

RECORDINGS

[Mp3](#)

[AC Recording](#)

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

PARTICIPATION

[Attendance & AC Chat](#)

Apologies: Sylvia Cadena, Mary Uduma, John Levine, Peter Vergote, Ching Chiao, Elliot Noss

Notes/ Action Items

NOTES / ACTION ITEMS

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.

Marilyn Cade is suggesting to have a role call. Every participant is to state its role and affiliation.

Note by staff: only members and participants are invited to the CCWG Auction Proceeds calls. Each chartering organization was able to appoint up to 5 members, while anyone is able to sign up as a participant.

There is no concept of "voting members". The group needs to reach a consensus decision. Membership / participant / observer information can also be found here: <https://community.icann.org/x/FpjDAw>

Action item #1:

When joining the AC room for future calls, members and participants to include behind brackets whether they are a member or participant, and for members to specify their appointing organisation. This helps to have an overview of the affiliations of those participating in the call.

2. Welcome / SOI & DOI updates

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

3. Discuss commitment and timeline for delivering Final Report by ICANN65 (see draft timeline attached)

How can we ensure that we have sufficient comment from all members to do the work and to finalise it?

Chair aims to conclude the work by this group by the Marrakech meeting (ICANN65)

Marika mentioned that the Policy Forum in Marrakech is a shorter meeting, less flexibility to have parallel meetings. Afternoons are dedicated to cross community sessions. Sufficient participation needed in order to have a productive meeting. Carving out time for this group means other groups may not be able to meet.

a. Is everyone committed to put in the work required to deliver a Final Report by ICANN65?

Marilyn: ICANN65 deadline is not realistic. Support from the chartering organisations is needed. Unlikely that ICANN65 can provide a workspace of at least 4 hours, needed to finalise much of our work, if we even meet the proposed timeline. We should take a slightly extended timeline and push forward on achieving decisions. Many people will not have travel funding. Those that cannot attend in person should still be able to contribute.

Chair is concerned that the money is frozen even longer before the process of building the implementation team can start.

Question regarding how to add sessions to the schedule. Marika clarifies that for the policy forum all requests need to go through an SO/AC to get a session on the schedule. The CCWG effort is part of the GNSO room allocation. For the policy forum 7 slots are set aside for cross-community sessions or high interest sessions, and we are not able to schedule anything against those slots. Staff is hopeful to be able to secure a 4h block. This is not a staff decision, factoring in needs of other groups, and ok by GNSO leadership team.

Planning deadline around 27 April. GNSO and ccNSO have already working on a draft schedule. EPDP also wants as much time as possible.

Chair: ideally we should have a longer session at ICANN65, aim for a very early draft to be ready by ICANN65, to be finalised at that meeting. Further work after Marrakech will be needed.

Workplan to be fine-tuned, depending on how much time can be carved out at ICANN65.

b. How can productivity be enhanced? Longer calls, more calls, more mailing list activity?

- Marika: meeting the Marrakech deadline is challenging with the current pace. Target and goal are not realistic if does not match with the workload scheduling.
- Maureen: task assigned to sub-groups are not always clear. Just getting started already took quite some time. Marilyn: we should appoint a lead to these sub-groups, to ensure the work gets done.
- Erika suggests to have calls with a 2,5 h duration? Test this for the next 2 calls. Comments regarding the preference for a max 2h call. Sebastien: check that the extension does not conflict with other calls. In principle agrees to move to 2 hours. Chair suggests to keep having calls every 2 weeks, but instead of 90 minutes, have calls for 120 minutes.
- Marika reminds group members what the focus of the group is: What - if anything - needs to be changed to the initial report? Look at examples in the annex, guidance that is provided in the annex.

Summary of the discussions:

- have a very early draft ready by Marrakech
- aim for a longer session at ICANN65
- extended duration of the 2-weekly calls. From 90 to 120 minutes
- discussions by the CCWG to be continued after Marrakech

4. Follow up on action items coming out of ICANN64:

a. Comment #4 (charter question #2) - Marilyn, Elliot, Jonathan, Alan and Maureen to develop draft language for inclusion

Marilyn will take the lead. Draft to be shared with full group on mailing list, if needed discussion can be scheduled during the next call.

b. Comment #1 (charter question #3) - CCWG to review the ICANN Board letter and reconsider during the next meeting whether or not to add the Board's language

Consensus to add a clarification to the report, to make clear what the Board envisaged role is? In principle there was no objection.

This refers to charter question number 3, and guidance provided regarding the implementation phase. Some of questions were raised regarding the role of staff and the board. This was discussed in Kobe as well: neither Board nor staff will be approving or evaluating individual projects.

Action item #2:

Report clarification: to be discussed again during the next meeting, due to its importance. Letter to be circulated again to the CCWG.

c. Status of FAQs

staff aims to share the draft to the mailing list, prior to the next meeting. e.g. will address questions regarding for instance legal and judiciary requirements, and the board input provided.

Action item #3:

staff to follow-up on status of FAQs via the CCWG AP mailing list

5. Continue review of public comment templates:

a. Charter question #4 input (see template attached)

during the previous meeting, we left off at comment number 7.

suggestion to keep the original proposal.

b. Charter question #5 input (see template attached)

comment by ICANN Board. This is an area where further guidance has been provided in previous letters.

Erika's suggestion for further investigation into an appropriate mechanism to define COI

Grant distribution mechanism is a different process than what ICANN does within its own processes. Implementation team should do more examination of what appropriate COI practices are.

Drafting needed of the guideline for the implementation team.

Carolina Caeiro: I agree with the idea that the implementation team should take care of outlining in detail the provisions to avoid Col. Perhaps we can reinforce our recommendation language, to say "Robust conflict of interest provisions must be developed and put in place ***at every phase of the process***, regardless of which mechanism is ultimately selected.

Action item #4:

Regarding COI: leadership team to formulate language, based on Carolina's proposal

c. Charter question #6 input (see template attached)

Marilyn: concern about inclusion and exclusion. Who can benefit from the project, vs where the proposal comes from.

Erika mentioned a basket approach: target certain topics, or certain regions.

Maureen Hilyard: Perhaps the wording does need to be altered to not exclude deserving projects that may not be in what are considered underserved regions, etc

Carolina Caeiro: My read of the comment was different. The rec is about mechanism B (ICANN+external org). I think the fear is that an external org would not have a clear sense for what orgs are close to ICANN and supporting its mission?

comment number 4

see recommendation from previous comment

d. Charter question #7 input (see template attached)

6. Confirm next steps and next meeting

Next meeting 10 April 14 UTC