ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG Charter Drafting Team
Thursday, 02 June 2016 at 13:00 UTC
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-02jun16-en.mp3

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

Attendees:

ALAC
None

ASO
Sylvia Cadena

ccNSO
Will not be participating in the drafting team

GAC
none

GNSO
Jonathan Robinson

RSSAC
Kaveh Ranjbar

SSAC
Russ Mundy
Lyman Chapin

Board
Board Liaisons
Erika Mann
Asha Hemrajani

Board appointed staff advisors
Samantha Eisner

Apologies:
Alan Greenberg
Olga Cavalli

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Lauren Allison
Julie Hedlund
David Tait
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Charter Drafting Team. On the call today we have Sylvia Cadena, Russ Mundy, Jonathan Robinson, Lyman Chapin. Our Board liaisons are Erika Mann and Asha Hemrajani. Our Board-appointed staff advisor is Samantha Eisner. We have listed apologies from Alan Greenberg.

From staff we have Marika Konings, David Tait, Lauren Allison and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Terri. Hi, everyone. So we should be in a position to get going. You have seen the agenda previously circulated, I hope, from - by Marika. We've got a couple of items to go through, items listed 1-5 which you should see on the top right hand of your screen. And really having done the roll call I guess I could ask if there are any updates to anyone's statement of interest, anything changed of significance that you need to let us know in the meantime, so I'll just pause to see if anyone.

Okay thanks…

Asha Hemrajani: Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: Hello, go ahead.

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, sorry, Jonathan. I - this is Asha. I was just testing my phone because I suddenly heard silence so I thought I was disconnected. You're still there, good.

Jonathan Robinson: Hear you loud and clear, Asha.

Asha Hemrajani: Good thanks. Sorry for that.

Jonathan Robinson: Now looking at the agenda as it's currently shaped, our plan was to review the really significant item is just work through the changes to the revised draft charter, for which we should have a recent version. I think Erika supplied the most recent set of edits so that's the one we'll probably work from. And in fact if I can just check maybe, Marika, you can help me, are the principles already copied into the - that - the latest version of the principles? Or, Asha, go ahead, your hand is up.

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, thanks, Jonathan. So, no I just wanted to say mine was the most recent one with the diversity text in it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so that's got the diversity text in it. What about the principles derived from the review of public comments? Is that in the most recent version? Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, we didn't include those separately. I think the - at least from the discussions on the last call I think there was a sense that most of those are probably already captured throughout the charter. But it is something where the group will need to review and discuss whether those principles and/or others need to be called out separately or not.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Marika. Erika, go ahead.

Erika Mann: Yes, Jonathan, I was thinking about doing this, but then I remembered - and I couldn't find the note actually - I remembered the discussion where we had very - weren't totally sure in this group if we wouldn't want to annex the principles or if we want to include them in the charter. And this was the main reason why I haven't done this. So I should have made a note so that all of us could have seen it, why I haven't included it.

I think we might have to take a decision if we want to annex it or if we want to include it. We then had a debate and was my argument and argument from others it would be better to include it. But I wasn't totally sure if we have taken the final decision about this.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Erika. So I see - and Sylvia notes your points that you had previously - I remember that from the discussion that you had indicated that the principles should be part of the charter so it's a question of weaving those in either being sure that they are fully captured or putting them up at a relevant portion in the charter.

But it does seem - so can I just test that? Does it make sense to have the principles as a standalone item or does it make sense that they are essentially integrated and woven into the charter? Can I get some feedback on that please? I assume that's a previous hand so I'll go to Asha.

Asha Hemrajani: Thank you, Erika. Sorry, thank you, Jonathan. To answer your question about whether they should be standalone or integrated, I felt that it would be good to state them up front in the beginning that these are the guiding principles, and then we can also reiterate them throughout the body of the charter just so that, you know, they're reiterated and they're consistently presented throughout the document. But I thought it would be a good idea to put them - state them up front so that it's explicit and it's clear so that's my opinion. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, okay Asha, thanks. And just for the avoidance of doubt when I said "standalone" which is what you've taken it to mean is I meant isolated say at the top of the document, not as a separate document.

((Crosstalk))

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, yes, correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Is that right?

Asha Hemrajani: I understood what you meant, yes. I meant on the top of the document, yes, correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Good.

Asha Hemrajani: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right and go ahead, Russ.

Russ Mundy: Thank you, Jonathan. I am in agreement with - I believe with Asha just said and especially if the principles were considered an annex or an appendix of some sort it would be unclear that, you know, how they sort of - if they were distinctively part of the charter or not. So it seems to me that having a specific section in the charter identified as such, guiding principles, would be the wise way to go because then there would be no doubt that it should be applied anyplace where the topic items may come up. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Russ, and others. That does seem to be clear then. So we'll put as early on in the charter as practical a section called "the guiding principles" and we can include that. Erika, just checking that your hand is up and I think that's still the old hand but come in if you need to add something.

Erika Mann: I just had one quick point. Maybe it would be good and helpful for the second part how to include them into the charter if maybe Russ and I would do a quick check and based on the principles we had identified he would find the best location to reiterate again which part of the principles shall be included further on in the text. Would this help?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, so I suppose there's two ways of doing it, and maybe you could clarify the way you propose to do it, Erika. There's one way which would be to simply read the charter and check that it is consistent with the principles and if necessary reiterate or emphasize any relevant point. Or the alternative is to - I guess that - if that's what you're saying that seems to make sense, essentially proofread the charter against the principles.

Erika Mann: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: And make sure it…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: I think we would - yes, Jonathan, I think the point was raised by colleagues and I think it's probably good one to have them up front but then to check the charter again if it makes sense to integrate part of the principles again where it is appropriate just to have a reference to the particular part of the principles mentioned at the very beginning. It might not be needed but…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: …maybe it's good to do a check.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks, Erika. So it appears we agree on two actions then. One is to place - is to insert the principles as early on in the charter document as practical. And I guess that's a - action on staff who've been holding the overall pen. And then, two, an action to review the charter to ensure that it is

consistent with and supports the principles. I think well maybe just consistent - that it is consistent with the principles as appropriate. And that's - Erika has volunteered to do that and I guess volunteered Russ and - unless he objects we will collectively volunteer him. Okay thank you.

So I think that deals - I guess the next point under this principles point is then the draft on diversity. And I have - I must say I don't have the absolute latest version in front of me so I'm not sure that that is included - can someone confirm. I think that was included because if it was Asha's latest version it will be included. So go ahead, Asha.

Asha Hemrajani: Thanks, Jonathan. No, I think you said it basically that's the one I sent out about 11 hours ago so I think Marika has it and if she can show it. Now the problem is I cannot read - okay the font is so small. Okay, yes, I can barely read this but bear with me. So it's the orange or red text. And it's actually split into five portions, I mean, I've inserted text into five different areas of the document. So this is the first one.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh thanks, Asha. So perhaps it makes sense to do our full walk-through of the document in Item 4 when we review it and simply make sure we deal with this and take these diversity points in as part of that walk-through. That may be the most practical way to do it.

