ICANN Transcription

CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds

Thursday 06 September 2018 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds call on the Thursday, 06 September 2018 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-06sep18-en.mp3

Adobe Connect Recording: https://participate.icann.org/p18nwnigpyg/

Attendance is on the wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/bhdpBQ

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

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Julie Bisland: Okay, great. Thank you so much. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Thank you for your patience and welcome to the CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds call held on Thursday, the 6th of September, 2018. In interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now? After hearing no names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not

speaking to avoid any background noise. And with this, I'll turn it back over to you, Erika. Please begin.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Thank you so much, Julie. Let's go do our second item of the agenda which is the question what we do about an update in relation to the conflict of interest. No? That's not the case? Okay, let's have a look at Point 3 of our agenda. We want to have a look at the survey responses we received and we want to look in particular and we want to look in particular - talk today about whether we are ready to eliminate one or two options which we have debated so far.

I'd like to thank you first all because I think we have seen, in the second request which we sent out, a quite good response, actually a good response rate and I believe the - quite already, this is at least my understanding, that we can move forward and can eliminate some options. Let me give you a quick insight, insofar I have looked at it and my understanding and then I believe it would be good to have a discussion. If there's nothing else which then (unintelligible) who looked into the survey (unintelligible), if they would love to add something. If there's nothing, maybe we can move directly to a discussion.

So what I have seen and I looked at it both from the members' point of view and the participants', so we have a total 23 sponsors and I'm looking now at the options which we're eliminated the most which are the Mechanisms 4 and 3. So from the members, I have seen that nine members are eliminating the Mechanism 4, just to remind you all, Mechanism 4 is the one which would practically outsource the operations and would give it to a completely (unintelligible) - to a third party provider. So here we see nine members saying they like to eliminate this option completely and we do have - so this is just counting the members.

And then on the - and including the - including the participants we have 14 and when I look to the Mechanism 3, I have seen that we, from the member

side, seven are eliminating and 12 are eliminating in total. And Mechanism 3 is the new creation of a new foundation. So that's the clear proposed for the biggest number, which are saying we don't go down this path and we practically recommend to eliminate this option to the high numbers for the Mechanism 3, creating a foundation as well.

And then main focus in support and a few eliminate (unintelligible) recommendations for Mechanism 2 and Mechanism 1. Se Mechanism 2, if you remember, is about the joined venture with a second entity (unintelligible) with a second entity and here I have found one elimination, only one, if I have not mistaken and please, Marika and Emily, (please if you could go and) check again and everybody else, of course. And with regard with 1, I found two members saying interestingly no and three in total.

So which would then that the Mechanism 2, which would be the joint venture between ICANN and the second entity, would be, following the current survey, would be actually the frontrunner, then followed by - by the Mechanism 1. So the question, of course, is now what we do with this. I see, Marika, I see that you made some comments. I'll give you the floor in a second. So the question is then, of course, what are we doing with this recommendation?

The question is can we already and are we ready to eliminate two mechanism? I clearly see that we can eliminate, if my judgement is not wrong, Mechanism 4. We might still have some who argue that Mechanism 3 is still viable option so we should keep it in, but the clearly (unintelligible) on Number 2 and on Number 1. So the question which we have to discuss today is are we ready to make a recommendation. If we are ready to make a recommendation, can we make a recommendation to exclude two mechanisms or are we only ready to exclude mechanism and because then this will have sort of consequences, of course, how we prepare and staff prepare the draft recommendation for public comment.

Marika, do you want to go ahead first and then I give the floor to Alan?

Marika Konigs: Yes, thanks, Erika. Maybe first of all, so this is Marika, just what I noted in the chat, because I know the table may not be obvious to all and staff will actually add a legend because we afterwards realized that it didn't give the scoring and it may not be clear to all so just to - to emphasize that, we basically took the survey results and for those mechanisms where people scored a mechanism as their first ranked one, we awarded that mechanism four points, the second one got three points and so on.

