ICANN
Transcription
CCWG Auction Proceeds call
Thursday, 30 November 2017 at 14:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-30nov17-en.mp3 Adobe Connect recording: **https://participate.icann.org/p7kxxql2hq0/**

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/ewJyB

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

(Julie):   Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds call held on the 30th of November 2017. In the interest of time there will be no roll call.

Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room. If you're only on the audio bridge, would you please let yourself be known now? Hearing no names. I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. And with this I'll turn it back over to Erika Mann. Please begin.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, (Julie). Hi everyone. Let's see. We have some apologies today and they are mentioned on top of the agenda. I'm sure you can all see them. So then let's go to the topic that is concerning the conflict of interest. Anybody who love to make an update? No, not today? Then I have on the next item welcome to the new board member, the liaison, Maarten Botterman, but he can't be with us. He sent apologies and he can't unfortunately be with us today, so we will do this next time.

Next item on the agenda still under the topic of welcome, I have two calls and I would love to brief you about them quickly. So I have a call with Cherine and with Chris and I have a call with Maarten and with Becky. In both cases I discussed pretty much the same topic. I wanted them to know that we would love their engagement as soon as possible once we have sent them the information concerning the preamble and concerning the list of examples.

The reason for this, and you'll remember we discussed this, the reason for this is that we would like to avoid any conflict with the board at the very end of our working group and we would love to ensure that we receive their feedback as long as we can still modify our approaches and our justification.

This was in particular a topic for the preamble, because the preamble the basic idea is that it serves in the future, well future evaluators, in areas where we - that they might have a not clear understanding if the project they receive is in the mission or outside of the mission, so this is area what we call gray areas. So it would be good to have - receive feedback from the board so I'll let them know that this our intention once we have finalized it, which we can hopefully can do today, and then send it to the board and hopefully receive feedback, their comments.

The second topic which I didn't go into details because I was concerned because I did not discuss it with you ahead of the call but I wanted to mention it, and this is the debate which is going on concerning the reserve fund and will the board - and the question is when will the board officially go to the SOs and the ACs to discuss the topic and at what time will the - our auction proceeds group be informed about it.

So it's in particular an important topic which I sent over the last two weeks when the debate about the height of the reserve funds changed slightly insofar as there had discussion that it might be a request to have a reserve fund up to 17 months, which of course changes the overall number from 12 to 17 months. And my feeling was at the time, and I discussed this with Ching,

my feeling was it would be good to just draw the attention to the board in particular, in this case to Cherine and to Chris, to just making them aware that our discussions and the way we frame the what we call the mechanism, how the funds or whatever is this going to be really established in the future. That depends to some agree on the amount available.

So I didn't discuss and we talked - I didn't go into details. This is all something we will have to discuss as a group once we know what is debated, and I just wanted to let them know this. So. And I see Becky is with us now. Wonderful. And Becky has been there working on feedback. So these are - I just wanted to brief you and I will wait a second to see if there are comments. I see Marilyn is waving her hand. Marilyn, please. Marilyn? Okay. Might be just a mistake.

Marilyn Cade: Hello?

Erika Mann: Marilyn, are you talking?

Marilyn Cade: I am talking.

Erika Mann: Ah, we can hear you. We can hear you.

Marilyn Cade: Let me try again.

Erika Mann: Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Oh thank you, (Julie). Yes. I just wanted to make a comment on behalf of the - I'm a BC - a member of the Business Constituency. I'm not speaking here officially on our behalf but I do want to note that we have called for 17 months' reserve, and I don't want to - I think it's just useful for me to disclose this, if you don't mind. Our comments are public. We actually will be submitting additional comments about why we think this is within the scope of

the use of auction funds, but it's premature for me to say more. I just wanted to highlight that this is under discussion in the Business Constituency.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Marilyn. This is very helpful to know and it will make it easier for us in the future to talk about it. Sebastien, please.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes thank you very much, Erika. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I hope that you can hear me okay. I'd just like to add a few things about this question. First of all it's that today it's close of the comment period about the reserve funds, the level and so on and so forth. But it would be very interesting to have all of us what is the process that staff and board want to follow for the next step. And the next step will be how to replenish the reserve fund, and of course the question will come about the auction proceeds using that case.

But it will be interesting to know what is the process and when they want the discussion to happen, because it seems like some comments take into account that, some of them didn't, as it was not the question raised. But to know where we are going and what the level of reserve fund will be useful but what the rest of the process will be is also important. Thank you.

Erika Mann: It's Erika. Yes I agree with you, Sebastien. I think it would be extremely helpful. And I will go - I'm looking - I'm checking Ching now. I see Becky with us. Becky, I'm sure you can't make an in depth comment today but maybe you can just guide us a little bit and just let us know how you want to approach this in the board. But let me take Ching first. Ching, please.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Erika. This is Ching Chiao. And first of all I'd like to, you know, start by thanking you taking the time and, you know, let us know, you know, transparently you had the call, two calls, with Cherine, Chris, Becky and Maarten. I mean that's very - I think that's very helpful, I mean letting them know that - especially for Cherine and with - and also Maarten, who just took

for the liaison role to understand what's going on, what would be the concern from us.

And also my second point is raised I mean previously by others for the reserve fund. I think the - from our standpoint as a group, we need to maybe to think a little bit more beyond what our individual SO and AC represents. I mean as a group it seems by far we are not in a position to kind of talk about what would the group - what this working group would be thinking of, what would be the right size for the fund and what type of mechanism that's, you know, going to be useful, be a resource for for the benefit of the Internet community.

So it seems that we're - it's premature or it seems that we don't I mean even have the time for this type of discussion. So what I'm saying briefly just, you know, the size of the fund that the CCWG will consider, because everything that seems - or actually it is depending on the board's decision about how they would like to pay the, you know, the money and also to replenish into the reserve fund.

So I think we should be aware as a group as a whole just to make sure that, you know, we have, you know, as time goes by we will have some thoughts, you know, have some, you know, kind of educated thoughts and so when the board asks us, we will have a response. I'd simply like to point that out. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Ching. Let me just respond quickly, Becky, because I think it's important for your reply. Let me just respond quickly to a comment made by (Judith). She said that probably the finance, so ICANN Finance, will have to put it to us just to remind us the request will formally go to the SO and to the AC.

Now I think it would be helpful if we would be informed about it at the same time because our work, in particular the framing of the mechanism and the

structure of the future of the fund will actually depend on the amount available, as Ching just mentioned. So it would be good to get the information at the very same time. Becky, please, to you.

