SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 10 May 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 May 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-20100510.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

ALAC
Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC
Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large
Carlos Aguirre - At Large

GNSO
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison
Alex Gakuru - NCSG
Andrew Mack - CBUC? (in the process of being accepted as a member of the BC)

Michele Neylon - RrSG

Fabien Betremieux - Individual - AFNIC
Richard Tindal - Individual

ICANN staff
Olof Nordling
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:
Avri Doria - NCSG
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Dave Kisoondoyal – ALAC
Baudouin Schombe - NCSG
Olga Cavalli - NCA
Vanda Scartezini - ICANN Board
Tony Harris – ISP
Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachines

Gisella Gruber-White: Evan would you like a quick roll call?

Evan Leibovitch: Are we recording yet?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Thank you. Welcome and happy Monday everybody to this meeting of the working group. Because of the relatively short notice, first of all I appreciate you all coming on this fairly short notice. One of the things I guess we'd like to find out ongoing at the end of the call is whether or not Mondays like this will be okay on an ongoing basis. But we have I guess some of the basic house cleaning. So Gisella take it away with the roll call.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On Today's call we have Evan Leibovitch, Rafik Dammak, Alex Gakuru, Michele Neylon, Alan Greenberg, Carlos Aguirre, Richard Tindal, Sebastien Bachollet, Tijani Ben Jemaa will be joining us shortly; from staff we have Olof Nordling, Glen de Saint Géry, myself Gisella Gruber-White, and we have apologies from Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Vanda Scartezini. Thank you, over to your Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so hopefully the agenda is fairly straightforward we can get through this. I guess the first thing the update of statements of interests. So I guess Gisella would you or somebody else from staff be able to tell us who has yet not sent in their SOIs?

Gisella Gruber-White: Glen is dealing with the statements of interests. She is on the call but on the road. So what I suggest is that after the call we will do an update via email and the statements of interests receipts so far and those still missing.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Olof Nordling: And this is Olof, what of course can be questioned to those present is whether there are any updates that they want to make vocally on the call.

Evan Leibovitch: We're just making sure to everybody on the call if you haven't sent yours already, please do. You could do like what I've done and essentially ask staff to reuse the statement of interest already submitted to another group because, you know, your conflicts don't significantly change I think from one working group to the next. So please if you haven't, get in those statements of interest.

Okay, next thing is the working group charter approval. In the Adobe Connect room right now we have a draft charter, and so what I'd like to do is essentially open the floor to comments on this with the intention of officially approving it.

So first off if you haven't read it, please do so quickly. While this is happening, does anyone have any questions or comments?

Man: Not a question on the charter but whoever has control of the screen, could they make it all visible?

Man: Yes.

Man: I have...

Man: I...

Man: I have no...

Man: I...

Man: I have no scroll bar. Oh, okay.

Olof Nordling: You should be able to scroll it now. Sorry.

Man: Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Olof Nordling: Just a little comment that I think you can see it all in the - on the screen in Adobe Connect the actual, the charter because that's only the first part of it up to and including Objective 5. And just for your information, this is exactly what I sent out following our previous call last week. So there are no changes in relations to that. That so CNO. If you read that one, you read this.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Does anyone have any comments or questions or especially with things such as the timeline. It does look fairly aggressive, but I think it's something that we can do.

Alan Greenberg: I question the first sentence. It's Alan speaking.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: That it implies our sole purpose is to propose policy recommendations. And certainly part of the possible outcomes are what would generally be called best practices or things like that that is alternatives the eval - the applicants may use which don't involve ICANN policy but may address the long - the problem.

Alan Greenberg: So in other words, you're suggesting changing the term "policy recommendations" to - let's see...

Olof Nordling: May I suggest to simplify that -- this is Olof -- you have to delete "policy."

Alan Greenberg: That's what I was going to suggest because the specific objectives certainly address things that are not policy, so I see no reason to limit it in the lead-in sentence.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have no problem with that. Michele, go.

Michele Neylon: I was going to suggest "proposed solutions" instead of "policy recommendations"...

Evan Leibovitch: (Unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: ...as possible solutions.

Evan Leibovitch: What you're feeling about just scratching the word "policy" proposed recommendations? Doesn't that imply solutions?

Michele Neylon: A bit weaker though with no. I mean a recommendation to me is something very passive, whereas a solution sounds more active. But to be perfectly honest, I don't really have a particularly strong feeling one way or the other and I'm just going to argue about this on a purely linguistic basis, which is a bit pointless.

But, you know...

Evan Leibovitch: I...

Michele Neylon: I...

Evan Leibovitch: I -- yes, Michele, I think solutions is too strong. If one of the items is go to the large registrars and beg, I don't think that's a solution but it's a recommendation or registry...

Michele Neylon: No, that's fair enough. No, I mean, as I say, I mean, I'm - it's just - it was just a - it was just my suggest -- the suggestion I had to remove policy. I mean, yes, I - but I do love the idea of people begging. I do like that.

Evan Leibovitch: So we're going to change this to "evaluate and propose recommendations and ways to plead and beg regarding specific support." So, are you okay with just taking out the word policy and just - or what do you think, I mean, or should we set ourselves a bit of a higher bar and say we want to come through - we want to come out of this with solutions.

