ICANN
Transcription
CCWG Auction Proceeds
Thursday, 22 February 2018 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-22feb18-en.mp3
Adobe Connect recording: **https://participate.icann.org/p38mdb56ff6/**
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/iQJyB
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Julie Bisland: Great. Thank you very much. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Thanks for holding and welcome to the CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds call held on Thursday, the 22nd of February, 2018.

I would like to remind all to please mute your lines as we are hearing some background noise. Attendance for today's meeting will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourself be known now? Okay, hearing no names I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep all phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. With this I will turn it back over to Ching Chiao. Please begin.

Ching Chiao: Thank you very much, Julie. Thanks, everyone. My name is Ching Chiao, once again, the Chair of this working group. And so actually my cochair, Erika Mann, she sends her apologies because her office booked her into a flight that she couldn't make the change. So I'll be chairing once again for this meeting.

So any updates for the SOI or DOI? Okay, hearing none let's move onto the next topic which is the status update regards to the outreach letter sent to the external experts. We do finishing the work on drafting the letter last - right after our last call. The letter has been sent out since last week and to a number of experts which we do have contact with.

I would personally like to, and the leadership team would like to thank the CCWG members that helped us to follow up with the contacts and also helped to encourage the responses. I do want to remind and hope everybody here can also help to do the same. And there's a couple of items, this one including how do we keep track, how do we make sure that some of the organizations which we do not have the point of contact and other stuff, I need your help, Marika, on this one so maybe you can share with us what's the latest updates? I understand you have the document updated but please if you can help us to briefly let us know what's happening now. So over to you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you very much, Ching. And apologies again for joining late. This is Marika for the record. So what you see up on the screen is the latest version of the document. It has further updates compared to the version that we shared with the agenda as we got some additional responses from the people we reached out to. And, you know, as Ching noted, you know, a couple of people have been very helpful in following up with their direct contacts for those where we knew that there was a direct relationship, we copied those people on the email that we sent out and several of you have already followed up.

We'd like to encourage those that may not have a chance to do so to do that as well or if you have direct contacts with any of these organizations or individuals identified and, you know, to let us know because it obviously will have a better chance of getting a response if there is a direct relationship that we can make use of.

I would also want to note that there are still a couple of organizations that were identified by CCWG members and participants but for which no point of contact was provided. At least I think our perspective that just writing in the blanks is probably not going to be helpful here so there's still opportunity for those of you that may have a direct relationship or point of contact with those organizations that currently have a TBC next to them, you know, to let us know so we can still reach out to those organizations as well.

I am happy to report that for a number - from a number of the people we reached out to we've already received a response indicating that, you know, they are willing to assist or do their best to provide responses to the questions. Some did indicate that, you know, the timeline is relatively tight so I think the group may need to be prepared to provide some more flexibility to those that may need the additional time. The timeline that we've currently set is to get input prior to the San Juan meeting but obviously we have limited time available at the meeting itself to review potential responses that we'll have received by that date. So there may be flexibility in any case to provide some more time to those that need it.

I will also note, and I think also comes back in a later agenda item that with regards to the San Juan meeting Xavier as well as Sam have confirmed that they're willing and available to participate in that session and provide their input on the questions that were sent to them as ICANN experts that were identified on the list as well, noting that Sam maybe slightly late for that meeting, but I think Xavier will cover ground until that time.

And we did also extend an invitation for that specific meeting to both Nominet and SIDN recognizing that those might be organizations also in attendance, but we have not heard back from them yet but that may also be an opportunity with regards to the agenda for the meeting in San Juan.

So I think that's all at this stage, so I hand it back to you, Ching.

Ching Chiao: Sounds good. So pretty much we have sent out some and we need to fill out the blanks for which we don't have contacts with, I mean, that's for sure. And maybe do another round of you know, follow up for those who may not have found timely before or after San Juan. We probably also need a round of follow up so I guess that, you know, we'll leave it to some of us to handle the follow ups. But other than that, I can see this has been on track. I'm very - really glad that at least from what I heard initial response from those who we know quote unquote within the ICANN circle, they are willing to share their experience especially like SIDN, Nominet and also with APNic which I happen to be here this, I mean, the next week is the APNic meeting here in - in Katmandu. So we will definitely get some of the feedback from them.

