

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN64 Kobe  
GNSO – New gTLD Auction Proceeds  
Monday, 11 March 2019 at 13:30 JST**

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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Man 1: It is Monday, March 11, 2019 at 13:30 in (unintelligible) at ICANN 64. This is the GNSO New GTLD Auction Proceeds one of two.

Erika Mann: Can I invite you all to come to this room because we will start in maximum two minutes. So please join and let us start as quickly as possible. Thank you. I'm looking at (unintelligible) Marika and who else do we have with us today for the - for the protocols? Do we need to make an official announcement this time that when we are starting or do we just...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Erika Mann: Yes? Who is doing it from our teams?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. We just need to make sure that the recording is started. But I don't know if you want to give it a few minutes because I think we're pretty low on members...

Erika Mann: I will start. I'm German.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Erika Mann: I mean, I give maximum - I do not do these kinds of things.

Man 1: I knew there was a reason for me to observe Erica. I think - I'm reminded of what you are why we - the board meetings always started on time.

Erika Mann: So can we get started (Marika) because we lose time - valuable time.

Wonderful. So my name is Erika Mann and I'm here with Ching Chiao the co-chair. The two of us we are heading this CCWG Auction Proceeds for quite a while and we would love to at the beginning give you just a quick and a super quick update.

It will not take much time so that you just have all - everybody who is the room and understanding where we are and what we are talking about and then we will go straight into our work.

Can I have the first slide? We do have some issue this week with slides? Let me see if I can make few remarks on the - looking at my computer if I can find them.

Marika Konings: Erika, maybe we can also quickly take note of the members that are here...

Erika Mann: Yes.

Woman: ...for the record?

Erika Mann: Absolutely. Just like to see the slides. Okay then, let's start this. Chris, why don't we start with you?

Chris Disspain: Chris Disspain ICANN Board Observing.

Erika Mann: Can we continue here on the side of the - the table? Daniel? Daniel please.

Danile Dardailler: Daniel Dardailler. I represent W3C. I'm a participant I guess because I'm not in any ICANN body.

Marilyn S. Cade: Marilyn Cade I'm the CSG designated member.

Samantha Eisner: Samantha Eisner from ICANN Legal.

Becky Burr: Beck Burr ICANN Board.

Maarten Botterman: Maarten Botterman ICANN board via the legit liaisons for the board to the group.

Elliot Noss: Elliot Noss Registrars.

Erika Mann: Erika Mann co-chair.

Ching Chioa: Ching Chioa co-chair.

Jonathan Robinson: Jonathan Robinson. I'm not sure if I'm a member or a participant actually. I think I don't recall the roles anymore.

Alan Greenberg: Alan Greenberg member from ALAC.

Maureen Hilyard: Maureen Hilyard member from ALAC.

Sebastian Bachollet: Sebastian Bachollet member from ALAC.

Peter Vergote: Peter Vergote CCNSO.

Marika Konings: Marika Konings staff support for the CCWG.

(Hugo Parker): (Hugo Parker) staff support.

Erika Mann: Erika - Erika Mann. Sorry, I don't know. It's electric here. It's like an electric chair (unintelligible) field trip. Can we check as well if Sylvia is with - and Bhavana - we had Bhavana who wanted to be on the call? Can we check if they are with us?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Bhavana is in the Adobe Connect room.

Erika Mann: Wonderful.

Man 1: And before we start should we - because I received the notice for this that you stick to items on the moment of silence that we will give out.

Erika Mann: Are we doing this today at this time or is it later?

Man 1: 2:46.

Erika Mann: Its 2:46. Yes.

Man 1: Its 2:46 so we will stop at that time. Okay.

Erika Mann: Yes. Yes.

Man 1: Okay. Got it.

Erika Mann: And you will do it. Yes. At 2:4 - definitely at 2:46.

Man 1: All right. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. I will be able to see the slides now? Wonderful. Thank you so much.

Here we are. So this is just a quick overview and a very quick one through about the history just to remind everybody in particular if we do have some new members.

So this group was formed in 2000 - generally 2017 and it's chartered by all of the ICANN supporting organization and advisory committees. It has 26 members 46 participants and 36 observers.

And the goal of this group is to actually develop a proposal on the mechanism to allocate the new GTLD opportunities. And then this proposal they are going to finalize will be presented to the board for consideration.

Now because I was asked many times, a mechanism and it's a funding structure. So it's the structure which in the future will decide and will evaluate the incoming proposals for supporting projects. So that is what we call a mechanism.

And the one caveat to add to this slide and this is that instead of waiting until we will present this proposal to the board, we had some very early exchanges with the board and with ICANN staff so that we hopefully are able to have a common agreement during the course of the discussions instead of waiting until the very end. And hopefully we will be able to avoid conflict because of this.

The three important items so we will decide upon the scope of funds allocation, the accountability measures which need to be in place and what kind of conflict of interest structure needs to be in place as well.

The next slide please. So this is the - this is a quick one through and you can see this on the (picky) pages actually so I'm not explaining all of the various

phases -- jut just to give you an idea where we are and an understanding about these further processes.

So maybe we can just see quickly the next slides Marika. No. Then let us go back.

Let me take one further introduction into - no. One more. So then just to give you an idea on the very right side on the top you will see the public comment period. So what we have done in October, we finalized the recommendation from this group, it went to the public comment period.

On the 26th of November we finalized the comment public period and we are now in the phase of consideration - re-consideration of the original recommendations we have made and reviewing what if we need to reshape our original recommendations take on both some of the comments we received or if we are going to ignore some of the comments.

And then once we have finalized this and we hope we are able to do this in Marrakesh. It's a little bit a tough schedule and we still need to discuss this in this group but the two co-chairs would love to recommend this to you.

Then the recommendations depending on the face of the new recommendations we will make we will have to come to a conclusion do we have to go to a new public comment period in case the new recommendations divert from the original into a large degree? But if they are just minor changes we probably don't need a new public comment period.

Once this is finalized to peers then everything will go to the board and then we will have a new phase after similar to this one very likely. We haven't talked about this yet and we haven't taken a decision about this and this phase we call - and you'll see this to the very right.

This phase we call the Implementation Period and then the Implementation Period the name suggested already we will have to deal with the complete implementations of the mechanism we have selected.

So now let's look into some of the topics on the next slide.

So here you will see the constraints which we had and we still have as a group and so we have to ensure that whatever we do on the mechanism and on the implementation and everything else is consistent with ICANN's mission as set out in the bylaw.

