

ICANN Transcription
Cross-Community Working Group on New gTLD's Auction Proceeds
Thursday, 23 February 2017 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Cross-Community Working Group on New gTLD's Auction Proceeds call on the Thursday, 23 February 2017 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance is available at:

<https://community.icann.org/x/SpvRAw>

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-23feb17-en.mp3>

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great thanks, operator. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the Cross-Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds Call on the 23rd of February 2017. In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants online. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. So if you are only on the audio bridge, would you please let yourself be known now? Thank you.

Elliot Noss: Sorry. Elliot Noss' is only on the audio bridge.

Michelle DeSmyter: All right great, thank you. We'll note that.

((Crosstalk))

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. As a reminder to all participants, please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll turn the call back over to Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi everyone. Welcome back to our meeting. I'll be chairing today's meeting. The other co-chair, Ching Chiao, is on the call with us and I've worked with Ching, Marika, and the other staff to prepare the agenda and obviously work with the different materials in the run up to the call.

It's good to see that we've got a complete set of statements of interests and declaration of interests now complete. So we were having the concern that we may have to suspend participants who hadn't completed that formality, but that's no longer the case. So that's good to see.

If you do have an update, and obviously in particular if pertains to the work of this group at all, like you think there is any chance you'll be a future applicant for funding out of the auction pot, obviously most specifically, but if any other area of your work impacts on what might be a conflict of interest or perceived to be a conflict of interest related to this work, please do update those documents dynamically. So don't forget. We'll probably make a routine call just to remind you that keep those current.

Reminding you again, we are planning to meet on a regular basis, and I'll come to that schedule in a moment. As far as our appointments are concerned, I think we have an update from the ALAC. Just checking if Alan is on. And, Alan, if you are -- Alan Greenberg -- you could give us a quick update as to the status of the ALAC as it pertains to the group.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you very much. We have approved the five members and I am one of them, and the other four are Sebastien Bachollet, Maureen Hilyard, (Sharna Dedaisy), and Vanda Scartezini. They had all previously been participants and have now been moved into the member category.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes great. That's wonderful. Thanks, Alan, and welcome to those members, now members and we'll look forward to working with you. And I note from I think correspondence between yourself, the co-chairs, and staff that there's no current intention to appoint a co-chair but that may change in the future.

Alan Greenberg: That is correct.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Thanks, Alan. So currently we have myself and, as you know, I'll stand down shortly and be replaced by an alternate co-chair and Ching from the ccNSO.

So my hope and expectation is that the GNSO will find - locate and appoint a co-chair in the very near future, and ideally that hand over will take place at or around our next meeting but one so - probably around Copenhagen, ICANN 58.

There's a call out there and if you know anyone who - this is a sort of informal call, if you like, an awareness that this is a requirement so if you know anyone or believe that anyone would be particularly suited to the role, please do put them, you know, encourage them to make themselves know. I expect there'll be a formal call for applicants or for volunteers soon and we should get this all tidied up.

So just a couple of key points on the practicalities on the schedule. We are currently meeting a fixed time and I know we've had feedback from a couple of participants at least that this is a particularly awkward time for them, and that's acknowledged and understood. And what my sort of view of this is that we won't want to just do a mechanistic rotation because that - whilst on paper that might look right, what we probably need to do is something which is more nuanced than that but we certainly recognize that for some people this is a horrible time and - but for many it works. So we need to find a way of not

always meeting at the same time but rotating to accommodate those who are on the outer fringes of when this convenient.

So those inputs are noted and if anyone else is particularly compromised by this and hasn't yet made themselves know to staff and the co-chairs, please do so because we're going to do our best to set up a schedule that reasonably accommodates everyone who is, you know, obviously motivated to participate. And we don't want to prejudice participation by running it a particular time.

So that's an ongoing open item that we hope to address shortly after our ICANN 58 meeting. I think those are the main sort of administrative points. Let me pause there in case either staff or my co-chair would like to remind us of anything else. And I see, Ching, you would like to do so. So let me pause and hand the mic over to you.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Jonathan. And hi this is Ching here. And probably we should also to remind the members and participants here as we discuss in our prep call is that the - as you just mentioned, the GNSO is expected to appoint a new co-chair ideally by the Copenhagen meeting, at which we - the CCWG will have a face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen. So the ideal case is that the GNSO will have the new co-chair and will be helping out (unintelligible) to chair the meeting.