And then in addition to that, as it wasn't easy to set it up in a way that the survey itself would show us those results and we then also kind of marked those mechanisms that people in a subsequent question responded that they would like to see that eliminated from further detailed consideration, we marked those as - with a zero and those have also been highlighted in yellow. So that basically leads then to the aggregates total score that you see on there for each of the mechanisms.

And if I can maybe add a little clarification or at least, you know, Erika, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think based at least the approach that staff has taken in starting, you know, starting working on the initial report is that, you know, the idea is not to eliminate a mechanism completely from that report. I think what we're talking about here is that the report would explain all four mechanisms that have been considered and their characteristics and some of, you know, the concerns that may have been raised to some of those but that's based on the discussion today.

The focus on answering the charter questions from the perspective of the mechanism would focus on those mechanisms that are, you know, higher scored, so 1 or 2 or potentially 3, so that is more focused and we're not covering mechanisms where - from which it's maybe clear from the survey result that there's little to no support from the group to further pursue those but they will still be mentioned in the report so as part of public comment.

That will allow the broader community to weigh in on, you know, all four mechanisms if they would want to but giving a clear indication that, at least from the group's perspective at this stage, you know, which ones are the clear frontrunners and are such likely to be recommended at the end of the day and that, you know, information is provided in response to the initial report that may lead the CCWG to reconsider that decision. (Unintelligible).

Erika Mann: This is Erika, just a quick comment in response to what Marika just said. That's absolutely correct, so we have discussed this before and I was a little short in saying, in eliminating - we are not eliminating it in that we - insofar as we will report about it and we will - staff will of course draft language which will capture the debate which we have so far with regard to Mechanism 3 and 4 and we will as well report about the key points which we heard from our external experts. So definitely it doesn't mean we are excluding it, it just means we are paying less focus on the mechanism, we are excluding either one or two, just so that we can free the time from staff to focus more on the more viable scenarios which we believe are those which we like to recommend. Absolutely right, thank you Marika, for this addition. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much, Alan Greenberg speaking. Two comments, one on presentation and one on substance. On presentation, due to the way we're using the numbers, 1, 2, 3 or 4, if we had for instance gone all the way through and not assigned zeros but actually put 1, 2, 3, 4 on everything, a method that was rated absolute last by everyone would still get a score of 25. So I would suggest in - either in addition or instead of that line at the bottom of total score, we show four lines of how many people rated this for second, third, fourth or first, second and discard, whatever it is. In other words, show the breakdown. I think that will illustrate the results a lot clearer than just the number where the implicit weighting of those numbers skew the results and make it hard to see. So that's number one.

Number two, on substance, the documents we had made it pretty clear what functions we would outsource on option, Mechanism number 2, but on one on one discussions with a number of people, there are some people who assigned a weight to number two based on an assumption that different functions would be outsourced. So at least some people said I like the concept of outsourcing, those aren't the functions I would outsource, I would outsource different ones.

And so assuming we're going to keep Option 2 in the game, I think we need some clarity to make sure we're all selecting the same Option 2 because I know in some cases, we are select - people who voted for number 2 with (unintelligible) priority were voting for two different things and I think we're going to need clarity moving forward if we keep that option in the game, that we not set expectations incorrectly. And as I note, we were very clear, but not everyone read that definition and voted on it. Thank you.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Yes, indeed, Alan, we noticed it as well. Marilyn, please. Marilyn, can you hear? Maybe you're talking but you're on mute?

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, I was on mute. Thank you. Marilyn (unintelligible). I have a process question as well to raise. While I support with our moving forward with our report with the (unintelligible) that we have, there are 26 members and as I count them and there are, I think, 36 or 37 participants. So as I look at this, the number of members who voted, I believe the count was 12, which means it's not even quite 50%, probably 46, 47, 48% and in the participants, the percentage would be, I think, roughly a third, since that there's 31, roughly a third, there's 31 participants and I believe it's 31 because on the attendance list I'm looking at, (Lawrence) is still shown is still shown as participant but he's moved to a (unintelligible) so I think it's 31. So that would mean roughly a third voted and I think we have to report that.