Michele Neylon: I don't think so -- I think we're better off restricting ourselves to what we can possibly achieve. I mean, if an ICANN working group is capable of actually achieving the goals (inside itself) at the (outsets) that would be a good result, never mind whether it can actually have some impact on the real world. If it can actually achieve its own goals, that will be good.

Evan Leibovitch: (Coming out) with something good is one thing, whether or not we get listened to is another. Okay, I get it.

Olof Nordling: So Olof here. As you may have noticed, there is a note part where I can actually draft and modify the text online. I screw up last time, that really got this (reader) mixed up, but I managed to sort it out after the call. But so...

Man: So...

Olof Nordling: ...up in the right-hand corner you'll see a notepad with - where I've got edit online. I can't edit online in the big screen document because that's in a - that's a PDF, and - but I can edit the text up here. So I just deleted "policy" so "proposed recommendations" this is how it goes right now.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Does anyone on the call have a problem with this? Richard, Glen, you have anything to add to this?

Man: No.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Man: (It's okay).

Evan Leibovitch: Going once. Going twice.

Man: It's -- I'll just make one quit comment and it's not a request to change. One of the things discussed in the last meeting was in fact somewhat counter to the premises in the original board resolution and the GNSO resolution, they're saying that - the implication though is that we could not change ICANN policy. That is, we had to adhere to it. The discussion last week went a little bit in the direction saying we shouldn't ignore that completely, that may be something that we need to do.

                 And I note that Objective 4 essentially does - I think it's -- well, one of the Objectives 4 or 5 in fact does cover that although that may not have been what it was originally meant. But we're not out - not ruling out changing ICANN policy to - as one of the possible solutions. So I support what we're looking at right now.

Evan Leibovitch: There's also issues of interpretation, for instance, what does cost recovery mean. I mean, so the GNSO (said)...

Man: I....

Evan Leibovitch: ...based on cost (reduction)...

Man: I - I'm not disagreeing, I'm just pointing out that we are not ruling out policy change by what we have.

Evan Leibovitch: Understood. Okay, Richard.

Richard Tindal: Yes, just on that point, my understanding of our discussion last week on that was that we were looking - so the board resolution and the GNSO require cost recovery, my understanding was that we were sort of tackling that three ways. One way might be that we think that the current fee structure is not in fact cost recovery, it's actually overstated. I think that was one argument made last week.

Therefore, my reading of Objection 2 is that one path there would look at areas where the current fee structure is inaccurate basically. So my reading of Objective 2 is that perhaps they're a certain type of applicant, we think that the current fee structure is in fact not cost recovery or in fact we might find for every applicant that the fee structure is not cost recovery either.

So my understanding was -- and perhaps we could clarify this now -- my understanding was that this was not something in Objective 2 where we're saying, "Well, no we don't care, you know, what - it's cost recovery or not, we still intend to find a way to reduce the fee." That was not in my understanding from last week, but rather that we were looking at ways where in fact we could demonstrate that in fact the fee was not (probably) cost recovery.

So perhaps I've got that wrong, or if not, we could clarify that now.

Evan Leibovitch: No Richard I think you're exactly right. I mean what we're doing is we're not going back to GNSO and say cost recovery is a bad idea, we're simply saying that somebody has perhaps interpreted this (lee) - interpreted this a bit too broadly.

And so it's possible to come back in saying, "No, we agree, you know, we're adhering to the policy of cost recovery, but we think it should be interpreted differently." So I think you're exactly right that we're not inconsistent with that at all.

Okay, just to close off this part of it. I don't see or hear from many people that have a problem with the document that Olof has put up with the exception of the one word that we have deleted. Everybody okay -- don't forget to go beyond the objectives, have a look at the milestones and the timeline that's right underneath. It seems a bit on the aggressive side, but it just might be doable.

The -- so does anyone - is everybody okay? Because if we can move on and there's not a lot of contention on this, we can approve this and move on to other things. Is there any last comments, questions or clarifications?

Carlos are you -- is Carlos on the call. I see him in Adobe. Carlos do you have something to add either in Adobe or by voice? Okay.

Man: (Evan, it's fine with me).

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry.

Alex Gakuru: This is Alex, and we (wait) for the other. Just for the record I do not have Adobe at the moment so, but I don't think there is substantive change to the document. So I'm depending on what I'm hearing.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Man: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Alan, go.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, the date of June 15 for posting a recommendation I think (pa) - goes past aggressive and perhaps completely unreasonable. Now if the group is happy with that, I'm happy to leave it. Posting something that's in a report form by June 15 which is about five weeks away, means we have to start drafting it in a couple of weeks. So I think it's overly aggressive. And posting

something may be possible, whether it's really a - something we could call a draft of the recommendations I'm not sure. But I'm happy to leave it as a target.

Evan Leibovitch: What about the idea of for the milestone of the 15th, rather than calling it initial recommendation, basically a snapshot of where we are?

Man: I mean...

Olof Nordling: Could I suggest -- this is Olof -- that we could soften it up since recommendation perhaps has a heavier - heavy meaning still for what we can achieve until that deadline. So posting of initial findings.

