SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 10 September 2010 at 1400 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 September 2010 at 14:00 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-20100910.mp3

On page:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep

(**transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page**)

Participants on the Call:

ALAC

Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair

Alan Greenberg – ALAC

Carlos Aguirre - At Large

Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC

GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison

Andrew Mack – CBUC

Avri Doria – NCSG – Co-Chair

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachine

Richard Tindal – Individual

Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

ICANN staff

Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large

Tony Harris – ISCPC

Alex Gakuru – NCSG

Baudoin Schombe – At Large

Michele Neylon – RrSG

Karla Valente – Staff support

Evan Leibovitch: Hello?

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry.

Glen de Saint Gery: Would you like me to do a roll call for you Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes please and I've just heard from Richard that he should be coming in any moment.

Glen de Saint Gery: All right, I'll just see if there's somebody waiting on the Adobe, no there isn't. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on Friday the 10th of September and on the call we have Rafik Dammak, (Carlos St. Peter), Andrew Mack, Elaine Pruis and Evan Leibovitch.

We have apologies from Tijani and we have apologize from Alex Gakuru and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. We've just had Eric Brunner-Williams join us and is there anybody on the Adobe that I have missed, Alan Greenberg is on the Adobe and not on the call.

Thank you Evan, over to you.

Evan Leibovitch: By the way it's my understanding that Alan as well as Richard Tindal will be coming in soon. I've heard from Avri and she has said she will be coming in a little bit on the late side but it is her intention to join us.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you very much.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I guess without further ado and since my brain is still spinning I'm going to toss things over to you Andrew to go ahead with what you've been talking about.

Andrew Mack: Okay super, let me just pull it up real quick. Elaine says she did not get it that was from - it reads as sent in my outbox.

Evan Leibovitch: When did you send it?

Andrew Mack: Oh ten minutes ago. And my apologies for that, I literally - you know I have the same issue that you did about losing the name.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Andrew Mack: If you'd like it shorted up I can just put it in the chat.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, it's not in my inbox so it may not have gone.

Andrew Mack: If there's no objection I will just go ahead and post it in the - can I post it in the notes section or just in the chat?

Evan Leibovitch: Post it in the chat for now and we'll take care of it. My guess, it will show up. If it's as short as you're saying then just paste it in.

Andrew Mack: Let's see if this works, okay guys? Did that come through?

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes, we see it Andrew.

Evan Leibovitch: And I don't know if anyone else can see it, I just tried at least temporarily raising the chat window.

Andrew Mack: Yeah, that works on mine at least.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so let's take a moment for everybody to take a look at that.

Andrew Mack: Would it be helpful for me to read it out loud for people who aren't on Adobe if there are any?

Evan Leibovitch: Actually yes, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Okay. And please - this is all open for - you know obviously for bending and shaping. But on the bundling discussion based on our desire to come forward with a consensus formula that both promotes more access in underserved languages and script.

                 And yet also avoids some of the possible unintended consequences/gaming opportunities noted by Eric, Richard and others, Richard and I worked up the following formulation.

                 And in place of bundled support for IDN build out, the working group would recommend a simplified direct package of cost reductions to incentivize IDN build out in underserved scripts for all applicants, whether national or international, NGO or private.

On the following basis, for scripts with one to 10 million native users, a 60% discount from the typical price for any gTLD. For scripts with 10 to 50 million native users, a 40% discount, for scripts with 50 to 100 million native users a 20% discount.

No discount is recommended for scripts with more than 100 million users as they are considered large enough to constitute a strong market in the near term and most support would be better focused on other script groups.

And then I suddenly got cut off. But that was the general gist of it. We were trying to take everybody's suggestions into account and so get us where bundling was intended to get us.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right, that's actually incredibly detailed compared to what I thought you were going to do but that's fine. Rafik you've got your hand up, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thank you Andrew for the work done but I just have some question. Why is the you selected the number 50 to 100 native user, because with that for example for my language I know no - how to say, no applicant can apply for Arabic script IDN.

And to get - so we get less discount. But the problem like for Arabic language how we can talk about native user because Arabic language is - there are more than 20 countries using that language. How we will calculate for that, that applicant if it's a community and I'm not sure how we would calculate this number to know the discount.

Andrew Mack: Okay, it's a really good question and I have an imperfect answer for you if you'd like. But would it be better to take all the questions and then try and address them?

Evan Leibovitch: I'll leave it to you, I've got another question or comment from Eric. Well okay, Andrew, what's your preference? Do you want to tackle them one at a time or just wait till you hear everything and then address them all at once?

Andrew Mack: Well I'm kind of hoping that Richard will join sometime soon too because we discussed and he had some good thoughts on it. But why don't we go ahead with the questions and I'll do my very best.

Again this is an imperfect attempt to come up with some sort of structure that we could actually put into place. We rejected a number of more complex options.

Evan Leibovitch: And I did hear from Richard that he did say that he would be dialing in shortly because the other call is just as I understand it wrapping up. So okay Eric, go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. I appreciate Rafik's point, I don't know if we would be defining Arabic to be modern standard Arabic which is spoken nowhere or Maghrebian Arabic or (Magrussian) Arabic or any language which isn't Arabic which actually uses Arabic script which includes (Jawe), the (Jawe) script in Indonesia, Farsi and Dari in Afghanistan and Iran.

