

**Transcription ICANN Singapore  
Possible CWG on new gTLD Auction  
Saturday 07 February 2015**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#feb>

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

Jonathan Robinson: Great we're good to go. So the purpose of this next session is to discuss the council's view of an appetite for commissioning or initiating or working with others in the community on a CWG to determine best use or appropriate use of auction proceeds. That's the funds that have been derived from so-called ICANN auctions of the new gTLDs in the current round.

In order for a CWG to be initiated it will require communication with one or more other potential chartering organizations such as the ccNSO or others. It will require someone to pick that up and be motivated for and driven by a desire to do something with that.

So any thoughts, feedback input on that end in thinking about that think about whether you would be willing or are interested in doing anything about it?  
Brett?

Brett Fausett: Just to play the contrarian here I do think it's time for us to talk about this. This is the first time it has not been theoretical. We now have \$32 million so it's the appropriate time and I would support that.

I wonder why it needs to be a CWG? And this is money that came in through the gTLD program. Why would we invite the ccNSO to participate?

Jonathan Robinson: Great question and actually great context as well. There is \$32 million and perhaps more available to be dealt with in some way. What should we do with it? Avri?

Avri Doria: I think it's definitely time for that subject. I think it's been time for that subject before I thought we should have tried it and in fact NCSG has been pushing for a while, what it was something to start talking about it before money was burning a hole in somebody's pocket.

I agree that the ccNSO may not be the most appropriate partner in that but I do think a CWG makes sense.

And it's the advisory committees in a sense that we might want to get involved, the ALAC in the GAC that, you know, the GAC had various issues along the way of and this goes to some of the outreach that was being talked about earlier of, you know, how do we do the outreach how do we build the market in developing economies? And that's something that they would have an issue of.

So I would think that doing this in a CWG would make sense but I think I have a different notion of the partners so I think it's a great topic to bring up.

Jonathan Robinson: To be clear I wasn't suggesting that the ccNSO is the partner.

Avri Doria: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: I was just making it clear that it would require partnership with one or more it by definition it would require...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...a partnership with one or more...

Avri Doria: Understood.

Jonathan Robinson: ...other...

Avri Doria: And but it also feeds into what we were talking about before in terms of doing more development and developing.

Jonathan Robinson: Right.

Avri Doria: It's kind of the topic. I mean yes I know people say give it back to us...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Avri Doria: You know, but there's other notions.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I know Volker wants to speak. Does anyone else - has anyone else been missed who wanted - Volker go ahead and then...

Volker Greimann: Yes I just want to try to voice my agreement with my previous RHS that the use of this - these funds, the discussion of the use of these funds it's high time the board has been waiting for the community as stated at the last meeting and I think the meeting before that as well that they're waiting for the community to make a decision on what to do with these funds.

And I think we needed to move ahead quickly to figure out how to do this and what to do with these funds.

Personally I think they should not be allocated to any existing budgets but rather to issues that are currently not budgeted within ICANN. I have a few ideas but those are probably better voiced within the context of that working group once it is formed.

Jonathan Robinson: So it's Jonathan. Just a reminder that you should state your name before you speak so that it can be properly recorded.

In order to form a working group to do this that working group would need a charter. And it would need some other organization to be brought - one or more organizations to be brought in to form that chartering team. And in order to do that it needs someone to pick it up and run with it.

If anyone in a sort of individual capacity is anyone willing, has anyone got the bandwidth and believe they have the capability to pick this up and start to do something with it because that's a key issue?

Is there anyone around who feels that they have the sort of willingness, experience because this is going to take some, you know, diplomacy and ability to pick it up with other organizations and to run with it?

I don't want to be intimidating but on the other hand I don't want just anyone to feel that they could do it if they haven't had any relevant experience.

There may be someone willing to mentor or work with a willing volunteer. What are the thoughts as to whether anyone is prepared to start to pick this up?

Man: You didn't mention depth but I might run into the risk of being shallow but if there is some help there I would love to help in the direction.

I mean you could do it a consultant if you have 32 million. It depends how expensive meetings are.

Jonathan Robinson: That was - just remember your names for the record.

Man: I'm sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: And given...

Man: (Unintelligible)

Jonathan Robinson: I must say I had realized that there was a kind of fee involved so I'm actually now prepared to volunteer.

Man: Put my name down.

Brett Fausett: Jonathan you remind me of the - what is the work that needs to be done here? We need someone to draft a charter? Is that what you need?