Becky Burr: Sure. Obviously I can't give a sort of a final answer here that the - there is a consultation that's ongoing --I think the comment period ends today or very shortly -- about what the appropriate target for the reserve should be, and I think that there are going to be a variety of views coming in from the community about that. The board will, with the finance team, consider that and communicate with the community about where we think the reserve should end up.

We then think that obviously it's important for us to have an appropriately sized reserve fund but we also think that we owe it to the community to come back, you know, with a plan that lays out how we intend to get that, the final reserve fund target. And while I think that the board does believe that the use of some auction proceeds may be appropriate for that we also feel that it's on us to take funding out of operations with a appropriate discipline to get to that.

So I think that there will probably be, following the close of the ongoing consultation about the target, we'll come back to the community with a plan for getting there which would encompass a variety of different approaches. So the community will be consulted obviously and we are working on this, but I think right now the first order of business is to decide on the target and close that off based on the community comments and the expert advice that we're being given and then reach out with a funding plan.

Erika Mann: Erika. Becky, I think this is a very good way in approaching it. For this group I think we have to keep in mind that when we talk about the future structure and the future mechanism and, depending on how much money there will be from the auction proceeds, we may have to review at the very end once we receive this information, we have to - may have to review our

recommendations for the structure or for the mechanism because it might, depending on the amount left, it might be desirable to re-discuss this.

Since we will talk about it later, we will - our ideal scenario is that we end in Puerto Rico with our discussion and afterwards we can do the drafting of the recommendations or maybe have even a draft recommendation already available ahead of Puerto Rico so that we can discuss it in Puerto Rico. We may have to review the timetable then, but that's something we probably don't have to discuss today. We can maybe put on the agenda again for our next call. Jonathan, please?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Erika. So as I hear and understand it, there's clearly this process going on separate entirely really to this group which is about the size of the auction - of the reserve fund. The next thing is, as Becky articulated, that the board will need to decide how it deals with whatever comes out of that process ultimately, what it does to reconcile the gap between - it doesn't almost matter whether it's 12 or 18 months. The fact is currently it falls short and there's really it's then going to the reserve fund to the extent that there's a new policy in place or retention of the old, the board's going to have to come up with a plan as to how it replenishes or rebuilds or develops that reserve fund.

The key question for this group, and it sort of goes to the point that Marilyn made most recently, is how do we feel about the use of auction funds. And there's really two ways I see that we would deal with that. We'd either make it as part of the thinking of the group that says anyone's welcome to apply for these funds within certain criteria we described, including the board for the purposes of topping off the reserve fund, or we stay silent on it, or the board simply decides at some point, in consultation with the broader community, that it might use some portion of the auction funds independent of this process to top off the reserve fund.

So from my point of view, I think whatever happens we need to be - continue to keep it in our minds and, implicit in what Marilyn's comment in the chat is, we need to talk to our respective groups about how they feel, so that we know and understand when we participate in this group or in any other forums how our groups feel about the use of auction funds, whether mandated by this CWG or not, to top off the reserve fund.

So for me it's a bit - it's a key thing that we need to just keep thinking about and discussing it. It needn't dominates the work of this group for now but it certainly should be something that's going on in the background and we're thinking about, and ultimately our report needs to either take a position on or not take a position on. And as I say, I feel there are various positions.

We could reject it out of hand and say that we believe there's no way that these auction funds should be used to top off the reserve fund or we believe that's a very good use of it, or we believe it's a very good use but only if the board applies alongside anyone else. So there's various scenarios, and those aren't the three exclusive scenarios, but those are just some thoughts. The summary, the short point is I think we need to keep, A, an open mind and, B, talk with our respective groups about this. Thanks for hearing me out on that one.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Jonathan. Erika. I fully agree with you and I would recommend we keep the topic on the agenda for our next call and we debate it as soon as we have a clearer understanding. Just one addition maybe to the point whether the board has to come to us and request a certain amount, I think there might be a different understanding insofar as the budget authority is with the board insofar a request might be seen maybe more as a diplomatic issue and less as a legal one.

But I think we should put this on hold, this debate for now. I think we had a good exchange, a good understanding, and I will read the comments a little bit late because I was listening so I couldn't follow all of the points raised

here. But if you agree, we put this on the agenda as soon as we have a clearer agenda and understanding. We will take enough time so that we can debate this intensively, if that's okay with you.

Okay then let's move on and let's have a look at the next item, which is, if I'm not mistaken, if the close of the recommendations will close, let me have a look if I can find it quickly enough, the completion of phase two. And this would mean two things to close the discussion about the preamble. (Unintelligible) and the leadership team one more addition, and Marika will implement it, two more additions. They are tiny.

And I will - I hope they can see the document and Marika can explain the three changes we recommend, and then we recommend to close it for now, not to close it completely, because then we would like to send it to the board, as I just mentioned, so we can receive comments back hopefully relatively early so we then can review the document and can get an understanding if we want to continue to reshape the preamble.

And with regard to point two, we are as well discussing the samples which we collected. If you remember, we had a long discussion last time and we saw that at the very end, three new - or actually four new proposals were recommended, and in the leadership team again we made a recommendation to you for today to accept two.

One was withdrawn and the last one, which was example 22 which was related to the reserve fund, we said we would love to take it out of this list. We don't take it out completely but we are aware it was added but we will not have it on the current list. Then again, once we have finalized our discussion today, we would love to send this list as well to the board. Marika, over to you.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So the first document you see up now in redline format to facilitate your review of the updates that were made and as also noted in my

e-mail. The first update is basically to reflect discussion of last week's meeting to clarify -- or not last weeks, week before last meeting -- to clarify that the preamble is specifically focused or intended to facilitate the review and selection of projects not necessarily the development of applications. So that has been changed.

And then some of the edits that are in here, those were actually suggested by (Xavier). He made some of those comments already during the face-to-face meeting at ICANN 60 and then in a follow-up e-mail actually sent those, but they kind of got lost in the mix. I've added those I think, at least from my perspective I think those are merely a clarification and to make sure that there's a common understanding of some of the concepts, especially the change in the second paragraph.

One change that was made as well in the third paragraph, I think that was based on the leadership discussion, is to change that from must to shall, again recognizing that at the end of the day, projects to be funded need to be consistent with ICANN's mission and of course ideally our consistent as well with the open and (unintelligible) Internet definition, but that is not the determining factor in that regard.