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, that makes sense.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. Thanks.

Asha Hemrajani: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So we'll proceed with that further under Item 4. All right, which then leads us able to move for now onto Item 3, and just - we have received an updated or current version of the fiduciary and legal constraints from Sam Eisner. So I don't see Sam on the call but I see Lauren so I guess - it wasn't immediately

obvious to me what changes had been made but perhaps we can just have any further input or comment on that.

Sam Eisner: Hi, Jonathan. This is Sam. I'm just walking into the office. Could we move this item to - next item in the agenda so I can get in front of my computer to adequately support the conversation?

Jonathan Robinson: That's fine, Sam. What we'll do then we'll go straight on to working our way through the charter, I think, and we can come back to this Item 3, which will give you quite some time so it makes it much less rushed.

Sam Eisner: Great. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem. Okay now hearing Asha and others may have a similar problem with regard to how much you can - how readily you can see this charter, it was my intention and plan was to sort of walk through the changes and really seek any concerns or issues with them. So in other words we'll take it as read that a change is accepted, unless you say otherwise. And note that you do have individual scrolling and magnification capabilities in the bottom - at the bottom of your screen there. So you should be able to magnify and/or scroll and your leisure. I won't be directing that.

Okay and Sylvia makes a practical point that you can actually use more screen real estate by losing and the chat and the notes but of course that is - there is a loss to that.

All right so I suggest, as I say, we walk through it and please let me know if - in running through a change. Many of the changes that certainly that it made were, I would say, you know, just in the interest of enhancing clarity and slightly modifying the language used, they were not of significant substance. So hopefully they'll prove relatively uncontroversial and we can just walk through them relatively ease. And thanks for giving a little bit more real estate there, whoever is controlling the Adobe, I think Marika.

Okay so Section 2 we deal with the problem statement. And I'm just - okay, Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So I actually have a comment on that one. I know I think most of you, your changes here were more stylistic and probably to reduce text, but I was wondering if we could put back the reference to the "ICANN authorized auction service provider" because I know there has been confusion in the past whether, you know, ICANN was just doing these auctions. So to make sure that it's clear that that was, you know, an external provider that managed that I would like to ask if we can maybe put that reference back.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Marika, I only deleted it because it was duplicated in the same section. We had already made it clear at the outset that we were using ICANN's authorized service provider so given that it was up there further ahead in the same section that's the only reason - I didn't delete it because I didn't think it was relevant information, more that it was repeated. Would you still like to see it included?

Marika Konings: Okay if we leave the other one there, I'm fine with that.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, it's just - all right so really that's - as I say, those - it's really mostly definition and just minor expansions of the English. I think clearly we don't modify the gTLD Applicant Guidebook text. So I'm now going on to goals and objectives. Please just, you know, I'm sort of scrolling as I work so just flag me if I'm going too fast or if you think something needs to be discussed.

I guess this is my question. And Erika has responded here on the scope. I wasn't quite sure what we meant by "scope" here, "ICANN is also expected to consider the scope of the allocation." It doesn't have a standalone meaning to me. So I was preferring to be - to define it somehow. And I'm just trying to make sure I understand Erika's point here. It says, "Currently we have

discussion with the (unintelligible) APF," I'm not sure I know what APF is. Go ahead, Russ.

Russ Mundy: Jonathan, this is Russ. Were you calling for me? I'm sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, please go ahead.

Russ Mundy: Oh, thanks. One of the questions that I had, especially in the scope space, is whether or not we, as the drafting team, had or desired to take a position on the area of the eventual funds dispersal being within the mission of ICANN or, if you will, related to the good of the Internet. Had we reached a conclusion on that? I don't remember that we did. You know, and I think this would clearly impact the scope statement or it could.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks very much. And in a way that's the point because if by scope we mean, for example, within ICANN's mission then we should define it because scope could mean many things to many people and I think that's my point. Sylvia, go ahead.

Sylvia Cadena: Hi. My - I think - well I - Russ is okay that we haven't reached any consensus on the scope part. But I think what we discussed before was that with the review of some of the text in the ICANN mission as it is, it might be good to just refer to the mission of ICANN without saying exactly what it is. My consistent comments over the last few weeks have been to make sure that we don't say - that we don't open it too much because this is not - it is a very unique opportunity to support the element of the Internet from the technical community and support the technical community to do better.

And I think that if we open the text around the (unintelligible) where ICANN (unintelligible) or to strengthen or something that is a little bit too vague then it would be everything and anything and that will probably hinder the impact that the funds can actually have. I have discussed my points with Asha during the days that we talked about the diversity text. And I'm happy to share a little

bit more. But I think that the scope, which I have mentioned in several parts of the document, should be in line with ICANN mission and not open it up too much. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Sylvia. And just to be clear, my concern is having this word "scope" and then not actually making it clear what we mean by scope. But maybe Erika and Sam will help us a little more here as well. So go ahead, Erika.

Erika Mann: If I remember this right, we had a discussion in particular last time with Alan. And Alan was keen to have a broader discussion but we didn't take a decision then. So what we could do to find a solution which would, you know, accommodate the various wishes, we could talk about the mission and so we could reference it back to the scope to the mission but then we could say as well we could talk about ICANN's ecosystem, which would allow colleagues which come from different communities and which might want to have a broader definition in the future would allow them to be covered but it would still relate back to the ICANN environment.

It wouldn't cover all of the Internet, which I agree, wouldn't be desirable. So could be a kind of compromise to cover both ICANN and ICANN's ecosystem - ICANN's mission and ICANN's ecosystem.

Jonathan Robinson: There we would be moving to try and define what we mean by scope from - yes, okay. Go ahead. (Unintelligible) your hand is up but we don't hear you.

Sam Eisner: Oh, sorry. I had trouble hearing. So from - I know we've had earlier conversations about this on the drafting team. And we've gone back and confirmed from the legal perspective my thought is it's very important to not suggest that there's a scope that would allow the CCWG to make reference or to make recommendations that the allow the use of the funds outside of ICANN's mission.

It's a key tenant that ICANN acts in support of its mission and through the - however the funds ultimately get allocated it's still ICANN's act and allocating the funds and providing the ability for grants or whatever will ultimately be used. And so there's a really - there's a necessary requirement to make sure that it ties back to ICANN's mission. I know that there are some language on - there's been some concern about the language that was used.

I see that some of this was ported over from the memo we had and we'll discuss this in the next section. I apologize for (unintelligible) to move the order of the call a bit. But we've tried to clarify some of the language of the furtherance of or those types of statements that were used in the memo because there were multiple comments that that needed to be strengthened.

But, you know, particularly with the new bylaws that we have in place and the community focus on making sure that ICANN's mission is not just an aspirational mission but actually an enumerated mission, it's very important that we make sure that the community itself as it's working on other projects support that enumeration or else we'll walk into the situation where ICANN itself could be subject to challenge for taking acts outside of its mission even though it was relying on community input.