We have to understand that there will be no possibility to fund individuals. It has to account the use of the - the funds can't be used for political activities or any kind of lobbying activities related to political activities and can't be used for lobbying activities neither. And can we have the next slide?

The conflict of interest considerations need to be very strong and not just for this group but they have to be very dependent on the decision which will be taken in the future. They will have to be strengthened and reevaluated again for different groups related to the - which is going to support the future setup of the future structure.

The same is true is for accountability measures and for financial and fiduciary concerns. That's an item particularly important because the board and the offices of ICANN who oversee the fiduciary duties to the organization that cause many of the concerns mentioned here. And they are in legal terms even liable for some of the execution of the future work. Let me keep it simple.

Next slide please.

So these are the - which I mentioned already at the beginning so I'm not reviewing this page - this slide again. So you can see here on the 8th of

October we published the initial report for public comment and then we closed it on the 27th and not on the 26th as I said.

We received 37 community submissions, 9 groups and 20 from 28 individuals. And now we are in the process of actually reevaluating these comments and have to work with those two today.

Can we see the next slide?

So these are the originally four identified mechanisms of funding structure.

So A is an in-house and builds a proceeds allocation department in-house of ICANN house.

The second would be a merger between such kinds of in-house auction proceeds departments in combination with an external entity. Ideally an entity which is familiar with our environment.

Mechanism C would be a new structure would be created. For example, an ICANN foundation could be in-house or could be outsourced as an ICANN foundation the different models imaginable.

And the last one would be to hand the whole mechanism to a separate entity who would then deal with the issue.

During our original discussion and our recommendation we came to the conclusion that we would favor mechanism A and B. But then in the comment period we received many comments actually favoring mechanism C.

So that's for example one of the discussions we will have, how to deal with this. Marilyn do you have a comment related to this please?



Marilyn S. Cade: I do Erika. It's Marilyn Cana - my comment refers - Marilyn Cade. My comment I refer to the way you describe mechanism C which is not the understanding of the CSG that the foundation could be either inside or outside ICANN.

As we read the initial description it was clear and I think also in our own comments the CSG but also reading the comments that in order to have an independent foundation it actually could not be inside ICANN.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much Marilyn. Marilyn is right and this is my - and thank you for highlighting this. This is my personal opinion because I have worked in many different foundations where I have seen different structures -- some of them started in-house and then were totally outsourced and some were outsourced from the very beginning.

Thank you Marilyn. You are absolutely right. That's my - it's a personal point.

So this is an indication what kind of - what kind of decisions we will have to take. So remember the original recommendation was to focus on A and B, we still have mechanism C included. What we have is not favored in the same way as mechanism A and B -- because of the comments we received we will have to review this.

I'm not sure if you want to have a discussion about this because we come to this topic much later. I'm still explaining just where we are.

Elliot: Yes. I do...

Erika Mann: So Alan and Elliot afterwards.

Marika Konings: Go ahead and speak.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Option - mechanism B in the various documentations - the various documents we have written at times it's very specific about which parts of the process do we outsource and which parts are kept inside. People's comments on them often have seemed to favor mechanism B but outsourcing a different part.

So I think we need to be very careful that if we are specifying which part we are outsourcing it needs to almost be in that sentence so people can't misunderstand it.

If we are simply saying outsource some appropriate parts to be decided that's a different issue. But I think we have to be really clear because otherwise people may well be selecting something that is not really what they want because they have read it different ways. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Elliot?

Elliot Noss: Thank you. I do want to note that Erika you said a number of the commenters favored C, I identified specifically that the registrar's comment which did talk about C. Also did so in light of the fact that they like I had found the way that our description went out as misdescribing A.

So many I believe of the comments that favored C were driven that way because I think our initial draft talked about ICANN staff having a much greater role than I think we either envisioned or we intended to suggest.

So I would take that sort of favoring of C in light of that potential misunderstanding about the role of ICANN staff which I think and I think a number of others do too should be as thin as possible as an oversight role. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Yes. Thank you so much for clarifying this. Frank, do you want to come in?

Frank Michlick: Yes, please. I think whatever mechanism the group may decide to choose for its important to understand that the mechanism to choose or select individual applications will never be staff or board for that matter. Just to be explicitly clear on that. That's true for all whatever mechanism you would choose.

Erika Mann: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I just want to note that Marilyn, mine and Elliot's comments all said effectively the same thing. That if we are going to give people options we have to be really, really clear about what those options are because otherwise people misinterpret them and read them differently. So I think is the general message there.

Erika Mann: Absolutely Alan. I was just trying to do a very whole quick presentation and Alan I'm not - just to be understood where we are and then we would have to come back to these kind of discussion anyhow again.

This is not our discussion for the - for this working group today. It's just a whole presentation what we have, what kind of choices we have, what we looked at and where we are right now.

But I'm very happy about this exchange now so it's not - it's actually quite helpful to have it.

Any other points with regard to this particular slide before I move too fast and we have some misunderstandings? No? Okay.

Then Marika, can we see the other ones?

So this is just a reminder again and it's just a reminder that the goal of the new GTLD program - I don't think this will be needed, yeah?

Yes. I agree with you. Let's skip this. This was even a more discussion referring back to the very beginning when this group was shaped so I agree we don't really need to have it again. So we can just continue to have the discussion we just had.

Maybe to give you a little bit of background and flavor of what we need to discuss and maybe we can have - in the meantime do we have access to the agenda of today? Can we show it? We have some difficulty with slides today. Really apology for this. Do we have the agenda? I can't access the slides. Thank you so much.

So what we really would love to do is now in the review of the public comment just before we started we just would like to highlight and we heard from the leadership team a discussion on how we would love to do this. So there are a few topics which we need to touch upon before we review the charter questions.

So one is for example is the discussion we just had so what does it actually mean how mechanisms can be structured and how will staff be part of the discussion and part of the debate or how much will the board be part of the discussion and part of the debate -- because there was apparently some kind of misunderstanding in previous discussion that both or staff would get and would intervene directly in the selection of projects and would want to do the evaluation as well.

But this was the kind of understanding and some of the comments which we received reflect upon this.

So I would love to give the floor quickly just to get rid of this misunderstanding which some of our commenters had and I would love to give the floor quickly to either Becky or to Maarten just maybe to highlight the point again from the perspective of the board.

Maarten Botterman: So just important for us to reemphasize because we are going to come up again and again and I think it confuses the discussion whatever recommendation that CCWG comes up with. It will not be (OAK) or board deciding on individual projects. Let that be clear and you can take the battle through.

What remains important on the very highest level is physical responsibility, is mission and values and from that perspective - and independence of the selection is an important factor of that. Underneath that everything becomes possible.