But I think this group will still probably rely on, you know, your expertise and probably we still need the continuity for the work of the group. So I would probably just put the caution here and probably just to shoulder you more burden you, for Jonathan, is that we probably need you to, you know, to chair for the Copenhagen meeting if the GNSO candidate is not fully prepared and ready for that. So just want to make a note on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. And I'll do my best to make a structured handover, so point taken, and make sure that things work smoothly for the group and the

community as a whole. Just a slight clarification on that point, there is a - whilst many of us will be in Copenhagen, so to that extent it will - we'll get to meet in the same location, it's not technically a face-to-face meeting in the sense that we're not sponsoring a face-to-face meeting. But I expect that in practice many of us will be colocated in Copenhagen, but of course anyone who's not there will be joining online as per usual and we'll have systems in place to do that.

Right. So getting then on to our next item in the agenda, which is really the work that we've done on the assessment of skills and expertise, this was actually very good participation. So thanks everyone. It's a really great start to see both the attendance on the calls. And I know we haven't got fully into the meat of things yet, there's been quite a lot of preparation, organizational work going on to get us up to speed, but over 40 of you, from memory, filled in this survey on skills and expertise.

And I think it's a very useful way for both - for co-chairs, staff, and members and participants and observers of the group to understand the lay of the land in terms of skills and expertise. Unsurprisingly, there was strong ICANN-related (unintelligible) and then some other interesting items came out of it. I think Marika or staff will share something with us now, for those of you who haven't had an opportunity to look at it.

I wonder if the graphical information there is probably best. Let's just have a quick look at this and scroll down the document, all right? So this is the graphical representation. So I hope many of you will have seen this. If you go right to the end of the document, you've got - you should have independent scrolling capabilities, and if you go right to the document, I think there is a bit you see - yes, you see a summary of the questions there on Page 10, which shows you the questions posed and the percentage answers.

You should be able to both page through the document and set up the scaling. You'll find about 150% scaling will get you -- or at least it is on my

screen -- gets it reasonably full. But just to pause a moment, I don't know if Marika you had intended to say anything. We didn't discuss specifically how we would present or discuss these results. I certainly wanted to make the group aware of them. Did you - is there anything you wanted to say or any observations you wanted to provide, just to give you a moment to check?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to know that, you know, we've got responses from 43 members and participants. That doesn't necessarily equate to everyone that's in the CCWG but however it does represent a good cross section of those that are involved here. And I think, at least from my perspective, it's encouraging to see that in almost all the categories, there is at least one person that has identified themselves as an expert.

Just to note as well, I think there are still some people that actually haven't completed that. I think Samantha for example that's actually participating in (unintelligible), I know that she couldn't make this call this week as I think she was traveling, hasn't filled this out yet and I think she may have as well some relevant expertise from a legal perspective. And then we had also suggested to the CCWG that (Sara Berg) would fill out the form. She may also bring some additional expertise to the table.

Just want to reaffirm there as well, as I noted earlier in the e-mail, the idea that indeed this expertise is available to the CCWG, should you want to make use of it. And I think this effort is trying to identify who has relevant expertise and to be able to call upon that expertise. In certain cases, you may want to hear different opinions or different viewpoints. But obviously there's no obligation whatsoever to, you know, call upon any of the experts that are identified from - they're either on staff or working with staff or here similarly of course, those that are identified within the group or we also have - there's other lists available that identifies potential external experts that could be consulted on specific questions or issues.

So I think it's, at least from my perspective, comforting to see that there's so much expertise available within the CCWG, but of course it's up to you to review whether you believe whether that is sufficient or whether there is significant expertise that is missing that either you want to do another call within the CCWG members and participants to highlight that would like to know if people have specific expertise in a certain area or whether indeed there's a further need to look externally and also set up a list of people that have already been identified in the Google document to see whether they may be able to bring some of that expertise that you may be missing to the CCWG if and when and needed.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks, Marika. And just noting, Erika's question in chat. So let's put this in a little bit more context then. What we sought to do here is - I mean we've essentially got a group of volunteers with a varying set of skills, dealing with a problem, as you well now, it's well articulated in the charter, to set up this mechanism or process that can then be used to deal with the disbursement of the new gTLD auction funds.

What isn't clear to all of us at face value is, A, what level of expertise exists within the group relevant to this particular subject matter; and, B, to what extent we need external help and assistance with this job, given that we are all, in quotes, volunteers with various skill sets and capabilities. So we felt and we talked with the group about conducting a survey where there was a form of self-certification or voluntary provision of information on expertise. And it's not entirely objective. It's not measured against exactly the same perimeters in each case. It's just simply individuals self-certifying a degree of expertise on a scale of 1 to 5 on a given set of questions.

So you'll see those - if you go to Page 9, you'll see those questions there on the left-hand column which say, you know, what's your knowledge of ICANN, what's your understanding of the needs the Internet community that ICANN serves. And so those are some broader community-based questions. And then it goes it detailed points like, you know, what knowledge have you got of

fund management, or trust management, or financial planning, or taxation, or detailed points.