Alan Greenberg: (I did find) - I just note that the 15th is too late to formally discuss it in Brussels. So I...

Olof Nordling: Formally, yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Olof Nordling: Nevertheless, we've - various - following the GNSO resolution, we should have something for Brussels.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: (What about) the idea is it unreasonable to call it a snapshot. Just saying here's - as of the deadline for submitting something for comment, here's where we are.

Olof Nordling: Yes, posting of -- well, what would you like to call it? Would you like to call it a snapshot?

Evan Leibovitch: Is that appropriate? Has that term been used before?

Olof Nordling: No, I think it's unoccupied still.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Michele, what did you -- go ahead.

Michele Neylon: I'm just - the thing I'm trying to understand is is the DAG the next version of the DAG contingent on us or is it just - or are we are operating in parallel?

Evan Leibovitch: It's my understanding that we're operating in parallel that if we come up with something, it could be applied after the effect, but I think we're under very explicit instructions not to do anything that would slow down adoption of the guideline, do I have...

Olof Nordling: And the guidebook if I may add will be the - posted in time for formal discussions in Brussels, so I mean the possibilities of interacting with any result in - and having that reflected in the DAG version four, well, remote to say the least.

Michele Neylon: Well, Olof, it's Michele, the concern - the only concern I had was that while the timelines that are set out here may be very, very strict and tight and everything else, something I was just trying to understand was whether anything produced or the lack of anything being produced or anything like that was being viewed by the board/ICANN staff as a reason to delay or hold up or introduce yet another stupid overarching whatever into the entire process (unintelligible)...

Olof Nordling: That is not the intention.

Evan Leibovitch: Is that...

Michele Neylon: Okay, that's fine.

Evan Leibovitch: It's not the intention, Michele, but I mean if we see something that is absolutely insane, must be addressed and every - and the committee has a strong consensus of that, I don't have a problem with us saying that. I just doubt it's going to happen that way.

Michele Neylon: No, it's just - I'm just trying to understand the dynamics here of the interaction between anything we may or may not do and everything else, that's - I'm just trying to understand that.

Evan Leibovitch: I don't know what to tell you. I think right now this is simply a community attempt to try and push back on something that a lot of people in the community see as wrong with the DAG. And of course it's up to us to come up with something to deal with it. As Olof says, we're not going to have something in time to directly affect the current - the one that's going to be released before Brussels, but it's my hope that we're going to have an effect on either whatever comes out after that.

If we can come out with a very strong consensus from this group that represents a number of stakeholders and get the endorsements of the stakeholder groups that say, you know, there's a certain way of dealing with at least a certain subset of the applications that shouldn't go through this whole thing or needs some relief; I think that's something that we can and should get built into a future version of the DAG, but it's not going to happen for the next one. Is that reasonable?

Michele Neylon: Oh, that's fine, I'm just - (I was) just a question, I just wanted to understand where we were, that's all.

Man: Evan, could I get in?

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Man: Having gone through the process on the GNSO which got this work group approved on that side and there was what I can only perhaps kindly or refer to as a visceral discussion, I believe there is - there was a significant part of the GNSO or at least a part of the GNSO that if they believed this was going to slow down the DAG - the gTLD process or perhaps even attempt to change the gTLD process, we might not have gotten this far.

            That doesn't mean that if we can - we cannot justify making a change, which I don't think will delay, but that's perhaps out of our control, so I have no problem saying that may come out of it. And I think the wording we have right now covers our various alternatives. So I would say we go ahead with it. I like the term "snapshot." The DAG is coming out in two weeks or three weeks or something like that. Although I'm told DAG is no longer politically correct, it's now just the Draft Applicant Guidebook or something like that.

Man: (This is DAG)?

Man: (ADG) I think. And that we go ahead with it. We're looking at having our quote quasi report ready near the first - near the beginning of July or at least sometime in July if we're going to finish it by the 10th of August. That's going to coincide with whatever the end of the comment period is on the Applicant Guidebook.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Man: So I think we're in an interesting timeline; if something comes out of it that has impact on the Applicant Guidebook, we will say it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Man: It may be accepted or not. So I think we - I think I like snapshot, the fact that no one's ever used it means there no set target as to what it includes.

Evan Leibovitch: It means we can define it on the fly.

Man: Indeed.

Evan Leibovitch: (Andrew) go ahead.

(Andrew): Thanks. I -- can you hear me?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

(Andrew): Okay, super. I - first of all, I think that we wouldn't have this as an opportunity that we wouldn't have been given this responsibility if people weren't a little - weren't okay with the idea that we'd come back with something. So while I'm getting and I understand everybody's desire not to slow down the process, I think if there was a, you know, there's some sort of implicit recognition at least the way I read it that it's worth having the community commit - comment on all this stuff.

In terms of the timeline, I guess a lot of it depends on how we'd like it to be used. If it - I would rather have an earlier snapshot if earlier is more useful or a later snapshot if it's less useful. So for example in terms of what we're going to talking into the hat in Brussels, will we - is it firm and fixed that we'll have the opportunity to discuss this to have some sort of a community meeting?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm cert...

