ICANN
ICANN Transcription

Cross-Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds

Thursday, 19 October 2017 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording GNSO Review Team Meeting on the Thursday 19 October 2017 at 14:00 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 may be found at: https://community.icann.org/x/b2zwAw

Recordings may be found at:

https://participate.icann.org/p1nwm2gmisn/?launcher=false&fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal AND https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ccwg-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-19oct17-en.mp3

Operator: The recording has started.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Well good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all. And welcome to the Cross-Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds call on the 19th of October, 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're only on the audio bridge today, would you please let yourself be known now?

Tony Harris: Tony Harris on the phone bridge.

Michelle DeSmyter: Great. Thank you so much Tony, we will note that. As a reminder to all participants, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And please keep your phone and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will hand the meeting back over to Erika Mann.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. And hello to everybody independently where you are. So let us move - there's one item forgotten on our agenda I just noticed. And this is just a question related to the conflict of interest.

Anybody who wants to make a declaration? Let us know that there was an update made on the internet - on behalf of themselves on the internet. No? Okay, thank you so much.

Then let's move to Point Three. And I hand over to Jonathan -- who was handling the - and was working with the drafting team on the - defining the preamble -- and reviewing the open and interoperable internet description. What I have seen I think they have done a marvelous job. But Jonathan, please, go ahead.

Take over now, and I'll let you monitor the incoming questions and comments as well. Just let me know if you can see if somebody wants to make a comment and raises their hand. If you can see this on your screen.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Erika. I haven't -- to be completely frank with you -- I haven't had a proper chance to look at the email trail. It began with (Daniel)'s message yesterday. And I know there's been around 10 different messages from various people that I've been tracking -- as I've been doing other things -- coming in.

So it feels to me like what we've got to do is digest that. Although I see Marika has already attempted to incorporate those. So I guess what we -

what we'd be looking for here back on whether or not that satisfactorily incorporates people's comments and so on.

Now when we finished this draft, it hadn't been fully polished. So I would expect regardless that it has a final polishing edit before we sort of lock it down. Oh, I see, thanks to Manal for incorporating those in the latest version of the draft.

But if others -- especially those of you who have commented, but of course it's open to anyone -- if you feel like your comments are satisfactorily incorporated, then great. If you feel like you'd like to see something else or want to make something else known, please do so.

And then following that we will review it one more time amongst the drafting team and submit it back to the CWG for sign off. So any comments or inputs on it as we stand? And any thoughts if anyone's concerned that their comments haven't been satisfactorily taken on board? Okay, Erika - oh there's...

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: So Jonathan...

Jonathan Robinson: ...Manal's hand. Go ahead Manal.

Erika Mann: Ah, okay.

Manal Ismail: Thank you so much. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Please come in. Yes Manal. They hear you okay.

Manal Ismail: Okay, just very quickly trying to explain what I tried to do here. I tried to incorporate the uncontested comments in changes. But also highlighted -- in

yellow -- comments that were not concluded. I mean, it was more of a question and things like that. Those are highlighted in yellow.

And finally to note that two more emails were received on the mailing list after this has been shared. I think there was an email from (Marilyn) and an email from (Daniel), so. Just to note that those were not incorporated in the version we have on the screen. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks Manal. And so noted. And that means we'll need to take care to incorporate those as we review it. And I should also make the group aware that -- although I'm - I've been called upon and very happy to sort of lead this civil discussion -- we didn't formally have any leader in our drafting team. We just collaboratively worked amongst the half a dozen of us -- six of us or so -- who were working on it.

So I'm very happy to work with Manal to help get this sorted out. But there was no formal leader of the group. Okay. Go ahead Erika. And I noticed -- before you did -- I've just - I noticed that Marika said she will attach this version with notes so everyone can have another look. And we can then incorporate those final changes. Erika?

Erika Mann: Yes. Thank you so much Jonathan. And thank you to everybody. I just wanted to ask you one question. Because I saw -- and when I did the first draft a while ago I incorporated all the comments including some broader ideas from Elliot and from (Ellen) -- from Elliot Noss.

Now (Elliot) is not on the call right now I believe. I can't see his name. And if I remember this well, he was in agreement. And if I remember it well as well he was part of your team. So because these are a little bit broader ideas which he had are not in the current draft anymore. I just want to ensure that he feels comfortable with this text.