And the idea was to both get people thinking about their own expertise and also sharing that thinking with the rest of the group such that the group would then be in a position to self - to better evaluate what level of help we need to bring into the group, whether that's paid or voluntary, to assist. And, you know, now you've seen from the recent discussion from the point that Marika made a moment ago we have for example on ICANN staff, we've got legal expertise, we have this possibility of engaging within some way or another, (Sara Berg) that Marika's mentioned, who ICANN organization, the board, the staff have contracted as a source of expert knowledge, independent expert knowledge on related topics.

We have the prospect of dealing, as we talked about a couple of times, with a CC or other CC operators or other members of our community who may have themselves had set up some form of charitable or other foundation fund disbursement organization. So it's really - what the purpose of this is to both self-evaluate our skills and capability and get an ability to decide when and if we need expert or additional input.

So I guess the question to the group at this stage is that's the outcomes. They are summarized on that table in sort of - in number form on that table on Page 10, and you can see, like I said, you've got around 75% of the group qualifying themselves as having good, advanced, or expert ICANN knowledge. But when you go down to something like taxation, understandably but it's useful to see it in this way, you're ending up with around 13.5% of the group having advanced or expert knowledge, similarly with legal, similarly with fund management.

And so it becomes clear that in the some of the key areas it will make sense to have external expertise. And then the judgment call is going to be when and if to bring that in. So I guess right now we don't have to have significant

input on this but if anyone's got any comments on how and when we engage expert input - and one of the ideas I had that we talked about I think at the last meeting was the prospect of bringing - of having a rolling program of input just to stimulate, you know, something like 15 to 20 minutes at the beginning of each call with some form of expert input. So any thoughts or comments on that would be most welcome.

And I see a couple of hands up. So I'll go first to (Vonda). Please come in, (Vonda).

Vanda Scartezini: Okay thank you. My point is I believe we need to start working on the process and discuss points before we get some help. Because during the discussion of those processes, we may find out which kind of knowledge we need to proceed. That's my point. I believe, and I know a lot of those people will have a very wide information and knowledge about many issues so that they could fill all the holes that we can find inside the process we are going to make.

But maybe in - during the process, it will be important to have an external voice to just fill some rows that we're going to find them. So that's my point. Let's start and during the process we know we have this person that is a high qualified, (Sara). So if we need at some point, but not now. We need to start now. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, (Vonda). So that's mostly consistent with where we are right now. And just to make - before we go to the next input, just to make two key points here. One is that we have a provisional work schedule and one of the things I'm going to talk with you about in the next topic is perhaps quite a fast first pass over all of the questions, which is - will be consistent with what you're saying.

And the second point - in other words we'll make an initial pass over all of the charter questions and understand -- and not necessarily in the order which

they were presented -- and understand where perhaps we have shortcomings of need for expert knowledge. So that is consistent with what you're saying.

The second is in one week's time we will get some expert knowledge and expertise in the form of Sam Eisner, Samantha Eisner from ICANN legal, presenting to us on legal and fiduciary constraints on the work of this group. So I think that will be a requirement upfront and we'll take that, and that's planned for one week from now.

Go ahead, Erika Mann. Erika, you're next up.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Jonathan. I think it is - since we have already a work plan for the next calls, I think it would be good try to understand the areas where we need outside expertise. And I'm very grateful for the work already done. So I think we need to evaluate the survey, the outcome of the survey, and then we need to see what kind of outside expertise is needed and how we want to get there.

Maybe we need a second call and asking -- I thought we did this already but maybe my memory is wrong -- but maybe asking all the people which are participating in this call maybe to then evaluate the missing parts and to put names forward for experts they have worked with in the past and might reach out to other people as well so that we have next time someone on the call. I think it is extremely important.

I like the idea that we maybe for two, two maybe three more calls, maybe we stay within this group and discuss how we want to proceed with inviting outside expertise. So it's good to have some next time. I wonder if we need maybe to have (Xavier) as well. Somebody from Finance and from Audit could be a good advisor as well maybe to ask (Xavier) to join us. Thank you so much, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Erika. So yes, I mean there's a very specific purpose to next week's call when Sam joins, and that's - it will be a - it's specifically to get that legal and fiduciary knowledge in part to the group perhaps in some Q&A on that session. So she's not simply joining our call, she's coming in to give us a decent overview of those issues.

You're right, we do have a work plan but it's a draft work plan. And in fact, we will talk about that in some more detail in the next item on the agenda. And so it will be helpful to get feedback and input into that work plan because one of the things that I and we as the sort of leadership group and staff have been grappling with is the pace with which we go through the charter questions in the first instance.