(Andrew): Do we know about this?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm certainly hoping we're going to have meeting time. We probably past all the deadlines from the travel group of who's allowed to book rooms, but I'm sure that - I mean, I think Olof and Gisella said last week that they'd be looking to see if we can be fit in somewhere.

(Andrew):   Right.

Evan Leibovitch: Certainly it's my intention that anybody from this group that's in Brussels is going to have some time to get to sit down. I mean heck if they can't give us official meeting time, then we'll figure out something informal. But...

(Andrew):   Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...I think the idea behind saying a snapshot is let's have something which forms the basis of what we're going to do and talk about in Brussels.

(Andrew):   No, no, no, I agree with you, I guess my thought is a lot of it depends on, you know, how do - what kind of an audience we have, that's all (there). And I think if we have - if this is going to be a public thing, than that reads differently to me than if it's going to be largely inputs to a report which will be submitted (expose).

So that's going to be a public -- if it's going to be a public thing, I think it's even more important for us to get something that we can use to push off of which is just kind of what, you know, if all we do is identify the issues that are out there that we see that are consistently coming up, I think that that's a positive contribution to the community. And I'd just like to see us rather than -- I'd like to see us have some sort of a finalized thinking on it we could work with even if it's a finalized thinking on (only) a slice of what we got. That's just my suggestion.

Evan Leibovitch: Don't' we...

(Andrew):   We -- go ahead

Evan Leibovitch: You're absolutely right and the idea behind using the term snapshot basically says we get to the point where we have to come up with something and there's where we are right now wherever that is.

(Andrew):   Sure. No, I think that that's a well-chosen word. One of my questions is will we be able to do enough on all of the different areas that we're looking for if we're working on them in parallel and do we need - do we have the time to pull the different work groups together before we have to get ready for Brussels. I'm not sure what the answer is, but...

Evan Leibovitch: I'll be able to tell you that after we get past this line item and go to the next bit of the agenda.

(Andrew):   Good, done. I'm off. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Olof go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Yes, two things. First of all, yes indeed we've requested with meeting staff that we be - we get a one hour slot on Thursday, that's in order to have some kind of public session for this whatever we have at that point in time. And Thursday during the Brussels meeting.

Secondly, I think we should also realize that this is all about what is doable in the short term and perhaps in the long term. I mean, this is not -- first of all, I think to split it up in perhaps two aspects, what can be done to the - for the first round, and what is something that should be taken into account for when we have the review of the first round and for the upcoming future rounds.

So that's a way to look upon it. I mean we have some like what can we pass through the short ten item counter at the supermarket and what is the rest of the baggage that should be taken into consideration for future rounds.

That's just - so there may be aspects or support for more - for upcoming rounds that we wish to consider.

Alex Gakuru: (All right). I'll make (CMA comments).

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, who's this?

Alex Gakuru: This is Alex. I want to support what Olof is saying, it's a very good strategic approach to issues that (I use) why I (split off) into three categories what I call immediate, then what I call medium term, and then the long term. So perhaps if we also adopted what can be done immediately and what can be done in the medium term and what can be in the long term, it should help in the strategic approach to the issue. So I quite support what Olof is saying so we could identify the quick wins we could actually have and report this can be done immediately.

The second phase maybe can be done in the longer term, and the final thing that will be done in the long term. So I do support that approach by Olof or suggested by Olof.

Evan Leibovitch: Well I'm going to suggest that if we have our two sort of sub little - our two sub-groups that were proposed - as was proposed last week, that the people who are sort of heading that up will keep that in mind. And as we bring those things together we seem to have two separate things that we need to work on. And I think both of those have both short term, medium term, and long term issues that we can deal with.

But I agree with you. If there are things that we can say short term and the snapshot that we end up coming up with before Brussels has something actually concrete in it that people can get into, then that's all the better.

Again, this is going to be I think a matter of getting as far as we can and then essentially, you know, when we get to that part of the timeline, when we get to the 15th of June, see what we have and see what's usable to put out there.

What I'd really like to do, I've got Alan and Richard on the queue, I'm going to end it at that because I really at least want to get an approval of this and then move on to substantive stuff. I don't think there seems to be any real disagreement with the document as it is, so after Alan and Richard talk, let's put this one to bed. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Just a comment that the board resolution which effectively created us was different from what we've heard for the last two-plus years or three-plus years in that it didn't say wait for the next round and then we'll try to do something. So there's no question in my mind that we are looking at short term things that might help this round. That doesn't preclude us looking at longer term things in the parallel with it and being ready to jump if we have ideas which apply to a further call for applicants.

But it clearly does involve short term ones. And I don't think we can avoid that part at all. So I'm happy with the wording, let's go ahead with it.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh, and I don't think there's anyone here on this call that actually just wants to come up with stuff that just might be something long term...

Alan Greenberg: I wasn't saying that. Just affirming that that - the short term is mandatory, the long term is not precluded.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Richard you have the last word.