The distinction between language and script is not one to one so as I look at this I'm not sure if we're speaking about scripts or languages

and then again to Rafik's point I'm not sure what we mean when we say Arabic.

The second thing - or actually the first thought I had is have you tested this against the hypothetical (indic) script problem, that is an NGO in India that is attempting to deliver services to persons in need meeting our definition for an applicant that is in need.

But is attempting to do so in more than just one of the official scripts and official languages of India but in the 11 official scripts and 22 official languages of India and possibly two or three more as we consider the adjacent nation states which have overlying - in which the community of interest is included.

I know India has a large population but I don't know what this means when we actually start talking about the individual languages and/or scripts and the number of users for each of the languages or scripts.

Andrew Mack: Okay, that's a good question. I can answer that one more - I can try and make an effort at these. I'll be looking forward to a little bit of Richard's talk but if you like I can give a try at these.

Eric Brunner-Williams: By all means.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Your first question about the Indian languages, we - you know we're working off of an imperfect starting point in the sense that I went around and looked for different places on the web where we might get some sort of a reliable estimate of the number of script users.

And you're right that there is some question as to who is a script user versus who is a language user and we want to try and steer clear of that as much as possible.

If we get to the level of just language users, I think we have all kinds of unintended consequences that may be impossible to make this work.

In terms of script users the source that I consulted which was the Wikipedia page that had two or three different references on it and we might come up with a better source, but for the 50 to 100 million user groups there were three Indian languages, Marathi, Telugu and Punjabi.

In the 50 to 100 million user group there were also three Indian languages, Gujarati, (Canada) and Oriya, there may be one or two more of which I am unaware and I believe that there may be also a few in the one to 10 million or the less than 10 million group.

So if one were to attempt to reach out to all of those since we walked away from the idea of bundling, the - then that person would have the ability to apply a 20% discount for some of the languages, the 40% discount for others, and a 60% discount for others still.

So to that question they would still be able to get to the different discounts, they just get to them in a disaggregated way. To your question about language and script, this is a really good question and we spent a lot of time talking about it yesterday and I've spent a lot of time thinking about it.

Our goal would be to try to use one of the most common definitions. If you look at it, Arabic is seen as a block in typical ICANN terms over the course of years. Urdu and Farsi script are fairly similar in that they use a (pero) Arabic alphabet from what I have been able to glean, I'm not a linguist in this state at all.

But that's the impression that I have. If Farsi and Urdu were taken as separate languages then they would fall respectively in the 10 to 50 million group for Farsi and the 50 to 100 million group for Urdu based on the things that we've seen on line.

If they are considered as one group then they still fall just barely under the 100 million user group. So that gets to the second question, whether I think both Richard and I were hoping that we could find an elegant way of categorization that would permit that we got as many languages from emerging markets and emerging areas with less historic web presence in.

And so we're trying to find the right way to categorize these, the right language such that these might be included. In terms of Arabic, I know that there are very - a number of different ways of using you know - a number of different pieces of the way that Arabic is expressed.

And I know that it varies distinctly between Morocco and the Gulf and all of that. I believe for our purposes that ICANN would consider all Arabic script to be Arabic script.

But again I'm open to differences. What we're trying to avoid is a situation where very, very, very small changes in the language get you

- very, very small like changes in the way that the language is written get you a separate space.

Because then you have all kinds of unintended consequences with a number of languages including a number of European languages which do not need support, which would then be able to argue for support and things like that.

Is that making sense?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well I've just done the numbers while you've been talking. And if we assume that there is an application that is intended to deliver services to the - a polite way to say it, well just to poor people.

So the hypothetical is an applicant which meets our criteria for need which is intending to deliver services to a class of people which is not defined by one script or one territorial jurisdiction but rather to a material condition such as poverty or reproductive health.

Something that's human, so if there were 25 different languages that this NGO or hypothetical NGO thought that it was necessary to support, that is to offer a label in 25 distinct languages, if they were all met the most generous of the discounts this would cost them just under $1 million to apply.

If it met the intermediate discount of 50% then it would cost them just under $3 million to apply and if the languages were large and of course there are a large number of poor people so I suspect large is the correct answer, they would be at just under $4 million to apply.

So when we're thinking of an applicant as being a single language which is reasonable and a single script for imitations of ASCII the problem of one language or one label per applicant doesn't appear.

But when we started addressing applicants who exist in thorough linguistic areas we're clearly creating the economic problem that exists nowhere else.

And I don't see that the continuing to count an applicant and the language - each label as a distinct application and then offering a discount to the better possible choice because this really does add up to some very large numbers very quickly.

Andrew Mack: Question for you then Eric, because I took some of your comments and the comments of Richard's comments about being able to gain the system and other things like that and yet our desire to not discriminate against potential applicants.

That's one of the reasons why we walked away from the idea of bundling and tried to disaggregate them. That was Richard's recommendation, I'm sorry he's not on the call now.

Are you suggesting that in cases where - that there may be cases where some sort of a combined approach might make sense? Some sort of a bundling approach, plus the ability to go on a one by one basis?

I'm open to that, I'm just trying to get us something we can use.

Eric Brunner-Williams: As soon as we say that the applicant must meet the needs criteria if we have a eliminated gaming already we have a problem whether we're talking about one language or many languages.

So my assumption is when we test for needs, we have eliminated gaming. And we have an applicant then who's attempts to deliver service is defined not by a single label which is what we have as a standard up to the present moment.