So other than that, do we have questions or comments on this text here? Pause here a little bit to see if everybody here had comments. Glad you can join us, Sylvia. Are you in Katmandu? I'm here as well for a number of these - for the Africa and APNic meeting. I'm also catching up on the chat here, seems that, yes, we just got started. Vanda was saying that she's contacting new director from (FINEP) and check if he can agree to participate.

Okay, but that's the case we will move along with this and once again just a friendly reminder for those of you help us to fill in the blank for those contact points, please do so as soon as possible. And once again, we will provide an update in our next meeting.

Okay so Daniel seems to have problem accessing the Adobe so please if you can - the staff please help maybe to dial out to him?

Let's - so let's move onto the next topic, is the - sorry, let me move back to my PC here. So let's move onto the next topic to continue to review the response from the Board liaison, their letter sent to us at the end of January this year in response to our preambles and the examples. For many of you who were in the last meeting, we can - we fully understand that there's need for the CCWG to obviously to review the input and also that has been

provided by the Board liaisons. And many of you actually commented on this topic on the mailing list regarding the - especially on the preambles.

I mean, once again this is a, I mean, overall - an overarching (unintelligible) that the CCWG wish to put together for the future evaluators for the projects. Some of you mentioned that the working group should ask for Board liaison for their specific inputs and their concrete edits suggestions to wording. There is a couple, I mean, points that they - the Board made on - is the recommendation or the examples are not concrete enough or either some vagueness there. We also - on this particular point we still welcome…

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Hi, all this is Marika. I think we've lost Ching, so if you bear with us a second we're going to try and reconnect him.

Ching Chiao: I was cut off. Can everybody hear me okay now?

Marika Konings: Yes, Ching, we can hear you again.

Ching Chiao: Hello? Oh, great. So I think I was mentioning that we should ask the Board liaisons to be more specific and to provide more concrete you know, edits suggestions. The leadership team we - so we have some suggestions but why don't - maybe I probably should stop here and listen to maybe how others are thinking at this stage what should we do. We do have some sense in mind but I want to hear, I mean, the members how do you feel at this particular time and your comments on this topic. It sits with us for a couple of weeks already so maybe have the members, if you have some inputs please share with us now.

If not, so Marika, could you maybe help us - maybe to capture the discussion I mean, that the leadership team has I mean, the other day what would be the

suggested way to - for us, you know, to respond to the Board comments on this, maybe to help us to capture the discussion that we have.

Marika Konings: Sure, Ching. This is Marika.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: And I believe that -yes, can you hear me?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Okay, great. And I believe Erika also sent a note to the mailing list trying to explain indeed the discussion that the leadership team had with regards to possible next steps in relation to the letter. As you may have seen from the comments that the Board provided they seem to focus on two different aspects, one the preamble and the other the examples that have been provided.

So with regards to the preamble, and Erika noted this as well in her message, the preamble was intended as a, you know, an important document but in view of eventually aiding evaluators in understanding ICANN's unique role and remit as it considers project applications, so at a much later stage in time.

So as such, you know, I think we may want to recognize that this has more is more of an implementation matter than anything else at this point in time. So one of the suggestions that the leadership discussed was whether it would be helpful just to leave the preamble for what it is at the moment and I mean, staff include a more general recommendation in - a general recommendation in the initial report that will basically highlight the need to make sure that sufficient guidance would be provided to evaluators regarding ICANN's mission and what is considered consistent with ICANN's mission.

The preamble could then maybe serve as an example for what such guidance could look like but it would be then up to the implementation team to actually work out the details factoring in also the other recommendations that the CCWG will make in its initial report. So that's one of the suggestions that the leadership team would like to make to the group for your consideration.

You know, similarly in considering the comments received in relation to the examples, you know, although some work could definitely already be done to generalize some of the examples because that was one of the comments that the Board made, you know, currently specific organizations are being called out and that may not serve the purpose that, you know, the examples are - the examples are intended for. You know, the task for prioritization and may become easier once the CCWG has actually settled on a model and the framework through which proposals are to be evaluated.

And, you know, one suggestion that was made, for example, you could think of a model whereby maybe SOs and ACs would actually define or set priority which are then factored in by the appended evaluators as they review projects or factored in as calls are done. So again, I think the proposal is to maybe, you know, park that for now but, you know, maybe make some specific updates as suggested by the Board with regards to generalizing some of the examples and you know, potentially think as well about some examples of projects that would not be considered eligible or would not be considered a priority but maybe to come back to this at a later stage in the broader context of the CCWG recommendations.