Richard Tindal: Yes, just back to the objectives for a sec. I just wanted to make sure there's not a incongruity that I may be seeing but perhaps I haven't read them properly. So it seems to me one of the objectives is saying that we've got - one of our tasks is to identify and set a criteria which (would to) indicate the

suitability of an applicant to receive some sort of support. So that's one thing that we're looking at.

And then another thing we're looking at is where can we get this support from, who might be providers of this support. And so my question is are the objectives and are we dealing with a situation where in fact either now or at some point in the future one of these providers of support might say, well, you know, I've got my own criteria for who I want to support and they're a little bit different from the ones that you guys came up with, you know.

You said that it should be this, this, this, this type of applicant, well, you know, I also want these additional three criteria in order for me to give my support, you know, to this. So what - do we have the flexibility in here to accommodate the fact that providers might have different views from us on who they might provide support to?

Olof Nordling: This is -- Richard, this I Olof here. I tried to encapsulate that in one of the sentences in the preamble which says accordingly, if the recommendations indicate that the preferred solutions are of a voluntary nature which of course would be in such a situation, we can't force other people to cooperate. The criteria and other provisions arrived at in line with the objectives below will solely serve as advice to the parties concerned. That - so it was - I thought about it at least.

Richard Tindal: Yes, I see that now. And that's certainly the concept that I'm referring to. So certainly in the preamble it's there, I agree with that.

Evan Leibovitch: And not only that, but we don't have control over things over which we don't have control. If a third party sponsor a charitable organization says, "Well, we're only going to - we will give subsidies to (TLDs) beginning with the letter R." There's not much we can do about it.

But I mean we can set out this is what the community believes are the ones deserving of support. And if there ends up being any ICANN related structures such as, you know, people commonly talk about a pool of money from auctions and things like that, that there are things that are done within ICANN we can basically say, "These are the community-supported criteria that we think ought to be deserving of money from that pool." if you would. Alan, make it quick.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I mentioned this part early on in the call - in the discussion. I think I used the term arrogance of us determining someone else's criteria. The rebuttal was, yes, but we need some measure of ident - understanding who we're talking about in only to - in order to have a meaningful discussion. So I think the word criteria is too strong, but I can live with it, (in other words) we should go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Last, does anyone have any objections to the wording as it has been - there have been two changes proposed; one, to change the very first sentence to take out a word; and to change the timeline, the milestone of the 15th from recommendation to snapshot; does anyone have any specific changes or objections to the charter as it is now put out there? Going once, going twice. Okay, we have consensus. Thank you.

Olof Nordling: Evan, Olof here. Just since we are - there are a few people missing and quite a few, shouldn't we put it up to the list to say that okay, any objections should be put forward before and I would say the date is the 12th of May because that's when the - there's a need for making a motion to the GNSO in order to approve the charter.

Evan Leibovitch: Essentially I agree with you Olof. I'd put it even less time, I'd say essentially 24 hours from now.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Haven't been able to make the meeting, this has been the result of this call through very thorough discussion and evaluation. If somebody's got a serious change to this, it ought to be made really quickly.

Olof Nordling: Okay. I'll bring that out in action points. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay now in terms of the next part of this, we have a whopping 20 minutes left to discuss to do the substance discussion. Now what I was hoping to do was to expand on what we started last week and to try to identify these two subgroups based on - Tony is not here, but based on the discussions we had last week, Cheryl (approsed) - proposed the idea of having two subgroups that would work on two parallel yet fairly meaty issues one of which is coming out of Objective 2 which is essentially to deal with the issues of in general as has been mentioned here - are the prices artificially too high for everyone, or are there ways of saying certain criteria of application may not have the same expense and so the cost recovery may lead to a lower price?

And what I'm hoping is is that one of our kind people from staff has sort of collected the emails from people who said I will serve on one or I will serve on the other group that's going to talk about, you know, categorization and ways of subsidy-based relief. Has anybody been collecting the emails from people who said I'll serve on one or I'll serve on the other?

Olof Nordling: I have collected the emails, but I haven't consolidated them; sorry for that. I was - didn't really have time and - since I came back only this morning. But anyway, there are - there was also the agreement last week that it be shared on the mailing list that whatever the working teams, as I think the term was, decide to do that they have the interchange - their interchange on the working group's mailing list. The overall mailing list. So we don't set up specific working team lists, but the exchange is on that - the list that's visible to all so people can jump in and jump out as they please.

That said, well the question is would it be a need for appointing a chair or someone that's coordinating these efforts from the respective working teams.

Evan Leibovitch: Personally, I think that would be a good idea to find somebody who could at least sort of be the first person to speak at the weekly meeting and say, "Okay, here's what we've been working on and here's the progress of where we are so far." (Tony) seemed like a natural for the group on reducing costs. We didn't have I think specific people step forward to want to lead the team on others. I see Alan and Rafik on - in the queue; Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I think it's mandatory that we name someone to lead the groups, and I think it's mandatory that we identify the people who said they want to work on the groups. Being on the main mailing list does not preclude someone else from contributing and both monitoring it and contributing, but if we don't identify a group - a small group of people who will say they're the ones who are interested in it, I'm afraid we'll end up to coming every meeting and find out that nothing was done on the list and no one took the bull by the horn so to speak. So I don't think not having separate mailing lists precludes going through the rest of the process.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh, Alan, I'm agreed with you. And part of what I'm trying to accomplish here is to try and identify who those people are.