What you'll see in the work plan, when we start to do the detailed work on a per-question basis, one of the key questions is does this need expert input, you know, and do we feel right away that this is something we need expert input. So we're going to build that up as we work through the work plan, but thanks for your input, Erika. And let's go then next to Mathieu Weill. Mathieu?

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Mathieu Weill speaking from the ccNSO. I think my comment is really a follow up to Erika's and it's clearly related to the work plan discussion that we're going to have later. But I think whatever the composition of our group's expertise, external experts do have very distinct values in different phases of our project.

And I would argue that we need to be very careful to distinguish between a phase where we will discuss on the requirements on what we do and I'll challenge their ego to be to find a consensus amongst ourselves in a broad and diverse group with probably many different ideas about what we're trying to achieve. So this is not the part where experts bring decisive answers but rather experts can broaden our views by sharing other experience from outside ICANN or outside our industry, provide benchmarks.

And then, once we have agreed on requirements then we will move into a more concrete phase of solution building, assessing whether there are unintended consequences about solutions and so on, and that's where external experts bring a number of values by their topical expertise. So I think what I would really encourage us to link this question of whether we need experts to a question about when and for what purpose do we need experts, if any, of the phases of our work plan because we want to move directly on that with the experts themselves. That's their primary value in a community-driven process is to help us build the requirements we have consensus upon and not sell us something or shape our community consensus-building process. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mathieu. That's helpful input. I'll pass the mic straight on to Alan Greenberg, who's next in line after you. And, Erika if that's an old hand if you could drop it. Otherwise, I'll come to you again. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Jonathan. I certainly agree that the need for experts is going to vary depending on what part of our work we're looking at. And the first, hopefully pretty quick, pass at it should help delineate that. I don't think I agree with Mathieu though that first we have to make our decisions and then get expertise.

I think there are going to be some phases where having someone brief us ahead of time on, you know, what can work, what can't work may stop us from going down dead alleys. There's no point in us coming to decisions and then being told there's some gotchas you didn't think about. So I don't think it's quite as clean as Mathieu was suggesting.

The reason I put my hand up, however, is on a different aspect. I wasn't aware, and maybe I'm just oblivious, that there were funds allocated for us to use for experts for this process. The appointment which was just announced, contracting with an expert was just announced, which I presume is a paid consultation, changes that dynamic a little bit. And I'd like to understand what

the constraints are. Clearly we're not looking to spend \$20 million as other CCWG's have in the recent past. But I would like to understand what kind of constraints we're under as to what extent we must find free experts and to what extent we could pay people under the right circumstances. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. I think I could attempt to answer that but since I saw Marika's hand go up in response, I'll defer to her.

Marika Konings: Yes. Thank you, Jonathan. This is Marika. I think actually your answer in the chat is also what I wanted to know. There is indeed no specific budget for external expertise allocated at this stage. And as such, and it's what the charter identified, is that it's the expectation that the CCWG at a very early stage identified whether they believe, indeed, additional resources are needed, whether that's in the funds of - in the form of external experts or otherwise, but also to know that, you know, for example some of the external experts that have been identified already to date do not necessarily require funds to provide their expertise.

It's also of course of matter of thinking through how to engage with some of these people, and it may not always been a cost element to it. At that, you know, we internally can then evaluate based on what is identified to see whether there are funds available within our current budget. You know, we do sometimes have some funds set aside, for example to conduct research or have some external expertise, but that of course is more on a limited scale. If it goes beyond, you know, to a much larger scale, that is something that will need to go through the different steps of approval and consideration.

Just to note again, and I think - I was hoping that made clear as well by the e-mail, the (Sara Berg) contracting, that's really on a limited basis, on a, you know, when it's needed. That is for the purpose of, you know, ICANN internal. She has not been contracted to support the CCWG but, as we've indicated, it would be possible to make her expertise available, you know, for specific questions the CCWG may have if you think that is useful. So it shouldn't be

confused with someone that has been hired as an external expert to full-time support this effort. That is not what that agreement is about.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, so thanks, Marika. And notwithstanding Mathieu's points and others about, you know, how we need to be careful when we seek this and expect that external expertise may be appropriate, one of the reasons -- and it's not the sole driver at all -- but one of the reasons why it might be sensible in our first pass over the charter questions to ask the question do we think external expertise is required on this point, and as Marika said, that may not necessarily incur directly attributable financial cost.

For example, the group will not be billed as such for Sam Eisner's expert input when we meet next week. But nevertheless, taking that first pass and trying to flush out any expert requirements will help shape our thinking and possibly even as far as thinking about whether or not we need to make any kind of budget request at this point to support work on one or more charter questions. So that's certainly a potential benefit from asking that sub-question as we pass over the charter questions in the first - for the first pass.