So I think those were in broad lines the elements that the leadership discussed. I do want to point out as well because there were a number of you that commented on the letter on the mailing list following last week's call specifically suggesting or recommending that, you know, the Board liaison should be requested to be more specific and provide concrete edits.

I think, you know, also having discussed this with the leadership team, you know, we of course would welcome if Board liaisons want to provide more specific recommendations, but the leadership team doesn't believe either that the CCWG would want to be told what to do so, you know, it may be worth first having a look at the input that was provided and seeing if there's a way for the CCWG to either address the comments or you know, follow the path for some of these items as just described and share that then with the Board liaisons to see if that accommodates their concerns.

You know, of course if through that process there are areas where the groups believes further details or input is needed you can of course always go back and ask for that. So I think that's it in a nutshell what we discussed within the leadership team earlier this week. I think Erika suggested in her message as well if that would be aligned with the thinking of the CCWG you know, the leadership team could work on a response letter to the Board outlining those aspects and of course sharing that with the group for your review before sending that. So I think that's where things stand.

Ching Chiao: Thank you very much, Erika. I think for Number 1 on the preamble part the leadership team does have this idea so I think that to myself it pretty much makes sense. But for the second one on the example, one of the things I'd, you know, I have in mind that whether - so whether the SO and AC that the members here are representing, whether they would have some time to kind of digest or suggest on the examples here.

I mean, although we are here joined this working group and help the, I mean, corresponding SO and AC to deal with issues, I mean, related to the auction proceeds, then I would - I actually would suggest that those examples probably should, you know, have the members taken back to their SO and AC and to have a kind of reviews and the comments and then we will get more as we all need to have more like the concrete comments or suggestions based on the examples.

Let me pause here. I understand there's a lot of readings and also the comments to digest at this point in time and prior to the ICANN meetings there is documents after documents coming through - coming to us. And so probably it's useful for us to at this point to discuss how do we want to tackle this during our call in San Juan - sorry, during our meeting in San Juan. We all want probably wish to utilize that face to face meeting to have a more constructive dialogue over this letter from the Board. So any suggestions on how do we tackle this during our meeting in San Juan?

Okay, I sense the silence maybe would best - the leadership team would maybe to have some suggestions and then for our session on Sunday we will definitely put this one on the top priority things once again, a response is definitely needed to go back the Board liaison and how do we, you know, this will help us to formalize our initial - I mean, initial report. So I guess we will just need to have a good way to tackle it.

Other than that I don't hear anybody commenting on this. Yes, I mean, obviously the face to face Sunday it's only 90 minutes so still I would like to - would definitely need to utilize the time we have and also the mailing list in order to move this forward. As Marika pointed out, the leadership team will start to draft something and maybe would put this for discussion prior to just around the time when the San Juan meeting takes place.

If I hear nothing we'll probably as like last time we would sit on what we have now on - during the last call, we have the breakdown, the expression that - for - that was put together by Marika. We still can utilize that particular form and for those of you who would like to share your comments and especially on the examples please do help us to do that. I can see Maarten is typing so let's wait a while. Oh, Maarten, would you like to speak?

Maarten Botterman: I'm unmuted now? You hear me?

Julie Bisland: Yes, Maarten, we can hear you.

Ching Chiao: Yes, we can hear you well, Maarten.

Maarten Botterman: So basically saying that I think the interpretation of leadership makes a lot of sense. We did not want to take over the process so we were very careful in phrasing our feedback as feedback rather than - and staying away from telling you what to do. With regards to the example projects, I mean, we had some more specific comments on some of them but basically the most important one is we see how useful it is and we just warn that we're careful about communication about it so the example projects are not taken as definite winners of grant money. So it's these two points that I'm - I hope to clarify and further supports what Marika and Ching have said.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Maarten. Thanks once again for your emphasis on the point and you also raised during our last call, so once again this is good reminder to us all. Not to - I mean, both times and also we have a - under the same head of the working group we don't send out confusing messages to the overall community for their perception of, okay, those examples are the definitely the projects that some applicants can go after. I mean, although there could be potential, you know, ways for the applicants to apply under the same or similar topic or subject items. But once again thanks for the reminder on that.