Jonathan Robinson: I obviously can't say that he does, Erika, but you are correct. He - two things, two responses to that. One, in a general sense we sought to sort pare this back if you like. To make it as simple, because by definition it is a preamble. It's meant to be a short but (unintelligible) set of points.

And second you are correct in your memory, (Elliot) was on the drafting team. And from recollection did weigh in on one or more points. So to that extent, I can say he has - is aware of it. But he hasn't specifically signed off on this draft or not. So, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: I think - I trust that he is okay with it, but that's not to say (he gave explicit confirmation).

Erika Mann: Yes, and since we will have another round. And if we go back I am pretty sure -- if there is something he would love to see added or one would love to see added from his previous ideas -- he will come back to you and then, so. Thank you so much Jonathan. Should be fine.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Good. Well then in that case, what we'll do is we'll take this back to the drafting team, pick up those last couple of emails, and give it a final sort of polishing edit. And then return it to the group with hope and anticipation that that is then the final version, subject to final review by the group. I'll hand the microphone back to you then Erika.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much Jonathan. Thanks so much for the great work to everybody. Now then let's move - if I'll just give a second, if somebody else wants to raise a question with regard to this topic -- the drafting team did -- just let me know please now. Or write a comment. I'll just wait a second. Alan, is this in relation to this point?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it is. I'm afraid I was late getting on to this meeting. And while you and Jonathan were talking, I was talking to the operator trying to make my connection. So I missed a lot of that. Can you be clearer on what the line is for anyone else getting comments in for the drafting team to review?

Erika Mann: Jonathan just said that we will resend this document the way it is formulated right now. And we'll review few comments and check few comments and review them, which came in a little bit at the last stage. So just to verify that all our comments were captured. In particular reference were made to (Daniel) and to (Marilyn).

And then Jonathan mentioned that we will - we haven't defined a time -- how much time we will give -- but we will give some more time for everybody to participate in the new document Jonathan will send. Jonathan and the team will send.

So there's not a real group leader, that's what Jonathan highlighted. Jonathan, you want to comment on this what I said? Or did I capture everything?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I think it's help - very helpful to Alan to have a deadline. Alan, I propose if we give - we have - we're aware we've got a couple of outstanding comments that haven't been incorporated into this draft. I suggest we give 48 hours after this meeting for any further comments.

And then the drafting team will consolidate those into the document and return it to the group at that for what I hope will be final sign off at the next meeting. If that works for you then I suggest we do that. And we will commit to getting it back to the group comfortably in advance of the next meeting. Because I think that'll be - I think our next meeting will actually be in person. In -- or to the extent that those of us are in person -- in Abu Dhabi.

But it's - it was around two weeks. So if we get 48 hours to get any additional feedback, we'll incorporate those in and get it back to the group for final sign off. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Since 48 hours gets it into Saturday, can we go to the end of the weekend?

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: Jonathan, go for...

Jonathan Robinson: Sure, that sounds fine.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you. That does give me some time. Thank you very much.

Erika Mann: Perfect. Okay. No other comments? Good. Then let's move to the next item. So the next item is an idea which the leadership team reviewed and circulated internally. And it's this idea to come back to the Charter Question Seven, where we need to define in a bit more details how we imagine the future structure for the funding will be set up.

And Marika did a very long overview. And I said to her "Marika, you want to send, show maybe a bit later the conceptual ideas". The first conceptual ideas I evaluated. So we would love to have a first exchange here. And then I will hand this over to Marika to describe this.

And then we had an idea -- and we will come to this point when we talk about the planning for ICANN 60 as well -- we had an idea maybe to use in Abu Dhabi the white boards to sketch out these potential ideas. Not to finalize them there, but just to have various white boards where various ideas will be discussed.

So before we do this, I will go hand over to Marika to explain first the skeleton, which she already sketched out and which you can see on the screen. Marika, are you ready to explain this?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. But just to clarify what is up on the screen is actually the review of examples, documents which was our next agenda item. I think you may have skipped to agenda item five, which is fine. And then we can maybe go back to this after that.

Erika Mann: Oh, no. Then let's stay with yours and you explain it. I can't see this point, it's not showing on my screen. I'm in a faraway mountain areas and I have a little bit patchy Adobe screen I see.

So maybe you go ahead then and explain this first so we stay - stick to the order. And then we come to Point Five, I will then explain this. So apologies to everybody. Marika placed - please take Point Four first. I can't see anything.