I fully support your comment, Erika, that we have enough input to move forward but I think we also have to note what I consider and I'm saying this to

all of the members on the call, as a member, I'm very disappointed we don't have votes from at least 75% of the members. Participants I can understand not voting but I think we are going to have to address, in our own discussion and understanding and also in our report what looks like an interesting gap still of input. I have one other comment but I'd like to just hear the response to that first.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Marilyn, I think we need to have a broader discussion about this but I totally agree with you. It is, to some degree, disappointing. On the other side, if we see how long these working groups continue, I'm not really surprised because people are busy, they have many things to do as you know all too well and for some of our members, it is maybe not a priority. But anyhow, I agree with you and we have to record it, we have it put on, we have to find a way so it is reported as well.

I would be surprised, though, if we would see a big change to the current survey if all members would participate so I would - my estimation is the current survey pretty much looks like the overall opinion and so far, I'm not too disappointed and I believe, like we just said, and I'm thankful for this, I believe we have to move forward because it's not getting better if we continue to discuss it.

You have to present (unintelligible) our recommendations and then, because we - you remember we discussed that we will have to consensus call after the draft recommendations, when they come back to us and we evaluate and we finalize our recommendations. We then need to have a consensus call so I'm still hopeful that all members can be mobilized and all ACs and SO can be mobilized as well to participate in the final discussion, at least that's my hope. So do you want to reply, Marilyn, or can I move forward to Kavouss. Okay, I believe Marilyn having some difficulty, no she's fully in support. Okay, Kavouss, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, thank you. I don't know what is the purpose of all these statistics, 8% and 5%, 75% and so on, so forth - member, observer, participant, I don't think out of any process you have that, well, I mean, some of the groups in the (unintelligible) are not exactly (unintelligible) but other ones, sometimes you have only five. Participants are numerous and members are numerous but they don't participate at all. You can't force the people and we can't do anything better than that so I agree with you, we need to move forward, it's about (unintelligible). We're discussing and we have to have something.

I remember the first time we talked about this whole auction and now after one year, we have to decide and so on, so forth. I don't think that we have to have any statistic or report anything about the participant and so on, so forth. We're not talking about quorum and so on. So I agree with you, we need to go forward. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Kavouss. This is Erika. Kavouss, in this case, we (unintelligible) really to be a bit more careful because we are talking about so much money and about a new structure and a new mechanism which we will create so all of our recommendation must really reflect the, you know, the majority of community members (unintelligible) really want and so far, we are a little bit in a dilemma. Otherwise I would say you're right, one can't continue forever and that's why I believe we have an understanding between all of us that we want to move now forward and we don't want to discuss the - the scenarios any longer.

Ching, do you want to come in? I saw you sending in Skype, which I can't open in the moment? Ching, can you hear us? He couldn't hear what Kavouss was saying. So Ching, Kavouss was raising concern that we are looking too much into detail with regard to percentages and the people participating and members participating so this was a concern he raised and it was more saying just move forward, from Kavouss' point of view. Marilyn, I still have you with a hand. Do you want to make a comment? No? Okay.

Fine. If there's something else, Marika, which we need to discuss and which we need to take into consideration, concerning this topic. Marika?

Marika Konigs: Yes, and thanks, Erika, this is Marika. As Emily noted in the chat, we'll update the spreadsheet and add some of the information, I think, that Alan suggested and also add a little legend to explain what the numbers and the color coding mean so we can also link to it in the initial report, to Marilyn's comment, so people can also see who actually weighed in on this and made their voice heard.

In addition to that point, we always include as well a list of members and participants as well, with their participation rate so that should hopefully give people as well an opportunity to review, you know, what - who has participated and who has actively contributed to it and it may also result in some of the chartering organizations looking at indeed how they were represented in these conversations.

And so I think - I don't know if you already want to move on to the next point or you're now getting to be, to kind of make a determination on which mechanisms can be discarded for detailed consideration in the initial report or if that's already clear to everyone.