(Douglas), you've been patient. Please come in with your points or thoughts.
(Douglas), if you do want to speak, it looks like your microphone is on soft mute. It's on mute within the Adobe at the moment, so you need to - that's it. You look like you've released it now. Please come in.

Okay not seeing - hearing from (Douglas) at the moment. There may be some kind of technical problem with the audio. So we will come back to you, (Douglas), when it's possible for you to talk. And in the meantime, if it suits you, please feel free to put a comment in the chat and just note some of the other discussion there about the possibility of getting Elliot Noss's point about putting - getting maybe bringing in I think (Sara Berg) for a presentation.

Personally I'm in favor of that kind of approach. I'd love to see some ad hoc or not quite ad hoc but input from one or more experts on a reasonably

regular basis. So I found that quite attractive just to continually educate the group and give us the benefit of experience.

And then I won't try and track all of the chat. Just noting that there's some active discussion there and please try and keep an eye on that as well.

Okay so I don't know how much more we can do on this. I think that's been some very useful input and we will touch on it again as we come into the next item on the agenda. But certainly I see there's one thing that could be controversial is the discussion about whether any expenditure to support the work of this group comes out of the auction fund.

So (Jon)'s put that in. I see that Elliott and apparently others support this so be aware of that point and then Marika says she believes there is no existing ICANN budget say for the operating costs of the start, supporting this and so on for...

Oh I'm sorry Elliot Noss I see you. You disagreed. This is the danger of trying to - perhaps even minus one. I didn't - yes, all right. It's not always easy to track this.

Yes and I think all of us are -- I don't want to use too much of an emotive word -- but all of us were - the size of the expenditure in and around the IANA transition shocked all of us to a lesser or greater extent. And so we are all very mindful of the potential to incur expense using outside expertise.

But as Marika helpfully pointed out, it doesn't necessarily need to incur expertise to get - I see (Jon) and Elliot Noss actually agree. So it's hard to track multiple things at once which is why I was reluctant to summarize the chat. All right go ahead Marika and then we'll move on.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So just if I may make a last point on this, just to note as well that for example within GNSO context we usually have some funds set

aside that enable some working groups if they identify that there's a specific narrow scope question they need external expertise on.

So that may not specifically be earmarked as for a specific PDP working group, but it's a little bit of a fund that can be useful for research or external expertise as needed.

So I just want to reassure the group if, you know, something like that is identified that's very limited in scope, that is probably something that we would be able to fund within the existing resources even without having to specifically allocate it to this project.

But I think the question is really indeed if you believe it's going, you know, much broader than, you know, a narrow scope external expertise, that is indeed where you need to have the conversation and identify what kind of budget is needed, although I recognize as well that at this stage it may be difficult to do so and maybe something indeed through the course of our work it will become more clear and, you know, in which direction that goes.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks. So we're in danger of it being a little hypothetical at this stage. Right now we don't have a specific substantial pool available for the use of external expertise.

There may be ad hoc money to be available on a basis when and if it's needed and we need to cross that bridge when we come to it. And there are probably differing views as to whether any funding required to support the development work of this group should come from the actual auction part or not but we won't try and resolve that question now.

Okay so that's really a good initial view of both the external expertise question and also the summary of expertise and knowledge within the group. I'd encourage all of you to look over that survey in as much detail as you can so you're familiar with both the knowledge and expertise and shortfalls of that

same knowledge and expertise in the group so you can properly assist with any discussions when it comes to selecting specific expertise and/or suggesting who we might get in to simply present to the group to enhance our collective overall knowledge.

Okay let's take that as an opportunity then to move up to Item 4 which is where we'll review this initial work plan and start to have a look at how that shapes up.

And I think the first document we should look at is probably the sequential work plan which really looks at getting us going. So this work plan, the way this is structured at present is as you might have seen from the e-mail comment that I think it was (Daniel) put into the mailing list earlier.

This simply takes the briefing next week and then starts to systematically go through the charter questions one by one. Currently they are presented in the order in which they appear in the charter.

And the suggestion on e-mail, which looked very concrete and interesting, was to break them - was to cluster those questions a little more and think about them in as forming in some kind of themes.

There's a second point -- and this is what would be very good to get your feedback on and discuss -- is it seems that to me at least it may make sense to go through all of the questions possibly using some kind of survey tool again at a high level. And this is where you'll see the mind map on the per-question basis with a little illustration where we can go through and say is this a gating question?

Do we really need to deal with this up front? Again do we need expert input and so on. And you would have seen that document as well which we'll flash up in front of you in a moment. And then we can take your feedback on this.

You got this perspective sequential working systematically through the charter questions in an order to be determined. And we have a suggestion on that order from the e-mail list today.

