

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 14 September 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) Thursday 14 September 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-ias-20100914.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

GNSO

Andrew Mack – CBUC

Avri Doria – NCSG – Co-Chair ([on Adobe Connect](#))

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachine

Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

ICANN staff

Gisella Gruber-White

Karla Valente

Apologies:

Richard Tindal – Individual

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison

Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large

Alex Gakuru – NCSG

Baudoin Schombe – At Large

Michele Neylon – RrSG Coordinator:

This call is now being recorded, please go ahead, thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Tuesday the 14th of September. We have Evan Leibovitch, Elaine Pruis, Carlos Aguirre, Eric Brunner-Williams, Andrew Mack, Alan Greenberg.

From staff we have Karla Valente and myself Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alex Gakuru, Rafik Dammak and we are not able to get ahold of Baudouin Schombe.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you very much, over to you Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Did you say Tijani is with us or sends regrets?

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry?

Evan Leibovitch: Did you say Tijani is with us or sent regrets.

Gisella Gruber-White: No, Tijani sends regrets, he's not with us.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Okay then, well thank you and welcome to another one of our twice weekly meetings on the JAS issue. It looks like we're starting to come to some resolution of most of these.

So what I would like to do is draw your attention to the document that Avri has been working on and sent out within the last little while. It is up in Adobe Connect and so what I'd like to do is take another run through to make sure that people are comfortable with this.

We'll go through it bit by bit. There is one other matter that I would like to try and discuss first. And that is to try and get a general feel from the rest of this committee about the issue that Andrew's been raising about bundling.

And there's been a discussion on the mailing list about whether this is in or out of scope and I would like to just to get some kind of guidance from the rest of the group on whether or not that is the case.

So what I'd like to do is - oh Tijani is on Adobe Connect but not with us in the phone. So what I'm asking for is to get a feel from the people that are in on the call right now to try and get an idea of whether or not you believe that the issue of bundling as it has been most recently proposed is within the scope of this group.

And specifically although Andrew I'll let you speak to the details if you wish, the general idea put forward is a proposal that would reduce the cost of adding additional strings in IDNs for an applicant.

And as part of reducing the overall cost but this would be available to everyone, not just for disadvantaged applicants.

And that I guess is the sticking point. The original point behind having this committee was determining ways of reducing costs for people from applicants from developing economies or from smaller communities that couldn't otherwise afford to do so.

And there has been an issue on the mailing list of whether or not a proposal that proposes to reduce prices for everybody is within the scope of this.

So I'd like to go around to people that are involved in the meeting right now and get a feel for what you each think. So since I can see on meeting view who is connected I'm going to go to everybody one by one.

And so is Carlos on - did Carlos show on the line? Could I just get a feel for what you - for your opinion on this?

Carlos Aguirre: Yes, hi Evan. I saw that the main sender by Avri yesterday and now Brady today, I like the word made by Avri. I think it's (unintelligible) to define the - some words in the text but on the other side the work made by Avri the complete document is for me very, very good.

I don't know if the other people think the same but for me it's good except made by Avri.

Evan Leibovitch: What specifically is on the issue of bundling as this is put forward by Richard and Andrew. So do you have opinions on whether that particular issue is within the scope of this group?

Carlos Aguirre: Sorry, you want to repeat the question, I don't understand please.

Man: Be clear Evan, who are you directing that to?

Evan Leibovitch: To Carlos, I wanted to get your opinion Carlos on whether or not that particular issue is within the scope of this group, the bundling issue.

Put forward by Richard and Andrew.

Carlos Aguirre: I'm not sure but I think yes, we have I think the board we will draft the possibility to think upon and to say our thinking in this issue for - that way I think it's in our scope, the sustainment.

I think it's yes, the response.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, thank you. Alex is or is not with us on the call?

Man: I believe there were regrets from him.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Elaine, what's your point of view?

Elaine Pruis: I haven't seen the emails, I've been on call so I do not believe that bundling is a part of what we should be recommending for our applicants.

The board Resolution 20 says where our numerous stakeholders have expressed concern about the cost of appliance in gTLDs and suggested these costs might hinder applicants requiring assistance, especially those from developing countries.

