ICANN Transcription
CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds
Wednesday 27 March 2019 at 1400 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/en/group-activities/calendar

Adobe Connect Recording: https://participate.icann.org/p4vtgp1khvc/?proto=true

Attendance is on the wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/kQ5lBg

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

Coordinator: Excuse me, recordings are started.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceed call held on Wednesday, the 27th of March, 2019 at 1400 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge could you please let yourself be known now? And we do note that Sebastien Bachollet is on the audio bridge only. Are there any others?

Thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your

phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn it back over to Erika Mann. Please begin.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, Andrea. Thanks so much for your help and support. So it's Erika on the call. Let's go and check if we have an update concerning the conflict of interest declaration?

Marilyn Cade: Actually, Erika, it's Marilyn.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I think we agreed to - yes I think we agreed to have a roll call.

Erika Mann: You want to have a roll call? You just not want to know who is on the…

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Yes…

Erika Mann: …wanted to next but you want to have a roll call?

Marilyn Cade: Oh I do. And here's why, I think we should state our names, our organization, whether we're a voting member or a participant or an observer so we can figure out then how we advance more engagement.

Erika Mann: Certainly we can do that…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Andrea, can you do this?

Andrea Glandon: Yes, absolutely.

Erika Mann: Perfect.

Andrea Glandon: On today's call - so I will state everyone's name and then once I state your name you can go ahead and state the rest of the information that was asked for. We have Marilyn Cade.

Marilyn Cade: I am - Marilyn Cade, I'm the CSG voting representative.

Andrea Glandon: We have Emily Crane Pimentel. I'm not sure if Emily is on the line. I'll move on. Jacob Odame-Baiden. Judith Hellerstein.

Judith Hellerstein: This is Judith Hellerstein. I'm with At Large and voting member.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Julf Helsingius. Okay, we will move on to Maureen Hilyard. Maureen, I'm not sure if your audio is connected.

Maureen Hilyard: Hi. Can you hear me, Andrea? This is Maureen Hilyard. I'm from At Large, voting member.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. And we have Stephen Deerhake.

Stephen Deerhake: Stephen Deerhake, representing ccNSO. Thank you.

Andrea Glandon: And Vanda Scartezini. And I think Vanda is having some audio issues. We also have on the audio portion only Sebastien Bachollet. Okay.

Sebastien Bachollet: Hello. It's Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I am on my car so driving but I am member representing ALAC Euralo. Thank you very much.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you, Sebastien. And then we have Carolina Caeiro. Okay, I have gone through all of the participants and those who are able to speak have spoken. I'm sorry, we do have…

((Crosstalk))

Andrea Glandon: …Maarten Botterman.

Erika Mann: Yes. And some have tried…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: …like Carolina she typed but she didn't state her status, so some are having difficulty in the moment. So what we will do, Marilyn, that's my recommendation, let's see this as a test for today which we have done. We will repeat this next time. We will put this in the agenda as well that we are planning to do this for the future purposes so we exactly know who are on the - either members or participants on the call and we - it's easier to remind ourselves each time instead of checking the document.

There's just one thing maybe we want to be careful it's not - I think we have to be careful with the term "voting members" I mean, they are members but I'm not aware that there's a difference you know, in voting terms. Yes, in case we will have to vote of course member will have different rights, that's correct. But we - in this group we agreed at the very beginning that we like to have at the very end a kind of consensus call based on what their groups and the SOs and the AC believe would be the right policy.

So maybe we can avoid a situation where we come to, you know, where we have to really we have to vote. But let's maybe have a discussion about this topic next time. Let's put it on the agenda because there may be more members than probably and participants who want to join this discussion. But I see you raised the hand so I give it back to you again.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. It's Marilyn. I'm just going to ask us all to go back to the terms of reference. Yes, we want to make decisions by consensus but I believe for

those of us who were sent by the chartering organizations, that we have obligations to fulfill.

Erika Mann: Yes, absolutely. And that's why it's…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: …good that you raised the point and we will have to discuss it, totally agree.

Marilyn Cade: Fantastic. Thanks.

Erika Mann: Yes. Marika, I see you raised your hand as well. Please.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks Erika. This is Marika. One thing we could ask members and participants to do is when they sign into the Adobe Connect room is that when, you know, they put behind brackets, you know, whether they're a member or a participant and if they're a member they should probably also indicate who is the appointing organization.

I think that will also help you then kind of see, you know, whether you know, we have critical mass and representation from the different groups that at the end of the day will indeed, you know, participate in the consensus call. And hopefully as well for the rest of the group provide more clarity on what role the different people are performing.

I did put a link into the member and participant list. I noted some people in identifying themselves as members while they're not listed as such on the list and just to clarify here again, you know, this group consists of members and participants whereby each chartering organization had the ability to assign up to five members if I'm not mistaken, and as Marilyn noted with very specific responsibilities in that regard while anyone was invited to sign up as a participant. So it's also important indeed to you know, remind ourselves of those roles and responsibilities.

And as said, you know, maybe putting that role in brackets for future meetings might facilitate identification and also clarity on, you know, where you know, perspectives are coming from.

Erika Mann: Yes. It's Erika. Thank you so much for reminding us, Marika. And I saw the exchange where you made the comment I believe it was in relation to (unintelligible) so I think it's important to check in case the document gives a different answer that some of our participants in this group are giving concerning membership or participant. This needs to be clarified and I believe it would be good if you would follow up and just check the situation and we have it then on record in correct terms.

Is that okay that we pick up the topic and we announce it next time what we are planning to do? Are you okay with this, Marilyn? And can we continue?

Marilyn Cade: Perfectly satisfied. I just have to be accountable - Marilyn speaking…

Erika Mann: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: …I just have to be accountable to the CSG. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes, and it's - it's good to do it and clarify a few points as well so it's always good to be very precise. Thank you for this. So then let's go back to the question whether somebody has an update concerning the conflict of interest declaration. No, that's not the case. Okay, then let's continue.

The next item is something, Point 3, is something the leadership team discussed. We had a longer call and we are a bit concerned with the time constraints, which we do have because we believe it's important that we finalize the final report as early as possible, as quickly as possible. It's not really reasonable to continue for over a much longer time because the money shall be used and should not be, you know, stacked in an endless circle of

debates and discussions about how it can be used, at least that's my opinion and I believe it's shared by the leadership team.

