

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 10 August 2010 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) 10 August 2010 at 13:00 UTC. 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 audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20100810.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

ALAC

Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC
Carlos Aguirre - At Large
Baudoin Schombe – At Large
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large

GNSO

Avri Doria - NCSG
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison
Andrew Mack – CBUC
Tony Harris – ISPCP

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachines

Richard Tindal – Individual

Michele Neylon - RrSG

ICANN staff

Karla Valente
Olof Nordling
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC

Alex Gakuru – NCSG
Erick Brunner Williams – Individual

Coordinator: Thank you. The recordings have been started. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. Gisela, can you do a roll on the call please?

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's JAS call on Tuesday the 10th of August. We have Avri Doria, Evan Leibovitch, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben-Jemaa, Baudoin Schombe, Sebastian Bachollet, Carlos Aguirre, Elaine Pruis, Richard Tindal, Michele Neylon. From staff we have Gisella Gruber-White, myself. Karla Valenta hasn't joined yet. And I have apologies from Alex Gakuru and Alan Greenberg.

I'll also remind everyone please to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. And Rafik Dammak will be joining shortly as well as Tony Harris. Over to you Evan and Avri.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah. Avri, give me about five minutes to finish setting things up.

Avri Doria: Okay. Great. So let me start with sort of a plan for the meeting. The agenda for this meeting is to basically continue walking through the comments and deciding what changes we need to make, what responses we want to give, what our reactions are to the comments.

Now what we have received is - first of all, we made it through to I believe Comment 5 on the Working Team 1 using the sort of breakdown that we had last week.

In addition, what's happened is (Carla) has sent us the first draft of the - first snapshot I guess of the more properly written comments. Now I didn't have a chance to map those against the way we were working before.

And what I'm suggesting is that we continue working the way we were before but we have these in front of us to make further reference as we're talking about them and working through them.

Also, I had taken on a task basically that had been brought up last time and had been mentioned several times before of sort of starting a list of things that we were not trying to get done in the next couple weeks. And I didn't get very far in that. I unfortunately or perhaps fortunately for my bank had paying work I had to do during the week that totally absorbed most of my time.

So I only started that this morning. I sent out an email with the first four points. Hopefully people can still hear me. I sent out email with the first four points and I'll continue working on it. I'm not suggesting that we talk about that today unless we make it through all the comments.

But I wanted to get that started. We can talk about that more on the list. If more items come up during today's conversation that belong on the list, I will talk about them and I'll add them to that list.

The other thing that needed to be done was to file a status update with our chartering bodies, in this case the GNSO and the ALAC. I filed one with the GNSO mentioning that, you know, we need to extend our deadline for our final report from the 15th of this month, which is I guess only a few days away to the -- five days away -- to the end of the month or actually the first week of September because we weren't going to - A, we hadn't finished the work.

We were still going through comments. We still needed to flesh out the discussion. But B, because we wouldn't have the comments from the non-English language reviews until the end of the month.

Now we still have a crowded schedule because what we're going to try and do is meet the deadline for materials given to the Board for their retreat on new gTLDs. And so we will have to basically - and I think that that is - I don't

have the date in front of me at the moment. But I believe that was September 3. But I'm terrible at numbers so I could be wrong. But that was the date we were going to for.

I received no negative or positive comment from the GNSO Council on the date extension and I'm basically going to operate as that is our date extension unless I hear from them - from Rafik who is our liaison saying no, no, no. And I guess also we need to hear from ALAC whether they have any objection to us taking the extra two to three weeks.

Evan, I don't know if you have anything (to add to that).

Evan Leibovitch: I don't have anything. Carlos is the liaison between this group and ALAC? Cheryl, you're on the call. Has anything been brought up to an ALAC meeting?

Avri Doria: Carlos is on the call also.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh.

Carlos Aguirre: Sorry. Sorry Evan. I believe the ALAC have no problem to continue the discussions to the end of the month.

Evan Leibovitch: Ah.

Carlos Aguirre: I think.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. Great. So I guess we can assume that unless we hear otherwise, you know, we're continuing and we're aiming for that deadline for reports into the Board for their gTLD retreat. I think that that is a critical milestone and I think

it's one that we can't cheat on a whole lot. You know, obviously we should try to hit it if - we should try to hit it. I won't say anything more.

The - I guess that was basically what I had to say as the beginning. For the agenda today basically to continue work through the comments. We're currently in the middle of Working Team 1 comments. We then will go to the Working Team 2 comments.

