for the broader Internet, but there's certainly areas which are not – where the two worlds don't connect. Now…

Elliot Noss: Yes.

Erika Mann: …I am worried if we start this discussion again I'm just worried we will have an endless debate and we will not come to a conclusion and we will come another working group which will consider discussion forever. And I really like us to avoid this. So my plea would be give it back to the small group, go and work on it. You pretty much have seen the discussion and you find a solution. But let me check first, I see two more people here, I believe Alan, is it a new hand?

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. It is.

Erika Mann: Thank you. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I mean, Elliot is asking a really important question. Now it's a question that could be answered by saying we should restrict this to things that are good for the Internet and things that are good for ICANN internally, making ICANN a better ICANN, should be excluded. Or we can be open and include those projects and not limit not restrict them. I personally, in light of what I said before, saying I would like to see us restrict things because.

I'll give you a specific example. ICANN has a Fellowship program and a Next Gen program. ICANN does not have a program to bring old people into

ICANN and make sure they can participate. Now, some people may say that would be a really bad idea, there's enough old guys around or old people around anyway. But it's a program that we do to have. If someone were to propose such a program, would that be a valid project?

And that, you know, that may be a bad example but it's an example focused very much on making ICANN more inclusive and not necessarily helping the Internet, unless you happen to believe that ICANN is actually doing good stuff in which case it does implicitly help the Internet. So I think it's a good discussion that we have to have. I know how I would like to see the answer come out that is we not be restrictive but let's turn it back to the small group and have that discussion and then we'll make a proposal.

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Yes, I would like to turn it – yes, Alan, it's Erika. I would like to turn it to the small group and maybe you can review language examples you want to recommend; maybe you have two language examples you can come up with. I just want to really urge you to be careful, if there's funds that are part of the funds becomes just a substitute for the operational budget, maybe we're then missing the big picture. So just keep this in mind. Do we just because we are afraid that part of the operational budget is diminishing, we just want to substitute it. Then maybe there's a better solution than using this money.

But just – I give it back to the group but first before I do so I have Julf and Robert. But after Robert I really like to conclude. Robert – Julf first please.

Robert Guerra: Okay, this is Robert for the record. But I think Julf, were you ahead of me in the queue?

Julf Helsingius: Go ahead, I can wait…

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: Yes, no worries. This is a – sure, this is a good conversation to have. I think two things, I think, you know, I'm in agreement with Elliot in his view in terms of how to proceed. And I would disagree with Alan and at least for me what I'm hearing from him is using this fund to try to complement some of the gaps that ICANN does itself already, for example, public participation. And so I think what we might want to do is, you know, say that when there are funding opportunities that overlap with what ICANN has to go, we might want to have some additional set of questions or criteria to go through.

It has to be (meritus), it has to be worth value, and it has to be exceptional because, you know, the Board can always authorize ALAC, for example, you know, to engage with the aged or folks with disabilities, that's within ICANN's mission. And so to then dip into the fund, we may need another thing.

The other thing altogether is a variety of security technical projects that – initiatives that might be proposed to help with the security and stability of the Internet that ICANN current doesn't fund but would help with the stability and the overall mission of ICANN and support the Internet as well. And so, you know, I think we may need to think – go through these and if we think that there's stuff that's exceptional we may need to document that and so that way we don't need that really good projects, but if it overlaps with what ICANN currently does, I think we just need to document it and make it worthwhile. Thank you.

Erika Mann: It's Erika. Thank you so much. Julf please.

Julf Helsingius: Thank you, Erika. I just wanted to point out that I seem to remember from the original discussion when the auction proceeds funds was set up, one of the rationales was really that they – there was an intent not to allow ICANN as an organization directly benefit for the funds because they didn't want to create an incentive for the organization to maximize the auction proceeds (unintelligible).

Erika Mann: Yes, it's Erika. I believe we had this discussion. But let's give this topic back to the group and let them come back to us with a – ideally with an alternative scenario or if you just want to get back to us with one language that's fine too. Alan recommended to have a call. Marika, are you able to help this group to set up a call to help them to have the discussions they need to come to a conclusion and the recommendation for the bigger group?

Marika Konings: Yes, Erika, this is Marika. We can work from the staff side to schedule such a call, no problem.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. We then can agree that we will have a recommendation sufficiently early ahead of our next call so that we have made the option to have an exchange already by email about it in case some questions come up and then we will have a discussion next time at our call.

Okay with this we can conclude this topic, and let's move to the next item, which hopefully isn't so conflictual. And this is about charter Question 3, see modified language suggested by Elliot. Marika, I give this to you to do the quick introduction to this topic, remind everybody about what it is and then Elliot, I will give you the floor. Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. This is Marika. This is an action item that came from the group's review of the comments in relation to charter Question 3. I believe there was a comment from the Board in which it suggested adding some additional language to clarify that the Board is not involved in taking any decisions on individual application. So that language was circulated to the list and Elliot suggested a slight modification of that language which I think received support from many on the mailing list.

So the proposal is to add the following language to the final report. "Neither the Board nor staff will be taking decisions on individual applications but will

instead focus its consideration of the slate on whether the rules of the process were followed by the independent panel."

Erika Mann: Thank you, Marika. Sorry, I'm moving between different documents and I might be a little bit slow sometimes to come back to the mic. Indeed, I just checked again, there was no further comment on the email list so I believe, Elliot recommendation stands as a good one. And if nobody wants to comment on it or nobody wants to make an additional comment right now I believe this stands and we can add this to the – to our list as completion. But I give you a second. Okay, Marika, we can put this to our list as completed.

Marika Konings: Great. Will do.

Erika Mann: Then let's have a look at the next item. Yes, this is something nice, what our staff prepared – Marika and Joke together and it's the (unintelligible) – the CCWG agreement reached so far. And it's a nice and simple overview so you can always evaluate it. Can we have a look and can we see it please? Oh there it is already. Marika, maybe you want to explain how you have done it.

Marika Konings: Sure. This is Marika. I just note that Julf and Robert still have their hands up. I don't know if that's old hands or new hands?

Erika Mann: I saw it as old hands but we can check. Julf? Robert? Julf?

Robert Guerra: This is Robert. It was an old hand.