But is clearly not going to be useful when we deliver service to areas of the world which are more complex linguistically than Western Europe and North America.

So I'm not concerned about eliminating gaming once we pass the need threshold. What I am concerned is that we're not identifying the applicant's need as being the definition of what the applicant is applying for, the resources that the applicant needs to accomplish the mission that they're setting out to do.

But that we're continuing to keep the applicant in sort of a mental confinement that really dates from the ASCII model.

Andrew Mack: Perhaps someone else can help, I'm not following exactly.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well I'm suggesting that if an applicant says that they need two languages to do their job they're probably correct and we shouldn't be saying oh well that's two applications. That's one application that requires two distinct labels in order to deliver the service that the applicant intends to deliver to the user community.

And since they're an applicant that is defined as being in need we do not need to worry about there being a possibility of scamming the system, they've already demonstrated sufficient need to meet whatever support we have to offer.

So this is distinct from the IDN variance question where for instance in simplified and traditional Chinese in order to make a meaningful label it really does require several different characters, one simplified and the traditional equivalent forming potentially a large number of labels just for a single multi-character set of characters.

Evan Leibovitch: Eric I don't mean to interject but I have to. I mean I think we're getting into a level of real technical detail that is going far beyond the intent of what we're trying to do here.

I mean Andrew has put forward something and by the way Andrew you have the luxury now of Richard having joined the call. So...

Andrew Mack: Well it's good to have other people who can help explain our thought process, it was you know not just mine.

Evan Leibovitch: But also I want to try and keep this out of the esoteric and trying to deal with the household practical needs behind the issue you're trying to address and Eric I want to ask you to try and keep the specifics.

You know I mean we can deal with some of the minutia, I mean it really does seem like minutia right now to me at this level and I'm really not sure that we can deal with it at a level of saying does the proposal that Richard and Andrew have put together, does it address the issues of bundling that we've been talking about?

Does it offer an assistance to new gTLD applicants and I really want to try to keep it on that high a level because we don't have the luxury of getting that deep in the details, at least from what I can see.

Rafik you've had your hand up for an awful long time. You said something in the chat, did you have something to add?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, I'm not going to a technical issue about IDN and (unintelligible) but just maybe if we - maybe if we raise the problem here that we mix between the script itself and the language because like an Arabic script it's used by other language.

So if maybe if we define that ratio for the community, I mean the possible user or speakers for that community. Because if we keep those (unintelligible) the whole I think nobody can - there won't be any applicant for Arabic, we too can apply for assistance.

But if we define that possible community which use that script with that ratio and we can keep those ratios and maybe it's not clear.

Andrew Mack: Rafik I'm not quite sure I followed you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so if for example we take the example of Arabic language or Arabic script for Arabic language, there is 300 - almost 300 million users or speakers but what we are working - we define the applicant for communities so the community can really be more smaller than the whole population of Arabic speaker.

So we define the user of script in relation to that community. For example there is community A of possible user of that script, that applicant want apply of maybe from 1 to 10 million.

It would make more sense than to have those big number of the speakers using that script. So we define more in regard to that community, not to the script itself, not like to say that because Arabic script, that's maybe there are 300 million of Arabic speaker and maybe more of user of that script.

But just for that community what is the number of people from that specific community which applicant want to provide that stream, how many of them use that script?

Evan Leibovitch: I mean Andrew do you - how do you - is there a way that you propose that this can - doesn't get gamed by the distinction between a script and a language?

Andrew Mack: I'm going to drop off in a quick second because I want to hear - because Richard and I talked about this and he had some good ideas. This is one of the reasons why I think it's very difficult to do in practice what Rafik is suggesting even though I understand and agree that in a perfect world that's the way we might wish to go.

I think it would be too easy to define the community so narrowly. You know the way that ASCII and the way that ICANN historically has used scripts from my understanding and the way the UN uses scripts it's not on a community base, it's just on a simple script basis.

The goal was to come up as much as possible with a rule that would take us out of the judgment call basis, you know of judgment call business.

And so if we have a better formulation, I'm very open to it. I think if we do it just on the basis of self defined communities, everyone's going to have the maximum - every application will be for the maximum amount of discount.

And that in and of itself is a kind of gaming, so I don't know the answer.

Evan Leibovitch: Richard do you have any - do you have something to add? Welcome to the call.

Richard Tindal: Thanks. Yeah, I'm not going to delve into the specifics just yet but I think rather I'll just maybe take your advice Evan here and maybe try and simplify this if I can, fashion at a higher level.

I think at the end of the day this proposal is not about supporting needy applicants per se but it's rather promoting the development of underserved scripts on the internet.

And an argument could be made that that's helping needy registrants if you like as opposed necessarily to needy applicants. But I think for this group the very fundamental question is are people endorsing the notion that it's a good thing for us to recommend this sort of incentive for script diversity.

Whether or not the applicant is - meets a needy requirement. I think if people on the group, and I may have misunderstood Eric but I think

Eric makes an argument that we shouldn't be endorsing or incenting applicants who aren't needy.

But if the group doesn't agree you know with that this should apply to anyone and not just needy then I don't know it's worth digging into the details because that's really to me the first and most important question that we've got to address.

Evan Leibovitch: Well Richard let me ask you this question in return. If it's something that's to apply to everyone and not just the specific kinds of applicants and a certain kind of need, is that not beyond what we're doing in this group in scope?