So our question is whether we can - or how we can ensure that we have sufficient commitment from all of the members and the participants to do the work. We have a core team of members which are always present and you all, I mean, carry the majority of the burden. And there are of course more members than we have today typically but it's still probably not enough to allow us to finish the work as early as possible.

So from - I made the proposal in the leadership team and I mentioned this in the GNSO discussions which we had recently as well that I would love to see us concluding in - ideally in Marrakesh because I believe it's important to have a goal and to have a time commitment instead of having an open agenda which is much more difficult then to confine the time available with regard to the topics which we have to master.

So that's the main topic we want to discuss under this umbrella. So it's the question, can we - do you believe we can manage this until Marrakesh? Do you believe we can get the commitment from the core - not just the core but a broader team of members and participants than we have right now? And would you - how do you believe we should do it? How should we advance it? Shall we have more frequent calls which I believe is a burden? Or shall we just request and ask if we can have a longer call session, so instead of having 90 minutes maybe, you know, going for two hours or for three hours even just to make a quicker process?

So this is what we discussed. My question - and there's on other item I want to mention because I raised it in the GNSO and you may have heard about it, I was wondering whether we should have an additional day - a zero day, an add on day in Marrakesh. Now I follow the discussion in the GNSO Council concerning the EPDP requesting something similar.

And I see how difficult the discussion is. So my feeling is it might be even not reasonable even to request this formally because it looks so difficult to get this arranged and that it might be not even worth trying and we spend a lot of effort in trying instead of maybe focusing on other matters how we can achieve something similar. But I just want to mention it here. And you might have some other ideas which we haven't discussed in the leadership team. So that's the topic I'd like to present to you. Anybody who wants to comment on it?

Do you believe it's reasonable we can manage until Marrakesh, maybe the first question.

Marika Konings: Erika, I have my hand up.

Erika Mann: Oh I see it now. Sorry, I don't know why I can't see the staff. It's somehow my Adobe is never showing the staff. Apologies for this. Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks, Erika. So I just wanted to briefly highlight what you see on the screen, it was also shared with the agenda for this meeting. Staff did a kind of quick and dirty timeline, you know, trying to get us to the Marrakesh meeting for a final report. And I think as you can see it's pretty aggressive and at least I think from a staff perspective at this stage in the current pace of work, you know, not a realistic one as, you know, there's still quite some comments we need to review, you know, there quite a number of working group agreements that will require further work and consideration.

And then of course, you know, there needs to be further discussion on, you know, how - what the final report will look like, so hence, you know, the conversation if, you know, I think the first question is, is the group committed to, you know, a Marrakesh target date for finalizing the report? And if yes, you know, what can the group do to be able to deliver on that? And I think Erika already mentioned a couple of options on how that could be achieved.

With - in relation to, you know, the Marrakesh meeting planning itself and Erika already noted that as well, you know, the request has been brought to the attention of Council leadership that as they prepare the GNSO schedule for Marrakesh that, you know, sufficient time is carved out for the discussions of this group. But of course, you know, it's important to note that, you know, the meeting is a policy forum which means there are only four days available.

I know that I think at least from a GNSO perspective I think we typically get two rooms that are assigned to the GNSO which are basically shared with stakeholder groups and constituencies as well of course the other policy activities that are ongoing. So there's typically less flexibility in having, you know, several meetings in parallel. So all of that will need to be factored in. But as said, you know, I know the Council leadership is aware of the request and of course will do its utmost to provide as much time as possible.

It may be helpful as well if indeed the group is committed to that timeline and, you know, the Marrakesh meeting would be you know, an important point to kind of finalize the work to make sure as well that there is sufficient participation to, you know, make that a productive meeting. And I think you're all aware that, you know, we did have the Council the second meeting in Kobe because there weren't sufficient participants available, so I think we do want to avoid that especially if, you know, carving out time for this effort means that other groups will not be able to meet.

And of course it would be very unfortunate if then we would need to cancel because there's lack of participation. So again I think those are some factors the group will - may need to factor in. And that's it.

Erika Mann: Yes. It's Erika. Thank you so much for the reminder. Marilyn, please.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Marilyn speaking. I guess I have a couple of concerns about trying to complete our work by Marrakesh. First of all, it's very unlikely that I will have - I think we have to be careful that many of the members, the voting members,

and I don't mean to be dismissive of the rest of the views, we want to have consensus, but we have to have present at these meetings the majority of those who have to then deliver support from the chartering organizations.

It's very unlikely that Marrakesh is going to provide - unless it's a pre-event or a post-event - it's very unlikely that Marrakesh meeting can provide a workspace of a minimum of I think at least four hours which would be needed to finalize much of our work, if we even meet the timeline that staff has laid out before that. I find it very, very challenging. I'm not even sure it could work.

I think we should pick a slightly extended timeline and push forward on achieving decisions but we're not going to have a public session in Marrakesh and I think we also have to be respectful of the fact that many people won't have travel funding to Marrakesh. So I would prefer we work toward what we can accomplish, assume we cannot meet face to face in Marrakesh, it would be highly unlikely to get enough people there who have funding to attend.

And then have an agreement that we have a marathon review, including maybe even a couple of webinars, post-Marrakesh, and then present our report, trying to take into account that those who cannot attend in person can still fully contribute.

Erika Mann: Yes, it's Erika. I think you - I'm worried - let me not say I'm not worried but I'm - I believe you and Marika's concern are probably correct. I must say I personally regret this because it's not really helping the end goal. It might help us to have more participation in the decision making but it will make it, I mean, the money will be frozen even longer before it can, you know, even the process of building the implementation team can start. But I hear you and Marika raised the same concern and I hear you.

And like I mentioned following the debate in the EPDP and in concerning arranging a meeting, I believe you are probably right, this is going to happen.

There will be less people, less people will have funding and it will be very unlikely to be able to arrange a worthwhile meeting.

Okay, can we maybe get some other opinions so that we just have an understanding between this group? What do you believe? Is it worthwhile pursuing the course, even trying for Marrakesh? Or rather more reasonable to follow the concept Marika - Marilyn just laid down? I'm fine with both approaches. Stephen, please. Stephen, can you hear me?

Stephen Deerhake: I say we shoot for - yes, I say we try to shoot for Marrakesh. We've got to get this wrapped up and otherwise I think we're just going to run out of gas here. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes. Maureen.