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Okay. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. So what you see on the screen is also a document that was shared together with the agenda on the mailing list. And what staff has started doing is to take the agreement from the review of the comments that

are also reflected in the template into the separate document so we're able to start tracking and also working on these items that the group has, you know, agreed to work on. So basically what you see in the first column is basically the agreement that was reached on how to deal with the input that was provided.

Then we've listed who is identified as the responsible party for dealing with that item. And then as well, you know, the current status of that item. I do note, you know, for some of the items it's likely that, you know, the group will only be able to deal with this at the end of the process or once, you know, there is an updated draft of the final report to kind of double check if, you know, if items have been sufficiently dealt with.

But we thought this might help, you know, keeping track of the work and hopefully allow as well for some parallel work to take place, you know, maybe during meetings especially when it comes to, you know, reviewing certain items and where people may want to kind of put forward, you know, recommendations, you know, based on the agreement that was made.

So we hope this is helpful. We did I think in the email also include the wiki link where we're posting, you know, this document as well as any updated versions of the templates. As you know after every call we kind of record, you know, what was discussed and specifically the CCWG agreement so we have that all on record so if anyone asks, you know, how did the group review the comment and what did you do with it, you know, we're able to point to that as a record of our discussions.

And of course at the end of the day, you know, the document that you see here on the screen will help staff as well in its revisions of the initial report you know, towards the final report, you know, reflecting what, you know, the group has agreed to change or modify.

So as you go forward in your review I just want to remind everyone again that, you know, the main focus of the review of comments is really on, you know, what if anything needs to be changed or added to the final report so if that really can be the focus and, you know, everyone can kind of be very clear on, you know, what is being agreed that will really help us track these items and at the end of the day, you know, turn back a proposed final report that aligns with the discussions and the agreements of the group.

Erika Mann: Apologies, moving between different documents takes time. It's Erika. So then I don't believe we have a – need to have a discussion about this. It's a very helpful document and thank you so much for having started it. It will help us to track and trace as we complete it and will remind us as well about areas which we still have to work on.

So let's move to the next item on our agenda. And we will continue our discussion concerning the various charter questions. And I will give the floor to you, Marika, because will not be able to read the small language even – and on my small screen. Unfortunately the function to enlarge the text is not working.

Kavouss, because you are on the phone, just – and you haven't been with us and everybody who's on the phone and is not with us, so what we are doing right now is reviewing the comments we received and during the public comment period on – with regard to our recommendation. And we will talk about it how we want to proceed with these kind of comments. The leadership team made a recommendation how to proceed but it needs to be discussed by this group. And there – topics may come up where you – where the group and the team wants to make a different recommendation then the leadership team.

So, Marika, I believe the first one is now – let me go back to the other document, it's going to be charter Question 6 and please, back to you. And

please be kind just to introduce the topic each time so that colleagues who are on the phone can follow the discussion.

Marika Konings: Of course, Erika. This is Marika. So we're picking up where we left off of last time. As you may recall we did start discussing this and this relates to the input received in relation to charter Question 6 and the related recommendations and implementation guidance that was provided. So charter Question 6 reads, "Should any priority or preference be given to organizations from developing economies, projects implemented in such regions and/or underrepresented groups?"

And as you may recall, we started discussing the initial – the first comment on this list and I think we kind of started moving onto the next one but then some further comments were made in the chat that made us come back here. And I think to kind of recap and I'm happy to stand corrected here if I got this wrong, you know, the focus of the recommendation was really on ensuring that, you know, projects to support capacity building and underserved populations were part of the objectives of the new gTLD auction funds allocation.

But I think some of the comments noted that it should not – maybe not only be about supporting capacity building and underserved populations but also making sure that applicants from underserved regions or populations would be in a position to apply. So something that staff has suggested here as a possible CCWG agreement that the group could consider modifying the implementation guidance to also focus on ensuring that applications are received from diverse geographic regions and communities.

And we noted that this is something to be further considered. And, you know, to clarify, you know, at least from a staff perspective, this is not tin ended to mean that, you know, there would be lower barriers, you know, for applications from, you know, other regions or communities but it would just making sure that there's a, you know, a level playing field that everyone is

equally able to apply and that there are no kind of restrictions in place that would put an unfair advantage on certain groups or regions.

So again, this is something we put forward based on the conversation, but of course it's really up to you to indicate, you know, whether this is in line with what was discussed and whether this makes sense in response to the comments that were made.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Marika. It's Erika. I believe it makes a lot of – so we would like to avoid artificial barriers and we may want to put something in the guidelines maybe as well. So just to remember for those who joined the group a little bit later, during our discussions we had a set of guidelines which we will hand over to the transition team. The transition team is the team which follows the work of our group and so to help them understand certain topics where we believe they need to continue working on, we developed this list of guidelines for this particular group.

So for example, we could add this topic there as well and say particular attention needs to be given, no artificial barriers shall be created, and maybe we want to enlarge the language for the guidelines even further. Robert, please, I see your hand.

Robert Guerra: Sure. This is Robert for the record. And so as one of the late newcomers I'll try to keep my comments short. I think I'm in agreement with what I've heard so far in regards to outreach efforts to make sure that underrepresented groups, communities and regions, that efforts be made, A, to reach out to them and that to make sure that we get some applications from them. So I'm in agreement with that.

But I think two, we also – the question is do we need to define what underrepresented groups and regions are? Or is that commonly understood? And then as well too, so we can get applications from them, I think it has to be clear to them and to others that the focus is making sure that it's also in

ICANN's mission. And so we may want to make sure for these groups that may not tend to apply that we're trying to reach out to them but there is definitely a scope and a priority in the types of issues or problems that the fund is seeking ideas from. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Robert. It's Erika. I believe we had last time a short discussion about this topic and the question came up whether we should mention certain already-used classifications for un-deserved – oh God, I can't even get the term right – regions towards a likely classification least and developed countries. But we haven't come to a conclusion I believe. Personally I prefer to have a more broader category which really captures all of the potential regions and instead of using a classification which is typically more used in the trade world like least and developing countries. But I'm open to it.

Robert, if you have a recommendation, if we can agree we like to see if you have a recommendation why don't you send it to us and then we can – we can review it quickly together.

