Recordings:
[Mp3](#)
[AC Recording](#)

Background Documents:

[Rec #1 Review Template - upd 7 Feb 2019](#)
[Leadership Proposals_comments_13Feb19](#)
[Public Comment Review Tool - 28 January 2019](#)

Participation:
[Attendance & AC Chat](#)
Apologies: Sally Costerton, Marika Konings

Notes/Action Items:

Notes & Action items – new gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG Meeting – 13 February 2019

These high-level notes are designed to help the CCWG navigate through the cotent 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. Feedback received on recommendations made by the leadership team in relation to the public comment review tool

- Group member commented that the leadership recommendations are not always clear: "invitation to check" for instance.
- How does the group comment on this? Chair clarified that technical checks are involved, in this case.
- Check needed, to see whether we overlooked something.

- Quick summary provided by staff of the comments received to date. Any further clarifications by the commenters? have we missed out something?
- Conflict of interest:
  - not clear that the COI for ICANN will be sufficient for managing allocating reviewing fund distribution.
  - That will need further consideration.

Action item #1:
- Staff to verify: have we sufficiently covered the COI issue?
- The group's report, which was sent out for public comments, never explicitly refers to the community review.
- e.g. CIRA, Nominet, SIDN. Outsourcing to experts versus insourcing for community review.
- A group member suggested staff intentionally overlooked this. Chair mentioned we may have overlooked it, but that was not on purpose. Several comments were received on this aspect, and the group will address this concern in a later phase.
- Some commentors raise entirely new ideas.
- In case the proposal is too new, the group might decide not to address that idea. e.g. different baskets depending on the type of project.

4. Commence review of input received on recommendation #1
   1. *Review updated template*

- The groups' recommendation was mainly focused on A and B, but C was still included as well. Some commenters suggested keeping option C. Someone suggested to neglect A totally.
- The group reviews the comments and the recommendations from the leadership team. We may have to send new questions to ICANN Org and the Board. e.g. independence is a topic that came up very often in the comment period.
- A lightweight funding processes, similiar to what CIRA AND nominet have, is worth reviewing in more detail
- A group member expressed a very strong preference for community review, and mentions that proposal number A should not be in there. ALAC was divided on this particular issue.
- Those who were against A (within ALAC) supported Elliot in that the feeling was that ICANN Org should not be involved in the decisions that this group has spent so much time on ensuring that they were the responsibility of the community

Action item #2:

Group to go back to the experts (e.g. nominet), and ask further clarifications on the in-house review model.
To verify how to incorporate the community review into the mechanisms.

1. Deliberate on suggestions from commenters and leadership recommendations

- Item 1: What does "effective and efficient" mean? cost-benefit analysis must take this into account

- Item 2: Based on today's discussion, see how community involvement fits into the recommendations: how can the community have an advisory role for each of the mechnisms? Suggestion by the chair to send a question to be sent to SO/AC leadership, for them to have a discussion in their own groups.This suggestion was not supported by one group member, because reaching out to the chairs does not provide you with the full input. There are sub-units for some SO/ACS, and you risk bypassing the community.

- Item 3: Confusion between item #2 and #3. number 3 says to enhance option A. Item #2 says to focus on B and C. We are giving a confusing message here.

Action item #3:
Leadership team to further clarify its recommendation on item #1, and send the updated version to the group for comments.

Action item #4:
Leadership team to combine the recommendations on item #2 and item #3. Make sure to keep option A, B, C in all iterations.

- Item 4: Go back to original recommendation, especially B. Do we need to re-evaluate option B? No further comments received

- Item 5

Action item #5:
The group to formulate questions to ICANN org or Board to ask for further clarifications, based on leadership recommendations

- Item 6:
    - Chair mentions it will be hard for the community to evaluate grants and make judgements.
    - Conflict of Interest topic might be too high. Maybe have a first evaluation by an independent panel, based on the criteria, and then have the evaluation done by the community.
    - Examples the group came up to guide the discussions in this group, to see what would be within ICANN's mission.
    - Difference between advising in an independent process, and being engaged in the process. The BC comments proposed an independent process but accepted

an advisory role, but not the community to review or approve, but to advise at a high level related to the mission; help to provide insights on the kinds of grants -- but not the actual grants.
- ○ Community member mentioned his involvement in a process for evaluation projects within European Commission.
- ○ Project reviewers need to be always independent. The criteria that the evaluators need to analyse for each project, come from experts.
- ○ Those criteria need to come from an icann community group, and that is where the consistency with ICANN's mission is being evaluated.

Action item #6
Leadership team to reword the first bullet point: should be more general in advising and engagement. Review mechanism is to be moved to the second bullet point. Review still to be defined.

- ● Item 7: The group has an understanding on this point. No further comments received

5. Confirm next steps & next meeting.

Next steps: rephrasing of the leadership recommendations, and based on the discussions during a leadership call, send the next version for review to the CCWG.

Action item #7
Staff to verify when the examples will be addressed.

Next meeting:
- ● Wednesday, 27 February 2019 at 14:00 UTC for 90 minutes.