Oh yeah, the other thing to add is I believe we have added the second meeting. Is that correct Gisella?

Man: Yes. She send email.

Avri Doria: Right.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes. The second meeting Thursday at 12 UTC, 60 minutes for this week and from next week on it's 90 minutes.

Avri Doria: Okay. So because - thank you very much. And that you everybody for responding to the doddle request in a timely manner. Hopefully we've got a time that many people can meet.

So - because obviously even with the extra two weeks to make it to the end of this process - initial process and have a final report by then will be a challenge. So that's why the group on last week's call decided to add the extra call.

So at that point, I think we're on Work Team 1 Comment 5 if I remember correctly. And Evan if...

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry. I'm desperately - could be - could somebody from - send me the - I've got the - I've got the summary list. I don't have the full list in front of me.

Avri Doria: Okay. I'll send both things to you. Basically there's the - you mean you don't have the (Carla) - the full list (Carla) send you?

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah. I have the - I have the summary. I have the snapshot.

Avri Doria: Do you also - you don't - the other thing was the doc that was sent out. And that was - I can send you - quickly send you a copy of that.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah. I thought I had that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So I've got the draft snapshot in front of me.

Avri Doria: Right.

Evan Leibovitch: And...

Avri Doria: And we're on - and then the box there we're at WT1-5, which is on Page 7.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right. Page 7. All right. (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: But you don't have - you don't have Adobe, correct?

Evan Leibovitch: As of right now I'm still trying to get in so (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay. Well I'll let you know when we all have hands up. So I'll do shouting for, you know, hands that I see up so that we can do that part. But I'll let you do most of the talking because my roommates start to ask questions about why I was shouting in my room for the last hours.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right. The - all right. Have we gone through the Red Cross recommendations for WT1?

Avri Doria: Okay. You're looking at the...

Evan Leibovitch: I'm looking at the snapshot.

Avri Doria: Okay. You want to work that way as opposed to continuing to work through the document?

Evan Leibovitch: No. No. I don't have the document right in front of me. So right now I'm working with that I have.

Avri Doria: Oh, I thought you did. I thought you did.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. No. That's what I'm desperately looking for that now. I was looking for it before the call too. Okay. Anyway. Okay. Were we through the Red Cross recommendations?

Avri Doria: No. We had - we hadn't been doing it that way.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: So if we're going to start doing it that way, go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: No. No. I don't want to - I don't want to disrupt it. I'm just desperately trying to find...

Avri Doria: Right. Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Could you just get the link...

Avri Doria: It's also on the Web page.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Give me another 30 seconds because my computer's been crashing all around me.

Avri Doria: Okay. I'll (unintelligible) through WT1-5. The Working Group's current document offers ICANN several possible solutions to allow new gTLDs to be available to organization and/or communities without imposing artificial economic barriers.

Actually we had talked about - we had started talking about this one I think. I just didn't have any notes on this one. The status quo is so often mentioned within ICANN realm. If you examine the current ICANN budget, it is clear that economic barriers were removed to allow .museum to operate.

The Working Group's document recognizes that strict criteria for economic exceptions need to be laid down and that only a limited number of applicants would meet the criteria. Several companies including ourselves have stated that they would be willing to offer services to qualified applicants.

So that one basically probably doesn't call for any comment from us at this point. Anyone wish to comment on that? See no hands. Okay.

WT1-6. Concerns raised that various fee structures in the program evaluation auction, et cetera, are cost prohibitive for non-profit organizations and take away funds otherwise used to serve the public.

Lower the cost for non-profit organization, waive the cost of program development, stagger fees, partial refund from auction proceeds, lower registry fixed fees, reconsider risk contingency costs for applicants, consider reduction of fix variable costs.

So basically that is - sounds like an endorsement of the IBS put forward so far and I don't believe it has any new ones. I see Tijani has his hand up.
Tijani.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes. Thank you Avri. I was absent last week. And I don't know what this table represent. I didn't see it - I didn't see it on the Wiki page and I didn't receive any mail with it - with this table. So please can you explain me?

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes. I actually - I'm surprised that the page is on the Wiki page and I - what the table is in the middle of the document - the table was my attempt to take the comments and Carlos wrote up an initial review of the comments received. I took those. I sliced and diced them into those that were applicable to Work Team 1's efforts and those that were applicable to Work Team 2's efforts.

I stuck it in the middle of the document. The document is on the Wiki page. If you look on the Wiki page - oh, let me get that in front of me. If you look for the Wiki page under the heading Final Document Development. First there's the original template for final document. Then there's the V21, include comments and snapshot text.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes, I see it.