((Crosstalk))

Maureen Hilyard: …for the record. I agree with Stephen. I think that, you know, we have to try and get as much done as possible even with the small group that we have and it's been for some time now. And I also think that it's probably, I mean, I'm actually (unintelligible) it's probably better that we, as for example for At Large is that we review our (unintelligible) and participant sort of like status, you know, because we ourselves have people who attend regularly and have been on the participant status but whereas others haven't been attending.

So, you know, just it's a timely - it's timely for us to be, you know, looking and reviewing it so that we can - because there are going to be more decisions being made and we have to be able to do them if we're going to able to finish that report by Marrakesh.

Erika Mann: Yes. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Maybe even the draft report and then we can sit together in Marrakesh and try to finalize it, an early draft report. But please some more opinions. Somebody else who want to make a comment concerning this item?

Marilyn Cade: Actually it's Marilyn. I have a question for the staff.

Erika Mann: Go ahead, Marilyn. We can't hear you. Or I can't hear you.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, I can't - but I can't get a meeting room for other events, and I just wanted to be sure can staff - is staff able to ensure that there would be the ability to get a working session of at least three to four hours in the four day event? In the past it's been with this new meeting structure it's been extremely difficult.

Erika Mann: Yes, practically impossible. Yes, Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. This is Marika. To Marilyn's question, you know, the way it works for the policy forum is that all requests need to go through an SO and AC in order to get, you know, space and time on the schedule allocated. So, you know, the way we're currently working this is through the GNSO as, you know, Erika of course hails from the Council, you know, part of the support team comes from there as well so we've been typically going through the GNSO in getting time on their schedule and you know, part of their room allocation for the meetings.

You know, however, if other groups feel that they have, you know, plenty of time in the schedule or a meeting room is available we can of course work it as well through other groups but I think we're still faced with, you know, that there are many other meetings taking place and there's only, you know, limited time and limited room available for the policy forum.

So how we typically work is that basically, you know, the Council leadership will look at all the requests from the different groups and that includes as well,

you know, the policy development activities that are ongoing but for the GNSO it also includes GNSO stakeholder group and constituency activities. And again, I mean, everyone's requested really here for the policy forum, you know, to focus on policy activities and leave more, you know, other topics for either other meetings or also calls that may take place at other moments and basically try to fit that in into the schedule.

Something that you need to factor in as well is I think for the current policy forum there are I think seven slots if I'm not mistaken set aside for cross community or high interest topic sessions which basically means as well that a substantial amount of time may already be locked up for other meetings and, you know, usually we're not allowed to schedule against those.

So that does I think give you a picture that, you know, it is a very reduced meeting and limited time but as said, you know, we have put this on the agenda, we have also indicated, you know, the request of having a longer slot, you know, kind of as long as possible, so we are hopeful that, you know, we're at least able to secure a four hour block.

But as said, you know, it's not, you know, it's not a staff decision at the end of the day, you know, it will be GNSO leadership decision factoring in all the other meetings that are requested and it may also need to factor in, you know, meetings that other groups are scheduling because of course in this group we have participants from all SOs and ACs.

So ideally and I know from the GNSO side we're already working on this to have at least a draft schedule shared with other groups as soon as possible so that others can also factor in, you know, if we, for example, are able to carve out a set amount of time on Wednesday that other groups are aware of that and make sure that they don't, you know, schedule something that's of particular conflict for those members that are participating in this effort as well.

So that's where we're currently at. As said, you know, from the GNSO side I think we're very keen to have a draft schedule as soon as possible so it can help inform, you know, the discussions both in high interest topics, you know, are all of those needed or can some of that be liberated to focus on some of the topics, you know, like this effort and also allow others to, you know, schedule around, you know, the meetings that are being planned so it doesn't conflict with schedules that each group is putting together themselves.

Erika Mann: It's Erika. Marika, just one follow up question, do we have an idea when we will have such kind of overview about the possible and potential slots in Marrakesh? Is there a deadline for the GNSO when this has to be done?

Marika Konings: Yes, so I think - and I have to speak here from memory - I believe the deadline for meeting requests I believe is around the 27th of April. But as said, you know, from the GNSO side we're already working on a draft schedule because again also, you know, not only for this group but I think as many of you are aware, you know, the EPDP is another effort where there's, you know, broad community interest and, you know, a group as wants as much time as possible. So we want to make sure that we're, you know, able to communicate at a very early stage, you know, the plans that are being made so that other groups can also factor that in into their scheduling.

And hopefully a discussion can be held with the SO and AC leadership. And I think they have a schedule as well, you know, I think the 25th of April, if I'm not mistaken, to kind of talk about high interest topic sessions and cross community sessions. But as said, I think at least from conversations on the GNSO leadership side I think they want to kind of start that, you know, sooner than that especially to give people clarity and also be able then to indicate, you know, on the draft schedule how much tie can be carved out.

So all I can say, soon, but I can't fit in - put an exact date on it. And as said, some of it is somewhat dependent as well on the conversations around high

interest topic session as well as the scheduling that's taking place in other groups.

Erika Mann: Yes. Thank you so much for this overview, Marika. And I see Joke is writing that the ccNSO has also started scheduling high level draft schedule for the ccNSO, so which is good, I mean, if we have these kind of information as early and possible and we would know we could either have an add-on day or we can have a long session which would be even better then we don't have to schedule additional day, this would help us all.

Xavier, I have seen you. Are you still there?

Sebastien Bachollet: It's Sebastien if I can join the queue please? Thank you.

Erika Mann: Sure. Please go - but I just wanted to see if Xavier is still there. He raised his hand and now I see it's not there anymore. Xavier. No?

Xavier Calvez: No thank you, Erika. I put my hand down.

Erika Mann: Oh there you are. Please go. Yes.

Xavier Calvez: No, thank you. I put my hand down. Marika addressed everything I was going to say more.

Erika Mann: Okay. Thank you so much. Thank you so much. Sebastien, please.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, I am sorry I missed part of the call because I was in a place with no phone and I just joined when Marilyn talk about the meeting strategy, and the answer seems for me a little bit strange. Maybe it's the way it was implemented but the goal of the meeting strategy working group few years ago was to try to decrease the complexity of the meeting and it seems that we have done the reverse and it's a bad job.

But if I remember well the idea was not to have a single cross community working group at one time, it was to have cross community time, it was supposed to be, on second part of the afternoon, whenever it's done. I can understand for the high interest topic that it's without conflict with other meetings, but if we take a cross community working group, I know that there are people who are doing everything and they will be in trouble.