Jonathan Robinson: We need someone to go out and knock on the door of the other SOs and ACs and say that that GNSO is intending to do something here and would like to work with others.

So I guess we need a - an initial outreach to go and talk to people informally and then probably a call for volunteers to join a drafting team.

But I just reluctant I mean I am reluctant to just put out - I don't think it's a GNSO called. Marika your thoughts?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just to give you some insight indeed how it has been done in recent CWGs and indeed it is an engagement.

And I think that has typically happened from the chairs level out as the first incident the communication to the different chairs saying we would like to work on this topic, are you interested?

Based on that feedback than it's it okay if you're interested can you then identify in each of your groups two or three people, you know, just a small group to actually develop a charter?

Work through that process, you know, check in with the different groups that are involved, you know, are you happy with the charter?

And once everyone is happy basically then start approval through the relevant processes and the different SOs and ACs that will be participating and following that you formed the working group.

There's also links in and a notice work going on on that on the CWG on CWG that's trying to formalize I think part of that process. But that is a bit I think the standard approach that we've been using at least for the most recent ones.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so that gives us a handy shortcut. Let's - I'll come back to you with here's the suggestion and that we should work around. And if you agree with it say so and if you've got any other comments.

But the suggestion clearly is therefore there's an action on me to write a note to and probably back that up with some other communication to fellow SO and AC chairs to tell them that we intend to initiate and would love to have their involvement in a CWG on auction proceeds and would like - so are we going - do we turn that into a call for volunteers? I mean do we make that straight into a call for volunteers? That's the question really?

Marika Konings: I think on the previous ones that was first a conversation or at least a confirmation...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...that those groups will be interested.

But it could be in the same way saying if you're interested, you know, assign two or three volunteers. I mean it could...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...be the same (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Let's be a little - let's tread a little careful. Let's put a note of saying we would like to do this and we would like to get an indication of interest.

But I think what I'd like to tell the board that it's our intention to initiate this. I'd like to be quite unequivocal with the board.

We've got a queue which is I think Avri, Brett did you have your hand up as well or that's no Thomas has got. So Avri, Brett, Avri, Thomas and then anyone else wants to comment?

Avri Doria: Yes before you became the (stuckey) for it I was just about to sort of say I wasn't sure about bandwidth but I was willing to help get this thing going.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So I think we'll bring you, yourself and (Carlos) in as volunteers into the drafting team as where I suspect this will go. And I just need to probably do the right thing and kick it off via a communication to the other chairs.

Thomas Rickert: We mentioned earlier that the ccNSO might not be the perfect partner for this cross community exercise. But now that we're talking about sending out invitations for this forecast remark might make me think whether it's actually the right thing to exclude the ccNSO.

You said that you would like to spend the money or allocate the money to things that have not been budgeted for inside ICANN.

And forecast had mentioned that. And, you know, I thought your original idea was the money come sort of from the GNSO and so it should stay inside the GNSO right?

And then I think it would be pertinent for the GNSO to maybe only have its own thinking and maybe consult other groups. But if this, if the outcome may be broader let's say put into the applicant support program or something along these lines then why not ask the ccNSO?

I mean the ccNSO has always been very diligently looking at ICANN budgets. You will remember that (Roloff Meyer) has been very active in that regard.

And I just want to be prepared as ccNSO liaison to answer that question...

Jonathan Robinson: Can I just ask clarifying point? Did anyone say we would not invite the ccNSO? I didn't hear that. All I heard was that the ccNSO so wasn't the only obvious other partner, not that that - I heard no one say we should not invite the ccNSO...

Thomas Rickert: Then it's all fine. Then I misheard what I heard. So fine good, I withdraw okay.

Jonathan Robinson: So just to clarify then I think the intention is that I will draft a note that goes to other SO, ICANN SO and AC chairs that says we are aware that it's now time if it wasn't before to initiate some bottom up community work on a CWG to look at best use of the auction proceeds.

And we would like to invite other SOs and ACs to join us and expect to put out a call for volunteers shortly. Any comment or input on that before we go to that next step and we would - yes go ahead.

Brett Fausett: Yes. And I was just going to complete that by saying maybe the tail end of that says that if we don't hear from you by such and such a date we will initiate this purely as a GNSO policy process.

Jonathan Robinson: Fair enough. Okay done on that item, everyone happy? Great and that puts us in a timely position to have a 15 minute coffee break so enjoy.

END