General policy of - you know we got into this very early on about you know are we trying to lower the cost for everybody or are we specifically in this group trying to address a specific need?

Andrew, Richard, take either of you.

Andrew Mack: I'll pick this up. Evan you and I had this conversation when we were talking about it in the context of bundling and we had a long conversation about it and we agreed that this was within scope because part of our goal was to get more scripts in the route from these underserved communities but the purpose of getting the applicant out there is to support these underserved communities.

And the one viable way of doing it and one way that in theory at least should be relatively easy to identify and relatively easy to administer assuming that the board goes forward with it.

I don't think any of that has changed. The only difference is that - and the language communities benefit by having more of their content on the web, there's no question.

Tijani and I discussed this, Alex and I have discussed this, you and I have discussed this, my sense is that this is an issue that we've had you know plenty of chance to talk about.

And I don't see the reason why this is going to - this falls out of scope now when it didn't fall out of scope before. The goal is to get more people interested and more people in and to you know give all of these different groups access to the parts of the - parts of commerce, the web, that they don't now have in their own languages.

And so I think that falls very much within our guidelines.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Before I give the floor back to Eric does anybody else here want to comment in? You know Andrew was saying you know - or the proposers are saying can we get some kind of consensus on whether or not this thing is even generally a good idea?

I mean I was under the supposition that it was, if anybody does not think this is a good idea please do an X mark in your Adobe Connect. I want to try and get an idea of what level of consensus we have at least on this call.

If there are people that do not think that this kind of proposal - I mean don't matter the details, but even in concept. If you don't believe we should be tackling this please put up an X mark in the Adobe Connect now so I can get an idea.

Right now I'm not seeing that, so I'm going to go under the assumption at least for now Andrew that this is something that is worth proceeding with.

Andrew Mack: Great. And I think Richard and I are both very open to you know playing with the formulations and also to Rafik's point of how we determine who fits into which group.

We made what I think is a heroic effort to try to come up with something to start with. And you know if there are better formulations or better sources for the categorization we're open to that.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead Richard.

Richard Tindal: Yeah, just to put in context my overall views on this, that you know my concern from the start has been that it could be gamed in ways that would benefit very well funded applicants.

And so you know what Andrew's been doing is trying to find ways to minimize or eliminate that sort of gaming.

I think he's come up with something that satisfies my concern that it's not going to be you know used extensively for large corporations to get their own brand of script at a cheap rate in a variety of places.

So the concern I have that would be abused has been removed. As to whether it's in scope, out of scope of the whole group, you know I'm comfortable either way.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Eric, you've got the floor again. I mean has any of what you've heard in the last few minutes addressed your concerns? Eric? Okay, Eric's either not with us or in chat or - okay Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, I think we have maybe two different definitions of gaming, that for gaming that where funded applicants want to apply for the (unintelligible), how to say, for many IDN streams.

So maybe we can already to prohibit this, that we say that it's - because first if we select the applicant, the needy applicant so we - I don't think that we have a problem of gaming from well funded applicants.

That which won't apply for many IDN and then we can focus on the definition of the community and for that just to focus on the definition of needy community which are the - for which the applicant want to apply different script.

And also that I don't think that there is - there are many community which need many script, maybe many of them just need to apply for (unintelligible) and just one IDN.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, is everybody else okay? Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yeah, Rafik, what we just kind of talked about this. I mean the way that Richard and I others have put it forward, this would be open to anyone because our end goal is to get more scripts in.

And to get more content built out in those scripts so I mean if we're - I think that the initial intention of all of these things, whether it was

initially bundling and now in this new formulation you can make that open to anyone because our end goal is to get more content out.

It wouldn't necessarily be for - there wouldn't be a needs test on this basis. This would be the only part that it wouldn't - in part because we're not really offering any support except for the price reduction.

My recommendation is that we focus that kind of effort on the first two baskets of support.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Is there any other comments on this? If not we will move on to other things. WE can certainly keep going on this on the mailing list, you guys have done a great job on this and Andrew I know this has been very near and dear to you.

And I think you've done a phenomenal job in bringing the issue forward in a way that is both palatable and that people get the idea of why you've been so interested in this.

Andrew Mack: Thank you, I appreciate it. We're working hard to get a compromise that everyone will be happen with.

Evan Leibovitch: and I think we're there. So what we're going to do now, Glen is there any other unfinished business from the last call that we need to deal with?

Glen de Saint Gery: Not that I know of Evan. As you saw I put in that little line in the addenda for you. Hope that doesn't make too much of a mess of it all over.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right. Now okay, now right now we have on - at least I have on my screen we're at the bottom of the comments list. I think we went through all the comments, did we not at the end of the last call?

I think we went through all of them. So at this point in time do we need to revisit? What parts of this do we need to revisit? Forgive me, I'm at a little bit of a loss without Avri here and like I say my name is a bit fried between two days and just coming off of - along with Richard and a few others a fairly intense 90 minute call even just before this.

So my brain is hurting. Anybody else here like to help me out on what uncovered ground we still need to deal with before coming back and trying to nail down some wording? Okay. All right, so if that's the case, should we be going back to the top and seeing what we need to do with this? I mean the intention is to try and come out with some final wording and see. Okay, dead air during a conference call.