Erika Mann: And for those who did not participate the whole time in this working group we have received advice from legal and we have received comments as well to questions we put forward to the board with regard to certain topics related to this particular discussion.

So what we would like to recommend just top avoid what we faced misunderstanding between ourselves. What we would like to recommend from the leadership team is that we reevaluate all of the legal advices or the comments we received from the board, we put these in a nice template so that it's easily digestible -- because sometimes these kinds of comments we received just take space and sometimes hard to oversee and to understand.

So what we will do is we will put them in a simple template and make them easy - much more easy than they are currently are accessible.

So hopefully this will then help us as well to avoid differences of opinion or misunderstanding between ourselves because such kind of misunderstanding are not really helpful in our work.

I'm just looking at Marika - Marika, do you have an example already how we want to do it so that we can get approval from this group? If it's just an

example but we would just like to hear from you if you like this idea and if you would like us to continue working on it.

Marika Konings: So this...

Erika Mann: Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes. This Marika. So what you see up here is basically excerpt of the Legal and Fiduciary memo that (Sam) shared with the group quite a while ago and we have tried to kind of break it down in a more FAQ format.

So the idea will be that we, you know, take all the parts of the memo and kind of put them on the questions that - hold on. In a format that it's easier to digest for the group and is able to associate with some of the topics that the group has been discussing.

I think similarly you will try to do that with the letters that the board has submitted because of course they have submitted several letters to the group as well on a variety of topics.

And it may be difficult to kind of go back to those different letters so the idea will be as well to put that in a single document organized by topics -- so again it is easier for the group then to refer to that input that has already been received over the course of the CCWG's deliberations.

So if that's helpful we'll basically continue doing that and that may also then help identify what further questions the group may have either for legal or finance or the ICANN board on this topic.

Erika Mann: Marilyn please.

Marilyn S. Cade: Marilyn Cade. I just have a clarifying question. You know how there is a disclaimer on the transcript that says, "It's the best effort. Don't count on it as the real legal record."

I do think the idea of taking an approach like this may be helpful to the broader community. But if we are omitting certain parts of the document then I think we have to have a disclaimer of some kind that says the base document or the core document can be found here. This excerpted approach is presented as a simplified tool or something like that.

So that then somebody who only reads this doesn't miss what might have been in another document where one paragraph leads into another but that might not happen in the tool or the new resource or whatever we call it.

Marika Konings: Yes. Thanks Marilyn. This is Marika and yes, we would also see adamant into the approach we have taken so far as we copy and paste and not really leave anything out. And I'm happy of course as well to, you know, send this to (Sam) so she can as well double check that. We wouldn't leave anything out that might confuse the input or feedback that that has been provided.

Erika Mann: It's Erika and we discussed as well in our leadership meeting that exactly what you just mentioned is needed but you may even have to go a step further because these kinds of legal advices they might get reviewed by legal as well. So there might be a reason where legal are arguing we want to - that's a particular important topic and we need even to strengthen our advice or review is.

And then the second item which we found in particular relevant and important that all what we are doing right now will serve the implementation team and the evaluation team in the future as well as guidance.

So we have to be indeed super prudent and super cautious how we prepare these kinds of references.

I'm pretty sure Marika, Kolker and (Sam) and where it affects the board you can have a discussion about this topic so that when we do a review next time -- because this is just the whole idea we are presenting to you based on discussions we had. And I'm grateful to see that in principle it looks like you are supporting this.

We then can show it to you in a much more refined way and it's much easier then to see if we are on the right path or if something needs to be edit. Kolker please.

Jody Kolker: On the comments from remote participants Aikman Scalese is asking, "In connection with mechanism A to whom would the head of the ground making department report?"

Erika Mann: I would like that we really put this comment really on the side because this - we need to focus on our day and we shouldn't go back into these more detailed discussions about the various mechanisms.

So if you can just maybe take note from who it comes so that we then can send just a short email maybe if you have an email address from this person we can send a short email. I would appreciate it. Is it possible Kolker? Can you do this?

Jody Kolker: This is Kolker. Yes I will do so. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. Okay. Oh, please.

(Malcolm Hearthey): If you are taking comments from my participants may you take one from thought?

Erika Mann: Absolutely.



(Malcolm Heartley): Your first question, why must the auction proceeds be consistent with the ICANN mission...

((Crosstalk))

(Malcolm Heartey): My name is (Malcolm Heartey) speaking on my own capacity.

Erika Mann: Because that's what the...

Man 2: It states that the reason why auction proceeds must be consistent with ICANN mission is because of ICANN's 501(c)(3) tax exempt status. The real reason why auction proceeds must be consistent with ICANN's mission is because it is a founding constitutional principle of ICANN that everything that ICANN does must be consistent with ICANN's mission.

501(c) status it says - by reason the 501(c) status suggests that it is some detail of American tax law to access a constraint? No. We have chosen 501(c) status as an acceptable vehicle for ICANN's institutional structure because it supports the founding constitutional principle that everything that ICANN does is consistent with its mission. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. Helpful comment. Can we conclude this discussion about this topic here? Yes? Okay.

Then let's go back to the agenda. Under the review piece is where we are.

So great. We started already the work during our calls in reviewing the public comments. So what you see us doing now is that we will continue this charter question 2. The input we received and Marika, are you able to show the slides and to present the template? Thank you.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. So you see up on the screen the template for charter question 2. And we left off last time as you may recall I think it was - trying to see. I'm just trying to see where we left off. I think we left off here comment 4.

Erika Mann: Comment 4?

Marika Konings: Yes. So that's up on the screen. It was a comment from the registries. And again as a reminder the full comment made by the registries can be found further down in this document. This is just a shortened version to facilitate your reviewing and consideration. And the group started deliberations on this topic but agreed to further focus on this during today's meeting.

And maybe as a reminder for those that are in the audience here what we are doing here is basically reviewing the comments that have been received. And especially focusing on those that either provided a new input or feedback on the recommendations for the group now to determine what if anything should be done as a result of those inputs. And what changes if any should be made to the preliminary recommendations and the report.

Erika Mann: Marika, why don't you read it? You know I have the - my contact lenses and it's much easier if you continue reading it and then we can have the discussion. I can see the screen which is fine but it's just totally blurred for me. I would not even be able to read it.

Marika Konings: Okay. Of course. No problem. This is Marika. So again what we did here is try to focus on the specification suggestion that was made by the commenter so that the group was able to review and respond to that.