Robert Guerra: Just a quick follow up for me. I mean, I think…

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: … of particular interest, and it was about the (unintelligible) is underrepresented groups. And so for example, something that's been mentioned before, persons with disabilities, the aged, but I think as well who (unintelligible) more as well. But I can try to think of some ideas and I'll send it to the group to consider. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Okay thanks. Marika, I believe looking at what I see here and what I hear, I believe we have a broad understanding, we like what you recommended we just will wait for final conclusions of this topic until we see if we can find a language which capture the group – the various groups we want to see included. Is this okay for you, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. Yes, thank you, Erika. We can add some clarification here aligned with the conversation.

Erika Mann: Perfect. And we may receive something from Robert and then we can evaluate it quickly together, the leadership team, and if we need to consult the big group we will do it by email, otherwise based on the understanding we reached today we will just move the topic forward.

Okay, then let's take the next item. And I need to, again, Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes, no problem, Erika. This is Marika. So the next comment is from the ICANN Board. And it seems to align with some of the previous conversation but of course the group may decide that this may require additional clarifications or additional language. The comment relates to the request or the suggestion for the CCWG to consider adding language for the implementation team on how to best – to support applications from diverse backgrounds. Erika, you may be on mute if you're…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: It's Erika. Yes. I'm, yes, sorry, I was talking on mute. It's Erika. I'm just reviewing the original language. So from commenter it was – came from the Board, yes? So it's just review previous…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: …communication on the use of the independent panel as a means – yes, best practices for evaluating applications. Yes. And then the leadership recommendation was check how shall independent panel be defined. Well the Board has the right for approval of the slate of successful applicants. That's similar to the language we approved as recommended. And check out the comments made by other SO ACs support such Board understanding of

independent or not. Yes, I believe we have an understanding about the second bullet point, at least in this group.

So the ask would be actually to add again another bullet point for the guidelines I believe if I'm not mistaken. Marika is saying I'm looking at a different document. Are we not talking about charter Question 7? Because we just had 6.

Marika Konings: No, there were still two comments in relation to charter Question 6 that we…

Erika Mann: Oh apologies.

Marika Konings: …that we didn't…

Erika Mann: See, that's the problem. Yes, that's the problem moving between two documents and following at the same time the chat room. Okay, I give it back to you, Marika, it's better you handle these two things. Please.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Erika. So the first comment still remaining in this category in relation to charter Question 6 is from the ICANN Board. I think I just read it out. I think the question for the group is, you know, is the language that we've provided or that's suggested to be modified in relation to the previous comments, does that also address this comment by the ICANN Board or is there anything further that should be done or clarified in the language? Erika…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: It's Erika. I believe nothing further needs to be done. But I'm looking at the chat room if somebody wants to make a comment. Ching, you are making a recommendation in the chat room. Can you make it please so that everybody can hear it? Please be reminded, many are on the call today. Ching, can you

talk? You can't talk? So you are saying in generally I think it is important to have some guidance here for the implementation phase. Okay.

So we would translate practically the recommendation into some more concrete guidance language. We can do this. Is this what you are meaning? Okay, Robert is making a comment with regard to the other topic. We will come back to this.

Okay, anybody else wants to make a comment concerning this item? So otherwise if not, Marika, I believe we should in the leadership team make a recommendation for next time concerning the language we believe should be included in the guidelines. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, we can add that as an action item.

Erika Mann: Yes, it's easier and faster and I must admit I need to read the full text and complete text and from the silence I hear I have the feeling many need to do the same as well so let's make a recommendation and then we can review the text next time. Judith, please.

Judith Hellerstein: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. I just had a question on Robert's comment and I'm not – when he says we should encourage proposals, are we going to – how would we go about encouraging? Are we going to have any budget for outreach? Because especially in indigenous areas where they're not aware of ICANN or other areas where they're not aware, we would have to do some outreach into those regions. And so that's also – is that what he's looking at? Because how would we – how would we get – encourage people who don't know about us to apply without doing enough outreach?

Erika Mann: Judith, my recommendation would be we continue with the charter question and then at the end of it we come back – if we still have time we come back to it, otherwise we put the agenda on our next – on our next call. I believe we understand the difficulty you pointed out to the – to a key question, even if we

include a more broader language which is more inclusive, there needs to be still a program backing this up and then the question comes will this be covered by ICANN operational budget or shall this be - if we believe and we want to make the recommendation shall this be covered from the fund?

And always keep in mind shall support ICANN mission and the bylaws with the understanding that we still have a dispute about how this connects to the broader Internet, the topic Elliot and Alan raised at the very beginning. So let's put this aside for right now because otherwise we have another discussion and I really would want us to focus on the charter question. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I don't think we need to put it aside. I don't think we need to discuss it. If we put – make clear statements that it is important that we do outreach and that we reach communities who might not otherwise be aware of this, and I think that's blatantly clear, that that has to be one of our requirements, then the fund covers the administrative costs and that's one of the administrative costs.

I don't think we need to micromanage it at the level of, you know, should we go outside of our normal rules and say ICANN funds this out of its operational budget; I think that's just out of the question. So if we make it a mandate that we have to make sure we attract the attention of those who don't normally – aren't normally attending our meetings, then that's part of the job and it has to be covered out of the costs. So I don't think we need to come back and discuss it. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Alan. That's a difficult approach and maybe you're right. I just believe we will postpone the potential problematic discussion in the future. But you're right, it's more simple approach and we can do this, but please.

Elliot Noss: Just had to unmute there. You know, I really – Alan, the most important words that Alan said there are "if we agree on that." And because I think that,

you know, I would certainly say it was my experience with CIRA and their attempt around this (unintelligible) and you know, with other philanthropies. And by the way, with the mainstream activities of ICANN itself that, you know, reaching indigenous groups in particular, but certainly just generally disadvantaged groups, is extremely difficult and a big black hole.

And, you know, I think we can all agree on it being desirable but, you know, having that as just some unfunded – when I say "unfunded mandate" like we just tossed the issue over the wall and say well now it's a requirement. Wow, you know, is that going to just – just create massive problems for anybody who's got to pick up our work after us?