But for the rest of us who are concentrating one or two or three topics usually it's not conflicting therefore it could be possible to organize a cross community working group like ours in parallel with other. And of course the other will have to decide which one they will follow. But I really think that I heard a lot of things about this meeting and maybe it's time to review that and I will be happy to participate (unintelligible) but frankly don't say that it's not possible to do and we are locked with everything, it could be more flexible than it is presented to us. Thank you very much.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. Stephen, are you - is that an old hand? Okay. Looks like it. So maybe…

Stephen Deerhake: Yes it is. Thank you.

Erika Mann: …I believe what I hear and what I see in the comments I believe there's a tendency to work with the idea to have a longer session in Marrakesh and ideally to make progress and advance our report as much as possible so that we may have - and I'm very careful here - may have a very early draft which we then can discuss in Marrakesh and can finalize in Marrakesh as much as possible.

We then will still have to continue to work on it because we will receive new input and there may - new questions may arise hopefully not too many. And then we will continue to work on it after Marrakesh and finalize the report after Marrakesh, ideally we should set ourselves a deadline until we want to have it

finalized but we don't have to do it today. But maybe we can work with the schedule like two months after Marrakesh, something like this is reasonable.

We will have to get signal from staff as well, Marika and Joke, because they have to carry the burden and you will have to decide as well how much time you need before we have the final consensus call how much time you will need them to communicate again with your constituencies. And depending on, you know, the decision which you will make based on how much time you need and how much time staff needs we then can set ourselves a second deadline.

Does this sound reasonable? Can we try this and then we hopefully receive quickly - as quickly as possible from staff a reply, you know, can we actually have a meeting and a longer meeting. I don't think so, it's worthwhile to have a one-hour, one half an hour session again. It takes so much time until one can start and each time you need to make an introduction because new people are participating which is on one side wonderful, but it hinders us to make a lot of progress. So just an hour or one and a half hour session is not really super helpful.

So Maureen, do you want to say something?

Maureen Hilyard: I was just agreeing with you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. I like this. Some - everybody else is okay with this strategy? And then we have a - depending on what we hear from staff and how long the session can be in Marrakesh, we then can fine tune our approach, we don't have to do it today but I believe we have an understanding in principle we like to have an early draft which we can hopefully finalize as much as possible in a longer session in Marrakesh and then we give ourselves again time depending on how much time you need to discuss this with your constituencies and how much time staff needs, we give ourselves again time.

Marika, I give you the - I can check in a moment what you want to say, I give you the floor in a second, and then you can just say - and everybody can hear what you want to say. It's difficult to switch on the little computer I have with me and I'm in Taipei so I'm a little bit constrained about what I can see. And I believe this is a quite good approach.

Marika, please, you wanted to say something.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. This is Marika. I just wanted to ask the question so I think it's great that, you know, people want to set a target, you know, an ambitious target to get the work done. But I think we haven't really discussed, you know, how we are going to get there. Does the group expect to kind of continue on the same schedule and same pace of work? And, you know, as I've noted, you know, we did put together a schedule but I don't think it aligns with the reality of how we've been able to progress work to date, so, you know, that would make it very challenging to actually meet that Marrakesh date to have a, you know, a draft report.

You know, is the group open to, you know, extending the duration of calls, you know, have additional calls, do more work on list? Or again I think we're just trying to get some clarity because it's really great to set a target and a goal but if we don't align that with an increase in work and workload I'm not really sure how, you know, realistic that target is going to be.

Erika Mann: Absolutely, Marika. It's Erika. I wouldn't have forgotten this, I would have to come to this but it's good that you mention it, yes. So if we can agree on this in principle, then we have to define how do we want to continue working. Do we want to have more calls? Do we - what I prefer but, I mean, you might have totally different idea, shall we just prolong our twice weekly calls which would make it much easier - twice monthly calls, which would make it, in my eyes, easier? Or - and can we continue by email working as well between these calls?

Maureen, I saw your hand.

((Crosstalk))

Maureen Hilyard: …to be into the chat. But I think that, you know, even just trying to progress is a little bit difficult at the moment. I think that when we were given - assigned a task, for example, to develop draft language on the universal acceptance and Elliot asked about whether, you know, at what sort of format that statement was required, I think that we just need a little bit more clarity on what the requirements are of the particular assignments that we're being given so that we got a better idea and perhaps some like the information back to you that you require.

But I think that just that - just getting started was something that we needed to get some clarity on so that we could move forward. So you know, as you say it's just we, you know, we just need to sort like know what the requirements are so that, you know, when we're assigned something like this that we can move ahead with it. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes, I agree. It's an overburden for the whole community, the whole work is just too much and this is what we see as a result is you know, we have decreased participation and it's not just in this group. You only see high participation in some of the high - super high, you know, political topics areas like GDPR and the other areas, you know, it's similar impact like what we experience. And I believe our group is still very - it's still high in participant, I know that some are doubting it's high enough. But I believe it's still high and it's a very committed team working on it.

So anyhow, we will have to discuss this. Shall we test it? Shall we test to have maybe for a month calls for let's say reasonable time, maybe not three hours because one gets tired after a while, but two and a half hours. Would this be something you could commit to? Would this be something that you

would believe you could manage? And then we have to look into the other questions as well, you just mentioned Maureen, how can we get the commitment defined in such a way that people really know what they committed to and how they can finalize the work.

Marilyn put a similar point in the commitment which was made to work by email on a particular commitment. She signed up and then people didn't - apparently didn't show up and didn't continue working on it. I give you the floor in a second, but can we in principle agree for the next call we will have a longer session and let's say let's test us for the next two calls and let's see if we can manage this. Would this be something you can commit the time to? Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Marilyn speaking. I think it's kind of my fault that we didn't move forward because I didn't insist that somebody be appointed the lead, whoever it was, of the four of us. So let me own that responsibility. I will volunteer to say at least I'm going to coordinate the working call and the draft. And in the future when we assign work let's appoint a lead or two coleads and then they carry the responsibility to get that project content put forward. I think that will help the staff as well.

I'm not very sympathetic to the idea that volunteers are running on volunteer fatigue because when somebody really cares about a topic, fatigue is not really the issue. It may be overlap of events or competing events, but fatigue doesn't, in my view, if you are really committed to an event, then you - or a topic then you're energized, you're not fatigued. But I don't think we can have calls, Erika, that are more than two hours.