Erika Mann: Erika. So let's do a quick, just a quick between us, just a quick getting an understanding. So if nobody objects to my recommendation now that we treat Mechanism 4 in a (unintelligible) way. So I'm not saying eliminating this because we will still present it but we will treat it in a less detailed and we will say it is not a favorite recommendation coming from this group.

So if you agree that number, Mechanism 4 is out, then you don't have to do anything. Only if you disagree and you want to have a further debate then please show and I'll wait a second. Okay. I think we do have an understanding here. I don't see anybody typing in the chat room, I don't see - I see somebody raising their hand. Okay.

Now let's do the same for Mechanism 3. Just to remind you, Mechanism 3 is the creation of a new foundation and here we have seen some members and participants saying they would like to keep this option included at a high relevance, so we're not saying - remember we're not eliminating anything, we're just treating it with less high relevance. So would you agree that we can find an agreement between us that we will agree on Mechanism 3, the creation of a new foundation with less high relevance? And again, if you want to have a different point of view, please either raise your hand or put this into the chat room. Marilyn, is this a new hand?

Marilyn Cade: (Unintelligible). Marilyn Cade speaking. As I count, Mechanism 3 got 11, received 11 votes in support with different ratings, between three and four. So I am not comfortable with it not being a fully outlined as an option. Fully in support of really, as I said, my CSG comments moving for - personally, I would move 4 into the basket of don't go there anymore, but I understand the recommendation that you're making and I'm in full support of it. But I do think since Mechanism 3 received 11 supporting votes of the only 23 votes that we received - 23 voters that we received, that we do have to keep that alive for sufficient examination. Now notice I didn't say extremely thorough examination.

Erika Mann: (Unintelligible). This is Erika, thank you Marika - Marilyn. I agree with you, that's my opinion, too. It is clearly a difference to 4 and we want to be fair and we don't know what comes in in the public comment period. There might be a new point raised and so we have to evaluate, definitely, the option, Mechanism 3 maybe again as well. So I agree with you. And I am a little bit, we had a leadership discussion about it, I'm a little bit less concerned about, you know, the (unintelligible) of these three mechanisms, Mechanism 1, 2 and 3 because I believe Mechanism 3 automatically will need more investigation. Concerned about, you know, the depthness of the three mechanisms, mechanism one, two and three because I believe mechanism three automatically will need more investigation once let's assume there will

be one day a decision taken the mechanism three is the top mechanism. Then it will need so much more investigation anyhow because it will depend on the structure of the foundation or the structure of the foundation can differ to such a large degree that I don't think it will be of any value to go to into too much depth into it in the way we are talking about the recommendation be prepared for the public comment period. So I think we can find a nice balance in describing option three well and I believe we already have sufficient material for it. So Maureen Hilyard: , please.

Maureen Hilyard: Thank you, thank you Erika. First of all I'd just like to because I support Marilyn's views against like site and your own too against throwing out number three completely. But I think too that in relation to the discussion that Alan raised alluding to what other possibilities we might be able to look at if we can investigate some alternatives to mechanism two from the discussions that we had with the - amongst the LX group was that, you know, if we could look at other alternatives that possibly, you know, haven't been raised yet but that could include mechanism three and investigation into deeper investigation into mechanism three but incorporating it in some way into mechanism two but that's, you know, something we can discuss down the track but it's sort of in support of my not totally excluding mechanism three at this time. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much Maureen Hilyard: . I don't want to open the discussion here, it's Erika, but I don't want to open the discussion about would there be a way to include mechanism a creation of a foundation in the model of model two. I think it will be - maybe it's a discussion we should have if we get the responses back from the public comment period because I'm pretty sure there will be some people waving new ideas which we might - may find interesting and we want to investigate further. But maybe for this time for what we get to public comment period maybe it's good to have the option one, and two, and three and four and the way we discussed it because otherwise if we open a new discussion we would have to redo the whole

debate with our external expert and I believe we're a little bit too late to do this.