And then also a suggestion from (Xavier) was in the - in the last paragraph to actually remove the reference to support ICANN community activities and consensus-building processes. And if I understand correctly, his rationale is that those are specifically activities that are already part of ICANN's role and remit and as such those are activities are already supported by ICANN's core budget. And at least the understanding of the discussion so far has been that funds would be allocated to those types of projects that would not fall within the core role and operation of ICANN. So that was his suggestion there.

I think, as Erika has alluded to before, this is not set in stone as such or the idea to send this document as well as the two other hard documents here, the one the review of examples and the other one being the proposed objectives

for funds allocation to the board for their feedback and input. So based on that feedback, there may of course be a further need to review and revise this.

And of course later on in the process there will also be initial report for public comment so again that may trigger further feedback. So I think there shouldn't be any concern either that you won't have an opportunity to review this again and make further updates. But as quite a lot of time is already spend on it, it may be worth parking this for now and giving indeed others an opportunity to look at this and then review that feedback and consider it again.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Marika. This is Erika. Marilyn, please, you want to make a comment? Marilyn, are you talking? Are you muted still?

Marilyn Cade: I'm here now. Sorry I forgot to unmute. Thank you. I'm not in agreement with (Xavier)'s suggestion to cut this out. I understand that there are ICANN funds allocated to communities, constituencies, et cetera, to support activities and consensus-building processes, but that's not fully adequate to address support for ICANN's mission and of the activities we need to engage in.

So I really do not support cutting this out. I think if you were just to have a quick listen to those of us who are doing work in developing countries and with indigenous people who want to participate, ICANN's work is fantastic but it could really be augmented by additional community-funded support. So I prefer at this time not to take that out.

And then my second comment is I could be confused but I see footnotes maybe duplicative, at least one is one duplicative, but maybe I'm confused because I'm looking at a very small screen. Thanks.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Marilyn, thank you so much. Can I get a quick understanding in the chat room or if somebody wants to comment on it, do we have an

understanding to reinstate this point, the one Marilyn just mentioned, support ICANN community activities and consensus building both? I mean the idea from (Xavier) just to remind you why he, if I remember him right, and I think he is not wrong, his comment was more related to the fact that this money comes out of the existing operational budget and should not come from auction proceeds. So this is what I remember.

It would change a little bit the dynamic if financing would come out from auction proceeds. I'm not arguing one way or another. Just want to hear what you think. I see (Tony) is supporting. Yes I understand, Marilyn, the point. So why - Alan, would you love to make a comment, please?

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you very much. At one level I support (Xavier) and I, you know, because I've said many times I don't want to see this money simply used as an expansion of what we normally do with operational funds. But the other way of viewing is if you look at the special budget requests that get put in by ACs and SOs, there is significant overlap because we do do capacity-building, you know, we have supported schools or requested the support for schools of Internet governance, and there's a whole bunch of things which have already been accepted as overlap or rather as appropriate uses for the auction funds.

So whether we have this there or not, we've already accepted the concept that there will be overlap, if not with the straight operational budget then with the special budget requests, which of course are part of the budget. So I tend to support Marilyn that ruling it out completely is not appropriate.

On the other hand, sending the message that we are not trying to supplement the regular budget so ICANN can simply cut back and use our money as long as it lasts, I think is not the right message either. So I understand. I agree with the intent I think of what (Xavier) is saying but I'm not sure it's actually correctly true that there is no overlap and shouldn't be overlap. Thank you.

(Xavier): And Erika this is (Xavier) I'm on the phone. (Unintelligible) for a second.

Erika Mann: (Xavier), I'll take the other person, then I'll take you. Jonathan, please.

(Xavier): Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I must say I think you can -- thank you, Erika -- I think you read support two ways. You can read it in the way that perhaps (Xavier) has, which is financial support, to put it plainly, or you can read it in a different way, which is to be consistent with or out of alignment with ICANN's community activities and consensus-building processes, which is the way I read it.

I must say I understood it to mean, so there's an important distinction here, I understood it to mean - to be consistent with ICANN's community activities and consensus-building processes, or not inconsistent with, rather than to be used as financial support for community activities and consensus-building processes. So maybe this is an issue of wording and it's a different - slightly different form of words that maybe ought to be remain in and address (Xavier)'s concern. Thanks.

Erika Mann: Yes. This is Erika. Jonathan, thank you. (Xavier), please.

(Xavier): Thank you, Erika. I just wanted to clarify that the edits that are offered in the documents was simply intending to reflect what I had understood one of the principles established was to not allow the auction proceeds to be used for the ongoing operations of ICANN. And I was not trying to formulate an opinion, simply to offer an edit that was intending to be consistent with the principles formulated by the group.

So it's not my view, it's simply - it was offered as a consistent edit with principles established, and you all in this group should define what you think that overlap, as Alan was calling it, or intent or spirit needs to be. So I just

want to state that it was a not a personal opinion that I was trying to insert into the document but simply the mere reflection of the idea or principle that the auction proceeds should not be used for funding ongoing operations of ICANN. Your opinion of use will prevail and I was only offering an edit for technical purposes. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, (Xavier). This is Erika. How about doing the following? I think I don't see anybody else wanting to comment and I followed the chat room, so I think we have an understanding. We'd like to reinstall it with the addition of what Jonathan said.

So what I recommend, I'll give this document back to this tiny group or maybe Marika can already do this drafting, otherwise I'll give it back for a day to - just one day, because we'd like to get this out, give it back to Jonathan, Marilyn, and the small group -- I don't have all the names in the moment in front of me -- who were working on this document, go and review, reinstall the point, support ICANN's community activities and consensus-building processes, the caveat will be the addition Jonathan made. And can we get an agreement on this one?

A quick check about the language and then if the language is the appropriate one or there needs to be tiny changes concerning this point, but can we get otherwise support and agreement that we can also send out this document for review to the board? We will of course send the final document to you so that you can review it again. Yes, who is on the call? Yes, who is it? Kavouss is it you? Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes that it me. I'm on the audio bridge, I'm not on the Internet.

Erika Mann: Go ahead, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: ICANN's community activities is a very, very broad subject. What is included in that? Anything could be community activities because community is not

specifically the entire community, is that inside this ICANN community activities? It needs to be quite clear. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Marilyn, would you - do you want to say something? Then I have (Nadira). I'd really love to conclude this debate but please, Marilyn, then (Nadira). Please.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. Let me just quickly respond to Kavouss. And, Kavouss, thank you so much for joining. I know it's frustrating to just be on the phone. I think that an example of a ICANN community activity would be support for a training program on DNS security in countries, your own and others. Support could be bringing together different individuals that have not had the opportunity to engage at ICANN, to understand what ICANN does. Those are, to me, examples of community activities.