Marika Konings: Thanks Erika. And I do hope others are able to see the screen. For those of you that can, this is actually the same document that I circulated to the mailing list yesterday. Also (unintelligible) fixes the relevant - so some others may have issues.

So if you have problems, please try to log into - re-log into Adobe Connect. And as I said, this is the same document that I circulated yesterday. So as a small reminder you may recall that we sent - spent some time working on defining the overall objective of fund allocation.

And -- as part of that exercise -- the CCWG agreed that it would be good to illustrate those objectives by providing some concrete examples of the types of projects that the group would consider. You know, both consistence with ICANN's mission as well as the objectives that the CCWG preliminary agreed upon.

So through an initial survey we gathered a number of examples. And then some additional examples have been suggested as part of this exercise, which are included in the table that you see from Page Three onwards. So the exercise we undertook was by asking all of you to look at each of those examples and try to identify -- for each of those -- with which specific segment of the ICANN mission you thought the propose project would align or be consistent with.

As well as the part of the proposed objectives that the CCWG had developed. And so that actually was already open for quite some time. Unfortunately we only had three responses -- oh no, four, sorry -- by close of business on Tuesday. After which I started - after which I downloaded that document and tried to come up with a draft CCWG conclusion based on the input provided.

As you can imagine -- on the basis of input from three or four people -- it's a relatively limited sample. And in certain cases it did mean I had to kind of take a, you know, two versus one vote approach on deciding what the draft conclusion would be. But hopefully you'll have had a chance to look at that draft conclusion and assess whether that indeed aligns with your thinking or whether there are any further concerns.

So basically -- if you go through the document -- you'll see that for each of the identified examples a draft conclusion has been provided which either indicates that the type of project is considered consistent. And in certain cases some further detail is provided as to why it's considered consistent. And for a number of projects it also has been indicated that it's -- even though it's considered a noble cause -- it's not necessarily considered consistent with ICANN's mission.

I do know that (Daniel) already provided some feedback on the list indicating that some - the CCWG may need to think or deliberate a little bit more what

consistent means. In a number of his comments he indicated that a number of the projects were - could be considered as in service of the mission.

Again, it's probably for the CCWG to determine is that sufficient to indicate as well sufficient - or consistence. Or does that differentiation need to be made? And as well would that change the assessment of whether something is deemed consistent or not?

As I noted in the email as well -- based on discussions with the leadership team -- the idea would be that after the CCWG has had a chance to look and to draft conclusions -- and there's at least a sense that at this stage it's in a sufficient state to share more broadly -- the idea would be then to share this with the board liaisons appointed to this effort, as well as the to the staff liaisons assigned to this effort. To obtain their input and have their feedback on whether - if they're of the view that the CCWG conclusion with regards to consistency is correct or not.

The idea being that having an early indication of whether there's alignment indeed with regards to consistency with the ICANN bylaws will help the group moving forward. Instead of waiting until a much later stage and realize that there may be a mismatch or discrepancy between the different perspectives. So that is where this document currently stands.

I did know that I think someone went in yesterday -- into the document -- and added some additional comments. I do want to note, those were not considered for this particular document. But I would encourage you to review and make sure that, you know, the status of the document does reflect that perspective. And if not, to indicate so on the list.

One last thing I wanted to flag as well, there were a couple of additional examples added -- I think as well on Tuesday -- that people may not have seen before, which are on the last page of the document, which I think were

put forward by some of the RSEC representatives in this effort. So I just wanted to make sure that people had a chance to look at those as well.

So I think that's all I had at this - have at this stage. So Erika, can I hand it back to you?

Erika Mann: Yes, thank you so much. I would love to receive some comments in particular from those who commented and from those who did not comment yet, just to get an understanding for how long we have to keep this list open. Because in our leadership call on Tuesday we thought it would be good to keep it open for a while.

We will have to close it each time so that Marika can do the summary. Nonetheless it will stay open to allow for more either comments or even to present examples. But there will be a time where we will have to close it. And because otherwise it will be hard to make a concrete judgement based on what we received.

I see Ching wants to make a comment. Ching, please.

Ching Chiao: Yes, thank you Erika. This is Ching Chiao. Just to build on top of what you said is that I would also like to encourage everybody to look at the examples and contribute more. Since this is not only the examples themselves. So once we have the mechanism -- the proposed one, you know, which we'll be talking about shortly -- we would like to use those.