Avri Doria: So it is there. And there's both the doc version and a PDF version of it. What also has been sent - and I believe that it was sent to the list. But if not, I apologize. I did put it on the Wiki Page. And then there's a block under net that I added before this meeting on the comments saying where the full text of the comments can be found.

And also a version of the initial summary of comments that (Carla) has to send out. So basically what I did was I stuck the comments temporarily in place in the final document that's taking shape so that we'd have a direct reference to them.

What I did at the end of the last meeting was - because I've also been taking notes while people have been talking but very incomplete notes because I'm very bad at sharing and taking notes at the same time.

So I put those - I send my notes off to (Carla) and to Evan for augmentation. But I guess they had the same problems I had last week with additional time because, you know, a later version did not come up. What came out from (Carla) was the snapshot on comment review. So hopefully that explains where we are.

So if I can go back to W1-6 and Evan...

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...whenever you're ready jump in.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So right now I am on Page 8 of the document and WT1-6. Concerns raised at various fee structures in the program such as evaluation, auctions, et cetera, are cost prohibitive for non-profit orgs, takeaway funds, otherwise used to serve the public.

Lower the costs for non-profit organizations with the cost of program development, staggered fees, partial refund from auction proceeds, lower registry fixed fees, reconsider risk contingency cost per applicant, consider reduction of fixed and variable costs.

This is pretty close to what WT1 has already been talking about. Obviously there's some things such as auctions that can't be done in the first round. But, I mean that particular comment is essentially totally jiving with what we've been talking about. I don't know if there's any comments or questions on that one because that just seem generally in line with what we've already been talking about. Okay...

Avri Doria: I see no hands up.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Thank you because Adobe is still refusing to let me in and anyone on staff, if they can help me. I've also found that from other people that use Linux that Adobe Connect now no longer works for anything.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's been really flaky for more than just that operating system actually.

Evan Leibovitch: Anyway, so I have to officially give up on Adobe Connect. Anyway, getting back into the document. I am now onto WT1-7. And this goes to the comprehensive statement African and (AFRALLO) about the extent of support. I'm assuming that this is the exact same document that was submitted in Brussels at the meeting we attended.

Avri and I were both at the (AFRALLO,) African meeting where it was announced and I also mentioned it during the workshop. Tijani was anything changed between the version that was submitted in Brussels and the one that was submitted officially to the public comments?

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: No, it's the same.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: It wasn't changed.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Now we've already discussed that. I don't know - does anyone have any questions or comments? I mean it's summarized very briefly here but the document is a couple of pages and fairly comprehensive.

My only personal comment about it is that given the scope of what we're doing, we're finding I think worthwhile and deserving organizations around the world and I don't know whether or not it would be acceptable either community wise or otherwise to essentially to favor one region over others.

I mean if we have some kind of a means test that allows us to determine who's receiving it, I guess I'll leave it to the rest of the group onto what extent specific geographic factors come in to play.

For instance, we've got a submission from the American Red Cross elsewhere that talks about reducing costs for all non-profits anywhere. And I think most people on this group would probably think of it fairly of a different circumstance for the American Red Cross applying for a TLD versus a small NGO in Africa applying for a TLD.

Well does anyone else have any comments on that kind of thing because this...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...things.

Avri Doria: I have some hands up. Tijani had his hand up...

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...but he put it down.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes, because I realize that Evan is not seeing the Adobe so...

Avri Doria: I'm still watching that so I'll still announce the hands going up.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Okay. Okay. Thank you. So Evan intention wasn't to make the group say we have to give preference or priority to Africa. It's not the intention. But inside the statement there is, not specific, but more perhaps more detailed recommendation that perhaps need to be read and to be perhaps included in some parts of our report.

We can say in our report that the African community has submitted a statement, a specific statement for African applicants. That's all. I don't - I would not want the group to say the group will advantage the African applicants' applications.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tijani did you want to speak to the...

Avri Doria: I also have Carlos had his hand up too.

Evan Leibovitch: I know but I'm just following up with Tijani.

Avri Doria: Yeah (unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Did you have anything specifically you wanted to say about the document itself at this time?

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Not at this time but I will send an email if you want.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I want everybody - I want...

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...to encourage everybody on the call to pay attention for the document. If you haven't seen it already, it was submitted in Brussels. And it's actually fairly comprehensive and it's worth reading by everyone here. Who's next?

Avri Doria: You have Carlos.

Carlos Aguirre: Carlos.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Go ahead.