And so in my mind that means that we should not be suggesting lowering any fees for groups outside of those that meet our requirements for support.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, thank you. Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I agree with Elaine.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Andrew I guess I know where you're coming from. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I agree also, if the board or whoever wants to say hey, that's a marvelous idea, we should do it for everyone, that's their prerogative.

I mean if we lowered the overall fee for applying to zero it would help disadvantaged countries, disadvantaged applicants but that's not our mandate.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I can't tell from Verizon, is Baudouin on the call or not?

Gisella Gruber-White: No, I've spoken with both him and Tijani today though.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh is Tijani here?

Man: No he said he couldn't....

Man: I'm calling in from (Bilius) well I'm on site actually from (Bilius) and I've spoken with both of them today. And I mean I also - with Rafik, the - Tijani definitely things that we are within scope.

I think that Baudouin does as well and I think that Rafik is kind of on the fence about it to be very honest.

But I think if there's enough interest my argument is not that - I asked what people are saying about being in and out of scope. My argument is as follows.

We've already spent this much time and effort on it and we think that the idea has some merit. Why not let it go forward, if she chooses to reject it that's absolutely their prerogative.

It won't hurt us in any way, we've already put in tremendous amount of time and effort and there are a significant number of people on the call, Alex has written in about this is well.

I'm sorry that they're not on this call now but we've got a number of people who believe that it is in scope.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I mean my personal view is that if we add in things that were beyond our mandate that it actually could hurt some of the element - the other elements of what we've got in there.

Okay, so we do not have consensus on whether this is within scope. What I'm going to suggest and we will punt this issue to Friday when more people will be on the call.

But I'm going to suggest that this be included in the document but as an appendix as opposed to within the core recommendation because it really is not in the same vein as something of - we've been determining in terms of

here's the criteria under which somebody qualifies for special consideration, here is the special consideration.

The bundling thing is neither of those. So if there is at least some general support on this group to have it in, I'm okay with it but I'm going to suggest that it be put in as an appendix as opposed to part of the core document.

Man: That's okay with me.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right, now does anybody have - okay, Alan, your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, maybe I'm getting a bit confused and when we keep on making statements about this is within scope, it would be useful if we actually say what we're talking about.

IS there anyone who believes that bundling multiple IDNs for a lower price for disadvantage applicants based the ones fulfilling our definition is a good thing.

Is there anyone who does not agree on that? Hello?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, you're asking...

Man: Alan I'm not sure we understood the question.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. We - the people who have answered on this call have said that they do not believe asking for lower prices, bundling for everybody is within scope.

But my understanding was pretty much everyone felt that restricting it to just the applicant that meet our criteria was within the scope. Am I incorrect on this? Is that a wrong assumption?

Evan Leibovitch: I think you're correct Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, then why don't we make a recommendation that for - again for our applicants like the rest of the things we advocate some form of bundling of lower pricing for multiple IDNs.

And we can note if we wish that some members of the group feel in fact this should be extended to all applicants and simply call it like it is.

I think we have consensus that it would be a good thing for the applicants that we're looking at and there is a varied view on whether it is something that we should be asking for in general.

If that is indeed the case, if I'm not mistaken then we can simply say that and we don't have to sideline the application - the use for our applicants because we can't get unanimity on the second half.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, would either Alan or Andrew like to suggest a little bit of working that we could put in there that would just fine tune it to say exactly that?

Andrew Mack: Sure, I could work on that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I mean we're not talking about something major, basically just something small that essentially encompasses what Alan just said in the sense that we believe that this would be good thing for disadvantage applicants.

A suggestion has been made that this be presented for all applicants, however that general level of application is beyond the scope.

Man: Or there's no unanimity. Let's not argue whether it's in scope or not.

Man: Leave scope out of it. I agree, I think if we leave scope out of it and that I think what you're saying is there's unanimity around that it's good for the

disadvantaged applicants and there are different arguments and not unanimity about its broader extension to everyone.

Am I understanding you correctly?