And so, you know, I really do think that we need to be very thoughtful about the way that we approach that and, you know, I think the – again, the most important thing that Alan said in all of that was, you know, if we agree because you know, I don't think that we can discuss it without discussing the how and how much. You know, otherwise it's wishful, it's like us saying let's end poverty.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Elliot. It's Erika. I'm – I feel very much in support for what you just said and this was similar to the concern I tried to raise. But I understand Alan's approach too. So let's put this aside and really let us move forward because we in a moment (unintelligible) two different topics and it's very difficult, there's no concrete languages there for in particular for those which are on the call only and who haven't joined recently this team to follow the discussion and the debate. So we will pick this item up again. We have received in the meantime a recommendation which I saw in the chat room from Robert. And we will pick up this item at now our next call.

Marika, remind us where we were about the topic and if you can maybe just remind us about the takeaways from these two items we just discussed.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. So staff and leadership have an action item here to, you know, in relation to these two comments, I think 1 and 4, to draft some proposed language that would get added to the implementation guidance. And we would of course take that back for – to the CCWG for further review and consideration. There is another Comment 5 remaining in this section. Do you want me to go ahead and read that one? Erika? I'm assuming since (unintelligible) so I'll go ahead and read the next comment in this section…

Erika Mann: Apologies, I was talking and was…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Yes, apologies, I was on mute. Please continue.

Marika Konings: Thanks. So the next comment is from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. And the Registrar Stakeholder Group is suggesting or recommending that the CCWG to consider whether it's appropriate for ICANN Org or constituent parts to make determinations regarding which underserved populations are in need or where capacity building is needed.

Erika Mann: It's Erika Mann. I would recommend based on the discussion we just had in which I want to park until the next time and we have more better understanding and recommendations how we want to bring this topic forward based on the particular discussion we just had, comments from Alan, comments from Elliot, and from Judith. I recommend – and Robert – I believe the leadership team should make a recommendation and then how to proceed with regard to this topic and then we come back to the full group and we can discuss it at our next call. Can you put it as an action item to our list, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Erika Mann: Okay. If there is nobody who wants – I'm just looking at the chat room. If somebody is making a comment and I'm missing it? No, no hands up. Then please take the next charter question, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. This is Marika. Next charter question, Number 7, is, "Should ICANN oversee the solicitation and evaluation of proposals or delegate to or coordinate with another entity including, for example, a foundation created for this purpose?" I think just to note that this wasn't actually a charter question where the group made a recommendation I believe at this stage but asked for input on this item.

                 The first comment in this section is from the ICANN Board, and it's a suggestion for the CCWG to re-review previous Board communications on the use of an independent panel as a means of best practices for evaluating applications. And the leadership recommendation here is to check how shall independence of panel be defined, you know, while the Board has a right of approval of the slate of successful applicants and check are the comments made by other SO AC support such Board understanding of independence or not.

Erika Mann: Yes, thank you. I believe there is some – it's Erika – there is maybe some confusion. So my recommendation would be to accept the – to accept the language from the Board in its communication and already working and she mentioned this at the very beginning, on this overview, bringing all the – what recommendation and comment from Legal into one document related to the different charter question and related to the different topics we are debating. So this topic will definitely show up on this list.

                 So we have a – we can accept the independence, and I believe in all of our discussions in the past there was no disagreement that we like to see independence. There was only disagreement which we had sometimes in the past and I believe the topic come up later again how the community shall get

involved in this. But I believe the term "independence" was something we accepted in the past.

Now the second question, how shall independence be defined? I believe that's something which we will have to put into the guidelines. We have to give some criteria how we believe as a group independence of panel shall be defined but the implementation definitely will have to be done by the leadership – by the implementation team.

Concerning the wording which is in the bracket, I'm not totally sure where this is coming from so maybe that's something, Marika, we have to check by the Board has the right for approval of the slate of successful applicants. We have to look into this where this language is coming from and check this. I'm not really sure why this is actually mentioned here. It's somehow contradictory to the comments we received so far from the Board I believe.

But let me go back to you, to Legal team, and let me go just change quickly the (screen) again so that I can see if somebody wants to comment. Okay, I'm back. No hands up. No, I believe we have an agreement here. Marika, can you put this as an action item and maybe just summarize what I said so that we have a clear understanding as a team?

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. This is Marika. I believe the action item is to, you know, review the Board input received on this topic through the FAQs that will be circulated shortly. And I think based on that determine, you know, whether or not any further changes need to be made, you know, recognizing that I think in one of the other action items we already have is additional clarification that, you know, the Board will not be involved in evaluating individual applications.

And also make a note of – that the CCWG will need to give further consideration to any criteria that should be provided for – in relation to the implementation phase to determine independence of the panel. And I note – I think the addition that comes from the leadership recommendation, I'm

guessing here that that relates to the fact that, you know, the Board will, you know, approve the overall allocation of funds without, you know, going into the individual specifics. I'm assuming – or I was assuming that that was referring to that aspect of the Board's role in its fiduciary role.

Erika Mann: It's Erika. Thank you, Marika. I believe you – I make the first draft of the leadership recommendation so I may have done a paste and copy and just put this in a – from an original text without noting the text itself so I believe you are right. But we still want to clarify the language so it's correct what is said here. I agree. So we can put this item on the side. I'm – just give me a second and I will go back to the Adobe room just to see that nobody wants further comment on it. Just give me a quick second.

No, I don't see anything. Okay, Marika, we can put this topic aside with the action item to just summarize. And let's take the next item please.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Erika. Next comment is from Judith and Marie who are both on the call so I'm sure they'll be happy to speak further to this. But the way this was summarized was that the CCWG should consider an independent panel or organization to select and review applications.

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Yes?

Judith Hellerstein: Maureen was commenting.

Erika Mann: Fine too. Maureen, please.

Maureen Hilyard: Just – no, I just wanted to say it has been discussed and – before is that the independent panel. And I think the comment that was made was like, you know, what the – we do need to get some clarification about what we mean by independence just as what has just been discussed. So I think that, you

know, other than that I don't think that we have anything extra. I think that two is that when we're looking at selection and reviewing applications the comments that were made before about – in the previous issue was that, you know, that the Board – neither the Board nor the staff are involved, those sorts of things have already been incorporated into our statement. Judith may have something else to add. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you. Thank you, Maureen.