Alan Greenberg: I wasn't disagreeing with you, Evan, I was disagreeing with what was implied that we might not need - because we have no mailing list we may not need the other parts.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh no we absolutely will. We definitely need a couple of people just to drive this along. Like I say, I hope that (Tony) would call because he was - it seemed like, one of the people most eager to lead the - I'll call it the reduced priced component of this. And but that's exactly what we want and try and do here with the time we have left is at least identify the people who will be leading those teams.

In the queue I have Olof and Rafik and then the Tijani. Olof go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Yes, on - our problem is too even if it is a bit related to send out the list of the names in the little follow-up message I send off to this call so at least we have the names of the volunteers identified. And I put those on the wiki as well. So that's it.

Evan Leibovitch: Is there any -- okay, what I'd like to do maybe is go down a line of this call to the people in this call to find out if there's people who are interested in participating specifically in one or the other or just keeping in the general pool of this group. Rafik go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: So about having some subtask we did that in the (OSE constituency) called the groups work team and I think Alan that we need a leader for each subtask. And that said, it's better to share the information directly on the mailing list because at the end we need all the working group need to (be) refuse the (work) from those subtask work team and then to avoid this delay in the work and - but I'm not sure if work teams need (conf call) or (I) think so.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All I'm trying to do right now is to identify the people who would be leading these teams. The people to whom - from whom I would be expecting at least an initial report or statement at the top of each meet - each weekly meeting. Like I said, there's some people who are involved in this call who can't come in on this call who I thought would be good at this. I'm looking for other people who would like to step forward either to lead or at very least be part of it. So Tijani go ahead. Tijani, please it's your turn.

Gisella Gruber-White: Unmute. I'll just get him to be unmuted. (Robert) can you please just make sure that Tijani gets unmuted please? Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Hello.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. (Unintelligible).

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, very good. So I do agree with what Alan said about the list of people who volunteered for this working team or the other one. And we need it because we need them to identify themselves with the coordinator who would be the coordinator. And we need a coordinator who is volunteer because otherwise he will not be a good one. So the idea of appointing a coordinator for each groups - each working team is not a good idea I think.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, the only problem we have is that some of the people who were most vocal about some of the choices last week are not on this call. But we need to deal with that. Carlos go ahead. Is Carlos on mute?

Man: That's why you have (meeting you) Evan.

Gisella Gruber-White: Carlos is on mute, he does know how to unmute.

Man: (Unmute).

Gisella Gruber-White: (Robert) can you please...

Evan Leibovitch: Oh he's off mute now. Go ahead Carlos. Carlos.

Carlos Aguirre: Hi. Hi.

Man: Yes, you're here.

Carlos Aguirre: Hi.

Man: We can hear you.

Carlos Aguirre: Can you hear me?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Carlos Aguirre: Oh, thank you. Yes. I agree with the previous comments. And I think we need to identify the working group - the work teams' members (stat) without the - with the work team job without delays - more delays because I think this very important to have an initialed recommendation before we - before Brussels meeting on - with some time to translate the recommendation for the other languages.

I think it's very important to have a initial recommendation, but I don't know if the work or - of the work teams in a different mail list, but we need to start now with the job. I think it's very important.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Carlos Aguirre: You understand?

Evan Leibovitch: Absolutely. As a matter of fact, that's one of the things that I would like to try and tackle with the remaining time on this call. (Andrew) go ahead you have the last word before we start actually looking for people.

(Andrew):   Okay, well maybe I'm leading you in the right direction then. I earlier submitted to work on the group that is going to be aimed at the who are we trying to assist and how are we trying to assist them. Although like a couple of other people, I have an interest in both, you know, just very interested in both.

My - I'm not sure and I'm not sure it makes sense based on the number of people who aren't on this call to call the question as to who's going to be leading these groups; part of it depends on how many people (were) going to be and part of it depends on what exactly we're going to be looking to pull out

of this so that anybody knows what their time commitment might be which is one of the things that would keep me from volunteering.

So I don't know Evan maybe a, you know, an interim solution would be to have somebody from staff help us to organize the first call. And just so that there's something, you know, so there's - so that we can move the process forward. We've done that in the past in other organizations. It seems to work; it's just to get the thing going right away and have it...

Evan Leibovitch: Well let me ask...

(Andrew): ...have it shared.

Evan Leibovitch: Let me ask then. (Andrew) would you be interested at least in the interim of sort of being one of the persons who is the - shall we say torch bearer for the working team on the cri - I'll call it criteria and subsidy team...

(Andrew): I'd - I am - here's my thing. I am, you know, I run a small firm so the logistics is what gets me. So if we can find time I'm happy to be on the calls that I'm happy to help with the organization and even to help with some of the framing, the logistics of it is what's - is what I'm, you know, I just don't have the bandwidth for right now.

