

Recordings:

[Mp3](#)

[AC Recording](#)

GNSO transcripts are located on the [GNSO Calendar](#)

Participation:

[Attendance & AC Chat](#)

Apologies: Sylvia Cadena, Hadia El miniawi, Elliot Noss, Erika Mann, Alberto Soto, John Levine, Adetola Sogbesan, Marilyn Cade, Remmy Nweke

Notes & Action Items - New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG Meeting - 30 January 2019

These high-level notes are designed to help the CCWG navigate through the content of the call and are not meant as a substitute for the transcript and/or recording. The MP3, transcript, and chat are provided separately and are posted on the wiki at:

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

1. Roll Call

Attendance will be taken from AC

Please remember to mute your microphones when not speaking and state your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

2. Welcome & SOI/DOI updates

Please remember to check your SOI/DOIs on a regular basis and update as needed

3. Proposed approach for reviewing / addressing public comments:

- a. Present proposed approach
 - i. Acknowledge those comments that are in support of the proposed recommendations or recommend minor updates
 - ii. Leadership team to put forward proposed approach for those comments that are either new or differ from the proposed recommendations
 - iii. CCWG to review items in category 2 and flag for which the proposed approach is not supported or where an alternative is needed
 - iv. CCWG to implement proposed approach as agreed upon under 3
 - b. CCWG comments / input on proposed approach
 - c. Deliberate on comments identified as requiring further deliberation, as an example.
- Before going to the Public Comment Review Tool, let's capture what was discussed during our last meeting: we ended with the public comments. We received some feedback that the initial report was not emphasizing that the community should be reviewing the model, and decide on the structure of the auction proceeds. Some new

ideas were raised as well. Leadership and staff analysed the comments, and will present the analysis during today's call.

- Modified version of the public comment review tool, which we shared prior to the new year. Break down the comments, along the lines of the sections of the initial report, and the questions and recommendations.
- Further thinking about how to further facilitate your consideration. How to deal with input? Focusing on next step. Potential changes to the report might be needed.
- We added a column : analysis of the type of change suggested, and possible action. For those items where the CCWG is asked to consider certain perspectives, to assess what the next step might be for the CCWG. For those comments where no change was suggested, staff has put in the right column "thank you for the input, we appreciate your support for the recommendation".
- Way to develop a workplan for the next phase: we can line up the items that require further consideration.
- Example page 8: this recommendation is suggesting to consider enhancing option A. Staff labeled this a "new idea", and put together some preliminary recommendations.
- Concerns were raised that the comments are not helping us, since after 2 years of operation we did not come up with a report that was decisive and detailed enough
- There was a letter from the Board during/after the Barcelona meeting. For this particular Board letter we added a summary in this document. A reply should be formulated.

Action Item #1:

Group to revise the public comment review tool and to share thoughts on the recommendations made by the leadership team.

Action Item # 2:

Leadership team and CCWG to formulate answer to the Board's latest letter.

4. Next steps / proposed timeline

- Chair Ching Chiao suggests to give the group 2 weeks to further comment.
- Is a next public comment round needed?
- Chair suggests we have a better idea by the next meeting whether a next public comment period is needed or not. However, a second round means further delays in delivering the end results.
- Others say a second public comment round is inevitable due to the fact that our report asks too many questions, without taking any decisions, or that a second round would be needed more to the extent that we are not able to integrate the feedback from the community into the existing report.
- Some concerns were raised regarding what the group wants to achieve, other than a new comment round. The group needs to be more focused, and show a lot of progress, otherwise a second round will not be looked positively upon.

- Marika suggests for the group to work through to the comments and make updates as needed. Once the report has been updated, make the assessment whether the changes are fundamental enough to warrant a second round of public comment. Might be premature to say so now.
- Working Methods

There are substantial number of items that have been identified for further consideration. What is the best way of dealing with this? Go through those items collectively? Would offline work be helpful, e.g. via a google doc? Are smaller teams helpful here? A number of approaches are helpful to consider there. That helps us to work out a draft timeline leading into the final report, or a next report.

Action Item # 3

Chair suggests staff and the leadership team to spend further thoughts on how to help focusing the group on the leadership recommendations.

- Marika suggests the group to focus on reviewing the comments, and to flag concerns with the recommendations. Staff can put together clusters of topics that need to be addressed, including new ideas, so that the review can kick off.
- How to go through these questions? plenary style? 2-week meeting cycle, with set of questions and how to address whether changes are to be made to the report? Plenary style will take a lot of time.
- How is the CCWG supposed to deal with submissions where there are concerns? especially if there are checks and further study to be made of the submission idea

The CCWG will need to explain how those concerns were already considered and considered addressed, or consider how these concerns can be addressed, whether that is through further checks, further study and/or updates to the report / recommendations. In certain cases it may be a new concern that the group didn't think about yet, in other cases, it may be a concern that the group already considered and addressed as part of its recommendations. the group should focus on the review of comments and how that affects the recommendations, and only after that think about whether additional public comment is needed

- Categories in the public comment review tool, 3rd column: [Support], [Concern]: to flag anything that is not agreement, and not a completely new idea, [New idea]

5. Plans for ICANN64

- a. Monday 11 March – 13.30 – 15.00 local time
- b. Wednesday 13 March – 17.00 – 18.30 local time

Some concerns regarding the 2nd slot. Challenging for many SO/ACs.

Staff to verify whether there is an alternative slot for the second one.

We are most likely still in public comment review phase in Kobe, it is important for people to attend.

6. Confirm next meeting

13 February 2019, 14:00 UTC.

7. AOB

Reconfirmation of the membership. Not intended as a new call for volunteers. Ensure that we have a good participation level. Remind SO/ACs that is important that members actively participate, especially when we come to a consensus call.