Erika Mann: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I think if we could go for a two hour call and we assign work and then if people don't deliver the work we, you know, that tells us something. But I think we can make a lot of progress between now and Marrakesh. As I said earlier, I'm not supportive of trying to have a final product in Marrakesh, I think there won't be enough people there. But as you redefined it with having an early draft and then doing as much as we can and then finalizing post Marrakesh, I feel more comfortable.

Erika Mann: Yes. It's Erika. Thank you so much, Marilyn. I think we have a quite broader understanding between us. When I watch the chat room as well, Stephen is supporting it, Maureen, somebody else I saw, I believe it was Judith. So I believe we have an understanding, two hours so let's agree upon two hours. I take you in a second, Sebastien. But I believe we have a principle agreement two hours. If we don't like it and we see we can't manage it, we can always change it.

So I have two people in the moment on the raising their hand, Marika and Sebastien. Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. I wanted to respond to Maureen's question earlier and I think also, you know, kind of in general. So, you know, the focus at the moment is for, you know, the group to determine, you know, what if anything needs to be changed in the initial report. You know, whether that's based on the comments that are provided or, you know, further deliberations of this group. But that is kind of the focus I think for, you know, any action items that are assigned and any work that's undertaken.

So in relation to that specific action item I think the ask is there really, you know, look at the examples in the annex as well as the guidance that's provided in one of the annex and determine, you know, what changes if any are needed to convey this notion of, you know, projects that are already funded through the ICANN budget not being eligible in the exact same format for funding. I think that was kind of the gist of that conversation.

So I think that's, you know, if people can have that in mind, you know, both when we deliberate on input or comments and I think that's where we really need to drive, you know, all the kind of conversation towards is, you know, based on, you know, this conversation what if anything needs to be changed in the initial report. And with that kind of guidance it will then be as well, you know, easy or easier for staff to kind of go and do it and produce kind of a draft final report for you because I think that's, you know, the current stage we're at. So I hope that's helpful.

Erika Mann: Yes. Yes, it's Erika. And to add to what Marika said, we - from the - based on a discussion we had the leadership provided you with some kind of guidance concerning the possible changes. But these are of course only guidance but they may help you as well in judging the comments we receive and how we potentially can respond to them. So we have practically done a kind of early very, very, very early draft recommendation but of course it needs to be discussed in this group and potentially be changed. So yes, thank you, Marika. Sebastien, please.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you very much, Erika. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Just to take one - I agree with Marilyn and with two hours. Just starting to check that there is no problem with other calls because there are some calls that are rotating, we are not, and that create some time trouble. One within At Large we have a group about policy we rotate and it's sometime - at the time we are. Therefore if we extend it, it could change something and we have some call about ATRT 3 that could also be in jeopardize. And except with this question I agree to move to two hours. Thank you very much.

Erika Mann: Yes, and I see a chat room discussion shall we - are we talking about weekly calls or are we talking about twice in month? I believe we should keep the rhythm we have but we should extend it to two hours each time so we would have two calls in a month like we do right now but instead of 90 minutes we would have 120 minutes.

I believe this is something we can manage. And we keep in mind that in between topics which we discuss and which still need further elaboration then a small group may want to look into it and provide already answers to it after we discuss it like the next topic we are debating in a minute where Marilyn and the group already worked on a topic which we couldn't provide the answer in our last meeting, so they started working in a small group so that we can make quicker progress.

I believe we have an understanding here so we try to have a very early draft in Marrakesh, we hope that we can have a longer session in Marrakesh so that we can continue working on this very early draft and if we can get a longer session we will then discuss how we continue working with our - a certain commitment with a certain deadline we are able to define. And we agreed as well that we will continue the discussion after Marrakesh depending on the time you need to consult with your constituency and the time staff needs so it's not - we're not expecting to have a final draft in Marrakesh.

And we agreed as well in - until Marrakesh ideally to have continue our calls twice a month but instead of 90 minutes, 120 minutes. So any other point missing with regard to this topic, Marika? Something which we need to discuss just to have this discussion about this topic completed?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, I think we have a game plan here. You know, we'll go ahead and schedule the next few calls for two hours but we continue the, you know, the rhythm of every two weeks. And again, you know, hopefully as well we can focus our conversations to really, you know, hone in on, you know, what if anything needs to be changed as a result of, you know, the conversations in the final report. So I think we're good.

Erika Mann: Wonderful. Perfect. Then I don't see something else popping up in the chat room. No hands raised. So let's continue then. Marika, I need to read you the

next topic item, I can't read it. My screen again is not showing on the agenda items, so please be so kind to read it.

Marika Konings: Yes, no problem. The next item is 4a, and I think we actually already covered that, it's in relation to the follow up on the action items coming out of ICANN 64. You know, Marilyn has already indicated that she will take the lead on that one, so, you know, hopefully that group will put something together that they can then share with the full group on the mailing list and, you know, if needed we can come back to it on the next call or if anyone has any, you know, further - or if we can finalize on the mailing list probably even better.

So the next item is comment Number 1 in relation to charter question Number 3, that was an action item for the CCWG to review the ICANN Board letter that was sent I believe it was in October and reconsider during the next meeting whether or not to add the language proposed by the ICANN Board in relation to that charter question.

And, you know, I don't know if people had a chance to review this but it goes to the point that, you know, the Board has stated that they will not 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 panels.

So I think the question for the group is, is there any concern about adding that, you know, clarification to the report to make really clear, you know, what the Board envisioned role is or are there any concerns about doing so?

Erika Mann: Thanks, Marika. It's Erika. I believe we should add this. But can you remind us and maybe even show us the context in the report where it would be added? Is there a natural place where we would add this? Can you just remind us please and maybe even are you able to show it?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I won't be able to show it because I think we need to see, you know, how the report comes together and where it fits best. But this is in relation to, you know, charter Question 3 and the guidance that was provided in relation to the implementation phase. So I think it related to kind of the safeguards that would need to be put in place. And I think, you know, some of the comments I think you know, went to, you know, kind of questions, you know, what role would the Board have or what role would staff have in evaluating individual projects.