I'm not saying you're not too late in total it might be possibility to open the debating once we receive the comments back from the public comment period. There's one comment coming in I'm just looking at the chat room I'm not missing something. So (Danielle) is saying he is supporting that we should only downgrade practically mechanism four. Again all please be all remind that we will not eliminate none of the options but we will just treat them in a lighter way so that we don't spend too much time investigating the case further but we would describe it and we will say that we investigated it and looked into these kind of scenario three and four.

Alan is saying I did suggest we investigate other version of two but note that some people think that other outsourcing combos might be better. So we may need to investigate it. Exactly it's indeed it's true. But I believe Alan you would agree as well that this is something we can do after we receive comments back from the public comment period.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Erika Mann: And it's not something we may want to do now. Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. I just realized there was a typo in my message. I was trying to say I didn't suggest we investigate but if we end up with Version 2 we need to fit, we need to make sure that we're all talking about the same two so that may require some more investigation just to be clear.

Erika Mann: This is Erika, yes understood. The question is do we have to do this investigation before we do the recommendation for the public comment period or can we do it after because you are right depending on the (unintelligible) between two entities ICANN the second entity depending on the second entity the merger will of course each time change. Now my

understanding is that it would be much better than to have a separate - and let's assume opsin to will then be the most recommended option after the public comment period, and after we had another discussion and after our (unintelligible) if this then would turn out to be number two I then believe it would be important then to do such kind of investigation. And it might even happen in a second - in another phase instead of ours because then really the broad and again organization the members from the different constituencies will really clearly have to look into new scenarios depending on the second organization.

So maybe it is something I would recommend we postpone until then. I'm just checking what I can see here. Yes Alan is saying yes after two is still in the game of course. And then Marilyn is saying I think we need to do our reports. And exactly thank you Marilyn that's my own opinion. The comment is likely to have more comments. We will have a lot of work to do after public comment period I support during additional exploration after the public comment period it's very much in line how I feel about it.

So if there is somebody who believes - so currently we have an understanding about three like three and four the same but three we understand has a higher value than the mechanism four. And staff will value this when they do the first draft of the draft recommendation they will value the difference we would love to see captured. And now it comes to point, to mechanism two and one both are clearly favored.

And the only thing I saw that there are three members and a participant who was saying they're not supporting number one which would be ICANN organization only. And the main comment was because of worries that ICANN already had so much on his plate and so it might be not in the best equipped to handle it. And then there was only one person excluding. It was Maureen Hilyard: if I remember this right mechanism two. So the two are the front runner one and two, two actually is even valued currently higher than mechanism.

So let me have a look at the chat room. Yes okay Marika can I go to you what you want to summarize where we are at the moment? At any point you believe to add from the staff point of view since we've got what we have discussed right now and then we come to the next item how is this going to be reflected in the proposed timeline but let's first summarize what we discussed. Do you have enough understanding about what this group wants and can you work with this and can this be reflected in the draft recommendation? It's both Marika and (Emily) believe and (Joka) I believe you are all going to work on this together. So please whoever wants to say something now.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you Erika. This is Marika. So from my perspective I think I'm clear I'll just restate what I think I heard. So I think there's agreement to discard mechanism four from detailed consideration. And again it doesn't mean that it doesn't get mentioned or described it's just that there's no detail responses to the charter questions from the perspective of that mechanism. And for mechanisms three that is done with a light touch. So again there is a detailed description of the mechanism but from the perspective of the charter question it will be just a very light touch or reference to, you know, how it may differ from the perspective of mechanism three and we'll also indicate that.

Although, you know, and it's covered it definitely wasn't or definitely isn't one of the front runners at the moment. Then we'll provide a draft for the charter questions based on the perspective of mechanisms one and two. And indicate that, you know, based on the survey results those are currently the front runners based on, you know, the best current thinking of the CCWG having reviewed the external input provided as well as weighing that against the criteria that were identified by the CCWG.