Also we could use those examples. And to run against - run through those mechanisms and see from - if, let's take from the found applicant point of view. Would some of the examples work better in some mechanism? So I think that would give us some good ground base to - for the future work. So just like to add that. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes, good point Ching. And I see Vanda just said that she had no chance to comment but will do tomorrow. I think it would be wonderful if you, you know, if you - the work you are doing and the community you are a part of. And you just imaging what could be something somebody, you know, might - would you know, consider as being worthwhile funding.

So it would be good if you would review this and just put the example in. Or you review what was already done and presented and commented upon. Because Marika is right, it's very hard to make a judgement based on comments received from three or four people. And in particular, if they then differ and to have, you know, three plus and one zero.

This is not really a quite valid judgement and - to build upon later. So it would be fantastic if you just could do this so that we are then able maybe to make progress and review what was, you know, what was sent to us. The examples. And then review the comments as well and hopefully can have a debate about this in Abu Dhabi when we see each other.

A few more comments upon this or is everything clear? Are you fine with this? Yes? Okay. Marika, I think we are fine. It looks like we keep it open and we give enough time. There's no time actually pressure on this one. No concrete time pressure. So we can definitely keep it open until Abu Dhabi. Do you agree?

Marika Konings: Yes. And this Marika. Yes. I'll note it as an action item. And maybe we can then ask everyone indeed to try and review this before they step on planes. So we actually have maybe a - there and if - more final input that we can review and discuss in Abu Dhabi.

My question is do you in parallel want to share this already with the board and staff liaisons for formal input from their side? Or do you prefer to wait with that until the CCWG has additional time to look at this?

Erika Mann: Personally, I would rather prefer to wait a bit. Because I think it's -- at this stage as it just has -- it might be a little bit difficult for outside people to understand what we are doing. So let's receive us a little bit more - some more examples. And more comments. So we have a clearer and cleaner version.

And then we should send it out. I don't think so there's a pressure to do it right now. Only if somebody objects and would say we have to do it right now.

Marika Konings: Thanks Erika. And on that note, following this call I'll upload this version then as a Google Doc so people are able to add and comment to the latest version as it currently stands.

Erika Mann: And please be so kind to send it as a Word document as well. Some of us have difficulty and always working on Google Doc.

Marika Konings: Yes, of course.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. Okay. I don't see anything. And Nadiro is making a comment about an example in the Middle East. So just put this in whatever you have in mind Nadiro. And if you think it can be translated into a concrete example would be wonderful.

Okay. Then let's move to the next item. And Marika, first - maybe you talk first about the organizational things and the time changes which we have seen happening and -- for Abu Dhabi -- for our sessions.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. So basically we've listed under Item 7 the two meetings that have been scheduled at ICANN60. As you are hopefully all aware, we did move things slightly around to allow hopefully for better participation both in person as well as remotely. So we currently have two sessions scheduled on Thursday. The first one taking place from 8:45 to 10:15 local time in the

morning in Hall B, Section BC. And then the second session is scheduled for the afternoon from 1:30 to 3 o'clock again in that same Hall B.

The hope is (unintelligible) that that will allow sometime in between those two sessions to digest what was discussed and debate it in the first session and then, you know, prepare that for further conversation in the second session. As Erika already noted from a staff perspective we already started working with the leadership team on thinking through and how to make that use of that face-to-face time and make sure as well that, you know, it allows for making progress on the phases that the CCWG has set out and (unintelligible) in the next phase of (unintelligible) that we're - we'll embark on shortly.

Erika, do you really want me to say something as well about item 5 or you want to repeat your intro (unintelligible)…

Erika Mann: No, no, no, no, no. It - go ahead and make the introduction to 5 and then I will - I'd like to come to few of the points which I sent to you - only to the leadership team until now because we wanted first to have this discussion with you before we are sending you some of the ideas and some of the sketches we have done to explain what (Marika) is talking - going to talk about in a few minutes. So why don't you make the introduction and then I continue, yes. Thank you (Marika).

Marika Konings: Okay. Thanks Erika. So this is (Marika). So as you may all recall during the last meeting we had a presentation from (Saviey) in relation to charter question 7, the question of the role of ICANN in overseeing the - some citation and evaluation of proposals and as you may recall from that presentation it was quite clear that there are basically three different options that could be considered in that regard, one where it would all basically fall under the ICANN umbrella, one where there would be more of a shared responsibility and a third one where there would be outsourcing taking place with still having of course ICANN oversight.