Judith Hellerstein: Yes, it's Judith for the record. I don't have anything to add, it's just we wanted to make sure that it was independent by the reviewing it, however, we define independence. But that also that we have – that it wasn't staff or others reviewing it.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Judith. And thank you, Maureen. I believe we have a common understanding about this here. So in the action items we have an understanding, and Marika just summarized it and I believe you point – the point you were making here is covered by this topic already. So review the criteria and we can do this once we have language and we can make a recommendation from the leadership team to you just to make it simpler and a little bit easier.

Okay, then let's take the next topic, Marika, please. And I have to go on mute, give me a second. Just go.

Marika Konings: Okay. Yes, okay thanks, Erika. So the next comment is from Anne Aikman-Scalese. In summary she's suggesting that the CCWG considers possible conflict of interest or appearance thereof if ICANN Org is involved in administering applications and grants of funds. And leadership recommendation notes that this topic is already covered and I believe it has been addressed by some of the previous responses and additions that the group has agreed, but of course we can further discuss this if needed.

Erika, if you're speaking I cannot hear you.

Erika Mann: That's strange, I wasn't on mute. Can you hear me now?

Marika Konings: Yes I can.

Erika Mann: Marika? Oh okay.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Erika Mann: So I was just saying we can put his aside. I don't believe we need to discuss this further. We have a common understanding here in this group. Yes, see confirmation coming in in the chat room. Take the next item, Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Erika. This is Marika. Next comment is from the Business Constituency. The CCWG to consider requirements in allocation of the auction proceeds put forward, a fully independent process, operate independent of ICANN staff with required expertise, ICANN's status as nonprofit corporation, reasonable compensation, focus on single purpose entity and the role of ICANN Org – ICANN Board/Org in composition. I think these are some of the factors that the BC believes – or requirements should be provided for.

Leadership recommendation here is that the – most of these topics are already covered in other comments. Check the Board clearly indicated they won't intervene in the allocation process. We really want to recommend that the Board gets involved? May deliberate as to whether the ICANN Board or ICANN Org should have any role in determining or guiding or influencing the allocation of the proceeds and management of funds.

Check, do we need to define the number or shall we need to leave this to the next phase, implementation, to decide upon – and this relates to the specific input from the BC – that the group should be composed of at least seven but

no more than 15 members seeking to ensure required expertise and sufficient understanding of the varied kinds of proposals and the applicability but also to enable the inclusion of external expertise as well as community members. And a question, what is reasonable compensation for the evaluation panelist members and provided by whom? Or is this an implementation question?

Erika Mann: Thank you, Marika. It's Erika. I hope you all had a chance to read this because there are many topics embedded and some of them we discussed and we put aside and some I would recommend we put forward to the implementation team. So the question concerning the independence and the – have a broad understanding between us. How – that we are clear about it, that the process shall be independent.

We have an understanding that the Board is not getting involved, neither is ICANN Org getting involved. So the first two bullet points I would say they fall and we don't have to discuss this further. The third one is do we define the number of the participants in the panel and the evaluators? I don't believe – my personal opinion is we don't need to do it, that that's really up for the implementation team. We define the framework and – but we don't have to – we can say a sufficient number of evaluators but I don't believe we should make a recommendation.

And it might vary even if it's a super big project and a super complex project typically one has more evaluators then if it's a simple project and it can be decided by a small group of evaluators. So we want to leave – my recommendation would we leave sufficient space but we put into the – for the implementation team into the guidelines maybe we want to add sufficient group of evaluators.

Concerning this topic, I'm now moving back to the Adobe room just to see if somebody wants to make a comment. Elliot, please. Elliot? You want to make a comment to compensation? Yes, I come to this point. Give me just a second and wait if somebody wants to comment on the other point.

Elliot Noss: I don't think I had my hand up. I don't know that I…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Oh, it looks like it. Yes, I saw it in the chat room and I see your hand up.
                  Okay. Nobody wants to comment on this point. I believe we have an
                  understanding here, Marika, so maybe for the guidelines maybe we want to
                  add for the implementation team sufficient – depending on the size of the
                  accepted project group of evaluators, something like this maybe. Somebody
                  wants to talk. No? Okay.

                  Then let's go to the next item, the bullet point. Question, what is reasonable
                  compensation for the evaluation panelists? Numbers and provided by whom?
                  Or is this an implementation question? Elliot, I believe you wanted to
                  comment to this bullet point. Please. Maybe you are on mute?

Elliot Noss: Sorry, yes, I was struggling with my mute. And no, I mean, I didn't want to
                  comment more than, you know, my comments in the chat. I really, you know,
                  I fear that just in general the more we include (competent), the more we make
                  this about ICANN and not the Internet, the more we institutionalize all of this.
                  And with the more that we move from, you know, sort of taking a one-time
                  opportunity to do great things and turning it into another trough. And I just
                  really have a fear of that.

Erika Mann: It's Erika. I understand you, Elliot, but I believe the point is right. I haven't – I
                  participated in many of these – of funds and evaluators are typically, in one
                  way or another, paid. I don't believe it will – it's possible to find a group of
                  evaluators with the exception of maybe the community, who would not want
                  to get paid. But I agree with you, I don't believe we have to set this right now.
                  It's a topic which will come up in the implementation period. And I'm – feel
                  very much like it's a topic maybe we shouldn't discuss and it's probably
                  premature to debate this right now.

I'm just checking the chat room. Maureen is saying something. Erika, as suggested by Ching earlier, we should leave some of these points – absolutely agree. Elliott, my strong view is the evaluation will come from the community, yes. That's – maybe, that's a topic we will have to make a recommendation certainly about this item. Ching is typing. Ching, why don't you want to speak up or can't you talk?

Ching Chiao: Can you hear me now?

((Crosstalk))

Ching Chiao: Erika?

Erika Mann: Yes, absolutely.

Ching Chiao: Great. This is Ching speaking. Just adding a very minor point, and I really haven't thought this through but right now the thinking it's a little bit different than what Elliot just proposed in terms of particular the – I mean, the reasonable compensation whether we should – we should have a – we should have a support on this or not. Basically I think for this particular point one of the case if I may bring up is when the evaluators contracted by ICANN for the new gTLD application reviews, I believe that ICANN does pay for the evaluators for this.