Carlos Aguirre: Thank you. I really with Tijani that the African countries need our support because have a disadvantaged position in the world. But I think like a short comment we need to see and other places need support also. For that I have also recommendation that the African segment - but we need to see another places also is my short comment.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: May I speak?

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead. Is it specifically to Carlos' comment?

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes. It's only to say that as I said in our report in our recommendations we will not give the priority to African countries or African applicants but we will say that the African community have issued a specific statement. And I encourage all the other regions to issue their own statement to express their point of view as a community to be included in the report as the African community did.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right. Do we have anyone next on the...

Avri Doria: No hands up.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Now in the document I have that is the end of the comments on Work Team 1. Avri, does this match what you've got?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Evan Leibovitch: So I mean given the fact that we basically said that Work Team 2 has more still on it's plate than Work Team 1. Avri, do you want me to go into work Team 2 a little since you've already taken...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Evan Leibovitch: ...some of my piece or...

Avri Doria: Oh please do. And what I think just before walking away from although we have (Andrew)'s hand up and I'll give you that in a second. What I have done is I have collected some comments from the discussions that we had last time and this time on Work Team 1. And I'll try and before our next meeting on Thursday have sort of put them together that looks at recommendations that we may or may not need to edit based on that.

The other thing we need to do still, and we can talk about that more next time, is how do we flesh out the description in the Work Team 1 document so that it gets to the point where we say this is our final recommendation pending review comments, et cetera.

Obviously they'll be one open period left which is when we get the comments from the non-English language reviews to see whether there's anything further that needs to - that and of course the non-English language reviews are a perfect time for other regions to speak the sort of proposal put forward by Tijani for other regions to get in a, you know, set of comments because it's still open for them to do it in their own languages for the most part.

So, yeah. So I would suggest moving on to WT2. I don't know that we need to end this end game be strictly divided by work teams anymore. I think we have a common document we need to finish.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I'm just talking in terms...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible). Right and you had (Andrew Lang) put his hand up. Yeah please because...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...I'm still in shouting mode.

(Andrew Lang): Sorry. Can you hear me Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

(Andrew Lang): Okay. Super. The only other piece that I think that I would like to talk into potentially into the WT1 basket that they sent that it's still divided by subject matter not by team. It's something that we talked about a little bit for WT2 (and) for WT1, which is this idea of a bundled pricing to get more scripts on the Web.

And I think that there's an aspect of that, that is WT2 but an aspect of that that is about pricing and might fall into WT1 and I know that there was some thinking that went on around that. I didn't see it in our list of seven.

Avri Doria: That's right. Those - this is Avri. Those comments and I didn't conclude them and probably should have were in the - we're not in the roll up of written comments but they were comments that I think came out of the open meeting. So it's very good that you brought it back up. And I should go through and collect those (unintelligible).

(Andrew Lang): Yeah. I mean I think it does have something that we could put numbers around relatively quickly and again would be something that would be a nice - we're saying to the community that we get the concept that, you know, we get the concept of offering things in keeping with the spirit of cost recovery, et cetera. So I just think that's something we should move forward on if we can.

I don't know the numbers but I think they would - that we should have some sort of a proposal to say, you know, here are some different ideas. Let's look at them at the very minimum.

Evan Leibovitch: Do you have any specific wording that you'd like to add?

(Andrew Lang): I tried (just write) together some things when we talked about last week. I sent a big email before the last (phone) call. Basically talking about the idea that we might have two different levels of two different tiers of IDNs because there's certainly going to be some IDNs that are likely to be well, you know, well covered and others that are going to be less well covered. I don't have specific language outside from that but I would be happy to sit down and work with someone on that language.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Do you want to take that to email and we can, I mean, I'm happy to work with you offline on that.

(Andrew Lang): Okay, that'd be great.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So is there anybody else? Oh this is wonderful. I have...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Richard Tindal still has his hand up.

Evan Leibovitch: I have Adobe Connect on but I've lost my mouse when I'm on my Adobe screen.

Avri Doria: Okay. So you can...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...everything.

Evan Leibovitch: Richard? Okay. Go ahead.

Richard Tindal: Yeah, on the point of multiple scripts, and I know we'll take it to email so we can discuss it there. But I'm sympathetic with the objective there but my concern is that if we accept that it's going to be a limited amount of support, I think what we're saying if we support someone with multiple script applications is that someone who's applying for more than one field may receive support where someone else who's only applying for one TLD will not.