We discussed at that time whether it would make sense to run again the survey on that particular question as the original survey that we had run had a rather mixed perspective I think. It was kind of half-half between, you know, ICANN taking full responsibility versus delegating that to a third party.

So the question was, you know, based on the presentation from (Saviey), would it be possible already for the CCWG to come to a preliminary agreement on, you know, what the preferred option would be. But I think based on some of the questions and I think several of you indicated that, you know, further details would be needed for example with regards to, you know, what are the costs involved in each option and there from a legal and judiciary perspective, you know, are there any preferences between those three.

And I think (Saviey) also makes clear that - and (Sam), sorry. I said (Saviey). That of course some of those details can only be filled out once the CCWG has actually provided more guidance on the direction it wants to take. So we're maybe in a little bit of a (unintelligible) kind of situation.

So based on that conversation we spoke with the leadership team and one idea would be or one suggestion is - and it may not be necessary at this stage to make a firm decision between those three options. What may be worth is running a survey asking people in the - at this stage in time, you know, what would be your preference based on the information you have but recognizing that there's still a lot more information to be filled out. Again just to get a sense of the room where people may be leaning towards.

And then also at the same time ask through a survey about, you know, having factoring maybe your initial preference and what are the most important factors for you to make a final determination on this? And those could be things like, you know, overall costs or, you know, ability to conduct oversight by ICANN. Again those are some examples that respondents may

give that may help a final determination on what the preferred model in that regard is. So again we could do that prior to ICANN60.

That would just be a preliminary survey. It's not intended to make a decision on any of those three options. It's just to get a sense of where there may be a preference at this stage this time and also then to have an idea of what are the criteria people would look at or where more information would be needed to ultimately make that determination. So that would be one part of that conversation.

Then looking ahead because we've kind of reached now the end of our stage two but we have reached, you know, (unintelligible) on some of the questions that were identified as needing to be answered before embarking on our next conversations or at least a clear path forward on how to deal with those. We get to the question of starting a kind of assessment or an overview of the different mechanisms that the CCWG might look at and evaluate and that's where Erika already shared with you that she has already started working on that because the idea would be that, you know, taking advantage of the face-to-face meeting in Abu Dhabi might allow for a bit of more of a kind of brainstorming exercise.

We're trying to see with the leadership team if we can come up with - and again that's where your input will be very welcome as well - from skeleton mechanisms that the CCWG may want to explore further. And if we have - if we're able to come up and lead with some general descriptions of what those different mechanisms might be and I think several of those you've already heard. You know, the foundations, trust, you know, there is presumably a limited set of what mechanisms that can be explored. Then the exercise for the meeting could be to focus on, you know, what are pros and cons of those different mechanisms again looking at a high level, recognizing that of course to make a final determination more details and answers may be needed but looking at a very high level for those different options.

Then based on those options again you can go a level deeper and, you know, (unintelligible) as well for each of those options you could then see as well for the three different models of ICANN involvement you can also then try to identify okay what are pros and cons if, you know, ICANN is for example fully responsible for setting up a foundation, running the foundation and, you know, implementing the projects. What would it look like if it's a shared responsibility where ICANN does part of that but part may be outsourced to an existing foundation.

Again - so the idea is to try and use the face-to-face meeting and we'll also try and make sure that those that are participating remotely can also do that through Adobe Connect to have a kind of white boarding exercise where people are able to write down, you know, what they think are pros and cons of each mechanisms, are there additional mechanisms that should be considered and I think an overarching question again is going to be from the CCWGs perspective: what are some of the principle, the ideal mechanisms should - ideal mechanisms (unintelligible). Are there certain principles that should underpin, you know, the consideration of which mechanism might be most suitable at the end of the day.

And again I said as we have two meetings the whole board's idea would be that by having the brainstorming in the first session and being able to gather all that input that would then have a couple of hours to try and digest all that input to then come back to everyone in the second session and kind of synthesize, you know, at a high level what the pros and cons and the different mechanisms are that the working group should or could consider then in its next phase of work and start drilling down for each of those for the different charter questions that would need to be answered.

I am aware that many of you, you know, may not be able to participate in person or not even able to attend remotely so I think it is important to emphasize that's not the idea that any decisions will be taken there. The idea is not that we'll have a list and we'll narrow it down and, you know, by the end

of ICANN60 we'll have one that we'll move further with. The idea is really to use it as a brainstorming exercise and again anything that comes out of the meeting will of course be shared with the list and hopefully allow everyone to provide further input and guidance on.