So I'm trying to go back into the document and seeing what holes are left to be refilled. I mean, does anybody have any specific other comments about other components of the document that we have? Richard go ahead.

Richard Tindal: Where are we at on the issue of prioritization of the standards?

Evan Leibovitch: I could have sworn that after the last call that somebody -- and it might have been Avri -- was charged with trying to come up with some proposed wording. I mean that's definitely one of the holes that we can come back and try and deal with.

We did not resolve it. We essentially tried to say, "We have some categories; do we want to just leave it open to any that meets it?" Or do we say that, "Some are more important than others?"

Part of the problem is we don't have Tijani on the call, and he was one of the most vociferous advocates of one of those positions. So any discussion we have right now is probably not going to have one of its strongest proponents.

So we did come up with the various criteria. But we did not - we definitely did not resolve the issue of whether or not we were comfortable with prioritizing them or simply listing them as various criteria that an application must meet.

Richard Tindal: Hi.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...here. Sorry, Richard, did you want to say something about that?

Richard Tindal: Go ahead and finish your thought there.

Evan Leibovitch: You go ahead.

Richard Tindal: Yeah, so I agree with you. We probably need to depending on the call before we dig into this deeply. Let me make sure that I understand the opposition to the notion of (unintelligible).

I'm getting a little feedback. Can you guys here me ok?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm hearing you breaking up though.

Richard Tindal: Yeah. How about now, is that clear?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm still hearing the breaking up.

Richard Tindal: Okay, let me - I'll just sit back for a second.

Evan Leibovitch: Now I can't hear you at all.

Richard Tindal: Yeah, how about now. Is that any clearer?

Evan Leibovitch: You're okay. But about the last three seconds of what you say get broken up.

Richard Tindal: Let me do this, let me put my thought into the chat.

Evan Leibovitch: Now that I heard all of. Anyway, go ahead and say your piece. And I'll let you know how much comes through.

Richard Tindal: Okay. I just wanted to see if my understanding of the objection to prioritizing is accurate or not in concern with prioritizing. Is the fundamental concern that by the very act of prioritizing the categories that we're inviting some other parties to somehow limit the amount of support that's provided? Is that the fundamental opposition to doing it?

Evan Leibovitch: Again, I guess without Tijani on this call, I don't if the people who are best in a position to answer that are here. My personal view on this is that the - is that we've already indicated that the financial need criteria sort of is paramount.

But after that, we've got a number of different criteria and we really haven't made a preference between them. I think - and without speaking for Tijani I think the main objection was, it is beyond having demonstrated the need.

Saying that, you know, there are certain categories, there are certain contexts of meeting a gTLD should not necessarily be given preference over others so long as an applicant has met the needs criteria. Does that answer your question?

Richard Tindal: Sort of. I mean, to my mind we're saying, "We recommend all of these people should receive a certain level of support. We're - potentially we're also saying that, "In the event that there is more need, that there is support, then we think these ones should go first. And so...

Evan Leibovitch: And that may be at the heart of some of the problem in that, "Do we want to recognize that there is a finite limit?" Or do we say that, "Everyone who deserves - everyone who demonstrates that they have the need but also have a legitimate string in any of the criteria we're talking about ought to be considered equally."

Do we make an assumption that the pool will allow for all of them or do we actually have a queue that says, "If there's limited money, these criteria have to go to the queue before those."

Richard Tindal: Exactly. And so it seems to me that we don't if there is limited or unlimited support. Common sense would tend to indicate, and historical experience, that funds are always limited. But we don't know.

But I don't know why prioritizing, you know, changes that. It just - to me, prioritizing just says, "In case - in the contingency that there is limited support, we think that these ones should go first."

So to my mind it's not saying, "Whether there is or isn't," it's just like, "Just in case, you know if we need $10 and only $9 is available, then this is our sequence of prioritization."

So it seems to me the only logical reason not to prioritize is the belief that in doing so you're somehow affecting the likelihood that it will end up being $9 as opposed to $10.

Evan Leibovitch: Well let me sort of play devil's advocate with you here because of the - one of the issues that we're dealing with is we are not going under the assumption that there is somehow a bank account or an accounting issue that puts aside a certain amount of money for needy applicants.

Everything we've been talking about so far has been dealing with cost reductions and certain, you know, certain benefits and cost reductions as opposed to you know, "Here's a pool of money from which you are going to be able to pay for things without having actually changed any of the prices."

So does that have a bearing on anything? The fact that we're not talking about, "Here is a specific pool of money," and dealing with the fact that you know, all of the worthy applicants that are going to meet a criteria will have reduced costs.

I mean in effect, ICANN either is giving out money or it's taking in less revenue. But in terms of the way they're perceived; in terms of you

know, "Here's a pool of money," as opposed to, "Here's a process that reduces the cost for those who qualify." How does that factor into what you're talking about?

Richard Tindal: Yeah, I think I understand the distinction you're making, but at the end of the day this is just, you know, money.

So it's coming from somewhere and if ICANN's going to decide to reduce fees for example they're going to have to make judgments about you know, "What can we afford in the scheme of our budget," and "How many likely applicants are we going to get here?"

And so you know, at the end of the day I think it's possible that the outcome of that could be that the outcome of that could be that there's a finite amount of cost reduction available from ICANN. I don't know the budgetary - too much budgetary risk my mind for them simply saying, "Okay, we agree (unintelligible) this category."