And if I can take this opportunity as well and, you know, just to confirm I think what was agreed on the last meeting is that in that first draft, you know, staff will be purely looking at, you know, what has provided by external experts

and basically derive from there draft responses which then are of course for the CCWG to review and modify. And of course any, you know, previous agreements or discussions that have been held around certain topics we've also aimed to reflect those.

But again, you know, those are not in any shape or form staff perspectives or staff recommendations. What we've tried to do is capture that from all of the information that has been provided to the group so you have a start to – you have a draft to start from but then it's really up to you to, you know, edit and change it and discuss how updates need to be made based on your understanding and your agreements. So I hope that aligns with what you've discussed and what your understanding is of staff assignment here with regards to the first draft of the initial report.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. I believe it does Marika. Just one item I was wondering looking at the discussion we had a few minutes ago maybe we can with regard to point mechanism two but maybe to some other mechanism as well once you drafting you would see that maybe some questions come up which we haven't answered. And we maybe want to raise these kind of questions in the (unintelligible). Like mechanism two we could raise the question, you know, would you consider that depending on - in case - if you see this as a viable option would you consider differences in what kind of differences would you see as being relevant if a different entity is chosen to work with ICANN on this topic.

So we could do something like this I'm saying we should do it but we can do it. And I'm just saying when you do the - and I know you're already working on the first draft recommendation and the leadership team will be able to review it pretty soon before we send it to the (unintelligible) maybe you see options how you can do it. And then we can check against this team if this is something would like to support and we believe it's a good idea.

Okay I don't see any arguments, I don't see somebody waving their hand and I know many are very - having some difficulty with timing today they only have one hour. So then let's move to the next item which would be confirm remaining steps and proposed timelines. Marika please?

Marika Konings: Yes thank you Erika. And I think we've actually combined items four and five in the slides that are up here. So basically this is kind of a draft timeline that we would like to put to the group for your consideration again in view of publishing the initial report in time for ICANN 63. So we've managed to discuss and agree today on how to move forward in relation to consideration of the different mechanisms in the initial report.

As staff already started work on that so we think we're in a position to circulate a draft for your review early next week. We do hope that we're able to get a commitment from all of you to take the time to review the document. You know, we are aware that a lot of other activities are going on that require your attention but hopefully there's a commitment to get this out in a timely manner which does require you to review the initial report carefully. And we ask you then within a weeks' time to kind of flag which parts of the report you want to further discuss.

Again we understand that you may not be able to review all parts of the report in detail but at least we hope that by giving you a week to flag, you know, which specific items you think require further discussion by the CCWG will help then the group as well to plan for, you know, what is needed after that. And so based on the issues that are raised and again in the next slide we'll go talk through how we would propose you carry out the review of the initial report so that, you know, we can manage any input coming in in an effective manner.

But the hope is that once we have the list of items the leadership team will be able to look at the magnitude of it and kind of decide okay what is the likely number of meetings and time we need to go through these issues. You know,

some of these may be able to resolve on the mailing list some may require further conversation. So for now we've planned or estimated that, you know, we may require at least three meetings to go through these but again, you know, if more meetings are needed or the sequence may need to increase those are all options.

And again depended on the input and feedback that's being provided by the group with the objective of publishing an initial report at the latest by 8 October for public comments which is then followed by a session of the CCWG during ICANN 63 which will allow the group to present an initial report to the community and encourage people to provide input as well as asking any clarifying questions that the group may have.

If I (unintelligible) combination can discuss how at least from staff side we would like to suggest providing feedback on the initial report and then maybe we can have a conversation about the two in combination. So our idea is to circulate the draft report both in Word and PDF format and we would suggested you include in the PDF line numbers…

Woman: This is a small right?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Someone needs to mute their line. I'm hearing some background.

Woman: Okay, I won't drive.

Marika Konings: So that will allow as well people to specifically reference to, you know, in line 25 I think this should be changed or in line 50 I would like to discuss this part of the response because either I don't agree or think we need to look at different approaches. And so as such, you know, it will be very difficult to manage any kind of that line substantive items because we may have, you know, people redlining similar sections with completely opposite kind of

approaches. So what we would like to suggest is that you only redline in the case of, you know, minor edits, you know, grammar corrections that may not need, you know, full group consideration but that any substantive items are actually called out separately.