So I think that's in a nutshell Erika I think what we've discussed. I haven't had a chance yet to look in detail what you've - you shared with the leadership team yesterday except leadership team is trying to put together at least a basic structure that will facilitate the brainstorming exercise by identifying, you know, some categories or some basic concepts that relate to the different structure but of course I think part of this conversation is while - is to get your feedback on what do you think this will - this is a useful exercise. You know, are we missing anything - any point we should be considering as we start and try to develop the skeleton for this session.

Erika, I hope I didn't (unintelligible)…

Erika Mann: No you covered everything. Just - yes no you covered everything. It would be nice if you would show what I sent because I think it would help those - if you can show it it would make few of the things we want - would love to discuss in Abu Dhabi a bit clearer.

So there are a few things to link into and I just - review what (Marika) said. So the - what we discussed and what we would love to do: we would love to identify the various potential scenarios that are possible for setting up a future structure. And this is based on a few ideas (Saviey) sketched out but when you would - will see what I identified they are different and what we debated in the past, there are different models possible based on what ICAAN and what (Saviey) sketched out already.

The second one what we need to do, I think we need to identify - yes thank you so much. We need to identify structures. And not - so not just the structure is it inside ICANN, is it going to be an independent organization or is

it be a combination between the two but what are the clusters we need to look into and we need to define. So I set up few of the structure which I know from my own work and foundations and investments companies. So you - and they are all for the different options that you can see on the screen now. They are all identical. But I'm pretty sure I missed many that you would love to see included so it would be good if you would review this when we sent this to you.

So structure: the structure on my list would capture for example how many people are required. Are they sourced from within ICANN or do we have to hire new people if it would be inside of ICANN? For example would there be a new project manager which would have to be hired? And depending if this structural question relates to inside of (unintelligible) outside of ICANN and in combination of ICANN we will have to add different components we would then have to look into.

The budgetary implications, it's a different organization request and we have to look into the - I added an advisory body. We debated this very early stage would be good to have a kind of advisory body which maybe comes - or hopefully comes from this community. An annual review which is typically done. The question where shall this organization be located and again dependent if it is inside of ICANN or outside or in combination with another organization. The it might depend where they are headquartered or where have already offices including us.

And then the - in each case the legal implication. They will differ and they will have to be reviewed. Like the budgetary questions they will have to be reviewed by our internal teams to judge if there's something which makes sense and can this be even something we can as an idea carry forward or would it automatically clash with some of the basic ICANN principles like for example the tax exemption. So these are the things one has to look into.

And then there's another round of question which we debated as well (Marika) and these are the - which I put here when you scroll through the document financial instruments. There are - and again they are all summarized from what was mentioned by all of you over the course of the - practically the last year. So shall there be grants given? Shall there be participation allowed into other projects? Shall the execution of the financial support only be given once or shall it be over - given over time depending on success stories which are coming in at evaluation?

So there are different things we need to look into and what we would like to do and what (Marika) just explained we would love to do this in three phases. So phase one would be ahead of the time and you can - if you like what have done you can build - we can - you can use this as a kind of blueprint and can either change what I did or add different topics which are not captured here.

So before Abu Dhabi then in Abu Dhabi we thought it would be good that we would use whiteboard where we would work on these different potential structures which we could set up so that we at the end have a clearer idea of what we as a group would love to do together. So we would have different whiteboards with the different potential future structures and then we start as in different teams working on them.

And then we would have a phase after Abu Dhabi where we would send around again what we have done collectively in Abu Dhabi and then so that we would have an - define another time where we would hopefully come to some kind of conclusive single idea which we would pursue or maybe just two alternatives so that everything can be checked and hopefully (Saviey) can start looking at these different ideas as early as possible and some as well so that we can rule out those which are more problematic or at least put them more to the end and not have them as number one or two at the very beginning.

So what do you - just a question now. Do you agree that we - it's a good idea to do this in Abu Dhabi and to spend our time in Abu Dhabi in working on these foundational structures? Some comments would be nice. Ching? Is that you? Ching do I see your raising your hand? No? I see an agree. He's putting in the chat room agree three scenarios. (Unintelligible) (Mark) looks good. Change fund to funds. Yes (Mark) we will send this out. Now if you agree we will send this to you all so you can start working on it and if you want to delete something delete or and if you want to add a different idea feel free to add one. Okay.