So from my perspective from a legal perspective I think it's very important to make clear that the auction funds must be used in a manner that supports ICANN's mission. And so if there are further questions on that I'd be happy to discuss.

Jonathan Robinson: Sam, from my point of view, that's helpful. And it seems to follow largely consistently with what the other two or three speakers prior to you have said. My difficulty is - and I think this is what we need to fix is you've essentially said to us, one, that scope must be - that scope in this context is very tightly tied to ICANN's mission. And my difficulty is under the goals and objectives section of the charter at the moment, that second sentence, which contains

the word "scope" is not a well-crafted sentence. It doesn't hang together well and clearly.

So in the end what's got to be required is on the back of this discussion I think we need to rework that sentence and that's what feels like needs to be done here. So this is helpful. Go ahead, Russ.

Russ Mundy: Thank you, Jonathan. I had a question for Sam in particular because under the new bylaws the mission statement I think has grown considerably in size, if you will, by, you know, the description, as you say, is more enumerated than sort of inferred. One of the concerns that I have in this particular area is the area of - the statements in the bylaws related to human rights - is very imprecise.

And I didn't know if the interpretation, especially from a legal perspective, would then mean that things related to doing things in the interest of human rights, would be considered part of the ICANN mission or not. Do you have a view on that, Sam?

Sam Eisner: Thanks, Russ. You raise a really important point and this is something that was a big part of the CCWG deliberations as well. So the human rights mention within the bylaws is mentioned within the core values, that - so it's not necessarily part of ICANN's mission but it's one of the values that ICANN should uphold in fulfilling its mission.

One of the important things that was stressed during the conversation about including the human rights provision in the bylaws, was that any point that we talk about human rights as it relates to ICANN, isn't just about upholding general human rights, it's about ICANN respecting human rights and particularly those within its mission.

And so, you know, there's the general things that we've left unstated within the legal document as well as the charter that these funds should never be

used to support things such as human trafficking or, you know, enslavement or anything like that, right? Those are things that we don't - that should go without saying. We don't need to spell out.

And, you know, so ICANN in its operations, you know, should make sure that it doesn't support companies that do those sorts of things. But really, when we talk about the bigger human rights picture and what it means within ICANN, we're looking at a very limited scope and so there's still work that has to be done within the community and that will start getting kicked off very quickly on developing a framework of interpretation of what respecting human rights within ICANN's limited mission means.

And so I don't - I understand the concern but from my perspective on the situation I don't think that having just human rights mentioned within the core values section of the bylaws means that we now said human rights is part of ICANN's mission. I think that the - there's a bigger picture to looking at how the two go together. I don't know if that's responsive to your question but I think that kind of the start of the conversation is happening within the community right now.

Russ Mundy: If you don't mind, Jonathan, if I could respond?

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead.

Russ Mundy: Yes, thank you, Sam. It does. And that was very helpful. And I know you followed it much more closely than I have this particular topic space. But with respect to our particular example here, the thing that, if you will, comes to mind is would, you know, the statement even within, you know, within mission, within human rights kind of basis for instance, cover applying for funds to create a solar-generating system so a village could have power and maybe eventually get on the Internet. I mean, that's the sort of thing that I'm trying to kind of play through in my head is how, you know, how much the human rights things would affect the eventual funds distribution.

And certainly you don't need to respond but that was the kind of thing that was in my mind. Not so much, you know, doing bad things like human trafficking; that's, you know, pretty much everybody would agree that would be terrible, but, you know, things that are good and good for human equality and human rights and so forth, that have only a very, very loose relationship to the ICANN mission. I guess that was more the question in my mind.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Russ. Sylvia's hand has gone up in the meantime and Sam wants to come back on that let me just let Sam come back on that and then, Sylvia, we'll come to you.

Sam Eisner: Thanks. You know, I think we're seeing a growing tension about - and it's not necessarily a tension but we're seeing an evolution of the discussion of the human rights space and how it relates to the Internet and that there have been some countries that have stated that access to the Internet is a human right in today's day and age.

However, I think we need to then step back and go back to what the core part of ICANN's mission is. And it's really clear that ICANN's mission isn't about access to the Internet, it's about the layer of work that ICANN does. And so I think that - I really understand the concern about the inclusion of human rights as a way to expand ICANN's mission but I think we still would have to consider the fundamental tenant of what's being asked for and any individual solicitation for ag rant or anything.

And you have to go back to the fundamental premise of is this an example of something that's within ICANN's mission to do? And if it's about supporting - bringing the Internet to remote communities that type of connectivity issue is really not within ICANN's mission. That's something that other entities across the Internet ecosphere work on. So that's how I would parse that sort of issue.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks for that input. And you obviously spent a lot of time on this issue in and around the bylaws and update of ICANN's accountability requirement, Sam, so that's helpful. Sylvia, why don't you come in and then I'm going to try and move us forward through the charter. Go ahead, Sylvia.

Sylvia Cadena: Thank you, Jonathan. Well funny because Asha and I have a very similar conversation and where I share a lot of the same concerns that Russ and Sam have shared that I really think although - that issues around access to the Internet can take the ICANN mission to a very long stretch. And that's something that we really need to be careful about.

So one of the things that we probably can do around to have some sort of ground there is that maybe we can either include as part of the guiding principles some ethical considerations, for example, where the human trafficking thing is considered, for example, without spelling it out. And then probably leave that work to the CCWG so that they can actually discuss how far those ethical considerations go and that is, I mean, that will fit well with members of the community that are concerned about ICANN's involvement or, you know, (unintelligible) in promoting or keeping some sort of framework for human rights around the Internet industry.

And I think that what a lot of people in the community are looking for is to - I mean, within the boundaries of every organization is what - each of our organizations in our work is that we actually think about those things and we either take position or we thought about it and we are neutral about it but at least there is some reflection on it.

So if we can add to the guiding principles something about ethical principles and have that in consideration I think that will probably help the discussion. I'm happy to include more than just the work ethical principles because I think it's very important. But, I mean, I understand that there is also the need to make it a little bit more flexible so we need to find a way - a middle ground. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks. And I see in the interim Erika's hand's gone up. I'm keen to move us along. I think just to reiterate where my concern came from in sending us off on all of this was that that sentence as it stands, the second sentence in goals and objectives doesn't stand on its own very well and doesn't link to the section below. So it seems to me the substance is contained in the subsection below. We do have a section on scope, it's just a matter of linking that and making sure that the section below is solid. That would be my thought on it. But go ahead, Erika.

Erika Mann: I would recommend to come back to the point I raised to consider to take the word ICANN ecosystem. I would be very concerned if we go into more concrete examples here because I mean, what we will see later the request which will come up from individual funding they'll be very diverse. And I think what we want to do we want to allow it to be diverse as possible as long as the connection to ICANN is given.