And then now you'll see in front of you in the document a potential mechanism for a fast or quick look mechanism at all of the charter questions in the first instance. And here you'll see the subquestions say okay is this a gating question? Do we really need to resolve this up front? Because this is a fork in the road.

And actually arguably number one is such a question and we can talk about that perhaps in a little more detail if anyone's got any points on that.

And then are there key subquestions that need to be fleshed out? If so, what are they? And is this a question that up front needs external input? And then are there initial responses? Now we started a document of initial responses.

So I guess the question to the group is how do you - any comments on these two prospective work plans? One is a systematic and methodical work through all of the charter questions and sort of bashing out answers on a case-by-case basis. The related point is well in what order do we do them?

Have you seen that e-mail that came out from (Daniel) suggesting that we actually order them a little differently and cluster them? And then the third is what about doing a fast pass, possibly even using a survey tool again -- which may be a very unique way of doing it -- in the form that you see in front of you now.

So any thoughts or responses from anyone would be most welcome at this stage on the work plan and your thoughts on that. So I've got Hadia Elminiawi your hand is up, so if you are able to come in on audio please do so now.

Hadia Elminiawi: Okay. I just think that we need to clarify each question more or elaborate each question or each item more. For example where do the methods of funding fall under? By the methods of funding I mean will funding, the delivery be through loans, grants, awards, (link sensing) the criteria?

I think we need to elaborate on each item first and then maybe answer the rest of the questions you put.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Hadia Elminiawi. I'm going to look if that does come in the - I'm just thinking about where and if that comes out in the charter questions in any event at some point.

But just looking at the chat, please do come in on audio if you want to contribute. So I see Elliot Noss seems positive I think about the first pass suggestion. And then (Becky) highlights the sort of overarching goals and purpose for which the auction proceeds should be dispersed. (Matthew)'s supportive of the reordering and the survey.

So let me put that out. So the straw man if you like that we're working around – and I'll come to you Manal Ismail in just one moment – the straw man that we're kind of working around at this stage is a quick pass to try and understand some more detail about the question.

So we've all given ourselves a decent view of all of the questions, possibly using a survey, certainly looking at reordering them along the lines as suggested and then go back to a systematic deep dive through each of the questions. So that's the sort of proposed work plan.

Manal Ismail do come in now. Manal Ismail your mic is showing as being on mute still in Adobe so if you could just see if you could unmute it in Adobe that would be good unless you're on a telephone line.

So it does sound like the goals and purpose as suggested by (Becky) is part of that. So it would be - it's something that's capturing some of your attention.

So you've seen the way in which you propose to break down each question on a question-by-question basis. You know, gating questions, subquestions. And in fact those may well – some of the key points – like the suggestion just made by (Becky) might come out of that because is this a gating question.

And one of the subquestions should hopefully come out of some of those. But I see others highlighting this point about the sort of overarching goals and objectives.

So I think we could run those in parallel. We could do our first pass on the charter question and do some parallel work on the overarching goals and purposes.

Yes Manal Ismail, it would be good if you could take the floor. So I did ask on audio and I apologize if it was in some way unclear. So please do come in now if you'd like to make your point.

Manal Ismail: Thank you Jonathan and very sorry that the voice was breaking. I couldn't hear you, I'm sorry. And I considered this my very first call so apologies if this point has already been addressed or if I'm asking something that has already been (unintelligible).

So is the first question supposed to cover everything else in all other questions? Because I can see one of the boxes here saying are there any subquestions. That question needs to be further fleshed out.

So I was just wondering whether we should also add to the selection and ranking also the allocation. And here I mean the allocation of funds. What's the criteria for allocating the funds? Is there a maximum amount that should not be needed? Should the fund be dispersed one time or on division? Does

the (fitter) make sense? I mean criteria that has to do with the fund itself, not the entity or the body request from the fund. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Manal Ismail. You were a little soft to me so I will make sure that - I guess a key point there was what are the allocation criteria and does this - so if I understood you correctly, how much does this question that's currently displayed cover what we are hoping to look at.

So let me be clear. As (Erica) pointed out in the chat, there are some principles covered in the charter and should remind everyone to look at those and be familiar with those.

There are a set of I think about - around about a dozen questions that the charter expects the group to answer. And what you see in front of you in the Adobe Connect now, I'm going to switch to those questions in a moment. Actually I think it will be useful to put those up.

But what you see in the Adobe Connect at the moment is the first of those questions -- which probably should remain as the first question but maybe not was we reorder it -- and some proposed subquestions that will form part of a high level first pass -- survey if you like -- of the charter questions, so the idea being that we go through all 12 or 13 questions utilizing a survey tool and ask these four or so subquestions that are on the right at the top of your screen in the center panel on a per-question basis and really try and make sure that we've covered everything.