So the commenter suggested that the CCWG should consider whether the work around universal acceptance falls within and supports ICANN's mission. The leadership recommendation for dealing with this comment was to check whether the universal acceptance effort falls within ICANN's mission and therefore can be supported.

But also the of question, doesn't ICANN sponsor projects using ICANN's Operational Budget is such a project also eligible for applying to the fund with the same objectives?

Erika Mann: Now Lindsay.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid: Thank you. I have a CSG question on this - the Commercial Stakeholder Group. I think I'm probably the person who indicated in the comments that, since there is a clear statement that these funds cannot be used to replace the ICANN budget I think the question has to be separated -- because activities submitted by a non-ICANN such as an NGO or someone else who is doing work in Universal Acceptance.

To me that work will be consistent and I'm just giving you my point of view on this. That work will be consistent with the mission.

However, using the funds to replace the ICANN budget funds toward that wouldn't not for us be consistent since there is a prior statement that we are not using the auction funds to replace.

So another example of that that I will just give which I think comes up later is, can separate projects be submitted for travel for participant to attend technical meetings or ICANN meeting and again that money will not be returning to ICANN?

But a grant that approached that submitted by a third party could fall within the ICANN mission in our view.

Erika Mann: Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Thank you. I think we have to be really careful here. We are in a budget constraint situation in ICANN. We could well be in a situation where ICANN is

funding a projects and decides sorry, we can no longer fund this and someone steps in and says, "I'll be glad to take over it, you know, if its funded through this new process."

I would think that's exactly what we would want to support even though it was once funded under specific things. We are in a real catch 22 if we say we can only fund things that are within ICANN's mission i.e. things that could be funded under Operational Funds should we have enough money. But if we have ever done it then we can never fund one of these things again through another place.

I think we may be walking away from really, really good things. Things that were at some point good enough to use Operational Funds for by putting in a rule saying there is somehow a judgment call that it's now deemed to be replacement by someone and can't be done.

So we have got a lot of money here that we want to spend in a good way. Let's not rule out really good work.

Erika Mann: Elliot please.

Elliot Noss: Yes. I think we should be looking for a black and white - you know, I think that Marilyn laid out a general principle, Alan laid out an edge case that may or may not - you know, I think that there is clear black and white right in this example.

I think what we have to be careful of to support Alan's is that we don't use labels like Universal Acceptance which can broadly applied to a Ranger project, you know, some of which would be in ICANN's clear remit sending someone to a meeting to discuss Universal Acceptance. Some of which would be probably clearly outside of ICANN's remit.

Things like building a browser plug-in or an application plug-in for email clients to further use Universal Acceptance. You know, so I just think that we need to accept that we are not in this group going to be able to be categorical about what's in or out.

I think Marilyn's comment is absolutely right, we need to be careful that we don't replace the budget items.

I think Alan's comment is correct, we've got to be careful to, you know, be not lose the ability to fund things that should be funded.

At the end of the day I think we are going to have to let this leave with the common sense inside the room of the people who will be making the decisions. And we need to trust that we have enough goodwill and common sense in this community that we can take these general ideas and that we can apply them specifically and do a bunch of good things. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Daniel please.

Daniel Dardailler: I think I'm with Alan I guess on this one. I think we should make the difference between what's in the operational regular budget of ICANN and what has been funded by the ICANN occasionally because it was urgent to do so and there was no other mechanism.

And in particular in this case of you are in Universal Acceptance is sort of complicated by the fact that this sort of entity of ICANN (unintelligible) work is also granting money to external party because they don't do themselves most of the work.

So it would be more like a situation where they transfer the responsibility of funding some party external party to the new funding scheme.

Erika Mann: So what are our recommendations then here because we will have to come to a conclusion? Are we saying that we are adding some language to the guidelines which we want to give to the implementation team? Or are we saying it is already covered in our original recommendation and we will then send a comment here to the commenters and we'll say, we assume that there will be sufficient flexibility?

Elliot Noss: Yes. I mean, I think that comments, you know, lives very nicely. You know, I think it captures Marilyn's concern which is a legitimate concern and I think it captures Alan and Daniel's concern which is a legitimate concern.

You know, there may be this is why I like thinking about black and white and grey here, you know, there may be some narrow area of grey in the middle where Alan would fund it or Daniel would fund it but Marilyn wouldn't.

But I think that's going to be the exception and 9 times out of 10 or 19 out of 20 they are all going to agree. So I mean, I think the comment is nice. It reinforces both sides of the issue.

Erika Mann: Yes. But we need to be careful that we have a clear comment about how we - yes. Exactly. So you will find at the comment group - Marika please. And...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Erika Mann: Peter, do you want to go first?

Peter Vergote: Yes. Thank you Erika. I would wonder can we not be adhesive in responding to this comment because it's pretty dangerous. First of all this could open the gate for other similar questions where everybody is trying to get some basic feedback.

Would this fall - would this particular project or this particular kind of activity fall within the scope? So I do not think that we want to go in that direction.

Secondly responding to this question may remotely create the illusion that we are actually providing positive or negative feedback to specific allocation of funds.

It's more perception than the real issue. But sometimes perception is enough to us in a position where do not want to be. Thanks.

Erika Mann: Ching please.

Chin Chiao: Thank you Erika. This is Ching co-chair speaking. Building on top of what Peter just mentioned, I think one of the things I'm having in my mind is that I think this ICANN the operational budget and also the auction proceeds money. These two can somehow, like, doing a back and forth tangle.

Meaning that sometimes you have the project A, B, C doing more things towards like say supporting fellowship, supporting life generation but sometimes maybe once the auction proceeds get started. And ICANN was being asked to hold back on spending on that particular money and getting those educational or fellowship money being placed or allocated to the new auction money. And then it could go back and forth.

So I think actually what Eliot was saying that in the grey area that I thing right now I think it's more safe I think. Thanks.

Erika Mann: Let me take - I saw some question here. Marika, do you want to contribute to the discussion or do you want to summarize more what we later want to do when - once I - Okay. Go please.

Marika Konings: Yes. Thanks Erika. I just want to read a remote comment from Anne Aikman-Scalese and she says, "As a member of (SAPRO) considering future policy for auction proceeds I would say it's very dangerous to move ICANN operational items out of the ICANN budget into funding via auction proceeds. These may not be there in the long run depending on (SAPRO) policy development."

If I can just make a comment of myself because I need - because I think we are going in the right direction as in really the focus should be here, you know, what if anything needs to be changed or added to the report in response to this comment.

And, you know, as I noted before it's also fair to say to say we appreciate the comment but we don't think need to make any other changes at this stage, evaluation will take place in line with legal and fiduciary requirement, which will determine whether or not a project like this would meet the requirements.