So if you want to comment on a specific passage of text you're asked to kind of identify, you know, which page number, the line number, the section in an email. And then you can even include if there's specific edits you would like the group to consider your of course encouraged to add those. But that will allow us to kind of have that conversation around that specific item and as people weigh in so that based on that conversation the determination can then be made if or how changes need to be made that reflect the broader perspective of the group.

And as said, you know, we always welcome kind of minor edits, you know, typo corrections and, you know, probably staff will make an assessment in that regard if there's anything in there that we think is probably, you know, maybe not minor will of course flag that and add it to the list of items to discuss and (unintelligible) always consult with the leadership team. But I think, you know, normally people have a good sense of, you know, what are minor changes and corrections for readability versus the substantive issues.

And it's the, you know, the objective of this proposed approach is that we make sure that, you know, we're able to discuss in a group setting, you know, any questions or concerns and are able to, you know, resolve those with a common understanding instead of having edits reflecting maybe only an individual perspective or having competing redlines in the document. So that's in a nutshell what staff is proposing. And we know that, you know, as said before there are a lot of other things going on but, you know, I think the hope is to get this at least two initial report publication by Barcelona. So I think we're hoping that we can count on your commitment to, you know, look at the draft initial report and, you know, provide input within the timeframe that we've proposed here. So that's all I had, Erika.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much Marika. This is Erika, well summarized. So for all of us the most important point, there are two things. So look at the time table. I believe its fine to have these three calls scheduled. And as Marika said where we will run through draft recommendation and the comments received to discuss them. But I believe keep in mind we will review, so the leadership team will review the draft at least the plan over the upcoming weekend and staff will send it to you at the beginning of next week. And then the main point is that staff would love to receive main comments, major comments so those which are really relevant and key not minor edits they would love to receive this by email. And obvious indicating of course the page ideally I mean the best is always just to paste and copy the part you want to make a recommendation to and just mention the page and then can be easily found and then make a recommendation how you would love to see the text to be changed.

Is this is something we can agree upon? I think Marika I believe we have an understanding here. It's a very experienced group here and we work so long together I don't believe we will have a big disagreement here coming up. I would be totally surprised I see only (Carolina) typing something so I'm waiting to see. Yes she's confirming it's a reasonable approach. And I take the silence from other members and participants as a sign that we have broad support. So Marika, that's it.

So I think we can move forward. We have a confirmation achieved a lot today. And I'm very grateful for all the work you have done the whole team so thank you so much for all of this. So next one when is our next meeting? Is it - have you scheduled it for 13 September if that's correct at 15 UTC? Yes there's one thing I have to tell you (Sylvia) sent a quick note so for her it's very late. I forgot to mention this she sent us apologies and it was 1 o'clock in the morning so we really can't expect her to join these kind of calls. But she is always somebody who will send a quick email if she believes that a point is

not covered well. So that's it probably I believe if there's nobody else want to raise a comment?

Marika Konings: Yes Erika, this is Marika.

Erika Mann: We can go ahead. Go ahead if you left over your thing.

Marika Konings: Yes I apologize. I think because we drafted an agenda for our previous meeting which then got deferred so this is actually this should be 20 September. As discussed our objective is to circulate the draft initial report early next week so that should give you the course of next week to look at it so that the next meeting would then be scheduled for 20 September.

Erika Mann: Doesn't make sense -- this is Erika -- the 13th would be too short actually to review the full draft recommendation. I agree. Thank you so much for seeing that. Okay I wish you all the very best and those who had only one hour we will be happy we kept the time and I'm giving back to you Julie.

Julie Bisland: Thank you Erika. Today's meeting is adjourned. Everyone can disconnect your lines. And operator you can disconnect the recording as well. Everyone have a good rest of your day or night. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much.

                                        END