And as Marika suggested in the chat that we could also ask what additional questions which would cover this overarching scope and goals if it hadn't already been covered.

Yes and Manal Ismail I'll take your point that so here your point is on allocation and should this be added? Well of course that the opportunity to do that is in the survey, and so that's a good point.

So under the second thing where we say are there any subquestions or does this question need to be further fleshed out, yes. Your suggestion there, that would make sense there.

So I'm not specifically asking for that detail to be fleshed out on this call but rather making sure we've got a mechanism to make some reasonable progress first because as I think Elliot Noss pointed out earlier we do know how we can all get caught up in some quite substantial process points if we're not careful.

So this is really trying to find a way in which we have a systematic first pass over the charter questions and flesh out the key issues that we're going to have to deal with as we do that. And I thank you for your input Manal Ismail. Acknowledging that.

Okay Marika if you could switch then to the 11 or 12 questions so that everyone can see those... And I think we are getting - and then I notice Hadia Elminiawi points to the clustering and recognizing that they may be a useful way of doing things.

So just to clarify these as they are presented to you now, these ten questions in the format of a mind map are in the order in which they currently appear in the charter.

And on that question 9 where there are three subquestions, those are three subquestions posed in the charter itself. So really those - it could be those as part of the number 9 bubble. Right so Ching go ahead with your comment or input.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Jonathan. So I think one clarification is probably needed as well for the members and the participant is that on the previous slide the example

actually given is the four subquestions about each individual charter questions asking if there's further clarifications or is it a gating question.

And on this current example, on Question 9 we are asking I think those are three further questions. Probably goes beyond or actually it's relevant to number – this question number 9.

So are we talking about maybe spending some times just between the staff - with the staff or potentially with all the members of developing such questions. Or are you or some members are suggesting that we will be using the previous, you know, previous format of, you know, that particular four questions asking number one is this a gating question? Number two, do we have - you know, do we an immediate response for the question?

So probably some member's probably just trying to capture what needs to be done here.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Ching I hope I'll answer this effectively. Please come back to me if I don't. But the way I am -- the way sort of currently putting it to the group that we'll do this -- is these ten questions you see in front of you now, we will create, we will build these up into a survey of the group.

And we will put under each of those ten questions the four questions that you saw on item one previously, the example of item one previously, and ask those four questions of the group -- is this a gating factor? Does it require external expertise? Are there additional questions that should be asked underneath this? And I'm forgetting the fourth one for a moment.

But that's the idea. So we'll take that through and what that will do for the group is - oh and do you have any suggested answers at this point? Do you have any responses at this point to the charter questions?

So what it will do is ideally build up a quick and – if you like – a quick and initial pass over all of the charter questions. I think what that attempts to do is make sure that we don't go down a particular rabbit hole or get strongly distracted by one question and also one question which may or may not be a gating factor.

So let me give a practical example of a gating factor. And I'm actually really tempted to poll the group on this in some way. I mean there's a polling function on Adobe but, you know, you may have a view that it would be most financially effective for this mechanism to be set up within ICANN's existing staff and operational structure.

Or you may equally have a view that there's no way that should happen and this kind of thing should definitely be outsourced. It's not within ICANN's core competence and therefore – and if the group felt really strongly about one or other of those, there'd be a fork in the road there that we could quickly get past.

If not, it's an area that we have to discuss in some detail and understand what different group's experiences are. So that's an example of where a first pass might highlight for us rather quickly some key elements of where there might be forks in the road.

Thanks Ching. Jon Nevett I'm not sure I understand why what the four questions. Why is this fund different from all other funds? I'm not sure I understand that point so maybe you could clarify that on (unintelligible). Okay, all right. When you're concentrating you sometimes lose your sense of humor.

All right so that's really the proposed mechanism. Any reservations, any major concerns? Because if not, I suspect that's the route we'll start to go down. We'll build up that survey with these charter questions in a different order, some form of clustering, and start to think about that as our

mechanism for working through them both when we do the systematic long pass through them but also for the initial short pass using the survey.

And so that's really that's the work mechanism proposed. Any other feedback, thoughts, comments on that? All right, we'll work with that process in mind then.

So I would like someone to remind me if there's any more work to be done here because it feels to me like we have a good initial discussion around the issue of external expertise, good initial discussion and a way forward on the work plan, a plan for our next meeting where we get our first external expertise in a kind of formal sense, and a plan to meet with as many of us in person as practical in Copenhagen in a few weeks' time. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings; Yes this is Marika. Maybe just a note on the draft work plan that indeed (unintelligible) sequence of meetings from Copenhagen Jonathan already mentioned that one thing that may be need to be reviewed is the timing of the calls and see whether rotation needs to be billed in, but of course something that the CCWG may also need to consider.