And I think this is a kind of clarification that has been suggested that is added to really make clear, you know, what the role of the Board and I think similarly and I think that was discussed as well in Kobe, you know, that, you know, neither Board nor staff would be, you know, evaluating or approving individual projects. So again, we probably need to see where that best fits, but I think if there's agreement that that would be helpful to add that clarification you know, staff can have a look to see where that fits best and then of course you can still review or you know, decide if it fits somewhere else better.

Erika Mann: Yes, yes, I think that's a good approach. So my recommendation and I believe leadership made the recommendation, if I remember this well, we definitely should integrate this, the point raised by the Board, we should integrate it into the report and it would make it much easier and would avoid some of the discussion and the complications we had that either people were concerned about how independent will the future mechanism be, independent if it's in house or if it is merged with a different entity or if it is a foundation.

Because you remember many community, many members raised such kind of concerns about independence and of course if staff for example it would be in house and staff would review incoming and evaluate projects independence would be of course pretty much quite low. So I believe we definitely should do it and we have a clear answer from the Board so we should integrate it. But I want to see if somebody wants to argue against it.

Or do you more need more time to consider, don't you recall the - maybe the letter, have you not seen it recently and do you need a bit more time maybe until the next call to read the letter again and to consider your opinion about this? Judith is typing. I believe everybody is still tired from Kobe. So let's put this again because it's such an important point and we don't want to rush it through and people maybe can't remember the letter. So let's put this again on the agenda item for next time, Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. This is Marika. Yes, we can definitely do that. And, you know, we can already reflect in the notes of this meeting, you know, that in principle there was no objection and also, you know, record that in the template that we're using for the comments, so, you know, people do have a chance to review that…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: …yes in the summary which you send out in the invitation as well be so kind to attach the letter again.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. Okay, then let's move forward please. And I need you again to read it.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. This is Marika. So the next action item coming out of ICANN 64 is the status of the FAQs. As you may remember, staff started to pull together, you know, different aspects of, you know, the information that has been provided in relation to the legal and fiduciary requirements as well as on the other side, you know, the input that the ICANN Board has already provided.

So from our side we've actually, you know, pulled that altogether but we've asked some of our staff colleagues to review this and make sure we haven't

missed anything or any, you know, additional information that should be added. So I'm hoping that, you know, we're able to share those ahead of the next meeting.

And, you know, hopefully that will be a helpful resource for the group as well as a helpful reminder of, you know, some of the limitations that, you know, that have been confirmed as a result of legal and fiduciary requirements as well as the input that the ICANN Board has provided through a series of letters.

Erika Mann: You are talking - it's Erika - you are talking about the document we - documentation we were talking about in Kobe, so this idea that you will summarize in a simple template format the questions and the answers we already received concerning the fiduciary and legal obligations, that's what you are talking about right now, yes?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Erika Mann: Yes. And so are you saying you will be able to do this until our next call?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm hoping we'll be able to share that, you know, before that through the mailing list. And again, it's more a collation of information that is already available in different documents so just trying to put that all together into, you know, two separate FAQs, one focused on the legal and fiduciary requirements and the other one on the Board input provided. So we just want to make sure that we have everything complete. But as said, I'm hoping we'll be able to just share that prior to the next meeting.

Erika Mann: Yes, it's Erika. This would be wonderful if you're able to do it. It's a lot of work, it's a huge amount of work so if you are able to manage this until our - ahead of our next call even if it's only, you know, one or two days ahead of the call this would be fantastic. And it would make our work much easier because it's always difficult to remember all the answers we received and to

review documents and to find everything, it's immense work for everybody involved in this work so thank you so much, Marika, for thinking you can manage this until - ahead of our next call. Thanks so much.

Okay then let's take the next item. I don't see any hand raised, I don't see a comment concerning this topic. I believe we are fine. Let's just continue. Marika, you have to read, I can't read it, I'm sorry.

Marika Konings: Yes, no problem at all.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: So that basically gets us to, you know, our kind of regular agenda to continue the review of the public comments through the templates that, you know, we've shared previously and have been working on. So we basically left off last time in charter question Number 4 in relation to what aspects should be considered to define a timeframe, if any, for the fund allocation.

And we already reviewed comment Number 4 and we basically left off at comment Number - the next comment which is comment Number 7 from Anne Aikman-Scalese, which said, "CCWG to consider in relation to recommendation Number 7 that mix of such grants should be determined by a professional grant-making organization."

And maybe as a brief reminder, preliminary Recommendation 7 says, "Funding should be allocated in tranches over a period of years. Tranches may be used for funds - to fund large grants over a period of years or to support projects that could be funded in a shorter period."

So Anne's comment specifically relate to that recommendation. So again there was no specific leadership recommendation associated with this comment so again I think it's for the CCWG to consider, you know, what changes, if any, would need to be made based on the input provided.

Erika Mann: Marika, it's Erika. Can I ask you something? Are you showing the text and the document?

Marika Konings: Yes, what you see in the…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: I can't see anything because I just got a request that some kind of certificate is not valid any longer, so something happened in the moment on the document, so I can't see anything, it's just - I can still see if somebody raises their hand and I can see the chat room but everything else is gone in a moment from Adobe so I can't see the questions and I can't see the review template. Which is fine, as long as I can see the - if somebody wants to make a comment it's fine. But you will have to - you will have to - you just have to recognize that I can't see the text.

Marika Konings: Okay yes, no problem. And hopefully everyone else will be able to see it. You know, the template was also attached to the agenda that we sent out on Monday…

Erika Mann: Sure, but I can't move back and forward and I lose - then I lose the - I can't see the other information anymore and I can't monitor it. So can you just repeat again the decision which has to be taken here, just the key part?

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. So basically Anne is commenting on preliminary recommendation that the group made in relation to, you know, allocating tranches of funds and, you know, whether that's to kind of larger projects or smaller projects. She basically notes that, you know, the mix of such grants should be determined by a professional grant-making organization, so this mix between you know, funding large projects or funding small projects or a combination thereof and she's suggesting that a professional grant-making organization should be determining how that mix should look.

Erika Mann: Okay. Any comments with regard to this topic? Anybody still on the call? Or have we lost you all?

Maureen Hilyard: Erika, we're still on the call.

Erika Mann: You're still on the call. I'm happy. I'm relieved. And I see somebody is typing. Julf is typing I believe. No comment? Okay if there is no comment I believe we just leave it like it is. Just leave the text as it is the original version. Stephen is typing. Yes but I can't see. Maybe I lost the contact to the chat room as well. I can see that…

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Erika.