They're outreach, they're awareness, they're education. They could also be funding the travel for bringing additional participants from government and others into not just the ICANN meetings but community - sorry, regional level activities where ICANN is speaking. Thanks for the opportunity to make those comments. I'll go back on mute.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Thank you so much, Marilyn. I'd just like to have you support now. We understand we want this point to be mentioned. We do understand it as well we're not talking about the financing which comes out of the operational budget. We're financing for community activities and for consensus building, that we talked about something different, something bigger. So back to the group, this document just maybe keep the current wording and then maybe add an explanation to the end which would already help.

And we give it back to you, Marilyn, Jonathan, and the small group - (unintelligible). Okay. Marika is sending me a note. (Unintelligible) this is wonderful. Let's just make a proposal, we send a proposal around today just as (unintelligible) if you don't agree please reply and let's try to get this out

tomorrow to the board. Can we agree on this procedure? Marilyn is writing, "We will work with Marika." Wonderful. Perfect. Do we have an agreement? Can we let - get this point from our agenda for the moment?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, yes, fine with me. One point though. We need to have a description of ICANN community activities. I'm not quite sure that was Marilyn thinking and putting (unintelligible) to do this because I'm (unintelligible) at ICANN but I think we need to have a description of that. There's a lot of things with that. I think that if we (unintelligible) and the people have a lot of (unintelligible) to spend that money, and we have to know where this money is going to.

So we need to have really what is the ICANN community activities description and so on and so forth, including but not limited. Put an asterisk, put a footnote, put something and really discuss that. I'm very sorry, Marilyn, I didn't have connection to the Internet so I was late and it was discussed already. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, Kavouss. This is Erika. Your point is well understood. Thank you so much. Jonathan. Is that an old hand?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I'm reluctant. No it's not. Thank you, Erika. I'm just I mean I'm reluctant to open this up. It feels like a potential can of worms. I mean I proposed a simple, what I thought was a simple solution to repair it. It seems to be - has been taken. It seems to have received quite a lot of support, and then Marilyn came in with what I thought to be sort of some extended potential uses. Personally I have some worries about using these funds for what I would consider more consumable or items that are funded out of the regular operating budget.

Personally I see this as much more of a kind of investment fund. So I just worry that we're not properly aligned on this. But I think we're going to have to flesh that out separately. I'm not sure we can do it now. I just felt that I couldn't just remain silent when I felt that some of the examples Marilyn gave

were not consistent with my understanding of where we might - where this funding might be applied. Thanks.

Erika Mann: Thanks so much, Jonathan. Originally this was my understanding as well, but let's do the following because I would love to conclude the debate. So we do have an understanding that for the moment we will include this comment, bullet point 2, with an additional remark which Marika will work on and will send back to us so we can review it. We do understand and we need to make an addition here before we send it to the board that we have disagreement in this group and there are different opinions.

We all do understand whatever is going to be funded shall not be - shall be not overlap with the operational budget but we don't have a complete agreement about this, what this would mean for community activities or for consensus-building processes. So I would want, Marika, if you can put this on an action point before we send it out and with the complete wording we will send to this group. We will include the wording how we want to explain the disagreement and so that this understood by the board, and then we will receive back from the board comments anyhow and we will - can continue our discussion once we have received back these comments. Can we agree on this one?

Marika Konings: Erika, this is Marika.

Erika Mann: Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: I noted in the chat and Marilyn actually made the same observation, because at least from my perspective this document needs to be read in conjunction with the objective statement as well as the example document. And the example document is basically the document that outlined what the group considers consistent and as such also consistent with ICANN community activities and consensus-building processes.

So I'm - from my perspective, I'm not really sure if that needs to be done here or whether, you know, in the example document for example, we already have one example where there's not necessarily agreement on whether it belongs or not. Similarly, you know, through the course of conversation, there may be other examples that come up as a clearly, you know, yes consistent or no consistent and maybe at some point that needs to be further fleshed out, especially on the, you know, what is not considered consistent.

And, you know, that may for example focus as well on, you know, which of those ICANN community activities and consensus-building processes are not considered, you know, applicable or consistent with applying for the auction proceeds as they're already being funded somewhere else.

So I would like to suggest maybe not to introduce that here but actually put further focus throughout the working deliberations and potentially also following board feedback on the examples document so that there a clearer delineation can be made with what is considered, you know, applicable and consistent for auction fund application and what is clearly outside of that bucket, either because it's already, you know, part of ICANN's normal operations or it's clearly not consistent with ICANN's mission.

And I do know that I think the examples for the moment may be focused on those aspects that are deemed not consistent with ICANN's mission but maybe there is also a need then to give more specific examples, of which the community activities are not considered to be eligible for fund application because they're already considered part of ICANN's operating budget.

Erika Mann: I agree that there is - that one -- this is Erika -- I agree that one needs to see the two documents together, so the list of examples and what we regard as being in and what we regard as being out and the preamble. Nonetheless, I think the wording the way they are bullet points do not - still want to capture that we are talking about something that is not covered by the operational budget and therefore might be considered fundable.

So can we give this - do we have an understanding now how we want to proceed and that we let Marika work on it, come back to us, and then we can send it to the board? Can we have an agreement on this one? I'm watching. Jonathan is agreeing on the - (Judith) as well, Ching. Marilyn, do you want to say something? Is this is - or is this support? Thank you so much, Marilyn. (Nadira) is commenting. So I guess support here. Yes please, who is it?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I don't support cutting this out at this point. I'd like to - you can put it in - how about we put in square brackets and tell the board square brackets mean it's still under discuss - I understand these comments that command that this is (unintelligible) of the operating budget, but the operating budget in some cases is inadequate. And I'm going to give a specific example.

I'm working right now on a different project related to diversity where language is very clearly viewed as a barrier. And the cost of providing translation and interpretation is a huge, huge problem that ICANN cannot bear by itself. So I want to be a little more flexible. So let me ask that we put in square brackets. We can put a footnote in saying there's not complete agreement. But sometimes the core budget is just not going to be adequate to do all of the things that we need to do.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Marilyn, there might have been a mis - yes wait a second. There might have been a misunderstanding. I haven't recommended, nobody else did by the way as well, to take it out. Quite the opposite. To reinstall it but with an additional remark that we are talking about projects which are not relating to anything that will be covered by the operational budget. And then we will have in the footnote as well explain the reference to the example so that these two documents need to be seen as being coordinated. So we are not taking it out, quite the opposite. Can we agree on this now?

Kavouss Arasteh: Erika, allow me to say something.