And a lot of it will depend between now and then it looks like I will be in a place where I can dial in, there may be a couple times when I can't. But I'm happy to -- like I said, if there are two or three people who are responsible for this, that's why it depends honestly Evan on how many people are in the group and what exactly we're looking to get out of it. And then I can tell you if I could do it or not. And if not, I will be as active a participant as I can be.

Evan Leibovitch: Well I...

(Andrew): Make sense?

Evan Leibovitch: ...my gut instinct right now says that what I'm looking for from these people are essentially somebody to make sure that those particular issues do get addressed and they don't get - nobody - they don't - you don't fall asleep on them between the calls. That's my main intentions with these two separate subtopics is simply somebody to make sure that if some objectives are being laid down that at least there's some moving forward on them.

(Andrew): Well I guess one of the questions -- maybe this is a practical question if you don't mind my diving into this a tiny bit. The - what's the best way for us to get these sub-issues to be taken care of? Is - are these going to be on email?

Are these going to be tried - are we going to try and get conference calls for the group of two or three or four or however many people want to talk about this? What do you all - what does the community have in its mind because that will depend - that will help us to be efficient in this.

Evan Leibovitch: It's my understanding from the conversations that we've had so far that there's a desire not to have explicit conference calls or separate mailing lists, that this in the overall main mailing list, but that the people that are driving this forward are actively participating and making sure that their particular corner of the issue gets dealt with.

(Andrew): Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Is that...

(Andrew): Well I said - I guess that was - my biggest fear was the - frankly with the time commitment and the idea that we get more people on more calls which I don't think is fairly really too realistic. So I think if there is another person who is willing to do it with me, I am happy to volunteer to be part of this.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay I'll tell you what, let's pencil it down. And Olof I've got you next on the queue, but I guess one of the things we're going to ask for staff is to help us track who's involved in what and from amongst those groups try and find people who are prepared to be if not a leader then let's just call it a driver of these issues. Olof go ahead.

Man: Fair enough.

Olof Nordling: Or coordinator. I think that was a term that was used by somebody. I kind of like it. And also I would like to raise a little flag for the possibility of using the wiki. There is space work on proposed text and such if you don't want to exclusively use email for example, you can also use the wiki to develop text and add it at your heart's delight.

Evan Leibovitch: And in fact these sub-teams can create their own wiki pages if they want a little private area to do some wordsmithing or discussion within the confines of the specific issue before bringing it back to the entire group. That's totally within the realm. But the fact would remain that it would all still be public and visible by everybody on the list.

Okay, (Andrew) are you - you've still got your hand up, did you want to say something else or...

(Andrew):   No, I'm sorry, I must not have figured out how to turn it off. My apologies.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, and I think that no separate mailing list, no separate call, we have to work between two calls through emails and through the wiki page. It's the best way. And I think that why we need the coordinator, we need at least something (proper) to work on. So it's a - if there is no coordinator, I would try to submit something to start, but I really want that we get the name of the work team so that we can choose our - how to say - try to find a coordinator.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. And from what I've heard from (Andrew) to try and spread the load a bit even if we have more than one coordinator in each group that will work fine. So what I'm going to ask. I'm going to close off that particular discussion now. And what I'm looking for right now is names. We only have a few minutes left on the call. I'd like to try and - to nail this down and get a couple of people. We only need one or two. We have two separate teams, one of which is going to be concentrating on identifying criteria and then possible methods of subsidy.

The other team is going to be identifying ways of lowering the costs for some or all participants. We need some people for those. (Tony) last week was an advocate and clearly I think he would be one of the better coordinators for the lower price group.

And (Andrew) has put himself forward as one of but not necessarily the only coordinator for the criteria and subsidy team for, you know, expediency. Would anyone here like to put their name forward to assist in coordination of either of these groups?

Right now that's what I'm asking here. Is anyone - would anyone here like to put their name forward as helping to coordinate one of those two particular subtasks?

Man: Evan, I don't see how we're - how we can have two coordinators. We have - we need only one to coordinate. It is not - I am not talking about submitting if you want language, I am talking about coordination.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, I mean if the workload isn't that high, essentially we're just looking for somebody to follow things and making sure that something happens and lighting the fire if it doesn't. (Andrew) are you okay with that?

(Andrew): Actually, I'm going to push back. I'm not sure that that's - that I would agree. If the primary function is administrative, then I'm probably not the right guy for it. If the primary function is aimed at actually keeping the conversation going, then I'd be happy to do it. I think that having two people given everybody - given that everybody is busy, they got, you know, lots going on, I don't see any downside to having a couple of people. When you get more than a couple of people, I think it becomes difficult to draw together your findings.

My understanding Evan is is that the idea behind this would be that the person who is doing this both seeds the conversation in terms of keeping it going but also is someone who is kind of follow it and then prior to our next call would pull together a small amount of notes about here's where we are. Am I understanding correctly?

Evan Leibovitch: As far as I'm concerned, perfectly.

Man: Evan, can I get in?

(Andrew): So if that's the case, then I think having two people is probably a benefit and I'm, you know, no one knows what's going - what their week is going to look like, so and neither do I. So I figured I have a little bit of extra help to make it more likely that I will get you what you want and vice versa.

Evan Leibovitch: Well look at the...

(Andrew): That's it.