Alan Greenberg: It's broader application to everyone, we'll help spread the use of IDN which is a good thing for our - for the community we're looking at. But it doesn't specifically help our applicants.

So I think it's worth mentioning but - and then we have a strong statement for our applicants. They can decide you know more globally whether it's applicable or not.

I mean we have - we don't have access to the models of if you mean there are any of how many strings are going to be applied for by VeriSign in 12 IDNs as an example.

You know giving that price cut may in fact change the whole pricing model if it's done to the non- disadvantaged applicants. We don't have to pass judgment on that, we can simply suggest that it might be a good thing to do.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Eric you had your hand up. First off Eric are you okay with that suggestion?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Actually I wanted to speak to the very issue that was raised by the previous speaker which is the assertion that it is a good thing for scripts and for language communities.

If commercial entities are allowed to have a discounted price to enter the script markets.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Eric before you start I wasn't suggesting we say that, it was just a comment on my part which may or may not be wrong, but go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well you're making the case that it is a good thing and I want to put a caveat to that which is that if a script community is sufficiently small that it can only support one registry that the effect of lowering the price for commercial applicants is allowing them to capture a monopoly in those script markets.

And that's not of service to the language community. But merely making their scripts available but making it available to a third party investor, speculator, someone external to the language community who has readier access to capital is actually contrary to the best interest of the language community.
Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Interesting point.

Evan Leibovitch: Andrew, can I ask for your comments on that?

Andrew Mack: I don't think there's any desire to have a script community become not of any interest but especially not of an outside interest. So I mean that aspect of it makes good sense to me.

You know I run a company, I'm not allergic to the idea of the companies but I understand I think where Eric is coming from.

I'm wondering whether there's not a more direct way to address that specific issue but I think I understand the example.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, I mean if it's a matter Andrew of saying okay, disadvantaged applicants can be given the ability to do this bundling but isn't extended to everybody.

Then essentially we've addressed what you want to do and we've addressed what Eric's concerns are. The moment we say we want it for everybody then all the sudden Eric's concerns come into play and you have the possibility of VeriSign using this to try and swamp the market.

Andrew Mack: Right, I hear what you're saying, that's not the intent right, but the intent is to bring people in and that was from the very beginning the intent.

And so I think if we - that was my intent for introducing it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, why don't we just leave it then to include it Andrew but to keep it within the scope of that we would want to include - to offer the bundling for those applicants that meet our criteria of having a need.

And then we will let somebody in some other form...

Andrew Mack: Well hold on, but that's the thing. I don't - I think that we've spent a lot of time talking about this and we've made a number of adjustments to the proposal.

I think it wouldn't match with the conversations that we've had to not include - I hear this that there are people that believe that the majority opinion is that this should be very limited.

I'm just wondering, the initial thing that you said to me is that we come up with language that says that this is something that we should include or the - our target community and that there has been significant discussion about extending it out.

And I'm comfortable with that if you are.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so...

Andrew Mack: That reflects really where we are.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, and so essentially we can say we have fairly complete consensus that this is a good idea, for disadvantaged we do not have consensus that it is a good thing for everyone. Okay.

All right, so having beaten that one into the ground then let's move on. So you all...

Alan Greenberg: Evan it's Alan.

Evan Leibovitch: Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Just one postscript on what Eric said, there's a presumption in my mind which may not be valid. And maybe Karla can help. That if ICANN approves an application specifically in an IDN and let's follow our current discussion through and there are multiple IDNs that have been given a good price.

The presumption is this goes along with the business plan which indicates they're really going to use it and they're really going to market to that community.

Is that a reasonable assumption? I mean we wouldn't want a disadvantaged applicant in Africa to get 12 different scripts and then put 11 on the shelf and not even try to market them or not offer them.

Can we assume that when things like business plans are reviewed that there's some level of belief that these things are going to be used?