So in the sense that there are going to have to be tradeoffs between where support resources are available I guess I'm a little sensitive to the notion that someone who's applying for two or three different TLDs might (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Dropped out there Richard.

Evan Leibovitch: Do you really foresee this being an issue Richard? I mean if we're talking about, you know, people who can barely afford to do one, are there really - I mean can you see a way that isn't gaming the system where people are going to want subsidies on having a bunch of them?

Richard Tindal: Well I thought that was what was being proposed, that someone - a needy applicant would receive support for one TLD and then would receive additional support for other versions of that. Is that not what's being proposed (Andrew)?

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew Lang): No. No. Richard I don't think that's it at all. I think, although I understand your concern now. What we had initially was we proposed was looking at two different baskets of support, right. One support will be for people to get in the door and the other one is for people who are interested in building out to try and encourage them to buy effectively the six-pack instead of one beer.

And the idea there being the costs of - the costs to get these additional scripts on especially to see - that each ICANN application is taken as if it were made of old cloth and completely separate single needle tailoring kind of thing.

And we should facilitate allowing one - effectively one application for a basket of scripts to go through. So I can see someone who is getting a new TLD in Latin or in Latin and a common script, give them an incentive to build out in these other scripts.

That's the only - that's the way that I had understood it.

Richard Tindal: So are you suggesting that that applicant would not be a needy applicant then necessarily?

(Andrew Lang): Wouldn't necessarily need to be, exactly. And so...

Richard Tindal: Okay.

(Andrew Lang): ...that gets us around your issue. I agree with you completely. If you're talking about a needy applicant who can - who will have trouble making it in one script and offering them the subsidy to do it in multiple doesn't seem to make much sense.

But there are others who could serve additional communities and additional language groups by being encouraged to do it who might not be able to otherwise make the economic case for building out in those scripts. That's the idea.

Richard Tindal: Okay. All right. So in that case then let's take it to the email list. I'm just wondering how that, you know, where that fits in our charter of support for needy applicants because we're really - we have a different objective now with this (recon-session). It's not really about needy applicants. It's more

about, you know, multiplying IDN scripts in the (rue) as opposed to needy applicants now.

For example...

Evan Leibovitch: I don't know if I'd agree with that Richard because I don't see that the two are necessarily decoupled. Reducing cost through volume is reducing cost through volume even, you know, even and maybe especially if it's for needy applicants.

Richard Tindal: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Elaine Pruis: Well this is Elaine. I can't raise my hand but I do have a comment on this when it's my turn. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Well please go ahead because you haven't spoken yet.

Elaine Pruis: All right. Well I would like to just say that I agree with Richard. I think that this secession should be more in the new gTLD application guidebook pricing, not - it doesn't belong in our working group in that the people who did ask for bundling got two comments. I think one was from (Keith Oblanco) and he was saying that his corporate clients like to build out in multiple scripts. And I don't think that our corporate client wished that our profile as a needy applicant.

And there was another one, and unfortunately I can't remember who it was. I think it was Chuck Gomes from VeriCenter. I hardly see that building out in multiple scripts would necessarily serve a specific community as compared to a single script for (zoo nation) for instance.

So I've already said this in the email on the list that these comments were submitted for the draft applicant guidebook and I think that's where this discussion belongs rather than within our working group. Thanks.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Tijani. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Tijani. Yes. I didn't raise my hand but if you would not mind I can...

Evan Leibovitch: No go ahead.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Okay. I propose that (Andrew) dropped his idea and send it by email so that it would be very clear. I really support what Elaine said but I would like to see - to read clearly the idea of (Andrew).

(Andrew Lang): Okay Tijani. I am happy to do this. We have actually had this on our list and in our documents for the last, I don't know, two or three months. And we have had good comments from Carlos and from Alex and others talking about the goals of getting the languages like Amharic and others on the Web. And...

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes.

(Andrew Lang): ...it strikes me that that is very much within our purview. If the goal is to help, you know, I mean if the goal is to - if part of our goal is to make sure that new applicants get in, those new applicants we've already determined don't need to be just NGOs. And they don't need to be just Africans and, you know, I mean that's a - a big part of doing this is to expand the district and diverse voices on the Web.

I noticed that's one of the reasons why we're trying to do this. And so while I understand that there may be some people who, you know, I guess my concern goes back to the comments from the commercial sector is I get you

completely. And at the same time if these are languages that are not going to be on the Web, it's going to - and if it costs ICANN little or nothing to approve this, especially that this is a positive that we can offer that will have benefits into our working groups.

But I will work on this with whoever wants to try and make it clearer if it's not clear now.