Erika Mann: Absolutely. And if you want to finalize and concretize certain points, we can put them in the guidelines as well, which then would serve the implementation team and the future evaluation team. So I have two comments here on the left. Please remind me, I see two hands. Alan, were you first? Then decide between the two of you. Ladies first. Okay, ladies first.

Maureen Hilyard: Mine will be a very brief comment.

Erika Mann: Will you please introduce yourself?

Maureen Hilyard: Sorry, I'm Maureen Hilyard from ALAC. I just wanted to, from my personal perspective, I think that when it comes to issues such as this, which is sometimes funded by ICANN, I have to be black and white. I don't like grey. I mean I think that we just need to be a little bit more specific just in case. So in case some things get accepted and some don't and then there's an issue.



Erika Mann: Alan, please?

Alan Greenberg: Well, I'm glad I let Maureen go first because I'm going to say the exact opposite and I strongly support what Elliott said. We're going to have to give people guidelines. There are plenty of black and white issues. We're not going to take Sam's job, deciding what is legal in a contract or something and outsource that to the auction funds. We're not going to take contractual compliance, which is clearly within our mission, and say it's going to be funded by auction funds.

But there's all sorts of outreach and education issues, which may well fit in either category, and I think we're going to have to put some reasonable guidelines in place and allow the discretion of the people making the decisions to recognize whether this is a good thing that is not just relieving the ICANN budget of money, but may well fall into a category of something that is similar to what ICANN does.

I think with guidelines, and goodwill, and auditing, I think we're safe.

Erika Mann: I would assume so too but I'm looking at Sam. Is there a topic you would want to touch upon?

Samantha Eisner: This is Sam from ICANN legal. I'm taking in the different inputs from here. I think it's a really interesting conversation. There's a very fundamental basis, I think, that we're still getting to and there doesn't seem to be consensus around within the group, which is how broadly do we want these funds to be used? Do we want them to be available for the things that ICANN has done, has funded out of its operational budget, and maybe consider expanding special projects or something, taking into account what Anne said in the chat.

That's right, it's not a fun for continual work, right. It's a one-time pool of funds at this point. We don't know what SubPro is going to come out to. But

there has to be a line. It's not - it has to be either in or out and that will really depend on - it will depend on what guidelines this group wants to develop. It will also make a huge impact on how the applications come in and how they're evaluated.

Because if you say that there is a possibility that something ICANN has done before operationally can now be funded through the auction proceeds for a different group to do it, that makes the application pool look a lot different than this is four things that fall within ICANN's mission but ICANN doesn't do. Those are two different things to say and it has a really big impact on including the size of your grants that you might want to issue. It just trails out and it really expands the pool of applicants.

So I would just encourage the CCWG to get more precise about it. If you want to go one way or you want to go the other way, we can figure it out in terms of a legal process. We can figure that out. But we do need to get clear and not leave a question mark about it.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, Sam. This is Erika. I'm not sure actually if we need to get clear. So there are two approaches, I believe, to it. So one approach is to have a wall between -- total wall -- between what has happening in finance from the operational budget and what is financed out of auction proceeds.

Now, another approach could be not to define it at all. So to leave more flexibility in the future in case because either the operational budget will not be able to cover many projects anymore. Or because of a project approaches we see or the future evaluators see coming in, which are worthwhile funding but which would fall in technical terms inside of the operational budget, but are not able to be financed because the budget is too small for that.

So the question is do we want to define it and say black or white, or do we want to leave flexibility for future - for the evaluators, in particular, to make the

judgment call. We then would have to define the language here in different ways.

So I'm - please, Sam.

Samantha Eisner: I think the more that there's an opportunity for the funds to be used to fund things that are currently done by ICANN, then we also go into that conversation about who is doing the work. Because there could be a possibility that people would want ICANN to - or they would want the auction funds to be used to actually fund additional activities within ICANN. That looks like funds going to ICANN for the purpose of achieving certain things.

First is there's a project that someone who qualified for all the due diligence portions, right, whatever requirements the entity has to meet and they have a project that looks similar to something that's been done out of ICANN's operational budget. Those really look like two very different things and that's really one of those other places. I know we've had conversations within the CCWG before about that line of ICANN funding ICANN doing work versus funding the community or other applicants doing work.

And the more you look - the more it looks like it's operational work, the more you raise that question. It's not that it's not a solvable issue. But I just want to define where those lines start getting crossed.

Erika Mann: Thank you for clarifying this, Sam. I agree with you. The big issue - this is Erika. And just to remind some of the original discussion we had on this topic -- I'll take you in a second, Wendy, I've seen you -- of course, some are arguing this is such a valuable asset, which we have available right now. So we shouldn't use it for too many small projects but rather focus maybe on some of the real big questions, maybe even technical questions, which this organization has to solve in the future.

So just to give another perspective. Wendy, please.

Wendy Seltzer: I'm with W3C speaking her individually. This dialogue, to me, highlights the importance of the independence of the selection committee from ICANN so that whatever choice is made about whether the project to be funded can be only outside or inside the scope of what ICANN could otherwise have funded, that it not be the same group making those decisions so that the auction fund isn't seen as a way to displace some of ICANN's operational obligations and budget.

And as long as it's independent groups who are making the choices, it might be acceptable for an independent group to say, even though ICANN Board didn't think that was a critical funding need in the priority stack, we do. But it shouldn't be a place that the Board can simply push items saying we know they'll be funded because they'll be important to those disbursing the auction funds.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Wendy. Indeed independent from the mechanism and selected the certain criteria, which are relevant in each case and independence certainly one of the top one. I see two. Sebastian, is this you? Is it a hand, Sebastian? So please, Sebastien and then Alan afterwards.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. I think we are entering into a very interesting discussion but we need to be careful of what is not personal budget within ICANN. For me, there is a big difference, for example, when - we tried to take concrete example, maybe not the best one, but when ICANN budget financed the participation to some of the members of the community to an IGF meeting and decide that because of the budget constraint it's not done anymore. If a group ask for using this auction proceeds fund to participate to internet governance activities, is it inside the operational budget or outside?

From my point of view, it's something different if we - if ICANN buy a laptop or a server. This is really operational things. But how we made the difference and I think we will find example in between and that start to be very difficult.

In the other hand, I like the way of independence and maybe to try to fund large project. In the same time, if we talk about universal acceptance, of course ICANN is financing part of the work we -- when I say we, the internet in general -- have to do with that. But at the end of the day, it's not enough to do this job.