Karla Valente: Alan this is Karla, that is correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Then my - the concern that popped up is not relevant, let's go on.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Eric you get the last word then we move on.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sorry, I'm trying to lower my hand but Alan the requirement is that delegate here from operational so warehousing (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Well delegated does not mean you actually try to do anything with it once it's in the room. But yes, I understand. I'm willing to take Karla's statement at face value and go on.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, all right. Having said that then we will try and just (unintelligible) indicating the parts that have consensus, do not have consensus, we will find the appropriate places to put them in the document.

In the meantime I draw your attention to the top of the document that is in Adobe Connect which is the latest draft, Eric has indicated that it includes his most recent edits and comments.

I want to thank you tremendously for the fast work in turning this around after you got back from holiday so we are not essentially what I'd like to do is go through this and see that we've got consensus amongst the people here on this call of the wording that's in there.

Okay, objectives, Item 2.1 Lines 2 through 7, I'm not going to read them out you can read faster than I can say it.

Does anyone have any comments, questions or are we okay to move on? Give about 10 to 15 seconds if anybody has something to say, if not we will move on. Everyone okay with 2.1?

Okay, Item Number 2.2, which is Line 8 through 3. Okay is everybody okay with that? Okay, so good for 2. Okay Lines 25, so Section 3, the heading so Lines 25 to 27 I am innocuous.

Okay 3.1, Lines 28 to 47, this is getting into the heart of what we're doing.

Okay, everybody is okay with 3.1. Okay, 3.2.

Man: Sorry Evan, I'm not at my computer, I can't put my hand up right now. The line's starting to - the bullet starting at 36 is not particularly clear.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Man: I mean are we making a recommendation to - decremented by \$12 or simply saying based on the previous rounds it should be lower?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, comments anyone?

Man: I'm just worried that a statement that's so vague right at the top of our document discourages or lowers the credibility of the whole thing.

Evan Leibovitch: we're going to have to make a note of that and come back to that one.

Man: Okay, fine.

Evan Leibovitch: Well Avri is trying to come in on Adobe Connect, can't come in on the voice part of the call so I think she's at a disadvantage on the ability that we talk to this.

So staff if you put a little mark next to (unintelligible). Oh hold on, Avri has - okay. Alan could you type your question into Adobe Connect so that Avri could...

Alan Greenberg: I thought I actually heard Avri's voice.

Evan Leibovitch: NO, she's in on Adobe Connect but not in the voice call. If you type your question in and while that's happening Elaine go.

Elaine Pruis: So what I see on Adobe is the excerpt but how are we going to get it to the board after this call, is that correct?

Evan Leibovitch: We're looking to get as much of this done as possible and if we can get - whatever we can get consensus on can go to the board.

Karla what is the intention at this point for what's going to the board?

Karla Valente: A summary, we have a standard format for the departments who submit to the board for the voice just to have a summary to understand our proposals and aware of the group stance on.

That's what we were talking about between Avri and the team before I went on vacation and in addition to the document there were some clarification questions.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so all right, Avri is now looking at Alan's question. Does anybody else have any verbal comment on Alan's question?

Woman: Can you not hear me Evan? This excerpt which I think Avri indicated in her email was what she intended to put forward to the board because the full paper isn't complete yet.

And the excerpt itself there are bits and pieces of from this first part here, 3.1 bits and pieces of what was written in the full document.

But from this explanation that seem to have just made it into the excerpt that haven't been fully drawn over across things which particularly Line 70 through...

Evan Leibovitch: Hey somebody's typing really, really loudly. Somebody's got a really noisy keyboard. All right, so you're saying decrement the fee but not saying how much to decrement it.

So that's Alan's point, so okay Avri's answering that we could not make a really substantive recommendation until we got more facts about what went into the pricing point.

So should we make that clear in this bullet point? The amount to be decremented will be determined upon further study of the pricing structure?

Alan is that reasonable?

Alan Greenberg: It would be slightly stronger. I stated my point from the very beginning that I don't think that the argument we're making here is a valid one because the prices from the earlier rounds was used as a sanity check, not as the derivation of the number.

And therefore I don't think it's a strong argument to begin with based on what we've been told how the pricing was derived.

If people are determined to keep it in, yes that would make it slightly stronger.