So I wonder if we gain much more from including words like ethical principle or similar words because they can be interpreted in the future in very different ways. So either we include this into if we want to have a reference to kind of ethical principles we could include this into the guiding principles but keep them sufficiently broad such kind of term and not to be too precise.

As soon as we select an example like human rights or similar one I think we will just be caught in difficulty so my advice would be if you want to go a little bit broader than just ICANN mission let's use a word like ICANN environment or ICANN ecosystem or something similar, which is sufficiently narrow but gives the spirit that we want to be able to support more projects than only the ones which relate to the ICANN mission.

And then if you want to include more precise language like ethical standards, my advice would be to review the guiding principles and see if it could be included there.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. My concern here is this - that we've - that we - and I've significantly contributed to us getting a little distracted here. I think we were given some quite clear advice and we have to limit ours as well bearing in mind that we're a drafting team. I felt we were given some quite clear advice by Sam. And my concern, as I say, was only that in the goals and objectives the scope doesn't tie in properly to the section below.

So here's what I propose. Notwithstanding the suggestions by Erika, Sylvia and others, I suggest we work through this, make sure that we feel that the scope is adequately defined and then offline we'll go through and make sure we link the goals and objectives properly to the scope. So really our focus should be in the substance within the scope section and so it feels to me like we should stick with that for the moment. And if others feel then that we haven't dealt with it properly please bring us back to that.

Sylvia, is that a new hand up? I think that might be your previous hand but let me give you the opportunity to speak if that isn't. Okay great so let's keep the momentum a little here or regain it perhaps.

So the CWG is required to factor the following constraints and then we go on and here again these are really - the remarks here are mostly detailed points about the way things - the way the text is done. There was a question from Erika as to whether we should reference the document here. And I think that does make sense that we actually put a reference in here at some point because I think - can someone remind me, is the memo going to be appended to the charter? I assume it would be or at least linked to it some way. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I would actually suggest that we link to it and, you know, we'll have the updated one posted as well on the wiki or we can create a place on a Website to have a link but it's probably easier to embed it than to have it as a separate attachment.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay good. So just making sure I keep track of the chat as well. And so, yes, all right so I think we can move then on through the scope and here we come with the first - the first substantial introduction of the points on the diversity here at this point. So, Asha, this may be an opportunity that you would like to just talk to this in any way. I think (unintelligible) with Sylvia, if you could remind me. But in any event it may be that you wish to come in here. I mean, these points are standalone but feel free to make any comments you like at this point while we're in the scope section.

Asha Hemrajani: Sure. Are you - okay what I see on my screen is the cover page. Is that - are we all on the same…

((Crosstalk))

Asha Hemrajani: Okay so you want me to tell you…

Jonathan Robinson: Asha, just give me a moment. Where we are is we are in Section - we're in the section on the scope. And in the scope…

Asha Hemrajani: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: …the fourth or fifth bullet point is where you first introduce the diversity points…

((Crosstalk))

Asha Hemrajani: The orange bit which is "the CCWG should incorporate the principles of diversity," that bit.

Jonathan Robinson: Correct.

Asha Hemrajani: Do you see that?

Jonathan Robinson: Correct.

Asha Hemrajani: Okay all right. So this here - okay bear with me, this is so small. And I can't make it any bigger. Yes, so this is the general introduction of diversity. And here we bring in the two areas of - that - the two areas where diversity can be manifested. One is in the allocation and the disbursement of the proceeds. And the second area is the composition of the CCWG.

And then so in the composition of the CCWG the point here is reiterated or repeated at the end of the - at a later section in this document where it talks about the charter members. I'll come to that when we get to that section.

Then the second bullet here is something which - well I couldn't' find a better place so it put it in here. And this is something Sylvia felt very strongly about and that is that the CCWG should give proper consideration as to whether proceeds can have basically groups from developing countries and underrepresented groups, such as women and youth, could be given priority or preference. So not to say that the chartering - that the draft team would make that decision but rather the CCWG should consider if these groups should be given any preference or priority.

So I'll stop there for any comments.

Jonathan Robinson: Asha, I have a comment there on the third bullet. The first bullet feels to me more like an overarching principle so I wonder if that shouldn't be included in the principles rather than - it seems to be more overarching than, whereas the second feels more like a scope point.

Asha Hemrajani: I agree with you. So that would be - you mean if we had a - if we had had a guiding principle section we can remove the first one and stick it in the guiding principles section, is that what you mean?

Jonathan Robinson: That's essentially what I'm proposing. And since we agreed earlier to have a guiding principles section I'm proposing this gets moved into that.

Asha Hemrajani: Correct, yes, that's what I wanted to confirm. I agree with that suggestion.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thank you. Let's keep moving on then. And look for items of substance here.

Asha Hemrajani: Does anyone have any comments on the second bullet?

Jonathan Robinson: Russ, go ahead.

Russ Mundy: Thank you, Jonathan. It looks to me on the first bullet that perhaps that text would be better off split, the first two sentences, I think would work very well in the guiding principles, and the third sentence would perhaps fit as a transition into the beginning of the next bullet. It really doesn't look like that third sentence would fit a guiding principle section particularly well. Thank you.

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, that also makes sense, Russ, what you just suggested. We can decide that after we've put - after we have the guiding principles and then see whether - how everything fits in.

Jonathan Robinson: That's fine. That's a sensible suggestion. Doesn't seem controversial, it's really just a matter of the appropriate placing for these items. Good. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. In that same line of thought I'm wondering as well if the second bullet actually belongs in the next section on providing recommendations on the following questions as I don't think this is a legal or

fiduciary constraint. I think it's more a question that the working group expects to give consideration to so maybe that should then move underneath that second section.

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, I agree. That makes sense too.

Jonathan Robinson: Very good.

Asha Hemrajani: Erika is asking - Erika, do you want me to read it out? It says - Erika says, "Can someone please read it?" Do you want me to read it out, Jonathan?

Erika Mann: In each case I would recommend that we read what we agreed at the end so otherwise we say we agree and it makes sense but are we really sure that we agree all to the same text? So please read - if we do a change please be so kind to read what we greed on.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks Erika. I mean, here this is not - we're not agreeing on any change of substance, it's really just where the text is located so it's not - I take your point, if we agree a specific change in text during the course of the call then we should make sure we capture that specifically. Here on these two bullets it's really about relocating the content in the appropriate place in the charter.

Okay so moving then on we go on to "The CCWG is required at a minimum, to provide recommendations on the following questions." I guess what we are saying here especially if we're going to move that previous bullet point on the CCWG should give proper consideration, what we should be saying here in this section is that the CCWG is required, at a minimum, to give due consideration or proper consideration and perhaps ideally provide recommendations on the following questions or is it firm that we want recommendations? So that's something we'll just have to think about that's tweaking the text to support that change in the bullet.