(Marika) it seems to be we are fine with our idea that we will discuss this in Abu Dhabi. So there will be - again the first phase would be (Marika) based on what I sent to you I don't know how you like to translate it into maybe more - in a better overview so that we can send it to everybody as soon as possible so that colleagues can start working on it and then we hopefully have a more comprehensive understanding before Abu Dhabi and then in Abu Dhabi we will start working on these whiteboards. (Marika)?

Marika Konings: Yes this is (Marika). Yes that makes a lot of sense. I'll transform what you send and probably start it in a word document in the form of a table. It may make it easier for others to add to it and suggest changes. And maybe as a brief reminder as well where we are with this stage. The idea of this particular phase of our deliberations is to get a sense of indeed what are the different mechanisms that are available and could be further explored. And I don't think at this stage we're intending to really go down into the weeds of, you know, if it's a new department in ICANN who would be running it, how would applications be done.

I think at this stage we want to get a high level sense of what that would mean, what it could look like then based on pros on cons have an idea of, you know, where there may be a preference or where there could be a potential preference to further explore because then the next phase would basically be to say okay are there any - based on the overall framework of all

the different structures available are there some that clearly stand out as a potential preferred approach and then the group would basically dive into the details of going for that mechanism or those mechanisms into the details of each of the charter questions and trying to answer the charter questions from the perspective of that mechanism.

And again the idea of that exercise is that once the group has gone through that to be able to make an assessment of okay is it something that indeed aligns with, you know, the objectives we've set out, the agreement we've reached on some of the other charter questions, does it align with the mechanism that we chose to explore (unintelligible). And it could very well be that at the end of that exercise that you all say no actually this is not really fit for what we envision the mechanism for fund allocation to be. And again then you're able to explore in further detail some of the other mechanisms. So I just want to make sure as well that people are clear on where we are in the phase of deliberations and, you know, where we hope to use this - how we hope to use this information.

Erika Mann: Yes thank you so much (Marika). Absolutely. The different colors you see on the project they just each time identify areas which - and questions which have to be asked only with regard to this particular structure. So I've each time selected a different color just to make it easier that when you for example talk about a new foundation there are different questions which will have to be asked, then questions which will have to be asked inside if you would select a - we would select a body which would be based inside of ICANN. So there are identical questions and then there are questions which are different and the ones which are different I highlighted in different colors just to make it easy to find them quickly.

Okay (Marika) we will - you will put this in a different format and will be so kind to send this to everybody and then maybe in a Google document again and a Word document so that people can start working on it and then we can receive comments back or deletion or added points and then we can - we

have something in hand which we can put on the whiteboards in Abu Dhabi and we can continue to work on this one. Great. If there is general agreement we will proceed like this.

Perfect. I don't see anything else (Marika). I think we can conclude this topic and can take it as an action item that the next one will be to send out the document in a different format and then to wait for a response hopefully ahead of Abu Dhabi.

Great. (Marika) is still on the call. So then let's come to the last item on our agenda. You have to tell me what it is (Marika) because I can't see that side of the Adobe screen.

Marika Konings: Yes this is (Marika). Right. We've actually I think completed our agenda. We had - we basically I think took items 5, 6 and 7 basically together, 5 being the next steps information to charter question 7, 6: the planning for ICANN60 and 7: the conformation of next steps and the next meetings which as we've noted before will be at the ICANN60.

Erika Mann: Oh okay. Wonderful and so we have more time today and we can give some time back to you. Just one item maybe because I see Becky is on the call. Becky are you hearing us?

No apparently not. I know that you all are aware that Asha is not reelected so we are losing Asha as part of our team and I know that the board was looking into selecting somebody else. I'm not sure if Becky can talk about it already or probably we have to wait until Abu Dhabi but there is a new board member selected and hopefully we will have this new board member joining then the conversation we will have in Abu Dhabi. I will send a separate note to Becky just to get her understanding how the board is going to present this to us and hopefully it will be maybe even before Abu Dhabi.

Anyhow with this any other topic somebody wants to raise?

No. Okay let's conclude our call then today. Have a lovely day wherever you are and I hand it back to the - to our team for concluding the call.

Woman 1:   Thank you so much Erika. Operator you may stop the recordings for us and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great day everyone.

END