Evan Leibovitch: So you're suggesting the removal of 36 through 40.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, but I'm not trying to go back to day one in this group and change the decisions that seem to have been made you know by the - by general consensus. I disagree with it, but I'm pointing out that if it's there it should be a stronger, more definitive statement.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm sorry, I'm typing some of this in for the benefit of Avri and whoever else is in Adobe connect that's not in voice. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I'm just not the right one to reword something I think was ill advised to begin with so if someone else who believes in it wants to try to reword it I'm happy with that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, all right, Elaine did I see your hand up about this or have you said your piece?

Elaine Pruis: I just typed that that particular point does not have full support from the working group and that was listed in the initial document as something that was put forward but we hadn't reached consensus on.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Then prefix it by there had been suggestions that or something like that, I don't know.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually okay, Karla at the end of this pointed line for a just say this point did not have full consensus of the group.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Man: I can live with that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, can we move on to Point 41, to Line 41 to 47. Is everybody okay with that? Okay, going once, going twice, okay gone.

Three Point 2, Lines 48 through hang on, so I don't know if this is a - this actually is a single one that goes through multiple pages so let's tackle it one bit at a time.

The first bullet point which takes us to - sorry I'm not scrolling very far on here, 161, so Lines 48 to 61. Any comments on this? Is everybody okay with it?

Okay, all right moving on, the wording of the (unintelligible).

Elaine Pruis: This is Elaine, I do have a question here.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Line 60, it says that funding would be distributed without regard to geographic location but with a priority given to linguistic community applicants applying for IDN streams.

Is it correct that we've all agreed on that?

Man: I don't believe we did, I believe we had - go ahead.

Man: No, you can.

Man: Yeah, I was just saying I think we had significant discussions on whether we should give priority to X or to Y and I thought the final consensus was we should not give priority to any particular subgroup of the group we're looking at.

Man: That's my understanding also.

Man: Now I'm confused, I recall us deciding that we were going to not favor any geographic group. Did we give up on the idea of targeting entirely?

Evan Leibovitch: Well elsewhere in the document we're talking about what are the criteria but it's saying - we're actually making another comment to those criteria I guess that's out of place.

Okay, so do we just take out 59 through 61, everything after that comma?
Actually we should take out that entire sentence starting at 58.

Man: I think being silent on it is probably the best move at this point.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so I'm not hearing any dissent to the removal of the sentence from Line 58 to 61. Okay.

Karla Valente: Sorry Evan can you repeat that? We're removing everything from...

Evan Leibovitch: The sentence from Line 58 to 61.

Man: The sentence starting additionally comma.

Karla Valente: Okay, got it.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm just waiting to hear back from Avri if she's getting any comment on that. Okay is this something also perhaps Karla that you could redline so that when we come back on Friday with the larger group that we can just nail this one down?

Karla Valente: You mean reconfirm the changes that we're making today?

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, like basically put this one in square brackets or something like that so that we can revisit it on Friday when we've go the idea people in on the call.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Man: Evan this is the second or third reference you've made to the Friday call. Is that actually scheduled?

Evan Leibovitch: I believe so, I thought based on the doodle that happened that there was a clear preference on Friday.

Man: I don't deny that but it's not on the GNSO calendar and I never saw - I don't think there was ever a notice going out saying it's scheduled.

Karla Valente: That's correct Gisella asked me today to confirm with Evan and the group that we are having that call on Friday you know at the time that was specified which I think was 20 UTC.

Evan Leibovitch: Elaine go ahead. Elaine you had your hand up. You on mute?

Elaine Pruis: I'm sorry, yes. So my concern or my question that what we're looking at right now is an excerpt of the document that Avri stated in her email Sunday she wanted to send that to the board.

And the chartering organizations on Wednesday and then we would go back to finish the final report, so what we're looking at right now is what the board will see as the first look at our report, correct?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Elaine Pruis: So we need to be very careful not to put in anything that we're going to be working on on Friday that we haven't achieved consensus on. That feeding line or is it...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, you know what Elaine your point is good so what I'm going to suggest Karla let's take the sentence from 58 to 61, put it in square brackets for our further discussion but take it out of the version that goes to the board.