Erika Mann: Kavouss, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I have - I'm not really clear what Marilyn said that ICANN operating
                  budget is not sufficient. This does necessarily have to provide that to the
                  auctions. If not sufficient, it's up to the ICANN board to propose a budget
                  which is sufficient and so on and so forth. If there is a request from ICANN
                  that we are not able to have a balanced budget, we're not able to have
                  something which is sufficient for our activities, that is another issue.

                  But we should not take the side of the ICANN board saying that in our view
                  ICANN budget is not sufficient for operating activities, therefore let's assign
                  something or designate something from the auction. So I have some difficulty
                  to agree with that. I fully agree what Marika said. Other than that, I have no
                  problem. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Wonderful, Kavouss. This is Erika. This was a slight misunderstanding on
                  your behalf, Kavouss. I don't want to interpret Marilyn but she was just saying
                  that she would like to keep the language in for the moment with the
                  explanatory remarks and make - and the ones Marika made and the ones
                  you agree to, Kavouss. And so far we are not talking the budget as a whole,
                  we're just talking about this single bullet point, the number two. So I think we
                  all have an agreement here. Alan, I take you as the last and then I really
                  would love to conclude the discussion. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. I don't want to belabor this. I just wanted to point out that
                  when we talk about the ICANN operational budget, it changes over time.
                  When I started at ICANN 11, 12 years ago, there was virtually no language
                  translation services other than perhaps at a general session. Now there are
                  several groups that have almost continuous language services and it's
                  becoming increasingly common at other types of sessions.

                  The rules change over years and part of it - these auction funds may well be
                  an opportunity to try something out before it becomes part of operational

funds. So we need flexibility going forward, and I'm not going to debate wording but clearly going forward we do need that level of flexibility. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Alan. This is Erika. So we have an understanding. The document is on the topic we debated right now. It goes back to Marika and Marika will do -- and to staff -- they will do a reframing of the bullet point two. It will come back to us and then we'll do a final review. We do this by e-mail. We don't wait for another two weeks, but we will do this by email, and then we will send it to the board. And afterwards, we will have another chance to discuss it. I'll wait a second just to see if somebody urgently wants to oppose this proposal. No, that's not the case. Okay, Marika, this goes back to you and to the team and we'll wait to see the way you want to solve this issue we just debated.

Okay then let's move to the next item which is still in relation to phase two, and this relates to the example. Marika, can we see the - can you have - can we see the list and can you please guide us through these few examples which came in quite late and which we debated on our call last time where we have a recommendation by the leadership team but we need agreement now from this group so that we can send it as well to the board? Please.

Marika Konings: Yes thank you, Erika. And this is Marika. So up on the screen you see the redline version, which was also circulated with the agenda that basically the latest changes to this document based on the last CCWG meeting, as well as for the leadership consideration.

So the changes that were made based on your last meeting is one of the examples, which was previously number 18, was removed, as I think it was considered not being a consistent and shouldn't belong in this document. And then another one, which I think was previously number 12, was basically moved to the end of the document in a separate category that we've labeled examples to be further considered as certain parts may be consistent while

others may not or indeed there may be disagreement on whether those are consistent or not.

And staff has previously suggested as well in those cases where there's maybe disagreement and maybe work on focusing - restating the example in such way that it's either, you know, community consistent or community inconsistent instead of having the gray zone. But for now it's parked here and I think as we noted previously, you know, additional work eventually may be needed on this document.

In addition, the changes that were made were to the last three examples that were added at a later stage and as such didn't receive a whole lot of input from those that went into the Google Doc at the time. So the leadership team actually went through those and has made a determination in that regard. So I think the question for the CCWG is whether there's support for that and the conclusion that has been proposed.

And note that one of the examples was removed and I need you to note as well that actually the three examples suggestions came from Ching, so we did feel a bit of a level of comfort in that conversation as he agreed to the proposed conclusion as well as the removal of the one example. Because it was actually deemed that the one example that was included was actually something that fitted within the existing ICANN discussions and process and as such didn't need to be called our here as example.

And as I said, you know, in my previous comment I did note that, you know, there may be a need at some point to further clarify, you know, what kind of existing community activities would be ineligible as they are already been part of the ICANN budget, but I don't think at this stage it may be helpful to spend too much time on this. I think it's, at least from a leadership team perspective, I'm very eager to get this now over to the board for that input and assessment. That will allow of course further consideration by the CCWG.

So those are basically the main changes that were made compared to the previous version. So as I said, you know, that the idea if there are no further comments or concerns at this stage that this document would be shared with the board for their input, noting again that of course there will be additional opportunities to either add or review this document based either on the board's input or feedback that may come back in response to the initial report, as well as maybe further examples or ideas that come up throughout the conversation. Erika, are you still with us?

Erika Mann: I was copying Marilyn. I was talking without being online. Sorry for this. Marilyn, you want to say something?

Marilyn Cade: It's very quick, Erika. Let me just congratulate Marika. Great report. I just need to make a very quick comment. I'm sure I'm channeling most everyone else on the call. As soon as we have something that we can put out for comment, all of us then will be able to review with our internal community. And so could I just ask a clarifying question? Congratulations on where we are but what's our timeline for when we can actually, besides the informal updates we're doing, when we would have something that we could it's going to the board but we also need to go back to our communities?

Erika Mann: Thank you, Marilyn. This is Erika. I mean you can always go back to your community. That's why you are participating in the auction proceeds. So we assume that informally you will - or formally you will brief your SO/AC and groups you are part of so that you can give the feedback during the debate which we are having.

The final - when we formally and officially will prepare the recommendation and then we'll ask for comments, for public comments, this will be after Puerto Rico. So the idea is to have the final, in an ideal scenario and if nothing happens, we are planning in the leadership team to have the draft recommendation hopefully ready for Puerto Rico so that we can debate it in Puerto Rico, and then with further adoption and hopefully not too many

changes it can then go out for the public comments phase. Is this acceptable to you? Marilyn, please.

Marilyn Cade: Yes I'll just make a very quick comment. So will we have a public session at PR, in Puerto Rico, to take as many of the other CCWGs to? Would we consider doing that?

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Yes, like we have done in the past, this will be a public session. If this is what you mean with public session, yes.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Erika Mann: Yes. So let's move - yes, do you have an understanding? Okay. Can we then finalize this document here today with the recommended approach and with the two additions which we accepted - which we said they would - the project would be able to be final so they're in and not out, could we conclude the discussion about this document as well so that it can be sent in cooperation with the other document we just debated to the board? And then it comes back to us and we will have a further chance for further discussion. Because I'm pretty sure we will see comments from the board as well.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, Erika.