Avri Doria: Okay. Hi. This is Avri. I'd like to put in a comment. One is, I mean, I see this bullet is in the document. It wasn't in as a comment but it was in a document.

Two, I don't know that our charter included - I think you're right. One of the reasons for IDN gTLDs is indeed to try and get IDNs out there in little used languages. I don't think that that is specifically in the charter of this group. In this group it's to help those who are needy applicants be able to participate.

Now obviously in a (veck) diagram there would be overlaps between those two goals. But I do think it's important to keep any of the proposals that we put in plays in the terminology of helping the needy applicant, not in terms - and I'm not speaking whether a bundling proposal should be there or not but any of its rationale needs to be on helping the needy applicant, not the goal of expanding IDNs in non-represented languages at the moment. Those - they're perhaps related but one is our goal and one is not. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

(Andrew Lang): Okay Avri. We're just - I just wanted to bring to the attention of the group that we have had this in the document for a long time. We've discussed it a number of times. And it strikes me as a fairly big change.

I understand the rationale behind it but given that we've already gone out to the community with this as part of our conversations, I'd love to see if we

could get your help in squaring that circle because I think that there is interest and I do think it would be a benefit.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Are there any more hands up on this issue?

Avri Doria: No hands at the moment.

Evan Leibovitch: It's im - actually I'm - I have Adobe on another screen halfway around the room.

Woman: I just wish you were videocasting this experience because...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...I think it would be very, very interesting for us all to have a record of you trying to deal with these challenges of the Adobe room.

Evan Leibovitch: ...be in help. Anyway. Okay. Not having any hands up on this, are we okay to move to the next issue? All right. Now so we - I'm on Page 11 of the document at WT2-1. Avri was this covered previously?

Avri Doria: No. We didn't cover any of the working two issues. Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: We were moving through Work Team 1. We're not at the end so we're just starting 2.

Evan Leibovitch: All right. So, WT2-1 - the targeting of ethnic and linguistic communities in the initial pilot phase while providing preference to applicants geographically located in emerging markets and in languages as presence is limited. The document also presents appropriate criteria for determining who would not qualify for special support.

Some additional thoughts should be given however to the evaluation process for those applicants who wish to participate including the timing and resources required.

The transparency of the process, including information about the applicants, details of the program applications as well as financial or other support received is particularly important to foster confidence in the program. So (Jamie)?

Avri Doria: I have - this is Avri. I have a comment on that one and I see Tijani just put up his hands. That is actually one of the issues that I listed as things we would do later. In other words, one of the things I had put in my list, and we would put a markup board in the document was the notion of, you know, definition of mechanisms.

For example, an external review committee operating under a set of guidelines for determining whether an application for special consideration is to be granted such and what sort of help should be offered.

So that whole how this would be done not, and as in this set of recommendations, we're sort of recommending what should be done, make sure that the Board's got it, make sure there's a section of the document that says we acknowledge that we need to offer further guidance on how it should be done but not actually tackle that work item at the moment is sort of my recommendation, but Tijani has his hand up and I jumped in in front of him.

Evan Leibovitch: And I've got something to say too but Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Okay thank you. I have read on the comments that American Red Cross opposed strongly to the fact that the initial or the pilot phase will prioritize the linguistic and ethnic applications. They wanted it to be extended to the not for profit applicants.

Evan Leibovitch: In other words...

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: So...

Evan Leibovitch: ...is a non-profit.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Pardon?

Evan Leibovitch: In other words, anybody who's a non-profit regardless of...

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes. That's exactly what these say. And I want to the group to discuss this point. It's very important.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm going to add one other thing about...

Avri Doria: Yes. That was W2 T - WT2-4, sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, could you repeat that?

Avri Doria: That Red Cross point showed up under WT2-4...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...was where that one was specifically referenced.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, what I - the comment that I want to make is something that I interpret out of this comment in asking for transparency. If I read this comment right at

what's being asked for is essentially giving up some privacy of the application in return for a transparent process that's helps in the evaluation.

That is there's somebody or some reg - if some applicant is going after a TLD that is asking for this kind of financial support that the request itself should be transparent and the process of evaluation needs to be transparent. And that essentially means that some of the privacy that applicants have right now in putting them forward may have to be foregone in return for being a subsidy process.

Do I read this right and if so what do other people feel about it. I see Michele's hand up.

Michele Neylon: Yes. Just - I haven't read the full comments on this just but the thing about giving all not for profits or non-profits access sounds a bit screwed up to me. It - just because an entity is a not for profit or non-profit doesn't mean that it cannot afford to pay the fees. I think that's - that should be a key thing.