Exactly. So, Marika - as Marika has phrased the question, then we could simply put it in there. Marika has phrased that as a question in the lower left in the chat so that would make - that could work there.

Now I asked the question about this partitioning of the funds. And I of course missed the meeting in the meantime and Erika said that that had been discussed but apparently no conclusion. Do others feel similarly that we are - do we need to give further consideration to this? Is this a question - this issue of partitioning the funds into perhaps or requesting that the funds be partitioned in some way.

And clearly the objective here would be that all of the funds don't end up dealing with one particular category of need. And so we could make it quite a high level recommendation that the CWG, if appropriate consideration is some form of partitioning of the funds in order to ensure appropriate segmentation. Sylvia, you seem to want to respond to that so go ahead.

Sylvia Cadena: Yes, Jonathan. Thank you. Well I do have expressed my feeling on that matter. I think it will be very important to actually mention the communities that ICANN serves and make sure that there is - is it not (unintelligible) at least some sort of consideration so that the names, numbers and standards communities have equal access to the funds.

And as you mentioned just thinking about spreading the power that these funds might actually have to strengthen the community and at the same time making sure that is not the people that have the right to (unintelligible) at the right place at the right time to get first (unintelligible) first served, it's not probably a good idea when (unintelligible). I think it's about the good quality idea and having the opportunity throughout the communities to mature what they might, you know, need and have an opportunity to apply at a later date if that's necessary.

So I'm fully in favor of splitting the funds. And I have mentioned before that around the three communities that ICANN serves. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Right so I'm going to - thanks, Sylvia. On the back of that point I'm going to put something to the group and then come to Erika. It seems to me that we need an additional item in here, and this is what's in effect being proposed, that the CCWG give appropriate consideration and - give - provide recommendations regarding - this section is about providing recommendations regarding the following questions.

And we should put in an additional question saying to ensure something along these lines, reasonable partitioning amongst the diversity of communities that ICANN serves or something along those lines that creates a requirement on that. Erika, go ahead.

Erika Mann: Jonathan, colleagues, I would try to avoid the word "partition" because, you know, it is so difficult at the beginning to understand how these funds will work and will operate. I understand the concern and I am very much in line with finding a word like what you just said, appropriate consideration, or something similar what Sylvia said before. But I really would avoid any kind of language which relates to equal partition or something similar.

I think it's dangerous ground. We don't know who will, you know, how it will work and how it will function. So I think to have the - to have something as an - as a kind of, you know, standard for the CCWG to be set up and to consider this makes sense, but I would really be caution us to go any step further.

Jonathan Robinson: So it might be worth like balance or consideration or balance, but let me not speak, let me hear from Russ then further on this point.

Russ Mundy: Thank you, Jonathan. I'm in agreement with the - I think the general principle that Erika just mentioned. And my - one of the concerns that I have if we start to sort of move in this direction, we seem to me going against what we had

earlier agreed to, which is to provide the maximum flexibility to the CCWG itself because any kind of pre-allocation or partitioning or something like that that we would put in as the drafting team, would seem to be a pretty significant burden on the CCWG determination. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So let's leave it that we need a form of words which needs to be crafted. I don't think we need to craft these on the fly now but that looks to give appropriate consideration to the diversity of communities that ICANN serves within its mission, or something along those lines that makes it clear what the intent was without prejudging the mechanics or detail on that point. But I think we can probably do something along those lines.

All right, let's move us forward, that's a helpful discussion around those points. Seeing if there's any other comments in this area. Please stop me if I do brush over a comment that you've made or a point down on the right hand side please make sure that you feel that it hasn't been adequately addressed please feel free to raise it.

Asha Hemrajani: Sorry, Jonathan, just to jump in. I just don't - I don't know where you are so I don't know whether you - can you tell us…

Jonathan Robinson: All right, we've just been - we've dealt with - we're on the second part of the scope. And I think we're about to move on to Section 3, deliverables and reporting.

Asha Hemrajani: Okay yes.

((Crosstalk))

Asha Hemrajani: So if you just let us know where you are because I'm - you're not as visually challenged as I am.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. I'm blessed with a bigger screen actually so that's helping me. I'm not at my laptop at the moment so that's very - I've got a nice big piece of screen real estate to work with.

((Crosstalk))

Asha Hemrajani: I'm on a massive monitor. I still can't see.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, well I see Marika's hand is up so go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just wanted to point out that there's also a comment from Alan, comment AG-14, which I think seems to suggest that an additional bullet is added. He says, "Deliberations on whether ICANN itself should oversee the solicitation and evaluation of proposals or delegate to another entity, including a foundation created for the purpose."

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, that seems to make sense. The wording needs to be modified slightly to fit in with the formatting of that but that seems logical. So the group needs to recommend as to whether or not ICANN who's handling the evaluation or is putting it out to a party, that seems to be a sensible recommendation. So I don't - unless anyone objects, I think that seems to be reasonable to include that. And thanks for your agreement in the chat there, Sylvia, and Erika.

All right so…

Asha Hemrajani: Hello? Did we lose - did I lose you?

Russ Mundy: I hear you, Asha.

Asha Hemrajani: Hello? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Asha Hemrajani: Sorry. Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: So we move into Section 3 where there's a couple of minor changes and then - but within Section 3 I made the point - and I think someone agreed with me - that we just need to make sure when we talk about the - in Section 3 here about the deliverables and reporting and we make a reference to the final report being reviewed by the chartering organizations and then that all chartering organizations support it.

But we go into much more detail on the approval mechanisms and the supplementary reporting in Section 5 so this is just a sort of drafting point that I don't think we need to go into here except to reiterate that before this next version is cemented we need to make sure that Section 3 is fully consistent with Section 5 which is where the detail on this is really dealt with. So Section 5 will deal with the substance. We just need to make sure Sections 3 is consistent with that.

So with that we can move on to Section 4, which talks about the membership criteria. And here we now have the introduction of some new content which I think is from Asha given by the color, but I may be wrong. And we have the fifth bullet which starts to say - we talk about the qualifications of the members and there's a point here. So come in, Asha, on this point. Go ahead.

Asha Hemrajani: Okay thank you, Jonathan. So two things here. One is something that Sylvia highlighted and I actually was going to highlight the same thing so I'll just mention that which is have sufficient expertise to participate in applicable subject, it might be appropriate to define or explain what applicable subject we're referring to, what sort of - what sort of areas of expertise would be relevant in this case? That's the first point.

And then I can come to the second point which is related to the diversity later, if you want to discuss this first.

Jonathan Robinson: Asha, let's do that. So in terms of the applicable subject we have really two options here. We can either one of us can go away and craft some better definition on a further rereading of this so in which case, Marika, this will need to be highlighted as an area that needs further development. And if anyone's got any suggestions here by all means bring them up now. Expertise to participate in the applicable subject, what do we mean by this?

Do we mean specifically - this seems to me like we could give examples of relevant expertise here such as having worked within a charitable foundation specifically on the disbursement of funds or something like that. That's what I think we mean here. But maybe others can comment. Erika, go ahead.