And again it may only be possible after having done that first high level pass which may give a better idea of where the focus of work will be or, you know, where they may already be that relative agreement or not is a need to set a kind of target.

I think that the current target in the draft work plan is to have an initial report by the end of the year. And I think as I noted as well in the draft work plan of course, you know, at some point if you believe that it's taking too long or that it's too short we can of course modify that.

And of course are ways as well in which the working group could consider changing the pace of work like for example going to longer meetings or weekly meetings. But I said this is a draft that outlines at least currently in the

kind of sequence but obviously will need to be updated once you've gone through your first pass, the high-level pass, to get a better sense of which questions may need further work and which ones may not.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika and I think that's something that others in the group might want to think about. As you start - as this work plan, this initial draft of the work plan starts to crystalize and it's clear it's already been reshaped a little by this meeting in the sense that the sequence will change and we likely require probably a couple of meetings to deal with - two or three meetings to deal with this first pass, this initial view of the charter questions.

But one of the things that certainly seems to - that I would encourage people to start thinking about is how they feel about any kind of time-based goals. You know, are we prepared for this work to take as long as necessary? Or do we feel there's a certain time constraint to get things done or we'd like to push ourselves toward certain goals, which of course might impact things like the frequency and length of the meeting.

So I think that would be a very useful thing to do. So (Daniel) just to answer your question on face to face, I mean, this has a particular meaning in our context. So the way we plan to meet is like this: using Adobe Connect with dial-out and live audio and so on.

We will hold these kind of meetings at I expect every ICANN meeting. So we have ICANN 58 in Copenhagen, 59 in Johannesburg, and 60 in Abu Dhabi. And I expect that we will have at least one meeting coincident with each of those ICANN meetings.

In the formal sense, those are not face to face meetings in the sense that there is no funding to bring the group of members together face to face and there is no plan to do that. So whilst we'll benefit from meeting coincident with an ICANN meeting, there is no plan to fund actual group travel.

But in practice it will end up being, you know, a (unintelligible) peep of members and participants in the same place so in many ways will be analogous to a face-to-face meeting but not technically a face-to-face meeting.

And Marika makes the point that given the new meeting structure, arguably ICANN 59 is not a policy meeting. But Marika I don't think that contradicts what I've said a moment ago in any event. We can still meet coincident with the meeting. And to the extent that those who are active in ICANN policy related work are in the same place there will be some likely benefit from that.

And (Madeira) asks if this initial survey is to be combined with the group expertise in mind. (Madeira) right now I don't have a crisp idea of how to synthesize these two bits of data but clearly what you have is now - as we go through this second piece of reasonably substantial work as we pass through the questions once, when we ask the question on a per-charter question basis, is external expertise required? We all collectively have the knowledge of the level of the expertise within the group or at least the 43 respondents from the group.

So to that extent they are combined immediately because we have some knowledge. But right now I haven't got a further idea of how we'll better combine them.

All right I think there's still a little bit of that going on about the meeting and so on but I think we achieved a good idea. And for those of you on-shore, look at the Copenhagen schedule. You'll see where we are at the timing of this meeting and so on.

So just to confirm with you then - and apologies particularly to I think - (unintelligible) possibly Rafik who have responded that this time already is not a good time for them. And let's fully and publicly acknowledge. But given the current schedule, the next meeting is scheduled to take place on Thursday,

2nd of March, and that is when we'll be receiving the input from Samantha Eisner on the legal and fiduciary constraints.

So with that, I think we're coming to an end. And just to comment on the time as a final comment, this meeting is set for a nominal 90 minutes. I think it's our goal to work between 60 and 90 minutes. Ideally we'll get it done in 60 minutes and that seems to be a productive amount of time.

But we have up to a half hour runover if it's necessary for particular reasons. So again on any - that's another thing you might want to provide guidance on on the list or your thoughts as to the requirements for 60, 90 or even longer.

But currently we're working within a 90-minute slot and looking to run a 60-minute meeting within that. So if you have a different view and you think it should be done or handled differently or we need more time, please do so.

So thanks very much everyone. Thanks for your participation. We'll compile these questions into the form of a survey with those subquestions. And please be active on the list. It's great to have such an active group and things like the clustering of the questions will be an active discussion.

All right, thanks again. We'll see you in a week's time when we hear from Sam Eisner. And then not too long after that coincident with the ICANN 58 in Copenhagen. Thanks again everyone and thanks to staff for your help in facilitating and making this happen.

Man: Thanks Jonathan.

Man: Thank you Jonathan.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thank you. The meeting has been adjourned. Operator would you please stop the recordings for us and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a...

END