I mean know of some very, very large not for profit and non-profit organizations that would have millions of Euro in reserve. So they would be more than capable of paying the same - the fees of - whatever fees that ICANN or any other organization might wish to levy. It gives a...

Evan Leibovitch: Michele is the issue one of size or of purpose?

Michele Neylon: Beg your pardon?

Evan Leibovitch: Is the issue one of size or of purpose?

Michele Neylon: That's irrelevant.

Avri Doria: Can I ask...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: If they were meant to be things - I mean my understanding of this is that we're looking at helping organizations that economically could not afford to have a new TLD.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: It doesn't matter a damn how big, how small or for what purpose that organization exists. I mean putting it very - that's my understanding of it.

Tony Harris: Could I get in queue, Tony Harris?

Avri Doria: Right. We've got a queue now of Michele, Carlos, Tijani.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...then Carlos. Avri, then Carlos, then Tijani, and then...

Tony Harris: And Tony Harris.

Evan Leibovitch: ...then Tony. Okay Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. I only wanted to add a quick explanatory comment. First of all when Red Cross speaks of non-profit and there's a slight language issue, they normally are referring to the charitable organization.

And the argument that they often make and I'm just passing on information, not necessarily making the argument is that while they may appear to have money, their main focus of money is giving that money to the charitable cause and not spending it on these overhead items.

So I - it - while it doesn't quite fit into the notion of they are, you know, the financially unable, the argument is being made that they really may appear rich but they aren't because they need to keep the overhead down so that they can get maximum help to the Haiti disaster or to the other.

So the non-profit definition that is used by Red Cross normally means the charitable service organization, just if that one be thought of but that - I just wanted to add that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have Carlos then Tijani then Tony. Carlos go ahead.

Carlos Aguirre: Thank you Evan. I think in order to be transparent in this process, in order to be equal the process for all, I want to put focus on the - some paragraph in the American Red Cross statement.

When the American Red Cross say significant outreach and a location networks are needed and should begin immediately and then increase once the final applicant guidebook is released allowing for the ability to timely ask questions and seek guidance.

I - for me, this paragraph is very, very, very important in order to be - to be equal process for all applicants in the world. So I want to put focus on this paragraph. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tijani and then Tony.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Okay. The intention of enlarge it to the - for - to the - for non-profit or non for profit applicants, it's not to ignore all for non for profit applicants to access to this mechanism. There is not only this condition. And I - myself I am against any condition.

I wanted to remove this filter which - that says we prioritize this or this other applicants. We - there is other criteria - criteria of if they are really needing

the support. It is one of the main points in the (observation) 20, they have to be needy.

If they don't need it, they would not have it. So the first criteria is that they need it. And there is also other criteria. If it's a language that is not - doesn't have an existence - an existing on the Net, it will be good to help them if they don't have money to apply, help them to apply.

There is a lot of criteria but we don't have to put a filter at the entry to say we prioritize this kind of application. That is the intention. The intention wasn't to say we will give support to all the non for profit applicants.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes. I have two very short comments with regards to the Red Cross situation. I think you could probably accommodate that by these lead by expanding the concept of saying on the one hand you have a non-profit associations and charitable associations would be a category unto themselves. And by definition, we let's say consider it as valid for the - for whatever assistance is being offered.

And my second profit - my second comment goes to non-profits and what was said about the fact that there are some huge non-profits. ICANN would probably be an example who could easily afford the cost of an application.

Perhaps one solution would be, and this gets away even from the geographic concerns, to say that non-profit entities that qualify for assistance would be those whose last let's say two balance sheets, two yearly balance sheets show that the funds that they intake per year are less than the application fee, in other words, less than \$185,000 per year. That's just a suggestion. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have (Andrew)'s hand up. Go ahead.

(Andrew Lang): Yes. I'm a little concerned that we're going back and revisiting this issue in the way that we are only because I - we talked about this early on. And I think that there was some agreement. And I think that this was also reflected in the conversation about the - about some - from the African statement that said that two things, number 1 is that we give - we were a little bit dangerous to just to give blanket preference to NGOs.

But the other thing is that what it means to be an NGO means different things in different jurisdictions. And so I guess I'm agreeing with Tijani pretty strongly that Number 1, we should be need based, and I have a hard time having worked with the Red Cross here in Washington, imagining that they have a need for a preference.