Therefore, it is because one part is already financed by ICANN that nobody can come and say we would like additional fund or funds to work on that issue. And it's a technical issue, global issue who involves both ICANN, (IETF), and the (unintelligible) and some other organizations. Therefore, I think this could be inside what these funds could be used.

And my last point is that -- and sorry for my colleague and friends from sister organization -- but the way the new foundation was set up in the sister organization raised me an issue on how we will do that. Because I don't think we want to move some part of the budget of ICANN in this foundation. It must be really outside of the budget and outside of the main activity of ICANN. Thank you.

Erika Mann: Alan, please?

Alan Greenberg: I just want to give one example of the kind of things that concern me with this discussion. The Office of the Chief Technology Officer, OCTO, has done, I believe, research on alternatives to the DNS, alternative naming conventions, looking at the evolution of the DNS and where it would become.

Yet, I would think that is an absolutely beautiful project that someone might propose to look at how the DNS will be evolving or design some alternative. And yet, this is definitely something that on occasion is funded by ICANN under operational budgets.

So I think we're going to have to allow judgment call. We definitely don't want to take a real part of the current operational budget and move it outside. Nor, do I think, as Sebastien said, we want to take something that we normally do and now say, from now on, it's the foundation that funds it instead of us. But I think there's going to be lots of crossovers.

Jonathan Robinson: Jonathan. I just wonder if there's a way of doing because you're right, I mean you either leave it open, and you leave a discretion. Clearly, if it's currently funded that excludes it because by definition, you wouldn't want to have anything that was currently funded. So if it's in the current budget, it's naturally excluded.

And then there's this concern that Sebastien raised and others have touched on, which is it was in the immediately prior budget. And ICANN has made a deliberate decision, for whatever reason, to remove something, it becomes greyer then. Of course, so the one thing one could do is say, if it is currently or most recently funded, it's by definition excluded.

For example, if it was funded maybe three years ago, beyond three years ago, or has never been funded, so then there may be a way of - if people are looking for something to, rather than leaving it completely discretionary, that may be a way of dealing with it.

Erika Mann: Yes, two quick comments. Elliot and Alan.

Elliot Noss: I really want to encourage just leaving it to the common sense of the people in the room and I want to suggest that having sat inside one of these rooms for a number of years, I think one thing we do not have to worry about is a broad array of projects to pick from. We are giving away money. I promise you there will be a long, long lineup of people who want to take the money.

The people inside the room will clearly use the direction, simple direction that we're providing around not replacing the budget, and that will be one of a

number of considerations -- and I'll make this comment about any of those considerations -- that will be one of a number of considerations that they'll use. They'll be going through projects. They'll come down a list. There will be a close call at the end between a couple projects. One, there's going to be no hint of it. One, there might be a suggestion of it and that will make the decision and that's great.

And I think that any attempt at precision, I mean they're well intended and we're going to do our best there. But it's just going to make their job harder, not easier. I really think that this - giving away the money will be clear. Anything that has a taint is going to not make it.

Erika Mann: Alan and Joke.

Alan Greenberg: The last comment I want to make is on some of these things, an evolution of the DNS is one of them, clearly within our mission. There may well be a dozen projects going on in parallel competing with each other. That's the way you actually do good design. Now, maybe OCTO or some part of ICANN is doing one of those. That shouldn't preclude someone else being funded to do something, again, presuming they have a good proposal.

Erika Mann: Joke please.

Joke Braeken: This is Joke reading a comment by Anne Aikman-Scalese out loud. You can actually develop grant-making guidelines with specifically either exclude line items from within the ICANN budget, but grant making could still be guided by the strategic plan goals.

Erika Mann: I haven't understood the last point. Can you repeat it?

Joke Braeken: You can actually develop grant-making guidelines, which specifically either exclude line items from within the ICANN budget, but grant making could still be guided by the strategic plan goals.

Erika Mann: Thank you, Joke. Yes that corresponds nicely to what was discussed here. So we have to come to a conclusion. So can we get a small group together, which will do maybe just a dirty draft of how we want to implement this. Do we want to have some change of the current recommendation we have made? Do we want to put an example to have it in our - which we have already our example list, which will serve future evaluator to be guided once they start evaluating projects? And do we want to have a recommendation in the guidelines?

So something we need to do with the discussion we have now. Marilyn, please.

Marilyn Cade: Erika, it's Marilyn. I'll have to look but, again, to refresh my memory, but to my recollection, I believe in our examples, there are some examples relevant. And so perhaps we should just look and see to make sure we do have some.

Erika Mann: Yes, it's Erika. And I'm thinking out loud as well. So maybe what we could do, as well, once we start evaluating the examples, maybe we can have an introductory sentence that would say that a judgment call is important and et cetera, et cetera. So that some flexibility. Maybe we can do this as well, but who can work on this? Can we have a small group maybe doing the work, Marilyn? Somebody else, Elliott? I'm just calling upon you. Jonathan, Alan. Who else? Yes. You can do this by email. You don't need a meeting for this. Is it possible? Somebody else just please. Maureen. Good.

Okay. Marika, can you just summarize the quick point and then we can move forward?

Marika Konings: Yes, thanks Erika. This is Marika. So the agreement I've noted down is for the group to review the example list and consider adding an introductory language to reflect basically what we discussed today and I think it comes down to that there is some judgment call to be made. But in principle,



projects that are either part of the current ICANN budget or just the preceding budget would not be eligible as they would be considered as part of the operational budget.

Erika Mann: Yes, we can review this. I don't think that we even want to go into the judgment about the operational budget. We shall keep maybe the language quite flexible and quite open. And I would add as well, check whether something needs to be added in the guidelines, which we have set up so that people can just evaluate both the list of examples and the guidelines.

Good. Thank you so much, Marika. And can we see the next item to discuss? The next comment, which is comment 5, which is related to this topic but it's very straight and simple. Please, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Erika. This is Marika. So the next comment came from the ICANN Board submission and the broad suggestion was basically for the CCWG to review and potentially strengthen the language regarding the use of funds if relevant or consistent with ICANN's mission to ensure that it's clearly understood that this is a mandatory requirement. And I think the leadership recommendation here is indeed to check whether that could be further enhanced in the language of the report.

Erika Mann: Let me make a quick recommendation here. It's Erika. Let the leadership do a quick evaluation check if clear and in the case we come up as a proposal to strengthen the language, we will send it to you and then you can reflect upon it. Either you can support it or we need to further discuss this. Is this okay for you?