We don't (unintelligible) everyone gets a reduced fee because if the cost recovery model shows that those people are paying than the actual cost of processing their applications, then ICANN's going to be in a financial hole. So I just think common sense just tells me that there is a possibility that there's going to be limits on what's available.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay again, like I say, "Without Tijani here you're not really going to get the kind of response that probably your comments merit. So I'm not exactly sure what you want to do with that. We may need to wait for the next meeting when is here or - either that or we can - I mean if you want to try and address it and have to resolve it here we can, I just don't think it would be particularly fair.

Richard Tindal: No, I agree with you. I think it was useful just to have a little exchange there and we should have a more detailed discussion with Tijani on it.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi Avri, welcome to the call.

Avri Doria: I'm sorry I've missed so much. One of the things that I have yet to listen to in all the conversations. But it strikes me, given where we are, and one of the things I did for Evan was to spend a little bit of time over the weekend trying to construct some language that basically shows that your viewpoint are being met.

I know some people have contributed language or (unintelligible) but to try and bring things down so that we have something to sell - sent or even if it's just, you know, "Here's the 90% that everybody's on and here's some of the topics where there's still a discussion with this being the two prevalent viewpoints." So...

Man: Avri is there a way you can dial in under another number or can you...

Avri Doria: There's possibly some way I could get somebody to call me a local (unintelligible) number.

Glen de Saint Géry: Avri give me the - send me the number on an email or something. Or I'll tell you what...

Avri Doria: Okay, I will.

Glen de Saint Géry: ...if you can give the number to the operator right now. (Patricia), are you listening?

Avri Doria: Sure let me find the number. Okay, I'll deal with it. Okay, sorry I'll shut up now.

Evan Leibovitch: No it's okay Avri. It's just that there's a very loud hum that only comes on as you're talking.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay, if you...

Avri Doria: Sorry, again.

Glen de Saint Géry: ...give me the number we'll call out to you Avri.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, all right. I'm just trying to recall for myself what other issues besides prioritization were very, very divided within the group.

Sorry, so is the call out to Avri going okay right now?

Well I mean, one of the things that is really strange about this is that we had that African intervention into the group that happened during the Nairobi meeting.

One of the things that they said is, "They definitely did want us to give some prioritization to geographical location." And yet Tijani is arguing against the prioritization.

So this is one thing that we ought to deal with because we've been specifically asked in some of the recommendations to consider the kind of prioritization you're talking about Richard.

Anyway because as I'm going through and looking at some of the blue lines in the document right now. Especially, I am on Page 19; is everybody able to scroll on their own or are you locked into what I'm doing right now?

Man: Right now we're locked.

Man: We're locked in.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so you're all seeing the blue line part that's on the - in the agenda right now?

Man: Yeah, we're seeing it.

Man: Okay guys.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay you now have - sorry, I've just turned it off so you have - you should have the ability right now to all go on your own. But what I'm...

Man: Yeah we do.

Evan Leibovitch: ...calling attention right now to the wording that is around lines 226 and down. Okay. All right so again, sorry I really apologize for this. But Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah the substance of that is not to say, "Give Africa a priority," it says "Allow African for profit organizations to be eligible."

Evan Leibovitch: Right. And so we reached the consensus that that should be okay. Richard, go ahead.

Richard Tindal: I'm sorry, could you repeat your last sentence there?

Evan Leibovitch: I said, "It - I believe that we had already reached consensus that this process not be limited to non profits. That's it's potential...

Man: Right.

Evan Leibovitch: ...so that a for profit body in an emerging economy would still need the help of this process.

Richard Tindal: Let me just play that back. If I understand what we're saying that (unintelligible) corporation that happens to be in Africa and wants to get .web should be, should look for some sort of support?

Evan Leibovitch: Go - Andrew did you...

Andrew Mack: Yes. I could - sorry, my Adobe shut off so I was trying to raise my hand. But the short answer is that wasn't where - Richard, I don't think that was where we were going.

I think that in - for the first two kinds of support that we were talking about we agreed that the - that if they didn't pass the need criteria it wouldn't really matter. And one of the reasons I think why we walked away from a specific geographical focus was because we had gone to this idea of a need based filter on the front end.

So that for example, so Africa may have you know, a really primary need. There may be other regions of the world that have a similar kind of need. But for sure, if it's an entity that doesn't meet the need criteria

then the first two baskets of support wouldn't be open to them. That's the way I understood it.

Richard Tindal: Okay, so a needy for profit in an economically needy for profit in Africa would be eligible. But I thought that that was already the case? In the other category had we limited it to only non profits? I don't recall?

Andrew Mack: I don't think there's any time - I think we walked away from the idea of limiting it to only non profits early on in our conversation.

Evan Leibovitch: That was my recollection as well.

Richard Tindal: So this African statement seems to be just already accommodated by the categories that we've created.

Avri Doria: Yeah, it wasn't clear enough to everyone.

Andrew Mack: If I might, the only part of the African statement that I think wasn't accommodated completely by our comments and our work so far is a specific focus on one regional area.

And I think that we all agreed that while we recognize the need, in the African context, that it's - that favoring one region over another was both politically unwise and probably also not very fair, I mean realistically, since there are other places in the world that have some similar qualifications -- some similar conditions.