And the second thing is that I think that when we get into this idea of a blanket approval or a blanket opening to the NGO sector, I mean NGOs literally different to different countries. So I - then we need to figure out what an NGO is. And I think we may be better off just saying let's do it on the basis of need.

Woman: (Philip) dropped out.

Woman: I don't know if he dropped out.

Woman: Or maybe just send it to (Andrew), were you done?

(Andrew Lang): I was, yes, sorry.

Woman: Okay.

(Andrew Lang): I tried to be brief. I hope that made sense.

Yes: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Give me for I - Adobe again. Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. I have my hand up and it's almost the end of the meeting. So.

Evan Leibovitch: Avri I got your hand up. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. My comment first to (Andrew) is that the reason that we are reviewing all of these things and going back to them is based on the comments. And I think it's perfectly justifiable for us to review our reasoning in terms of the comments. If we come out in the same place again, that's fine.

But I think the comment merits the going through the rethinking and sort of saying where do we end up given any new consideration that the comment brings into it. I...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew Lang): Fair enough. Okay. I take your point.

Avri Doria: Okay. I agree - I think Tijani makes a good point in that it's the criteria of need although we did at a certain point say the linguistic and cultural have a priority. That was what Tony said perhaps we do want - and this is a change that you all could decide to make as you discuss it more is linguistic, cultural and charitable service as a third category that meets that initial filter and then you're still looking at need.

There's no blanket, you know, opening to say well just because you are a service organization you therefore have need, it's just sort of saying that yes, we originally gave preference to linguistic and cultural in this path. We considered a comment and then we either did or didn't decide to add cultural and linguistic.

And we've got a minute left. I suggest we keep going through these both on the list and continue from where we are at the next meeting. And I pass it back to Evan. Sorry for taking up so much time.

Evan Leibovitch: No. Well considering that we're exactly (into) our hour, there's probably not a lot left to (unintelligible). We've got to cut it off at this point. One of my frustrations is that so little of this is taken to the email list. We have nice lively phone calls and then very often the gap between the phone calls is just near dead on the email list.

We really need to pick up the offline conversations if we're really going to be moving forward on this because of - you're absolutely right in that I think it was - was it (Andrew) that said, you know, where we continue to revisit things. And part of that is because, you know, we forget things from one week to the next.

Please, please use the mailing lists. We need to keep the discussion up and we can't wait a week before we revisit this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You're still going to end up revisiting. It's the nature of some work groups I'm afraid.

Evan Leibovitch: I under...

Woman: You've got Sebastian.

Evan Leibovitch: I understand but it's still going to - I'm still going to try and encourage people to use the mailing lists.

Woman: You have Sebastian.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry. Is Sebastian on the call?

Avri Doria: He is and he has his hand up and he had it up just as I was stopping talking.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Well we're an hour into the call so Sebastian you do have the last word.

Sebastian Bachollet: No I don't want to have the last word. First, do you hear me well?

Evan Leibovitch: Absolutely. Go ahead.

Sebastian Bachollet: Okay. No, I think what Cheryl just say it's important Evan. I think the nature of this - and the internationalized real side of the group, it's one of the reason I think it's more difficult to exchange by mail because of linguistic barrier even if all the people in this (college) fluent in English, it's not the same thing to exchange a lot of idea on - in English.

And my last thought it was about charity. I am not sure that - charity already know how to raise money. As the question is that do we need to support them or do we need to support new people who don't have these (specificity) to leverage money outside.

But that could be something we discuss on the mailing list. Thank you Evan.

Karla Valenta: Evan this is (Carla). Can I say one thing?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I guess you get the last word.

Karla Valenta: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Apologies for being late first of all. The second is, I would like to have some clarity from the group. We have two documents now. We have the actual report and then we have also a summary of the comments.

How are we going to present this to the Board because if we just add the sum - if we collate those two documents and add the summary to the report, it's

going to be a huge document and I doubt that the Board is going to read, you know, a single document that big...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Carla).

Karla Valenta: ...(leasing).

Avri Doria: (Carla) I suggest that we first of all have an offline conversation about, you know, this meta issue and then we can get into it again at the next meeting. I don't know that we need to, you know...

Karla Valenta: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...take this call later to discuss that one now.

Karla Valenta: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right. I still see some hands up or has everyone - I've got Avri...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: No. Yes, my hand is down.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: Sebastian did speak. I think you should call the call.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Well if that's the case then okay. I guess we'll see you in a few days. Don't forget we have the second meeting this week, so please see you back in a few days and we - maybe we can get this stuff through after all.

But please (unintelligible).

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

END