This may not be the perfect example but ICANN does contracted outside evaluators for the applications that you know, may or may not process by ICANN in terms of their capacities or whatever resources that they may not have. So therefore in particular on this point, you know, my personal thought and, I mean, and once again I haven't really thought that through but right now the thinking is that we probably shouldn't exclude, you know, if a reasonable compensation could bring, you know, more skill or more

experienced, I mean, evaluators on board and help with the work. Just my two cents here. Thanks.

Erika Mann: Yes, it's Erika. I have the similar opinion. I believe even if we would have the community as an advisory group supporting evaluators, the hard work of evaluating projects is really hard work and which takes days; to imagine this is done without financial support I just can't see it happening. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. We're talking about hundreds of millions of dollars here, so we're either talking about projects which have great value, and we better have professionals who understand the field doing – involved in that evaluation, or we're going to have a lot of projects or a combination of the two more likely. It's fine to say the community should do the evaluation, but having a string of reliable volunteers who do their work diligently and in a timely manner is not likely to happen on the scale we're looking at.

So I think we have to be talking about professionals in this business, perhaps augmented by community input into it or something like that. Otherwise I think we're looking at something unrealistic that will not be sustainable. It may be desirable but I don't think it's going to be sustainable. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Alan. It's Erika. Yes, you are very much echoing what I – what I believe I said. I think it is from my experience really not sustainable. But of course it's important to get input from the community and how the structure is set up. I believe that in one of our charter question at a later stage. But let me check quickly with Marika. Marika, just to remind me, we will have this topic discussed later in one of our charter questions. Can you just please confirm this?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I would need to double check that. I'm not sure.

Erika Mann: I'm pretty sure because I evaluated all the comments carefully and I would be surprised if my memory is not correct. Otherwise put this as an action item,

check, and otherwise we have to come back to this topic how the community shall get involved. But I would like to put this to rest for right now because w have to evaluate first if it's not already embedded in one of our charter question and we will come back to the point naturally without forcing it right now. Elliot, do you – is this a new hand or is this – Alan, is it a new hand from you…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Yes it is a new hand…

Erika Mann: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Just a very brief…

Erika Mann: Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Just a very brief comment. Again, on the issue of community evaluators, we're going to have rather strict conflict of interest requirements that – to make sure you're not evaluating projects that either you benefit from or you have a vested interest in. And that's going to be really, really difficult to enforce and I think we're going to have be really careful that we're not picking projects that are the pet projects of the evaluators. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Alan. Yes, absolutely. And I believe I made this point in the charter question I have (unintelligible). But Marika is raising another point in the chat room. There is a question about whether ICANN or constituent parts can apply for funding. Not sure if you're referring to that one, Marika. I'm referring to another one. So let's put this on as an action item. It's a discussion we need to have, how shall the community get involved in the evaluation process. My recommendation, and we had like Alan, maybe there needs to be a two-phase professional and then seconded or supported by community experts keeping the conflict of interest in mind, et cetera, et

cetera, but that's a discussion we need to have at a later stage. (Alissa) is typing. There's a question about whether I can—no, that's the same one you already had which I read. Okay. Can you just summarize the action item and then move to the next topic? Elliot, your hand is up. I had asked you, Elliot?

Elliot Noss: My hand wasn't up when you asked me. I think it was (Allen's) hand, so I just want to briefly draw an important distinction between conflict and pet project. A conflict is one where somebody has a vested interest. A pet project is one where somebody is passionate about the subject matter. I think both it would be accurate and in no way negative, in fact positive, to say that on this call, both (Judith) and (Robert) identified outreach to indigenous groups as a pet project.

In no way in my mind does that make them more or less fit to judge those projects. I think, you know, we want evaluators that bring knowledge and skills and passion and interest, and what we have to avoid at absolutely all costs are conflict, and conflicts are very different. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much for clarifying the point. I think you're right. Somebody who's passionate about a topic and is not involved in the same project or his or her institution is not neglecting or not even in the broader sense part of the project should not be defined as a conflict of interest. The broader sessions we made should and committee members evaluate projects in the house process.

That's the bigger topic we have to discuss, and we will discuss it either if my memory is correct because we already have a challenge question which relates to this item which I believe we do have, but in the moment, we have to the leadership team and suddenly we need to evaluate it until we come back to this discussion but not today so we will pick it up and if it's not mentioned in the topics and my memory is wrong, then we will put this on an action item which we will have to discuss. Okay. Marika, you want to summarize the action items so that we are just clear before we move forward?

Marika Konings: Yes, I'm Marika, so I think the action item here is for a thousand leadership team to verify whether, you know, community involvement and evaluation is addressed in another charter question and based on that response, the (unintelligible) further consider if how does the community is to be involved in the evaluation process.

Erika Mann: Marika, thank you. All covered. Let's move forward and just checking for a final time if I missed somebody. No, it doesn't look like it. I believe (Elliott Sanders) is at hand, so Marika, please, next topic, please.

Marika Konings: Thanks to Erika. This is Marika, and next the comment is from the registrar at the stakeholder group, and now it's at the CCWD should consider the community to review grants and make decisions about grant awards, for CCWD to consider the role of ICANN org and any of the approaches should be limited to oversight of the grant making process in order to ensure compliance with laws and with ICANN admission and the leadership back in these notes have been that this topic is already covered in other comments.

Erika Mann: Erika, let me just read this again quickly so that it's such a long time ago that we have done the recommendation, so it's similar to what we discussed right now, CCWD, to consider ICANN community use grants and to make decisions about grants at work, so that's a little bit different than bigger projects around typically different category of projects, CCWD to consider the role of ICANN org in any of the approaches to be limited to oversight.

Yes, the second item is covered. I wonder if the first item is covered or if it is not, we will when the discussion be just part about who is actually the viewer, so maybe we should put this item and should cluster it together with the topic we just debated a second ago. Would it be supported from this group? (unintelligible) new hand?