Erika Mann: …people are typing but I can't see a text showing up.

Marika Konings: Yes, Erika, this is Marika. I can maybe help you there. Comments from Stephen and Julf both agree to leave the text as-is and are fine with the current text.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. So let's do this.

Marika Konings: Thanks. We'll make note of that. So the next comment is from the Registry Stakeholder Group and they note that, "CCWG to consider implementation that permits continued and efficient allocation of funds that become available in the future, for example by setting up an independent entity to manage these funds or transparently determining how auction proceeds would be allocated prior to the auction."

And then the leadership recommendation here is, you know, or feedback is, "This idea goes against our original goal, identify a mechanism for one-off

funding model. Insofar we should not extend our goal but, if supported by the CCWG AP, we can propose to re-evaluate this option after one two review cycles and after one understands better how successful the selected mechanism is."

Erika Mann: Yes, it's Erika. So I wrote this recommendation based upon of discussions we had with experts in particular Nominet but I believe some others as well. And I have personal experience in this field too. What happened actually quite frequently that after a few years certain mechanism are regarded as - that, you know, people which are running these kind of funds believe they should change the environment. And it's often because a very different reason. Nominet I believe was arguing that they can handle this much easier in house instead of the past framework they had selected.

But there are different reasons so I believe it's not a topic we should discuss right now, we should stick with our original concept but of course if in the future the mechanism and we recommend is not the best and not the most appropriate any more than a new CCWG or any kind of other structure and discussion can emerge and a new mechanism can be selected. I don't believe - that's what we at least my recommendation we should reconsider this topic.

So my chat room came up again but not the center piece is still dead.

Marika Konings: Yes, Erika, this is Marika. Don't worry about it. I think the conversation in the chat is about something else about migration to Zoom, not about the actual comments.

Erika Mann: Thank you. Okay, anybody is against that we keep - we stick to our original proposal? I believe we have a commitment from the group, otherwise somebody will say something. Okay, let's move forward, and I can see the chat room again. I believe we have, yes, we have an agreement. Okay let's move forward. Marika, please, back to you.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. So this actually wraps up the comments in relation to charter question Number 4. So I'll pull up now the questions in relation to charter question Number 5 for those that can't see Adobe Connect. And as a reminder, charter Question 5 relates to the question, "What conflict of interest provisions and procedures need to be put in place as part of this framework for fund allocations?"

And the first comment here - or actually the only comment that requires further discussion is the one that identified by the ICANN Board which notes," The CCWG is to ensure that the mechanism recommended upholds avoidance of conflict of interest at every phase as one of its primary principles." And I think this is actually as well an area that if I remember correctly in the FAQ some further guidance has been provided in previous letters. And I don't know if any of the Board liaisons would like to further speak to this specific point?

Erika Mann: It's Erika. And I believe we had a discussion about this topic in Kobe if I remember this well and we already had an internal discussion about it in saying that we do understand that depending on the mechanism and depending on people involved and evaluators involved the level of - potential level of conflict of interest would for each level and for each (sphere) would have to be defined and strengthened. I believe we had discussed this already. The question is just how do we want to integrate it? Is there a recommendation, Marika, from the leadership team concerning this topic?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No there isn't.

Erika Mann: Okay. So one item would be we could put this in the guidelines; we could make a strong recommendation in the guidelines that the implementation team would have to look into this. So we would make a strong recommendation but then the implementation team based on how they implement our - the total of our recommendations they would in reality in the

practice would have to reevaluate the different level of safeguarding the conflict of interest environment. This would be one way how we could do it.

Marilyn is writing, "Conflict of interest, I have not found that the existing (call) of ICANN…" I can't read it. It's gone again. And just for the technical team, maybe Andrea, just for you maybe to note that we need to look into this why I can't see Adobe. It shows me always a little window and in the window I see the SSI certificate for this site is invalid. So maybe there is something which either I have to do but I have downloaded Adobe and I have it running for other purposes as well, typically I never see this, or it is something which relates to something ICANN must do that I'm able to see the page.

Marika Konings: Erika, just to note that Marilyn has her hand up.

Erika Mann: Yes, I see Marilyn and I see comments in the chat room. Thank you so much for helping me, Marika. Marilyn, please.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Marilyn here. I just want to be clear, when I said that existing conflicts of interest for ICANN for the community, staff or Board, I don't find them sufficient for grant distribution mechanism. That doesn't mean I don't find them sufficient for the purpose for which they're intended. I just want to be clear about that, right?

Being a grants distribution mechanism is very different and so I wouldn't - I don't want us to look at the existing conflicts of interest processes within ICANN, but I think that we can clearly recommend to the implementation team that they do more examinations of what are appropriate and effective conflict of interest practices. And I think I'm just reading - I think Sam agreed and I think also Maureen also agreed that we focus for the conflicts of interest on the grants distribution activities. Very different from what ICANN does within its own processes. Thanks.

Erika Mann: Yes, absolutely. It's Erika. Totally agree. I think we have a broad understanding here. So somebody has to do the drafting for the recommendation for the guidelines, for the implementation team. And maybe we - to make it easier somebody who wants to do the drafting or shall we just from the leadership team send you a draft proposal?

Marika Konings: Erika, not sure if you can read the chat but Marilyn noting, "Putting a recommendation into the implementation team works for me."

Erika Mann: Yes.

Marika Konings: And…

Erika Mann: Okay, then let's do the - we put this on our call from the leadership team and we will make a proposal and we send this to you. Okay, Marika, let's move forward. I see confirmation from I believe Carolina as well.

Marika Konings: Yes, and she actually - Carolina has actually specific suggestion. "Perhaps we can reinforce our recommendation language to say robust conflict of interest provisions must be developed and put in place at every phase of the process regardless of which mechanism is ultimately selected," so it's basically adding the, you know, "at every phase of the process" in addition to the current language to clarify that. And…

Erika Mann: Yes, perfect.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: …support for that addition so we can take note of that.

Erika Mann: Yes, and I see support is coming in, I see Maureen is supporting it and Marilyn. Thank you so much, Carolina, that's super helpful. So then we have practically already a draft proposal and maybe we then can just - staff can

just put this together in a complete sentence and we have a draft proposal. Thank you so much, Carolina. Marika, can we - do we still have time? Yes, we do have few minutes, just let's take the next item please.