Richard Tindal: Okay, so in a nutshell, the way it could be interpreted, "As seeking a priority for African based applicants." And we're saying, "That's not appropriate," for the reasons you explained.

Andrew Mack: My understanding was that where we ended up was that we recognize the unique characteristics of Africa but that we weren't going to single out one geographical region for support on the basis only of its geography. Is that what everybody remembers?

Richard Tindal: That seems quite sensible to me.

Man: I'm not sure I remember it, but it seems reasonable.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Avri, do you have anything to add to this?

Avri Doria: No, except that I think that we did have a conversation earlier. And while I could be misquoting, I believe that Tijani was in support of us not necessarily prioritizing Africa.

                But certainly when we had the discussion, there was never a feeling in the group that we should prioritize one geography. But it was understood why (Ranfralo) would say - you know would basically need to say, "We need to be in a priority position."

                So perhaps we need to find some language, not in terms of the report, but in terms of responding this to this that sort of acknowledges the special need of Africa but also you know, indicating how we need to keep that as an open issue in terms - and not limited geographically because of fairness, et cetera.

                And also point to the fact that with need as the primary criteria, that you know, their need and need as a criteria should contribute to responding to their call, or something like that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, if there were unlimited pools of money then you don't have to prioritize. If there are not unlimited pools of money but it's limited, then need should be the overriding factor.

But recognize that assuming we're talking about sources of funding other than just ICANN, the funders have priorities. So the African development bank is not going to fund a country in Southeast Asia, the Asian development bank is not going to fund Africa, and the World Bank has its own priorities and will honor those.

So since an awful lot of the world donors in fact are specifically interested in Africa these days -- Africa implicitly has priority among those sources -- and I don't think we need to refine those, you know, those things anymore. The natural way of the world in finding money is going to favor Africa to some extent anyway.

But I don't think it's our job to say, "Africa is more needy for a new gTLD for - in a potential profit making venture than Indonesia is." I don't think that's our job.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. It may actually just be something that needs to be handled in the text where we, you know explain what you just said in terms of when it's ICANN processing some level of assistance -- whether it's financial or practical or in kind -- then you know there's no differentiation. But of course if we bring in outside, you know funders, they may all have their own priorities that we'll have to work with, or something like that.

Alan Greenberg: I think you just said it perfectly if someone captured it.

Avri Doria: It's on the recording or I'll write it later. I fear I have some penance and some dues to pay by having missed so much this week. So I was going to listen to the two recordings, look at the document.

Since we didn't have (Carla) here to you know, sort of work on the documents, take a pass through them and get them out to people so that when we talk next week - and again, I'm not sure I'll make that meeting but at least I'll have contributed something to what's going on.

So Evan had asked if I could take over at this point because he's been carrying the whole load. But I'm not clearly quite sure what remains to be discussed in this last 20 minutes in terms of what issues are still open that haven't been covered.

And perhaps one of the things I can borrow from what Chuck's been doing in the MAPO group -- what I'm doing this Friday -- is actually collect what issues we still have that aren't, you know, covered to people's satisfaction, or people believe there's still some more discussion that's needed. Was there anything still on today's agenda that hadn't been hit yet?

Everybody's talking at once? Or does everybody believe that you've gone through now all the comments and that there's enough information on the calls and in various notes to respond to them all. Is that a correct statement?

Andrew Mack: Avri this is Andrew.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Maybe it would be worthwhile - it sounds like we're kind of at a stopping point, which may be fine. I know everybody's pooped who was on this earlier call. Maybe it would be worthwhile to just recap what our - you know, who we're expecting what from and then go on.

Avri Doria: Okay, that works for me. And especially, I'd like to know that. I certainly can't recap it. So perhaps put your hand up if you've got something that's on your plate. And then I can call and I can type it down to make sure I've got it. Because I certainly don't know to call on you all.

                 So who wants to go first? Andrew, what do you have on your plate?

Andrew Mack: I think we're pretty good with the piece that we were working on in terms of under-served script. And so I'm going to talk offline with Rafik to get a little bit more clarity around his ideas for the - you know, for the community. He had some ideas about how to define the script groups slightly differently.

                 So I'm going to follow-up with him on that and then put together, with Richard's help, some final text. So that's on my side.

Avri Doria: Okay, when do you think you'll have that text so that I can fold it into...

Andrew Mack: Sure.

Avri Doria: ...so then till (Carla) gets back I'll take the scribing and folding into the document task.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: So when do you think you can send me something that I can fold in?

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: I appreciate that. Rafik came to me and said he's going to be in IGF until I will be at IGF and so I will try and link up with him there and get you - get something, you now...

Avri Doria: Okay. I'll be here too so.

Andrew Mack: Okay. See you there.

Avri Doria: In fact I'm already here. I'm already here; I've been here a week. Okay so that's that. Who else? I heard somebody else in the background while I was speaking?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: I missed that. Who else has something else that they need to deliver into the document at the moment? Eric did you have anything? Alan?

Evan Leibovitch: Actually Glen...

Eric Brunner-Williams: I don't think I am already (unintelligible) I owe anything at this point.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: But if we go into the record from the meeting earlier this week, I could swear that there were other people besides Andrew and Richard that were going to take something away for (Wordsmith).

Avri Doria: Okay, well we can check. I'll - I'm going to try and listen to the last call, you know, over the next day. So I'll have a clue after that.