Elliot Noss: Yes, just to nuance it, the first part of that comment was less about what we just discussed which is kind of internal community versus external people and more to reinforce that, you know, inside the stakeholder group, there was a lot of concerns that what they read in Approach A or Approach 1 was set. ICANN org was going to making the determinations, and that was the big point, and it's been addressed. So, I think the registrar's comment has been addressed.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Erika. Thank you, Elliot, for clarifying this, so we can put this topic aside, as well, and with the clarifying language you just made. Thank you so much for this. Marika, back to you. Just make a quick action item and just summarize the points so we are clear about what is happening here and then move to the next item, please.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Erika. This is Marika. My understanding is that the agreed approach is to group this together with consideration of all the previous items that go to the same…

Erika Mann: Actually not Marika, it's Erika. Elliot, clarify that this is covered insofar as there was concern in the group that intervention would be made, but I cannot, and this shall not be done. Elliot, am I summarizing your point correctly?

Elliot Noss: Yes.

Erika Mann: And are you talking?

Elliot Noss: Yes, you summarized it correctly.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. So, Marika, we don't need it to group it with the previous item, just clarify the language and then it's done.

Marika Konings: Okay. This is Marika. We'll know that this has been addressed by previous commons.

Erika Mann: Yes, thank you so much.

Marika Konings: So, the next comment is from the NCSG, and it notes CCWD to consider having proposals reviewed by individuals representing different stakeholder groups.

Erika Mann: Yes, it's Erika. I believe the leadership recommendation is maybe not too totally correct here. The recommendation topic is in principle already covered. So the point that just opened is the different stakeholder group. Somebody from the NTSG on the call today and can clarify what was meant by this proposal? It's Erika. It's not looking like it. Yours is writing just looking into it because the difference interest group is a bit confusing, not clear what is meant here. Okay. Let's put this on an action item, so it needs to get clarified. Are you looking into it, so we have complete understanding about what was meant? Okay. Marika, I believe in the action item, you have to put a question mark behind it, and we may have to come back to this topic.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Erika. We know that the action item here is for NTSG (unintelligible) and maybe we can specifically point to clarify what's intended here and mail for the group for us to look at the full comment which you can find further below in the document. The next comment is from the ISPCP and CCWD to consider refuse applications for funding by panel of experts from the ICANN community and here is a minister of recommendations that's just also covered in other comments, so I'm guessing this is one in the mail, so I want to prove together with the further conversation around, you know, the role of the community in the evaluation of projects.

Erika Mann: Yes, I believe we can group this one definitely together, and so we don't have to discuss this right now any further, but we have to come back to it anyhow with the new proposal and recommendation and then a new discussion. Just take the next item and yes, go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, just to know that I think (unintelligible) has already provided the clarification and the chat on the previous action item. It's mainly about making sure there is broad and sure representation across the community, so I'm also guessing that that is also an item that will then be grouped together with a conservational…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: …together, I said.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Erika Mann: Yes, if there is a grouping together, then please ensure that the comment from yours is embedded in the text here, summary and a paste and copy so that we don't lose the clarification similar to what we have clarification earlier from Elliot, so we cannot find it again.

Marika Konings: Yes, and this is Marika. We've kept it, as well, in the notes, and we'll make sure, as well, that what we're getting cooperates.

Erika Mann: Yes, thank you so much. I'd like to see it in the template. It's so much easier for all of us than to find it again. Thank you so much and just please move forward.

Marika Konings: The next comment is from Access Now, and they would like the CCWD to consider having civil societies play a key role in all steps of the design and implementation process of disbursing funds.

Erika Mann: Yes, I mean, I wonder if you want to have a discuss about this year. Civil society in my eyes—it's Erika—such a broad term, and in many ways, if you find some kind of language and involvement of the community, civil society to a larger degree has already been part of the process, and I just wonder if we should maybe wait a second and get an understanding between all of us,

what we want to pick up this item at a later stage or if you'd like to comment on it right now.

There's no recommendation from leadership team concerning this topic. Elliot, do you want to comment on it? Is this a hand you raise or is it something else that I see there? Okay.   Okay. When (unintelligible) recommend my week what we do, and we from the leadership team make the evaluation of the role of the community. We will look at this particular recommendation again, and then we can see if we want to make a new recommendation or if we as a group just recommend to end this particular recommendations. There aren't…

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks to Erika. This is Marika, and I think in the month of the comments and the chat also speak to this item that it's probably about clear and broad representation, as well moving back, you know, civil society and other have had an opportunity to be involved in the design process by, you know, being part of all these efforts, and at the implementation phase, it's still to come.

Erika Mann: Yes, same thing I do have, yes. Okay. Just please be so kind and summarize the action item concerning this topic, and then we can move forward. I saw your point, Elliot. Thanks so much. Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Erika, so I think the action item here is to review this comment, as well, in the context of the broader conversation around the role of the community that maybe to already know that. It's more about fair and balanced representation and not favoring one particular group over another and also know that, of course, involvement in the design of the mechanism is open to anyone interested through the involvement in this effort.

Erika Mann: Indeed, thank you so much, Marika. How much time do we still have? We still have few minutes, so we can take the next item, please.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So, the next comment is from Mary Duma and her suggestion is for the CCWD to consider the establishment of an advisory committee from the community, and a leadership recommendation here is that your topic already covered in principal and check in case community advisory committee is established. It would need clear roles, time limitations and guidelines to be established, and the question is is this something this group should do or should this be left to the next phase.

Erika Mann: Yes, it's Erika. So, when we evaluated this in the leadership team, this is probably a more concrete idea than just saying the community shall evaluate, so we could have an advisory committee which is there for the—to the advice for the evaluation, to more professionally evaluate if they need help and support or if it's particular conflict rally before a major conflict which probably has to go to the board, but normal conflicts will arise all the time, so the community advisors could help as a brainstorming and other support and guidance and advice.

For example, this has to be fleshed out, so what I—Greenberg, I have seen you. I give you the floor in a second, so what I recommend, as well. We discussed as right now, and then we will make from the leadership team a proposal how to deal with this topic, and they will group us with the Creston's which we debated already before. Greenberg, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg speaking. I'd like very much the idea of an advisory committee overseeing the overall process. It's not clear to me that what we're talking about here is the group that will make the selections, but rather a group that will sort of oversee the process and evolve the criteria as necessary as we go forward or whatever necessary. Now is that also the same group that oversees the selection process and, you know, provides input to it or is that a different group? I'm not sure.