Evan Leibovitch: ...situation for chair. Avri couldn't do it, you know, and so we've been able to share the load.

(Andrew): Exactly, perfect - which is a perfect example. I don't see any downside to it is my point, okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I'm going to stress again, right now all I - what I'm looking for is names of people who are interested. Is anyone - if anyone wants to (either) raise your hand or speak and say I would like to be involved with one of these teams in helping to move it forward, please speak up now. Alan you've got your hand up. I hope it's for one - it's for that purpose.

Alan Greenberg: It's not. It's been up for the last five or six minutes. I just wanted to point out that I think it's mandatory to have each group have a leader regardless of what you call it. It's someone who if nothing else is the one who feels guilty prior to the call that we haven't done anything...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...either group hasn't done anything. I agree. (Andrew) I think has it exactly right and I - but I originally put my hand up to make a statement saying don't preclude special conference calls for that subgroup.

Two or three people on a call for a half an hour can be amazingly productive, far more so than trying to trade many email messages. So don't - I'm not saying you have to have calls, but don't preclude them. That's what I was trying to say. I...

Evan Leibovitch: We won't preclude them and we won't make them private, but if they are necessary and they'll happen, that's fine.

Alan Greenberg: That's fine. And...

Evan Leibovitch: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...regarding volunteering, I'm just overcommitted right now to put my name onto something else would guarantee I don't meet the objective. I will be watching and contributing when appropriate.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. We are one hour into the call. I'd like to try and deal with the rest as quickly as possible. Is anyone on this call besides (Andrew) who has already spoken up, is anyone here interested in being a coordinator for one of those two special interests? Okay, we may not have the luxury of having multiple coordinators.

All right. So what I have right now is I have (Andrew) who's expressed his interest right now for the criteria and subsidy group and (Tony) last week was very interested in being involved in the reduced price cost recovery group. So we've got those two names.

Olof if we could put something out on the mailing list that calls for some other people. If we can capture what (Andrew) had said about the definition of this I think that would be helpful. I think all we're really looking for is one more peop - one more person for each of these two groups just to help share the load.

If we can do that, I'll think we'll have accomplished a good bit.

Olof Nordling: I'll take care of that.

Evan Leibovitch: Is anyone here opposed to that way of proceeding?

Man: (Negative).

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right. So we've gotten that done. We've got two people at least and all right and the objectives approved. Any other business? Does anybody want to raise something at this time that has not been raised that should? So going once, going twice, okay.

Well if that's the case, then three minutes after the hour, I guess we've accomplished what we've set out (to do) for this call. And I guess that's about it.

Does anyone on this call have a problem with Mondays at this time? If we know it ahead of time, we can start to do agendas and a bit better planning. Does anyone here have a -- oh, okay, sorry I see in the chat, Carlos has indicated his interest to be involved in the who and what in the criteria and the criteria and subsidy group, so (Andrew) you've got company.

(Andrew):   Terrific.

Evan Leibovitch: It's you and Carlos. Now we just need to find assistance for (Tony) in the other group. Okay. So does anyone here have a problem with doing this particular time each week for (whatever)? Rafik go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Just have another working group (set) after this one. So I'm not sure that it can be easy every time.

Evan Leibovitch: Then it's just up to us to make sure that we keep our calls neat and tidy and end as close to the hour as we can which is what I'm trying to do.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

(Andrew):   Can I - Evan can I ask one favor? As we get these two little subgroups going, is there anything that we need to get us started. Maybe if Olof has a, you know, a conglomerate of what we've already discussed on each of these topics to get going with. I'm, you know, I'm just trying to get us leaning forward in the first week.

Evan Leibovitch: I'll tell you what, why don't you Olof and why don't you Carlos Olof and I just go offline a little bit, come up with a couple of frames of reference and then go from there?

(Andrew): That sounds fine. I'm just about to leave for a most of the day meeting, so I wanted to - if there's anything we need to put in place, soon is better.

Evan Leibovitch: We'll take an offline...

Olof Nordling: May I...

Evan Leibovitch: ...email.

Olof Nordling: That - if you go to the wiki, you'll find that papers and links are available under the two headings for the two working teams.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh, there you go. Olof you've been...

Olof Nordling: Some things there already.

(Andrew): Okay, okay, so but I guess my thought is only this; I'm not trying to keep us on the line.

Evan Leibovitch: I know.

(Andrew): But that is only - my time is only this is that there is - there are two things that we need, one is access to background data, but the other one is some relatively narrow framework that we can start the conversation off of. Maybe it would be worthwhile to re-forward the links to the wiki but also for us to come up with some sort of a short agenda of the week or something like that. You know what I mean? Just to give people a little bit of focus.

Evan Leibovitch: Well now that you've got friends, you and Carlos can basically go offline by email and just decide for yourselves what you think are your best short (terms) to reference.

(Andrew): Okay. Good enough.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, on that note since nobody seemed to have any other business, if that's the case, we're six past the hour and unless I hear otherwise, this call is done.

Man: Thank you very much Evan.

Man: Okay, thank you.

Man: Thanks Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Man: Bye.

Evan Leibovitch: Thank you, see you next week.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

END