Erika Mann: Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: I just wanted to note in response to Marilyn's comment on opportunities for formal input, (unintelligible) the initial report is the next milestone that's proceeding for formal input. But of course if at any point the group determines that there are - is additional need for formal input, of course free to do so. So I just wanted to make that clear. You know, currently the work plan for application of the initial report, although I do have to note that there's still quite a bit of work of course that's ahead of the CCWG and of course will require commitment and work to meet that deadline and that of course will be

then, you know, ideally as well accompanied by communications during ICANN 61 to (unintelligible) input in view of them being able start finalizing the initial report for publication shortly thereafter.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Marika is raising a good point. She's a bit concerned, and we had a debate about this in the leadership team, that we sometimes don't get enough responses. So we really want to urge you for all of the outstanding topics (unintelligible) that you would be so kind just do us a favor to look at it and try to respond to it. We promise you we'll keep it as limited as possible, but there are times where we need your feedback. Otherwise it's difficult for us to move the topic forward. So please be so kind.

We know it's a difficult time and you are all overloaded with work and now comes Christmas and New Year's and many so many different religions, different days to consider, but please we will keep it limited, we promise, and be so kind to give us your feedback. Okay. Let's conclude this discussion. Marika, this goes back to you and to staff and then, as we discussed, it can be sent to the board once we have agreement about and we have seen not agreement but we have seen the latest version about the preamble, both documents go out together to the board.

Okay. Let's move to the next item on the agenda, which is point four, what we call the phase three, and we want to have a discussion with you about the review of the list of experts we already have identified and how we want to move forward with this topic.

Again, in the leadership team we had a discussion about it and I just want to give you my and our thinking about it. We looked at it from the scheduling point of view and when we can really have these calls and how many calls we can have. I mean, it's a lot of additional work and how we want to select these experts or the organizations.

My recommendation was to do it quite technically, so for example, to select a large organization, to select a smaller one, to select one who is familiar already with ICANN -- and we have some recommendations -- and maybe one who is purely operating (unintelligible) so that we have a broad - we can get broad expertise from different experts.

But there are of course different ways in doing this. So I'd like to give - hand this over to Marika so she can show us, and the team can show us, the list. And then I would love to have with you a short discussion, if we have time, a discussion with you how you want to take this forward and how we want to schedule these calls.

We had a discussion as well -- and I'm pretty sure Marika would like to talk about this as well -- that we might want to start in December, because it will be hard to schedule calls in December with outside experts, purely because of time pressure. But we could, for example, start with ICANN legal and (unintelligible) to understand what it will mean if we would be selecting the model to in source the mechanism and the future structure into ICANN. And then they could give us already their ideas, how many people they would need, how such a department would be created, how it could be shielded from the rest of the organization, etcetera, etcetera.

So but these are only ideas and again, we need your feedback here. Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Thanks Erika. So what you see up on the screen is what I just took down from the Google doc -- whichever one -- provided input on the possible experts that could contribute to this discussion.

As Marilyn noted, currently it's quite a mix and arrange of groups or experts with different backgrounds, different kind of expertise. So the idea would be indeed to maybe make some kind of categorization of these experts to see, you know, whether there's potentially duplication or where there may still be a

lack or missing expertise that will be able to assist the CCWG in answering some of the questions that have been identified.

Of course this is also linked to the other document that was also circulated, basically outlined a number of questions that have been identified through the exercise that we did in Abu Dhabi, where each of the mechanisms that have been identified as possible options, a number of questions have been identified -- have been developed.

There is also a further need to look at those questions and really drill down to, you know, are these questions appropriately phrased? Are these the right questions? Are there additional questions? And then there may also be a need to triage those questions and say, "Well, you know, these questions are, you know, probably really for ICANN experts to answer, because these are very specific to ICANN." You know, these are probably questions that someone coming from a large foundation maybe best placed to answer.

So again, there's also a need to do some further work on that to really be able to prepare those discussions and meetings. And then as Erika noted, you know, one of the things that we discussed in our prep call earlier this week, whether it would be worth it in order to start that motion and engagement with experts to indeed, you know, dedicate the upcoming calls.

And again, there may be a need to plan in additional meetings in order for that to happen before ICANN 61 and have enough information to move forward, to basically have calls dedicated to the different mechanisms that were identified so that the focus of the conversation can be on that specific mechanism, the questions that have been identified for that and that, you know, those experts that are deemed best placed to provide input on those mechanisms are able to be on that call.

And as Erika noted, you know, looking at the list of mechanisms that we have, you know, a relatively easy starting point would be, you know,

especially number one and number two, you know, number one being, you know, create a department within ICANN, and the thing number two is to kind of hybrid, you know, have a department in ICANN that would work actually within our external organization.

And of course we have internal expertise in, you know, the form of (Saviay) as well (Sam) and potentially others that may be able to assist as part of that conversation.

Of course, it will also depend on their availability and ability to pull relevant information together for that meeting. But it may at least allow us to start having that conversation and we may then as well learn from that in order to prepare some of the follow up meetings in that regard.

One thing we did discuss as well -- and I think it comes partly to the point that Erika made before as well -- that in order to be able to do this and do this well, it will require your input and feedback.

You know, we did have the questions out already, I think, for the last meeting. We didn't really receive any further feedback on that, nor for this meeting. So one of the questions is, you know, how can that most effectively be done? And is it worth considering having a small team within the CCWG and, you know, maybe especially thinking of people that have existing experience in, you know, working with foundations or having been involved in grand applications, or setting up organizations in that regard to be part of a small (unintelligible) team or small sub team that would, you know, take on, indeed go through the list of experts, you know, categorizing those, identifying if there are any gaps still there, and then looking as well at the specific questions that have been identified to further, you know, reframe those?

And I think, you know, potentially as well, in certain cases, there may be a need to develop some kind of explanatory materials when we reach out to these experts, because some of them, you know, may have very little

awareness, for example, of, you know, what ICANN does or what this group has been set out to do.

So I think that's where we're currently at and at least where the leadership has been putting some thought into. But indeed the question is really now for you as a CCWG, do you think that approach makes sense? Are there any other ways in which this should be done? And, you know, would you be comfortable with having a smaller group, you know, trying to move this forward? Or should this be a collective exercise? You know, if it is a collective exercise, how can we make sure that, you know, people do provide input? So those are, I think, where we're currently at in the questions we have for you.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Thank you Marika. Just one addition to this point, because we haven't mentioned it but we discussed it last time, keep in mind we already discussed it. We will have a separate discussion and approach to discuss how we will deal with potential conflict of interest issues, because -- and I saw Marilyn's comment, that's true -- there might be some, although I expect very few, if at all, who might -- from the groups we selected -- who might want to approach the future plans for project financing.