So, I think we need to spend a bit of time talking about it because I think this a really important issue of just how does the community get involved in this

process and still not have it being a limiting factor that if the volunteers don't, you know, do their job diligently, we end up not being able to give out any money. So, I like the idea of an advisory committee. I don't think it's the selection committee, but I think that needs some fair amount of talking, but I think it's a key part to make this work in the long term. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes, I agree with you, Greenberg. It's Erika. Just checking if more people like to comment on this before I say something. No, I don't see anybody, so I think you're right. It needs more time to discuss, and there are different variations, so the model I know best is where the kind of stakeholders are doing the evaluation of what the evaluator states, so they do this typically once in a year on a day, evaluate and see if everything is on track.

If major crisis happens, if (unintelligible) were selected which should not have been selected, et cetera, et cetera. This one is a little different. It's really at times as far as I understand it, supporting it well as a community group which is constantly there to help the evaluators, so there are different models probably which we can recommend. So, the question is I don't think we can do it today.

We need a draft, we need some kind of recommendation based on what we discussed today, based on what was recommended to us, and then we can continue the discussion in this group. Just wonder, if some of you would like to join the leadership team in doing the drafting for the next trend and debating this topic. Greenberg, would you like to join and somebody else maybe so we're not alone in the leadership team making a first draft recommendation to this group.

Alan Greenberg: My time is somewhat limited, but to the extent I can devote time to it, yes.

Erika Mann: Maybe we can just brainstorm with you back and forward by e-mail and you can add some language, ideas. Okay. Thank you so much. I'm just checking what (unintelligible) is writing and (Maureen). (Maureen) is saying

she likes the idea, (unintelligible) as well. Okay. I believe they have an understanding. Marika, can you just summarize that action item, and then we can move on?

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Erika. This is Marika. I think the action item here is for leadership to engage with Greenberg around the conversation on, you know, (unintelligible) advisory could look at what role it could have and I'm assuming, as well, that also links together with the broader conversation around the role of the community and this process.

Erika Mann: Yes, it's Erika. Marika, I agree with you. We need to summarize it and bring it together with the topics we discussed before, and we may have to debate alternatives because (Elliott's) proposal was much more radical. Half the community would be evaluation, and then this is a different one, so we have to present the alternatives, as well, to this group and then come to a conclusion. Good. Do we have still have time for the next item? Yes, we do. Six minutes. Marika, back to you.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. This is the last comment in this category of relationship. He had a question on the 7th. So, a comment from the business constituency, the CCWD to consider if an advisory and see if established and it should be primarily composed of members with circumscribed interest in our (unintelligible) with ICANN outside of this role. Also, as needed, consider use of expert advisors in relevant areas which may be in the evaluation of certain kinds of projects.

Erika Mann: Okay. That's another proposal that you have to group with the one we just discussed. It's a little bit different. It's Erika again. It's a little bit different because here is the recommendation to have advisory expert from outside selected, as well. This makes sense if there are really big projects which are super complicated in nature. For example, we had one of, I believe, in our list of examples related to the root shown update and operation. Of course, it

would defend the importance you have the root shown operator that at least some of the roots on operators from outside.

I can engage them, and they then would be outside advisory experts so maybe we can group this topic to do this as we just discussed, but it's practically a distinction we would make between the role of the community and an engagement in particular cases outside advisors. Just checking if it's just be supported by this group what I just said or if somebody wants to make additional remarks or go totally against it. No, it seems to be fine. Marika, back to you. Can you just maybe summarize the action item of this topic. Marika, have we lost you?

Marika Konings: No, I'm still here. I was actually hoping for (unintelligible) to tag the action items as (unintelligible) another one where I'm kind of assuming that we're considering this together with the overall question around the role of the community if possible advisory committee or entity and, you know, how that would be staffed and, you know, what role they would serve.

Erika Mann: It's with the slight caveat that we hear the recommendation to engage outside advisory experts and my comments was that, yes, there might be a need in the future to engage with such outside advisory experts, indicate the nature of the projects by complex and complicated and such kind of advice is needed. So, we picked this up in the contracts of all of the other groups, but it's a little bit different than what we debated before.

Okay. Marika and everybody else, I believe (Maureen) is saying that she's good with it. Okay. Thank you, (Maureen). This picture has to support for somebody in the chat room, and I believe we should conclude the call, there's 10 minutes, because the next item then will be on a different topic if I remember this well. This will be response to Charter Question 7, guidance for the implementation for relation, we have to charter Question 7. Marika, is there anything that you maybe want to explain so that we have it easier when we have our next call coming up and before you sent out the review of the

templates for this particular charter question or is there nothing we have to mention right now?

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Erika. This is Marika, maybe just a reminder that, you know, the templates are posted on the Wiki page for all the topics that are listed here, so of course, to facilitate the conversation and the discussions, it would helpful if people refute that information in advance, and of course, if there any specific agreements they would like to put forward, to do that, as well, in advance. Of course, that speeds up the conversation and puts something specific on the table to review, so that would be my call to action or my suggestion in relation to preparation for upcoming meeting.

Erika Mann: Yes, thank you so much. Yes, you're right. It's Erika. It would be good if you were obviously able to review all the backlog materials concerning the different (unintelligible) because sometimes the short extent are sometimes difficult to remember the complete context. It's the same. I do have the same problem, and if I don't review it carefully, I will have forgotten the context, too. It's just too complex. Okay. The last item then on the agenda is maybe the reminder for the next call. Marika, can you just maybe read this, and then we can close our call today? Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Erika. I see it as dropped off the agenda, but that next call will be scheduled in two weeks time, so it will be the 24th of April, same time, 1400 UTC for two hours.

Erika Mann: Okay. Thank you so much, everybody. Thanks so much for the immense work to Marika and to (unintelligible) and everybody else involved. Thanks to everyone and talk to you again in two weeks time. Bye-bye. I give back to Michelle. Michelle, please.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you, Erika. The meeting has been adjourned. Have a great day, everyone.

END