Marika Konings: Yes, so I'm just moving over to charter question Number 6. Wait a minute for that to come up. So charter question Number 6 relates to the question, "Should any priority or preference be given to organizations from developing economies, projects implemented in such regions, and/or underrepresented groups?"

So the first comment here is from Anne Aikman-Scalese. And she notes, "The CCWG to consider reviewing the role of Applicant Support in ICANN's Mission and develop specific guidelines for a third party in Mechanism B." And the leadership recommendation here is to check, you know, shall this be done at all in this phase or the next phase, the implementation phase? And, B, include in Implementation Guidelines in case we come to the conclusion to do the drafting in the Implementation Phase."

Erika Mann: Okay. Somebody would like to comment on this one? Maybe somebody who is supporting this idea? Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to be very cautious about the idea of inclusion and exclusion. And I want to explain why. Right now countries can be countries - I don't mean stakeholder group but countries - can be designated as least developing. There's about - I think it's over 50 of them. (Unintelligible) small and island developing nations and WEOG, but even in the WEOG countries for instance in Canada and the United States, there are categories of groups that are in the indigenous family of tribes. And they would be excluded if we take a very, very strict idea about who can apply. So I would like to - I'd like to be focused more on the basis of who can benefit from the project as opposed to where the proposer is from.

I'll give one final example. It could be that people from - those who are - a project is submitted from Kenya, which is not a developing country, but is advancing engagement with the Masai. And if we limit who can apply, then I think we are ignoring the different uniqueness of those who can take benefit from these funds to include - to meet and contribute to ICANN's mission.

Erika Mann: Yes. It's Erika. I'm looking through the chat room. I do agree. So in the funding environments I have participated in, but I must admit they have been much larger, so the typical approach I have seen where - are twofold, so either the - they work with a basket approach so in case they want to target certain topics or they want to target certain regions, they selected the basket approach so they would, for example, say $30 million are reserved for projects from developing or least developed countries. So they would be quite precise. But if the total amount would be then let's say $500 million, then $30 million would be reserved.

Or a different approach is it's defined by topics and the topics are defined in such a way that practically they're only applicable for projects in certain developing regions or least developed regions. So there are different approaches how to do it. But I am a bit doubtful as well as this is helpful. I believe we already mentioned if I remember this right that attention shall be paid to all potential participant from - and I believe we even mentioned developing country if I'm - if my memory is correct.

So if we haven't done it we could note this somewhere, we could mention somewhere in the concept in our introduction, how important it is that we are inclusive and that everybody feels they can participate if they fulfill the missions and the criteria etcetera, which we have laid down. So I tend to - I feel - I tend to agree with Marilyn's approach.

But let's hear how other feels about it. Judith is saying focus on the content side. Daniel - I can't - no it's not Daniel, it's Rudi. Apologize for joining late.

Julf is supporting it. Judith as well. Maureen - perhaps the wording does not need to be altered. Yes, that's similar to what I said. I agree with you. Yes.

So I think to do is check have we covered that we want to be all inclusive so we should check the language if we have mentioned this somewhere, but otherwise we don't accept this proposal. Marika, is this clear enough?

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks Erika. We'll capture that in the notes.

Erika Mann: Yes. Okay, the next topic is it possible to manage in two minutes? Can you oversee this, Marika, or is it a more problematic item?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think we can try at least, you know, the leadership recommendation here is that the same approach as you've just taken for Number 3 may apply so if it's that easy we may be able to do that but I'll read the comment. It's from the ICANN Board. And it's basically in summarized version, notes that the CCWG to consider adding language for the implementation team on how to best support applications from diverse backgrounds.

Erika Mann: Okay.

Marika Konings: And if I can maybe just note there's a comment from Carolina in the chat which I think relates to the previous comment, and Carolina can correct me if I'm wrong. She noted that "My read of the comment was different. The recommendation is about Mechanism B, ICANN plus external org. I think the fear is that an external organization will not have a clear sense for what orgs are close to ICANN in supporting its mission."

Erika Mann: It's Erika. I can't judge this because I would have to go back to the original document and I can't do it right now and I can't see anything on the screen. So let's then come back to this point next time again when we all had a chance to review it and I had a chance to see the text which I just can't do

right now. Okay. And Carolina, this related to the previous point, yes? Oh I see you already responded to it.

Okay, so let's take this item up again next time and until then I will have a chance to read the document again and you all will have a chance as well to do it. So we recall the last item and we continue our next call with the previous topic. Marika, can you just summarize the things which we have to do, the action items, please?

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. And maybe I can actually hand it to Joke who's been capturing the notes and maybe she could summarize the action items.

Joke Braeken: Marika, thanks for this. (Unintelligible) in the notes, so I've noted a few action items. The first one being regarding when people join the AC room that members and participants are to include behind brackets whether they are member or a participant and for members to specify their appointing organization as this helps to have an overview of the affiliation, so that's the first action item.

The second one is regarding charter question Number 3, and the ICANN Board letter. There is a clarification to be added to the report. It was recognized that there was no - in principle no objection to adding this clarification but it is to be discussed again during the next meeting due to its importance, and the letter is also to be circulated again to the cross community working group.

Action item Number 3 relates to the status of the FAQs and staff will follow up regarding this via the Auction Proceeds mailing list. Then we have an action item regarding the conflict of interest and charter question Number 5. The leadership team should formulate some language based on the suggestion that Carolina put in the chat. And those are all the action items that I noted. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Okay. Thank you. I believe concerning - it's Erika - concerning the topic concerning the Board language and how it shall be integrated, I believe we set - we may have to do an evaluation once we have finalized the early draft report and then do an evaluation and select the best location for it. But just go and review the - how it was discussed, the recording and then maybe you are clear about how we would like to see this topic to be shaped out.

Joke Braeken: Thank you, Erika. We'll make a note of this. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. Thank you so much, Joke. Okay, back to you, Marika, you have to remind us about our next call and then we can conclude if there's no other topic on the agenda we can conclude the call today.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks, Erika. This is Marika. So next meeting will be in two weeks' time so that will take us to the 10th of April. And we'll extend the call to two hours.

Erika Mann: Okay. Thank you so much, everybody. And back to you, Andrea. And let's hope I can sort this out why it's not working anymore Adobe on my screen. Until next time, thank you so much, everybody. Andrea, back to you.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. This concludes today's - thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

Erika Mann: Bye-bye.

                              END