So yes, we will have to deal with it, but we should keep this as a separate topic, and legal will have to, in particular, some will need to look into this, how this will have to be set up and how we will have the discussion with these experts about this particular topic.

(Tony), I see your hand up, please.

(Tony):   Can you hear me?

Erika Mann: (Tony), we can hear you. Yes, now we hear you.

(Tony):   Okay, sorry, I was getting off mute. I'm unable to scroll this document that's on the adobe, but I'm not too sure if -- since unfortunately I had to miss a few calls back a few months ago -- if you ever considered consulting the international development agencies maintained by governments. There are actually quite a lot and I'm just looking at the Wikipedia site which lists them all.

            Some examples would be CIDA from Canada, for example -- excuse me -- and also one organization which I knew pretty well some years ago when I was part of the board of Global Knowledge Partnership -- which was an organization that had Rinalia Abdul Rahim as the CEO -- and that was set up from the (unintelligible) process and was heavily supported by SCC -- which is a Swiss development and cooperation agency -- and also CIDA and Microsoft.

            So I think these agencies are pretty much like Snow White; there's no commercial innuendos involved or, let's say, sectorial interests, and they do a tremendous job of aid and development all over the world. So it's just a thought, you know, they might be - one or two of those agencies might be good for input into what we're discussing right now. Thank you.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Marilyn next please.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, let me -- this is Marilyn speaking -- let me support (Tony's) comments. I guess I was a little disappointed when I saw this list because -- and, you know, guys, we have to remember we need to count, right -- and most of those recommendations for - really you're proposing we would speak comes as a very short list of people.

            And I'm not being critical of who those people are, but I'm just going to note that three suggestions from one person and two from another, that means we're actually not listening as broadly as we need to.

So I submitted some other suggestions. I support (Tony's) suggestion, we need to be a little more expansive. And many of the organizations that we could learn from, I understand the comment made earlier to me was, we have limited time to listen. So actually, if we take a organized approach with a fixed number of questions, we send those questions out to the different groups, and we're very, very organized in how we do this, we can learn and transcribe the comments that are made and we can learn from a larger number of people than is presently provided.

I, for instance, am not sure why we would pick the Bill Gates Foundation over the MasterCard Foundation or any other group. I don't know why we would pick the European Investment Bank and (unintelligible) over an organization that is working more globally, as (Tony) had suggested.

So I'm going to say, I'm not on board with our short list. I think it's interesting but not inclusive enough.

Marika Konings: Erika, this is Marika…

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: I come back to the point - Marika, let us listen first to everybody and let's come back…

Marika Konings: Yes, I just want to point out that…

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: I just want to point out that this version on the screen is actually…

Erika Mann: Go ahead.

Marika Konings: The version on the screen is actually not what people provided. For some reason it didn't take the suggestions. So I'm actually in the process of uploading the version that's in Google Doc, so that also has Marilyn's additions and some others as well. So I just wanted to make that clear and it will be coming up in two minutes.

Erika Mann: Yes, thank you so much Marika. I wanted to make this point as well -- it's Erika -- so we have taken on, keep in mind the way we work on the document, we have the Google document and everybody provided - who wanted to provide information provided information, and all the information we received we put into this document.

The short list came only out of the idea we have to start moving. We can't keep this ongoing and adding one project after another and one expert after another, because we need the name of the people, we need to contact them, and we have to do this until -- if we want to stick with our agenda -- we have to finalize everything by mid February, otherwise it gets very tough.

So let me move to Alan next please. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I want to support the comment on national development agencies, but in principal. Each of these agencies has specific areas of focus and they change over time. A number of years ago -- and actually in the timeframe that (Tony) was referring to -- there was an awful lot of explicit support for technology in those development agencies. Nowadays that has often been phased out in many countries and it's simply presumed to be integrated into their other targeted operations.

And since we're looking largely at a very specific technology, I think we need to make sure that when we ask for experts, they're people who have some idea of a field we're looking at, and also the size, magnitude of grants I think has to be something that is reasonable.

If, you know, we're looking at groups that typically give out, you know, $50 million at a time for a given project, we're not going to have many of those and it's not clear that they're going to give us the expertise we need.

So although I strongly support going to the major players in the area, we have to make sure they actually have some knowledge and interest in our general area. It's obviously not going to be just (unintelligible), but specifically in technology areas, because the methodologies will vary from place to place and that also goes along with the overall magnitude of the grants. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much Alan. It's Erika. So let's - I recommended we add to the list the proposal (Tony) made. If I remember, there's one of the recommendations Marilyn made are already included. I can't see the list in the moment, but I think we have done that.

And then I would love to make a recommendation, but I see Ching first. Ching, please.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Erika, Ching Chiao. I'm speaking now as a CCNSO representative. Although I did not, you know, I haven't got a chance to exchange thoughts with, you know, other members from the CCNSO, but I thought it would be useful, not only useful, but also resourceful, because I think doing the drafting phase of this working group, many CCNSO members or the CCTOD registries, they're affiliated foundations, they have been part of the processes.

I think this seems like it's more closer to what we are going through is that there's a operational fund and there's additional fund set aside for the charity purposes, which was not originally designed based on the, I mean, the core, I mean, business purposes.

So I think many of the CC or the, you know, for those, you know, the business, they have been going through kind of a spin off, the charitable organization part. I mean, the process is, I mean, officially in this case, the CCTO that I'm representing now, so I think it would be really beneficial maybe to have a kind of a separate session or at least one or two calls with them to pick up their brands and their - also their, I mean, their experiences of, you know, how they got their charity, I mean, organization spin off and get launched. So I would just like to point that out. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, Ching. This is Erika. I'm trying to follow the chat room. So my recommendation would be the following -- and we discussed this as well in our little leadership team and I would love to hear your opinion about it -- we build a small group, and ideally, those people who have experience in foundation funding environment, it would be the leadership team and then whoever wants to join this group.

So everybody who, in an ideal scenario, who worked in a (unintelligible), worked in the foundation, somebody who has knowledge about - intensive knowledge about it, I would love to recommend this and then we can make a recommendation to this group about the way we would cluster these extras in the organization we have received so that we can come maybe to a reasonable number of calls we can have.

I'm doubtful we can have more than six. Keep in mind, Christmas and New Years and other deadlines we have to committed to. So keep this in mind and then we can make a recommendation as our next call to this group.