Erika Mann: I wonder if Asha and Sylvia are not thinking about relevant expertise in subject matters related to the funds. This would be typically the wording which would be used in different funds I worked with. So maybe that's something both would mean. I'm happy to help to find the right wording.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Erika. It feels like we're trying to tease out the relevant expertise here that might help in doing the CCWG's work. Asha.

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, exactly, Jonathan. So Erika, what you said was exactly what I had just said in different words, so I wanted now to see whether we can brainstorm here, get inputs from everybody as to what we would consider to be relevant and then I would be happy to work with Sylvia or with you or whoever wants to volunteer on how to tease this out.

Erika Mann: Jonathan, can I…

((Crosstalk))

Asha Hemrajani: We don't have to go to details now but just wanted to ask if anybody had any ideas. And I don't - and I agree with Erika, I don't think - I don't think we should be too specific but we -but right now as it is it's too vague.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so let's do both. Let's hear any comments now and then Sylvia and Asha and if anyone wants to work with them, Erika, can go ahead and try to flesh this out a bit. But go ahead with your suggestion now, Erika.

Erika Mann: I really would - I really would advise against being too concrete here because this will - the whole topic is defined by what this whole charter will talk about. So the relevant expertise will relate to the whole context. It might be expertise in a finance matter, but it might be expertise in a particular ICANN-related topic. The whole document will relate to what expertise means. So I would be - I'm not sure it help us to be too precise in this particular context.

Jonathan Robinson: Erika, so one way of dealing with that might be to put a set of examples that - and make it clear that it's a non-exhaustive list. So relevant expertise may include, boom, boom, boom, boom, something like that, a set of examples. Okay so let's - perhaps we delegate this to others to try and just flesh that out a little bit because the clear concern is that the sentence as it's currently crafted is unspecific.

It says "has sufficient expertise participate in the applicable subject" without giving any examples of what that expertise or what that subject is. So it looks like we need a little bit more detail without tying ourselves down to prohibit others working in, you know, what we don't want to do is close the group unfairly either.

Okay, let me ask you then, Asha, to come back in on those further bullets you - further inputs or inclusions into the text that you made further down, Section 4.

Asha Hemrajani: Sure. Thank you, Jonathan. So this is about membership criteria so we said that the members of the CCWG should have this expertise and commit to participate, blah, blah, blah. And then also be able to understand the needs of the Internet communities that ICANN serves. And not so - and then not only understand the needs of the communities that they serve but also how - they should understand how to respond to the needs of the Internet community as a whole including those not yet connected.

So this is a bit controversial, for lack of a better word, but we wanted to be a bit broader here because we shouldn't - we didn't want to look at only the needs of those - of the 3 billion who are connected, we need to look at also the needs of the 4 billion who are yet to be connected. So what does everybody think?

Jonathan Robinson: Any comments, thoughts, responses? I've got a hand up from Erika and then Russ.

Erika Mann: Again, my - I'm sorry for this but my advice would be not to have such a broad scope. I understand the concern and I see that Sylvia and Asha are coming from. But my advice, and let me quote in this case or let me refer to my previous job with Facebook. We tried as many times to find ways to bring in the not-connected, and it typically never worked out well. It's a very problematic exercise.

And if it's already problematic for a company like Facebook, it will be even more problematic to have a reference in a document like this for a company with a much more smaller scope. So maybe, again, we can find a wording which would capture what you would want but maybe relate it back to the more precise obligation which we have as ICANN.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Erika. I'll go straight to Russ.

Russ Mundy: Thank you, Jonathan. I agree with what Erika just put forward, and perhaps something on the order of noting that the Internet is expected to grow without talking about the unconnected because that at least in my mind, would get back to some of the examples that I was giving earlier where human rights things were driving a lot of things that were beyond the ICANN core mission. Anyway, yes, I'm supportive, Erika. I think we need to find a better way to say the idea without being this broad. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Russ. Sylvia.

Sylvia Cadena: Hi. Well I just wanted to clarify that I think this is referring to the membership of the CCWG, not how the funds will be allocated. So the idea is to - that the members of the CCWG understand the community and understand the impact that it has in the Internet community as a whole. So it's about an understanding and going back to Erika example is if you let me elaborate, the strategy for Facebook doesn't work or haven't worked that well because they haven't understood what the issues for the unconnected are. And they are just prescribing solutions without consulting to people.

So that issue around having some understanding or a variety of views so that our collective understanding can be built around the members of the CCWG is what I was working on, on that text with Asha. I don't think it's about the allocation of the fund itself but at the membership of the CCWG. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So I see that this bullet point, thanks for all of that input. I see that this bullet point is having three components to it. It strikes me that the first component, understand the needs of the Internet communities that ICANN serves, no one is any - has any doubt about. The second and third component, Internet community as a whole, and then including those not connected, may be more challenging for some.

So let me just hear what Asha has to say and then I'll come back if - and see if that's consistent with what I was going to suggest. But go ahead, Asha.

Asha Hemrajani: Jonathan, can you hear me? Hello? Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, we hear you Asha.

Asha Hemrajani: Hello? Oh okay, sorry yes. All right yes I just wanted to hear everybody's feedback first before I jumped in. So I hear what everyone is saying. And I also had to - was in two minds about this. However, I would agree that the reason I had put this in - and Sylvia and I had put this in to begin with is because we were, from my perspective at least, I was motivated by the lack of - the lack of scope or the lack of vision or the lack of - maybe the narrow sort of vision that people from a certain - the usual members of CCWG would have.

So that's why I was more motivated by putting in something - putting in a statement in there that the members of the CCWG, the members of the participants and observers collectively, have a very - have as wide a scope or widest vision as possible. So not - this is a - sorry as Sylvia pointed out this has nothing to do with the allocation of the funds; this has to do with how wide of view of the world they have.

If somebody has been born and raised and worked only in the West then the chances of them understanding what someone in China or someone in India would need, a villager would need, is minimal. So I'm happy with - I would be happy to rephrase this but I wanted to still add in the element of having that wide scope of that - that wide vision and not only having the narrow scope of what they know or the lives that they have led.

I'm not sure if I'm making myself very clear but that's what I wanted to make sure that the people who are in the CCWG also understand that there is more than half the world who isn't connected. So they have to be aware of that. That's what I'm trying to get to. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Asha. So practically, as I said, it sounds to me like that bullet divided into three areas; one which is clearly acceptable to all and the second and third which have varying degrees to which they may or may not make sense in their current format. So what I suggest we do as practical point of editing it is we put in square brackets the second and third parts, in other words, we don't delete it, or edit it now, and we ask you and others to give further consideration to that but particularly you and Sylvia having heard the feedback of the group and consider raising that section in square brackets.