Okay. Fine. So we would have a discussion about it then at our next call. Next item please, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks Erika. So the next item is a comment from the NCSG. The suggestion here is for the CCWG to consider specific examples of projects

that could be funded in support of ICANN's mission. Furthermore, the CCWG to consider encouraging increased reporting requirements of grantees. And the leadership recommends here, I think, to check whether further projects would need to be added to the list.

In case of community driven project evaluation processes established, the following shall be taken into consideration and the NCSG would like to express support for diversion inclusive grant review process and to check the recommendation for increased reporting requirements, which is to be set up in the next CCWG AP phase.

Erika Mann: I believe this item, Comment 6, practically would fall because of what we just discussed in Comment Phase 4. It practically falls. We don't have to - we just park this for right now and depending on the language we receive from the group who's working on it, we will just keep this in the background of our evaluation.

Now, the granting requirement for granting is not something, which we will do. But this is part of the implementation period, which follows our period. We just need to check whether we want to make a recommendation in the guidelines, which we are sending for the implementation team. So maybe that's something we can do. We can just edit, Marika, Joke, to our list for guidelines. And then check once we review the guidelines and then we can do an evaluation in this group here.

Do we want to put a recommendation in with regard to requirements for grantees or do we want to just ignore this point or just maybe a placeholder, which is normal. Everybody who does project evaluation needs to do it. Is this okay? Okay. Fine. Marika, sorry to burden you with all the work.

Marika Konings: No worries. Next comment is from the business constituency and the suggestion here is for the CCWG to consider ICANN's existence within a larger internet ecosystem and to not disallow projects because they are

collaborative with other entities. And the leadership recommendation here is to check how to integrate regular public reporting in the whole funding process.

Erika Mann: Marilyn, please.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Marilyn. Taking off my CSG hat, putting on my BC hat, I wrote that and the BC approved it. I don't think that from my perspective, that the leadership recommendation actually grasped what our point was, if you don't mind my...

Erika Mann: No, it's Erika. Absolutely not. I did the check of these recommendations. So either there's a mismatch from one comment to another one, which I might have just made a mismatch. Because I reviewed this all in one day. So I might have made a simple mistake and this corresponds to another comment. The recommendation should be here on a legal obligation, which would not allow it. That's the only thing we need to check. And if there aren't, we need to discuss if we can want to do this. Elliott, please

Elliot Noss: Marilyn, when I read this comment, I felt like there was more underneath it than I understood. Maybe you could just tell a little story or sort of what are the types of things that you were concerned about here.

Marilyn Cade: Or trying to take into account. So an example might be that a group of subnational IGFs are getting partial funding from W3C, or ISOC, or somebody else and they would apply for auction funds that would be part of the funding. So it wouldn't - something like that.

Erika Mann: Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: I read this and I had to sort of blink. I've been affiliated with a number of do good things where you give away money and having a particular project supported by someone else is a plus sign. That is someone else is willing to

put money into this. It lowers the risk and increases the chances that it's a project that may well succeed. So I think collaborative funding is a plus, not something that we should be scared of.

Erika Mann: It's Erika. Thank you so much. I do agree. So this would be a question we would have to put forward if there are legal constraints we have to put forward to the list. You want to go? Apologies. So Ching, go first.

Ching Chiao: Thank you very much and thank you. As instructed by the local host, I think for those who are in the room, I would like to offer a moment of silence. So I read as follow on the 11th of March 2011 at 2:00 p.m., 2:46 p.m. local time, 5.1 magnitude earthquakes dropped in the Pacific Ocean off the northeast coast of Japan's Honshu Island. The earthquake, and by the way, that was right before the 2011 Silicon Valley meeting, the ICANN meeting.

So then the earthquake known as the Greatest Japan Earthquake triggered the massive tsunami with waves that rose to the heights up to 40 meters and traveled up to 10 kilometers inland. This was the most powerful earthquake ever recorded in Japan and the fourth most powerful earthquake in the world. An estimated 20,000 people were lost and close to 500,000 people were forced to evacuate.

In remembrance of the lives lost and affected by the greatest Japan earthquake, we are now observe a moment of silence. Thank you very much.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much, Ching for reminding us. So we had this taking a decision at our call that in case we have further questions we want to elaborate with Legal or with the Board, then we will send this question to these two entities. So can we agree that this is one particular one we want to put forward? I believe we have an understanding between us that we like the idea. I haven't seen anybody opposing it. We just want to have an

understanding on a legal constraint and if the case there, how do they look like.

Okay. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So that actually wraps it up for Charter Question 2. Want me to move onto Charter Question 3?

Erika Mann: Yes, move on. We still have time. It's wonderful to get this work done. And Marika, please be so kind -- it's Erika -- to introduce the question, read it, and make a quick introduction. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Erika. So in relation to Charter Question 3, (unintelligible) provided a guidance for the implementation phase and the guidance that was provided here is due concern needs to begin to ensuring that the required safe guards are in place as outlined in response to this question. Should mechanism B be selected, additional safeguards outlined in the responses charter question need to be factored in.

The first comment here is from the ICANN Board and the suggestion that was made is that the CCWG is to consider the inclusion of the Board's language from previous CCWG meetings and its letter of the 5th of October 2018. And the leadership recommendation is to accept that suggestion.

Erika Mann: It's Erika. Just a reminder. We received a letter from the Board practically when we finalized our recommendation. So there was no chance really to evaluate it anymore. You remember? So we would just practically add the letter of the Board and so there shouldn't be any issues involved and conflict.

Okay. If not, if you don't feel certain anymore because you have not a memory about the letter. So what we can do, we can put this on the - we can have a discussion about it again and then take a final decision at our next

call. What do you prefer? Yes, so let's do this. Marika, we put this - you kick this up again, this item, at our next call.

Marika Konings: This is Marika again. The comment number two is from ICPCP and the suggestion from the commenter was for the CCWG to consider sufficient care has been taken to ensure adequate oversight is in place and ensure that ICANN's reputation is not put at risk by requiring very thorough due diligence to be performed. The leadership recommends to add reputational risk to our checklist as an important factor in designing the final mechanism.

Erika Mann: It's Erika. Just keep in mind, what we are doing right now, so we haven't taken a final decision about how we want to discuss the different mechanisms. So A, B, and C, because C is now practically equal to A and B again because of the comments we received. So at the end of all of the review of the comments, we will have to come back to this point A, B, and C and we have to clarify do we want to make a recommendation just for a single mechanism or do we just, for example, do a hierarchy and we would have our top priority and then practically one, and two, and three.

So what we are recommending here just to put on the checklist is reputational risk really well covered in the language how we are framing the setup of the mechanism. Please?