Okay, so I think we have put together the action items on the notes. The last item for this call once again is our face to face meeting in a few weeks' time in San Juan, that's Sunday. So, Marika, anything to add other than we, I mean, obviously we know some of the high or some higher interest - some higher interest topics and also the invitation send out to some examples like SIDN or Nominet. Anything else we should keep in mind or should to be discussed about the planning for San Juan? Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So, yes, I think we already discussed or shared with what in principle the thinking is for the Sunday session which is scheduled for 5:00 to 6:30 local time or San Juan time. Indeed the focus would be on an

exchange of views with Samantha Eisner and Xavier Calvez as the ICANN experts identified on the questions that were sent to them last week.

You know, as mentioned, we also extended the invitation to Nominet and SIDN should they have representatives at ICANN 61 that will be qualified to respond to the questions that were sent to take advantage of that face to face opportunity.

Something that the group may want to discuss is that, you know, with regards to the community update that is currently scheduled for Thursday from 8:30 to 10:15 local time, we discussed with the leadership team earlier today whether it would make - earlier today - earlier this week - whether it would actually make sense to postpone that session until ICANN 62.

As you may recall, when we originally discussed and requested the meeting the hope was that the CCWG would have already been further along in its deliberations. But seeing where we're currently at, there don't really seem to be any specific questions or issues for community input at this stage. And so there may not be much value in, you know, providing the community just with an update similar to the one that was provided at the ICANN 60 and which the group could also provide in the form of a regular newsletter which we plan to publish shortly after ICANN 61 as well as the update that will be included as part of the GNSO policy briefing that will get published shortly.

So the idea would then be to instead of - to instead start thinking ahead to ICANN 62 and you know, maybe work on a well-planned and thought out session that would be focused on getting community input on some of the critical questions that the CCWG will likely be dealing with at that stage, you know, after you've received input from external experts and they have crystallized more your views and perspectives around, you know, the preferred mechanisms.

So I think the question for the group if there are any objections to postponing the community update session which is currently planned for Thursday at ICANN 61 to postpone that to ICANN 62.

Ching Chiao: Okay, thanks, Marika. So I guess we're hearing no objection. We would as proposed we will move the community update session to the midyear ICANN meeting. But that means that you get to keep the time slot for the discussion or are we seeing the hall being utilized by other subjects? Does the working group still get to us the time slot?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. One of the…

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: One option, you know, if the group would want to repurpose that session to an internal meeting or to a face to face meeting and not a community update, it could of course do that. I do need to point out that, you know, currently there are already quite a few other meetings that are scheduled opposite that session. I know that At Large has a capacity building…

Ching Chiao: Sure.

Marika Konings: …working group meeting, there's an ICANN Board SSAC meeting, there's a GNSO RPM Working Group meeting, so one thing I could maybe suggest is that we do not cancel the meeting yet but we could send out a Doodle poll to see if there would be sufficient CCWG members available to participate in a second session on Thursday to be able to determine, indeed, why don't you just change around the focus of the meeting and instead of having it as a community update it would just be a kind of regular face to face meeting or whether it would make more sense to cancel the slot as there wouldn't be sufficient participation for that meeting. Would that work?

Ching Chiao: That sounds a very good idea since many of us will be there, I don't see the, I mean, and I'm seeing many benefits of us getting together if time allows of meeting maybe to a specific for example, going through a couple of the, I mean, the examples made that, you know, I mean, over the past, I mean, the next few weeks maybe people will start to think about maybe this is working, this is not working. So I would think a Doodle poll will be helpful you know, to make sure that some of us can, you know, I mean, allocate time to meet we will take the chance to meet there.

Okay, sounds good. So I guess we can - we're finishing up all the items here so anything else that we need to cover in this meeting, any other business? All right, hearing none I guess we're good for this one. I wish everybody have a good travel to San Juan for those of who you can come, obviously we have remote participation for sure but see you in couple weeks and see you next meeting. Thanks, everybody. Thank you, Marika. Okay and Julie, thanks.

Marika Konings: Thank, Ching. Thanks, all. Bye.

Woman: Thanks, all. Bye.

Julie Bisland: Thanks, Ching. Thank you, everyone. Today's meeting is adjourned. Operator, you can stop the recordings, and everyone enjoy the rest of your day.

END