Does anybody remember whether Tijani had any thing that he was offering or did he already offer all the text he was - he needed to offer?

Okay, because what I'd like to do is see whether I can -- by going through all this and focusing more on the documents than the replies to questions -- see whether we can't have a document that people can look at that is something that can be sent on to the board with a cover note saying, "This is where we are now, and you know, some of the open points for discussion are marked throughout the document."

Because next week, you know, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, is kind of a deadline for getting them something like that. That way if we're a couple days late, I'm sure if I beg properly they'll take it into account. So I'm hoping we can get there. And that's why I'm going to put some work in on the document to see.

So I guess it's just - if anybody has anything to contribute in writing, please make sure you send it out in the next - real soon.

Anything else we need to cover today? Or should I just have come in the call in time to tell you, "Thanks for keeping it" - okay, Rafik.

Rafik Dummak: Avri, You mean that we can send the documents like snapshot and we will continue discussing after that?

Avri Doria: Excuse me? I didn't understand.

Rafik Dummak: I am just trying to understand what you said. I understand (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, okay. What I'm trying to say is we - oh I hear echo, is that we should try to delivery something to the board for their receipt - for their retreat that basically covers where we are now.

It could almost be considered Snapshot 2, in terms of I think that we've reached consensus on a lot of stuff. I think there's a couple issues, and you guys may have reached some more consensus this week that I've missed.

There's a couple issues where there isn't quite consensus yet. As long as we can find a description of those issues that satisfies the various positions in the issue, I think we can give the board something coherent for them to consider.

And then I think we also just keep working, you know, and perhaps we will have to put together a note to our chartering organization saying, "Hey, we just did snapshot," of course I would send the snapshot to both of those too, you know after we all agreed that this was the snapshot to go. And then we would keep working to try and finish and close out our final issues.

Rafik Dummak: So Avri, you mean that we can send the snapshot without (unintelligible)?

Avri Doria: I believe so.

Rafik Dummak: Okay.

Avri Doria: In terms of - we have two organizations that chartered us; we have boards that requested that this be done.

I see no personal - if somebody in this group thinks this is something we shouldn't do or unless one of my two liaisons say, "No, no, no," I think we could send the same report to all three of them and say, "This is where we are, have fun with it."

Rafik Dummak: Okay. Just about you mentioned the charter; I think that we fixed the problem of the missed items. So I forgot to send the email to (unintelligible) but we (unintelligible) last chance to conference call the issue of the missed Item 5.

Avri Doria: Fantastic. I'm so glad to hear that and I'm sure Tijani will be glad to hear that as well. Okay so does anybody here object to the fact that we try to put together a Snapshot 2 and get it to the board in time for them to consider at their retreat?

Man: No.

Avri Doria: Richard, I see your hand up.

Richard Tindal: Yeah, on the contrary of objecting, I think it's a very good idea for us to do that. I think the board workshop is probably going to make some quite important decisions about the new TLD program so I think it's quite important for (unintelligible) on the table at the same time (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. And I see Andrew with a check. And so, yeah that's sort of the task I'm taking...

Andrew Mack: I took two checks because I could.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I think that's the task that I'm trying to take up for myself this weekend -- in addition to whatever else I have planned this weekend -- is to listen to the call and see if I can't take the document and update it to that snapshot.

And then whoever can make the call and are on the list even, we can make sure that the snapshot is agreeable to people -- that it doesn't prejudice things one way or another, that it doesn't say that we have consensus where we don't, et cetera.

And then send it on with you know, a cover note that says, "This is a snapshot. We're getting close, we're not quite there yet but you know, we thought it was important that you know where we're at."

Anything else that we should cover of this - and I really apologize, but the IGF comes but once a week its - I mean once a year, and I really couldn't not be doing what I'm doing.

Okay, so anything else Evan that should be covered. I mean, I feel really weird jumping in and sort of saying, "Okay, we're done for today."

I'll send out a note on the list after this meeting reminding anybody that's not here, you know, to please get me input and telling them the same thing that I just said about me trying to gather together a Snapshot 2 for the board and that we'll continue working after that.

I won't try to update the answers to the comments that - this weekend, I'm just going to focus on the document itself. When (Carla) gets back we can ask (Carla) to, you know, listen to the calls and update the comments with what all's been said. And then we'll have to go through them again to make sure it says the right thing.

Anything else? Evan, have I covered what needed to be covered?

Evan Leibovitch: Absolutely.

Avri Doria: Okay, and I very much thank you as the Co-Chair for taking up the slack in my absence. I very much appreciate it. And I thank you all. And the call ends ten minute early.

Man: Terrific.

Avri Doria: What a kick. Okay, thanks a lot folks.

Man: Cheers.

Glen de Saint Géry: Operator? Hello?

Coordinator: Hello, this is the operator.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes hello, the call is over. Is that you (Patricia)?

Coordinator: No she's actually left ma'am. I'm taking over, you're speaking to (Carol).

Glen de Saint Géry: Oh this is (Carol). (Carol), that's right. (Carol).

Coordinator: This is - yeah.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes, thank you very much. The call is over (Carol) so we - guess I just - stop the recording please.

Coordinator: Okay sure, will do. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you ever so much. Thank you.

Coordinator: Not a problem. Bye.

Glen de Saint Géry: Have a nice weekend.

Coordinator: No problem, bye.

Glen de Saint Géry: Bye.

                              END