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Erika. This is Ching. I'm reading this comment once again and just got me thinking about besides what you just mentioned, Erika, about putting ICANN's reputation (unintelligible) does it also meaning that when the project - when the applicant start to (unintelligible) and then they start to promote this ICANN fund that the project is - project went wrong and it could lead to a, I think, reputation of risk sort of thing like that.

Erika Mann: Absolutely. So the recommendation is just here to have this topic item, not because it's so logical. Of course, it's something we should support but we need to ensure at the end when we review, before we send everything to the

Board, we need to review the whole set of recommendation and we need to understand is this item covered somewhere in an appropriate way, including the comment just Ching made, which would include it.

Okay. Marika, please. I believe there's no need for further discussion.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Erika and that was actually all the comments that we received on this charter question. So I don't know if you want to go to the next or save that for the next meeting as we have six minutes left.

Erika Mann: How many do we have here? Can we have a quick overview? Shall we try to handle them? There's only two I see. Three comments. Joke, please.

Joke Braeken: It's Joke. There's a comment from Anne Aikman-Scalese in the chat. It is in the nature of grant making that not all projects succeed. It would be good to determine in grant making guidelines how that risk will be assessed and what percentage of projects will be funded that are risky or aspirational.

Erika Mann: We can put this item to our list, a question whether we want something language included in the guidelines, not in concrete terms. This is, again, the implementation team but do we want to mention it or not. So let's put this down. Marika, let's just take the time and let's take the next item. Maybe we can get at least one comment maybe done.

Marika Konings: Sure, this is Marika. So this relates to Charter Question 4, which focused on what aspects should be considered to define a timeframe if any for the fund's allocation mechanism to operate (unintelligible) to preliminary recommendations. One, in relation to the mechanism must be implemented to enable the disbursement of funds in an effective and judicious manner without creating a perpetual mechanism, i.e. not being focused on the preservation of capital.

And the other recommendation was funding should be allocated in tranches over a period of years. Tranches may be used to fund large grants over a period of years or to support projects that could be funded in a shorter period. And the first comment here is from the NCSG. In relation to Recommendation 6, they noted that the CCWG to consider a potential benefit to having an organization set up in perpetuity. There's no disagreement with the mechanism having a sunset date.

And in relation to Recommendation 7, the CCWG to consider providing greater specificity in relation to funding being provided in tranches. For example, a public review should be conducted of the mechanism after each quarter of the funds have been allocated and the leadership team here is proposing to check whether we want to foresee a provision that would allow an open ended mechanism model to continue.

We believe in principle there's no need for this because if the situation arises in the future that the CCWG SO/AC ICANN Org Board could consider that this option should be available. It's easy to do and currently, we have to consider that it's in contradiction to our CCWG goals.

Erika Mann: This is Erika. So the goal for this working group and that we are considering one of mechanism and not something, which we'll consider in the future. So the recommendation from us if this topic will ever come up in the future, because suddenly maybe the execution of all the money takes much longer than people expect it. And maybe there's new funding resources coming in and the Board is considering to put this in the new auction proceeds into the same funding environment.

Then we should leave this up to the future - to the people then to decide. Of course, this means, on the other side, we shouldn't put in any provision, which wouldn't allow it. But I don't remember that we have done this in the current set of recommendations. Is this something you could agree upon? So we practically would say we don't do anything here. Okay.



Yes, Alan?

Alex Deacon: I would want to say I think that's actually a bad idea to then have public review after (unintelligible). It just feels like sort of the tyranny of the masses on some level.

Erika Mann: So we will tell them we will not - we will practically not take their comment into consideration. Marilyn, please.

Marilyn Cade: I actually just had a clarification of do we think that the request is the opportunity for the review documents to be publicly available as opposed to there being like a public comment? Yes, because those are very different things and I think actually the review documents normally will have to be publicly available with certain confidential information redacted. But to your point, but not opening up a public comment. Got it.

Erika Mann: Yes, exactly. Okay. We have one minute so it's not really making sense to take the next comment. Do we have already set up the time for our next call? Yes, I come to the meeting too. Yes, maybe we should discuss the meeting first. Do we now have a meeting actually on Wednesday or not? Have we taken a decision?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. In the last meeting, my understanding was that the group decided to push ahead with the meeting even though we know that several people cannot be there as their meetings are running in parallel, for example. I think the ccNSO Council meeting is taking place at the same time, which means at least none of the ccNSO reps will be here, NCSG.

Erika Mann: Marilyn, you had some issue too?

Marilyn Cade: Well, but I also have a different understanding. I didn't understand that we agreed to push ahead. I thought we agreed to look and see if we were going

to have critical mass before we pushed ahead. So maybe it would just be important to know who can't be here in terms of particularly from the voting members. So CSG cannot be here.

Erika Mann: Erika. We had a principal understanding. It was particular, Alan and I, and some members who said we should wait and do an evaluation again in - actually, once we are in the location. Because last time we discussed it was in our call. Do we have an overview how many actually decided to participate? Can we see this Marika, for the Wednesday meeting?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. That is identical of what we looked at last time. I'm not sure - I just know that one member who said he would be here actually wasn't able to travel to Kobe. So that's at least one less and based on that, I think we had one, two, three, four, five people confirming that they would be here, I think plus you, Erika.

Erika Mann: I haven't seen many conflicts actually during our discussion. So I was wondering how many from those which who are here now will be here on Wednesday and can participate? Can you maybe just show your hands so I have an understanding? Yes, can come. It's only the three of us. It will go fast.

Marilyn Cade: Erika, I'm sorry. It's Marilyn again. But I have a diversity concern as well. Now, Anne is on the - I think she's on the list. She's observing from the IPC. But from the other CSG reps, none of them can be available. So I don't think we can have a legitimate meeting if we have only two of the voting categories represented.

Erika Mann: No, it's understood. It was an ironic comment, a quick exchange between Marilyn and myself. It wasn't serious, Marilyn. If you're only three it is really not a meeting we should have. So we cancel the meeting on Wednesday and then we have to send around information, a summary about what we discussed today and the to dos and for our next call.

And then I wonder. Yes, Marika please.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Erika. So then I would suggest that we pick this up again not next week but the week after at our regular time which I think is Wednesdays at, I want to say 14:00 UTC if I'm not mistaken.

Erika Mann: Yes, and if the timing is not good we can discuss it by email. But otherwise let's stick to 14:00 UTC and in two weeks' time, not next week. That's okay? Okay, fine. Then have a great day and thanks a million.

END