And, I mean, also to be aware then I think that Russ makes a good point is that to some extent it is not our prerogative to select the members, the SOs and ACs putting members into the group and those that volunteer to participate will select themselves. So we need to give guidance but not constraint the SOs and ACs. So if you can try and walk that delicate line and, as I say, and a practical point I suggest square bracketing from "and" to "connected" in that point and then giving some further thoughts.

So Sylvia, just to answer your point, it's - yes from how they respond or just before "and" to the end. I think there seems to be no doubt from everyone that the members should need to understand the needs of the Internet community that ICANN serves. Asha, go ahead.

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, thank you, Jonathan. I just wanted staff to put that brackets in so that we don't forget. Okay thank you, Marika. Yes. And then, if I may continue really quickly? So I just, yes, to just summarize what you said, Jonathan, so I make sure that I understood.

So after the brackets are in, then I'll work on - rework the text and I think looking at the - what Russ and Erika have written in the chat they have understood better what we meant so we will perhaps tweak the words a bit, but I hope that - I think, rather, I think that the idea of the those yet to be connected, that concept the knowledge or the awareness of the people who are yet to be connected I think Erika and Russ don't seem to have an

objection to that anymore. If I'm - if I understood you correctly. Please confirm. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Russ and Erika, ready to respond so let me hear from Russ and let us hear from Russ and then Erika.

Russ Mundy: Thank you, Jonathan. Yes, Asha, I agree. This has been very helpful and I have no objection to figuring out the right words to identify the not yet connected.

There's one other point that I'd like to identify as far as how - that might be helpful in achieving those words, and that is in the introductory proton of this section we have that "each chartering organization will appoint a minimum of two and a maximum of five" and so it might - it might be helpful to suggest to each - that each chartering organization try to provide individuals that have a - that have the spectrum of views and insights. Maybe that would help, maybe not. But, you know, it's not just one person per organization. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: You make a very good point. Marika, and if you could note that because actually really it's the preceding sentence that Russ is effectively referring to. It says "chartering organizations should make reasonable efforts that individual members," and actually we don't mean that I don't think, we don't necessarily mean that all individual members should have all (unintelligible), we mean that the composite of individual members provided and then - or the bullet.

So I think, Russ, that's a very helpful way forward. And that could be - my suggested wording is something along the lines of "charting organization should make reasonable efforts that the composite of individual members," and them, boom, boom, boom, boom. Thanks for your checkmark there, Russ. And I'll go to Erika.

Erika Mann: Fully agree. I just would add that it would be good to say that we're not talking about the non-yet - not-yet connected to the Internet connected people but that we find a wording that it relates back to the ICANN - or at least to the domain name world. Because I don't think that we want to solve the problem of the people which are not yet connected to the Internet, but we want to be particular and specific as far as it relates to the domain name world. It's a little bit more difficult to find the wording but I think it will help us more if we get this right.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Erika. And then just as a point of overall practicality, to the extent that the edits that have - that exist in this form of the document are not controversial, what I will be proposing to us, and I am proposing to you, is that we absorb those into the next version of the charter. To the extent that there are open areas that these are either highlighted or put in square brackets, as I suggested earlier.

So I'm hoping and expecting that Marika will make a further edit of this document which absorbs the noncontroversial points and then makes the changes suggested on this call, including highlighting where further work is to be done. And so that's just as a matter of practicality what I expect to happen.

Russ, is that a new hand from you?

Russ Mundy: Sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: So - no problem. And Marika confirms to me that she'll be able to do that so that's very helpful. And then we've got the further diversity point there, which I don't think needs a lot of explanation. And then as we move further down we talk about outreach. We've inserted a point on outreach. And also - there's a good point here where there's a suggestion from Sylvia that the participants need to - not only abide by the charter but also the conflict of interest points as well. So it's - commits that the participants commit to abide by the charter.

I guess if the charter includes the conflict of interest points then that is included but it's worth checking that for consistency by committing to abide by the charter are they indeed committing to respect the conflict of interest points.

So I'm scrolling us down now - further down through this Section 4 where there's a series of detail edits made primarily by myself. I see a hand come up from Erika and then Asha. Sorry.

Erika Mann: Sorry, no hand. I haven't lowered it. I was just - if you would be so kind, Jonathan, to say this particular portion of the section you are looking at right now, keep in mind in the small screen I can't see the comments on the right side any longer. I can only center text and that's maybe true for some other colleagues on the call as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Erika. We are on Page 5 now, we've moved over onto Page 5, and I have a hand up from Marika followed by Asha.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And to Erika's point you can use the bar at the bottom of the (unintelligible) to scroll left and right. I know it's not ideal but that will allow you to see the right side and the left side.

My question or comment is in relation to the orange section that's at the bottom of the page which reads, "In terms of participants and observers comprehensive outreach and promotion should be put in place to ensure that a wide-enough (unintelligible) of people outside of the chartering organizations will consider participating of their own volition."

My question really is to comprehensive outreach and promotion, by who should this be done or by whom is it expected to be done and what does it mean in practice? Just to give an example we usually, when there's a call for volunteers that goes out that's, you know, put on the ICANN Website, goes

into the different newsletters, we ask the different SOs and ACs to help distribute that message. Is anything in addition foreseen here? And if so that may need to be called out as well as who is expected to do that, is that chartering organizations, the working groups, staff, ICANN?

Jonathan Robinson: Marika, that's good point. So you pull us back to the bullet point on the bottom of Page 4 which rolls over onto Page 5. And I think this was inserted by Asha, given the text color, but I may be wrong. And you're right…

Asha Hemrajani: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: …it's not specific. It calls for this outreach but defined who should do it. Go ahead, Asha.

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, thank you, Jonathan. So, yes, what I wanted to bring up three points. One is we've missed two bullets that I've added in Page 4 so we were too fast in going to Page 5 so can I - before I answer Marika's question can I go back to the bullet after the - including those not yet connected.

Jonathan Robinson: Sure, Asha. Go ahead. I took that as a red unless there was an objection. Go ahead.

Asha Hemrajani: Okay so I just want to make sure there's no objection. So CCWG member selection should take into account how they can better contribute from a diversity of viewpoints. This can be achieved by looking at the cultural, geographic, industry knowledge and expertise diversity as well as gender balance. I didn't put gender under - I didn't put gender diversity because in gender it should be gender balance, not gender diversity so I've separated that out. Any questions or comments on this point? If not then I can move to the - Marika's point - the text that Marika was referring to.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Asha, before you do that, just my only comment in response to that, and let's check if others would like to respond to that is that it's really subject

to Russ's earlier point that we need to make sure that we are requesting this of the chartering organizations but this - the CCWG is really giving the guidance to the chartering organizations in putting their members into this group.

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Sorry, I didn't follow that. Can you repeat that? I didn't quite get what you meant. Can you repeat please?

Jonathan Robinson: Well what we're saying here is in the charter we say CCW member selection should take into account how members can better contribute from a diversity of viewpoints. So what we're doing is asking the chartering organizations to consider this when they appoint their members. That's what in practice we're doing which is what we said we would make clear in a higher up sentence. But these are - what we're effectively doing is providing guidance to the chartering organizations who themselves will put the members into the group.