We will as well look to the questions which we want to ask. They might have to differ slightly. Somebody who's working only this grant might not be interested in different other questions.

We will try to identify and we would build a hierarchy -- keeping (Allen's) comments into consideration -- that we ideally want to find for each cluster

the number one, an organization who is, in ideal case, familiar with tech issues. And we want to work as closely as possible within the given deadline. Is this a proposal you would support?

Okay, I don't see comments. I assume this is the case. Marika, how do we want to handle it? Do we want to send out a further (unintelligible) and have people signing up to this, or how do we want to handle it in practical terms?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Maybe if anyone on the call at the moment is interested and of the few they need the criteria identified of having experience in this environment and now, of course, available to work on this on the next two weeks, and maybe they can already, you know, raise their hands here.

I've also noted that as an action item, so I'll draw specific attention to that when I send out the notes and action items, so hopefully people will then respond on the mailing list.

But as you noted, as the objective is to have something ready in time for the next meeting that of course will mean hopefully availability of those people to work on that in the next two weeks.

Erika Mann: Yes I see -- this is Erika -- I see a comment from Marilyn and from (unintelligible). So please, we will - I will recommend as an action item, Marika, we will have this included in our summary of today, but then we will send a separate reminder about this topic so that it's not forgotten. Sometimes it's difficult to read all these long summaries, so we do a second, and I would ask to be so kind to send a second reminder so that we get ideally as many as responses back as possible.

And keep in mind, we would love to conclude this so that we can present something to this group in two weeks' time so we can have a relatively short timetable -- leadership team, plus everybody else who wants to join.

Okay, let's conclude this item and then I would say we have to skip the next item on the agenda because we are running out of time. And we will move this to our next call. And Marika, can you do a quick update on point six, planning for ICANN 61 and then we need the confirmation of our next meeting.

So item six now. We skip five. We move to planning for ICANN 61. Marika please.

Marika Konings: Thanks Erika. So this is Marika. So I think as you all know, planning has already started for ICANN 61. Based on some of the feedback and experience from the last meeting where it was for many people difficult to join a meeting on Thursday, although I think those that joined did believe it was a good and productive discussion, the current thinking of the leadership team is to see whether it would be possible to request a significant slot on this Saturday at the start of the meeting -- so a three hour slot.

It will likely run in concurrence with some of the PDP working groups, but of course we will look at those groups where there is the least overlap with the CCWG. And at least, from my understanding, I think that's likely the right protection and mechanism PDP.

So that would at least give the group a significant chunk of time early on the meeting, hopefully with too - not too many other conflicts. And, you know, one of the questions, though, is, you know, will people already be available to attend if the meeting would be on Saturday and we could, for example, see if it would be possible to have it Saturday afternoon so that, you know, it would still allow for arrival on Saturday morning?

And then, of course, that is dependent on the scheduling of other meetings and, you know, from a GNSO perspective, PDP working group meetings are taking a precedent in that regard. But I am at least hopeful that it would be

possible to carve out that time. But it would mean availability from the CCWG members and participants.

Maybe to assess that we could send out a Doodle poll to see if that would be feasible. I know that some are suggesting Sunday, but Sunday, at least from a GNSO perspective, makes it very difficult, as there are already quite a few meetings that are happening. I think the only option would be very late on Sunday afternoon, but it would then conflict with stakeholder group and constituency and meetings that are scheduled, and I'm not sure if that is acceptable, at least from a GNSO participant perspective. But again, it's something that we could consider, and yes, Marilyn, we can do a Doodle poll to see what may work best.

Based on the comments as well, during the meeting today about having an opportunity for community input and feedback, you may also want to consider then having a meeting later in the week that would be more of a public facing session, a kind of update input session, which could either be just a CCWG, you know, update, or as I posted in the chat, there's also a question open for cross community sessions.

My only hesitation with going for a cross community session is that of course it will require having, you know, something substantial to discuss with the community. And I'm not sure if, you know, at this stage whether, you know, if we already know when we'll be able to have that kind of information that would, you know, listed up to a cross community session. But I'm happy to hear from others what they think.

We can at least plan or see if there's space for having a community update session that we could turn into more of a input session if there are specific questions that we want to ask the community and again, leave it up to you to provide feedback on whether or not this might be a topic that should be considered for a cross community slot.

Man: Erika?

Erika Mann: This is Erika. Yes Kavouss, please. Yes Kavouss, go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: I don't understand this Saturday and Sunday. Why are all these rush? What do you want, to rush to spend this money? Why Saturday and Sunday? What is the urgency that to go Saturday and Sunday? Because there are so many other group, there are so many other meeting, and number of the people, they are not as numerous in some areas (unintelligible) maybe one or two going to many other meeting. And then if these people would not be given opportunity, they have no possibility. Why Saturday and Sunday? I don't understand that. (Unintelligible) Sunday.

((Crosstalk))

Erika Mann: This is Erika

Kavouss Arasteh: Never on Sunday.

Erika Mann: Kavouss, Kavouss, Kavouss, Kavouss, give me a second. We are talking about those who are already participating. We don't want to add any additional funds or money factors to ICANN. That's not the purpose.

                     So in many cases, many will already be there on Saturday. That's why we are having this discussion to check can we do it on Saturday. We don't want to add anything new, which would cost as a cost factor.

                     So we will do a Google poll on this topic to verify shall we do it on Saturday? Shall we do it on Sunday? Sunday is very difficult. If we can do neither on Saturday or Sunday, we will have to look for a different option.

                     Second, of all our meetings at the ICANN events, they are always public. We have done this - all this public. I would have concern, as Marika, to do

already a cross community public meeting. I would rather prefer do this in Puerto Rico. I think it is - sorry, in Puerto Rico I think we will have to do it, because it's the last meeting. But we can't do it ahead of Puerto Rico. So it's not possible and this would definitely - maybe I misunderstood the chat room debate and discussion.

So can we maybe do the rest with a Doodle poll? Can we conclude this discussion? Yes, I see comments -- Doodle poll, Doodle poll.

Fine, Marika, back to you. Let's do it on this one. And then the last point would be the - our next meeting on the agenda, which is point seven, which would be Thursday, December 14, again at 14 UTC. And we will follow up the discussion we had about cross community or public just to get a coherent understanding between all of us. We will do this in the follow up email which we will send after this call. And then if needed, we can put this on the agenda again for next time.

Okay, thank you all so much and looking forward to our next call -- December 14. Back to the team to conclude the call.

<center>END</center>