Erika Mann: Oh yes, yes. Yes, yes, correct. So are you suggesting, Jonathan, we could put this under guiding principles?

Jonathan Robinson: No, I just - just that it needs to be clear that we're not going too far in selecting these members on behalf of the chartering organizations, it's their job to select them subject to these - this guidance that we are giving.

Erika Mann: Yes, agreed. Agreed. That's what I meant, yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. And then let's just hear - Erika, you make a point that Russ made a recommendation where this could be located. So let's just hear from Russ and then we'll come back to you, Erika, if you have a remaining point.

Erika Mann: One quick thing. I think it would help us if staff would include this in the document and then when we review the document and we receive it back we will see if we can all agree on this.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks Erika. And then Russ.

Russ Mundy: Thank you, Jonathan. Yes, I agree that it would be good to have it revised and look at it again. But as sort of a general concept I think what we have to have for anything that we put in this charter for the CCWG relative to the SOs and ACs would be that the CCWG should request that the SOs and ACs give consideration kind of thing statement. So we can't make definitive things. And I'll point out one example that we always have a challenge with in SSAC, we get asked to do a lot of different things and sometimes we can, sometimes we can't.

But, for instance, we have a real challenge with gender balance because we are - we just happen to be extremely unbalanced when it comes to that particular area and most of the time we're not able to support that sort of thing. So I guess I'm a little sensitive because a lot of times we just can't do it. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Exactly so therefore we give the guidance but we don't mandate it because otherwise it is possible that one or more chartering organizations may not be able to fulfill these if they were absolutely hard criteria. Asha, go ahead.

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, I - okay thank you, Jonathan. So I hear you, Russ, and I understand now better what you mean, Jonathan. So this is really about guidance, you're right, this is not really about a quota system that you must have 50% of your members to be women and so on. But it is a guidance. And the thing is you don't put that guidance in, if you don't put this remind people that this is something they should take into account then it gets left on the wayside.

I mean, for instance, you know, in Scandinavia they mandate that 40% of women on boards - 40% of members of boards should be women. And I'm not mandate - I'm not suggesting that we should have that kind of quota but I'm saying that if we don't remind everyone that we should have a diversity of - we should have geographic diversity, we should have members from India, members from China, members from Africa, or we should have more women, if you don't remind them or give them this guidance then it just gets forgotten.

So I agree with the word guidance but I wanted to still leave these kinds of types of diversity in there so that this is at the forefront of people's minds when they are selecting members. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I think it feels to me, Asha, like there's broad agreement on the substance, it's really a question of just tweaking the mechanics of how this is presented, which can be done in one or more edits. Sylvia, go ahead.

Sylvia Cadena: Well I already said on the chat that I agree with what - the comment that Asha has made. But I also wanted to, you know, bring forth that it is (unintelligible) to do it, it's not that difficult and it just requires thinking of how things are done and (unintelligible) consideration to the issues. And I don't think allocating over $100 million is something that we need to make easy.

It's about doing it right. So - and making sure that the people that are in charge of making those decisions know what they're doing and that they are taking all (unintelligible) considerations. So I agree that we can't be prescriptive and (unintelligible) quotas but if we don't tell them to either (unintelligible) it will be included.

Jonathan Robinson: Good. Thanks, Sylvia. I think we seem to be - we seem to have converged amongst ourselves as to what our intentions are here. And so that seems pretty clear.

Asha, we're now at the bottom of Page 4 going into 5 and this is the outreach and promotion point so unsure if you'd like to come in on that one.

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, please. Thank you, Jonathan. So I'll read it out. And, Erika, I'm now at the bottom of Page 4 and I'll read it out. "In terms of participants and observers," because the previous section we talked about members and the members are selected by the - or appointed rather by the chartering organizations so I'm not moving away from members and I'm talking about participants and observers.

So, "In terms of participants and observers, comprehensive outreach and promotion should be put in place to ensure a wide enough base of people outside of the chartering organizations will consider participating of their own volition." And I agree with you, Marika, that at least for previous CCWGs, even for instance, the ICG, for the CCWG on Accountability, there was a fairly loud call done, a call for volunteers done. However, while the statistics for the ICG - and I've studied this in detail so the statistics for the ICG - the distribution spread of the ICG observers and participants while it was much better than the actual member, so the distribution was wider, and had more women, unfortunately it was not representative of the world's population.

So I'm - so there's two parts to your question. One is who does it? And the second is, how do we do it differently from before so that we can get even better? And on the second part of that - on the second question I would think that we should not prescribe but we should suggest advertising or promoting or publicizing this opportunity outside of ICANN's media so outside of the Website, outside of - in addition to the ICANN Website, other media that would be able to bring in people who were not normally in part of the ICANN circle.

Because otherwise we're just restricting ourselves to the same old people, the same usual suspects who join as participants and observers. And as far

as who does it, I would - my guess is or my view is it could be staff plus - in collaboration with the chartering organizations. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Asha. I have neglected to keep a close eye on the time. I was watching I but I had in mind we had a half hour more and instead we've run 5 minutes over time which is a problem because we have other calls scheduled and things going on. So we are going to have to bring this to a slightly premature close.

I think the question remains, Asha, on this point, a sort of who, what and who will pay for it. And so I think that question may need some more work as we work through this. And I'm sorry for this not keeping us to time. I just simply lost half an hour in the cause of going through this. So it feels to me like we will need to - we've got further work to do on this charter, although we're in good shape. And I feel we will be in a good position to present it and Helsinki.

It feels to me like we will need two meetings between now and Helsinki to polish up our work and to prepare for a public session there. So I propose to you that we do have two more meetings before Helsinki and currently they are proposed for or planned for 16th of June at 1300 UTC and 23rd of June at 2100 UTC. So we will continue the discussion, Erika, to your point in the chat, we will continue online, certainly, on any of these points, but let's try and make our mailing list active, but also I suggest to you that we keep those two meetings.

If that - at the moment that's the plan. So I'm sorry if it feels like it's rushed to a premature close, it certainly does to me. So we currently are scheduled for 90 minutes and I welcome any suggestions if you think that will be adequate for the next meeting. I'll give it some thought as well. But in the meantime let me just check if anyone has any final points they need to make now before we bring this to a close.

Okay thanks. And apologies, once again, let's make further comments and edits. What we'll do is we'll wait for an output from staff which cements what has been agreed, highlights what remains to be agreed and we'll work on another iteration of the document. And apologies, again that I let it run over. Like I said, I simply lost half an hour. All right be working with you on the email group shortly. And meeting with you again as scheduled, 16th of June and June 21 as planned. Thanks, Asha. We'll be clear next time whether it's 120 or 90. Thanks a lot.

Asha Hemrajani: Thanks, all.

Terri Agnew: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. And have a wonderful rest of your day.

END