Elaine is that okay with you?

Elaine Pruis: Yes. Actually if you're going to say that in Line 26 that we've reached consensus on the following recommendations, shouldn't be including things we're still discussing without taking note of it.

Evan Leibovitch: Do we want to put something here that says you know additional - you know okay, let's just take this one out and Karla if you could just sort of red line it for our discussion at the next meeting.

Karla Valente: Yeah I have that so Evan the deadline for the document for the board was yesterday. I could send something still today but on Friday not going to be possible.

Evan Leibovitch: All right, if that's the case then folks we have not very much time to get through the rest of this and so our goal right now is to find out what everyone is comfortable with that we are okay sending to the board.

We are going to take out Lines 58 to 61, we're going to leave it in the document that we will continue to debate but it will not go in the version that goes to the board. Is everybody okay with that?

Man: Yep.

Man: So the stuff I'm going to get you that by the end of the day today, is that okay?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right, line - okay lines - okay Elaine go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: So that issue of what Andrew is (unintelligible) language to be suited here and I really don't think we've reached any sort of consensus on the bundling concept so I don't think that should be included in this initial snapshot that's sent to the board today or tomorrow.

Evan Leibovitch: I thought we were saying we had consensus for deserving applicants but we're split on the issue of applying it to all. Is that not accurate?

Man: That's what I have written down.

Evan Leibovitch: Elaine is that not accurate? Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Well I think Evan as the chair or Avri as the chair it's your job to make alternative consensus but from my perspective there's been a pretty loud vocal opposition to the concept.

Evan Leibovitch: Of applying it to deserving applicants? I thought we had consensus that it was okay to offer the bundling to those that met our criteria of need. I thought we had consensus on that.

Elaine Pruis: Well that part's okay with me but I hadn't heard that call for...

Evan Leibovitch: No, I thought that we - I thought we had an agreement that we had consensus that the bundling idea was good for - that we had general consensus that the bundling was okay for deserving applicants that met the criteria of need.

There was a disagreement on whether or not that should be offered to everybody. Is that not right? Elaine is that not accurate?

Elaine Pruis: That sounds good to me.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right, let's move on, we've got ten minutes on the call and still a good chunk of the document to do. All right, going to Line 62 to (unintelligible), everybody okay with this?

Sorry, 62 to 66, put more logical groupings around this.

Man: Yep.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so I'm going to go faster so there will be less time you've got like 10 seconds or less to - if you've got an objection state it quick.

Okay, Line 67 to 83, what's being discussed for is everybody okay with this?

Man: By the way Avri did put a sentence on the chat which I think applied to the first bullet, the distribution of ICANN funds.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, we've still got an awful lot of document to go through and we can revisit that or...

Man: Okay, let's go ahead, sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Eric, go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: There's a question asked by Avri on the text in section 73 through 80, if we're at the point I can answer that question.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes it's a voluntary. So if you put the word in the second line you can say registrants who voluntarily contribute to...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay what - okay so that's on Line 74, add the word voluntary?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Between to and contribute.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. Okay Karla do you have that?

Karla Valente: No I do not. Could you please repeat the line and the change made?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Line 74 to contribute becomes to voluntarily contribute.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, all right so any other comments down to the bottom of 83?

Man: Elaine has her hand up.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Elaine go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks, I understand the concept here but I have a very hard time reading this. It is possible to break it up into smaller sentences? I think we have a lot of different ideas made into one sentence.

Evan Leibovitch: Well we're running a little short of time on this meeting, we've got five minutes left and the rest of the document to go through.

I mean if you've got some ideas of how to clarify this, I mean it's clumsy but it's not inaccurate. I mean obviously this is a snapshot that is going to take more work before it comes in its final form.

I mean we can wordsmith it but we are running really short on time. Do you have some specific wording to suggest?

Elaine Pruis: I think it just should be broken into smaller sentences.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, can I ask you to submit to Karla how you would do that?

Elaine Pruis: Sure.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so offline Elaine is going to send to Karla some suggested wording that does not change the intent of this paragraph but simply breaks it down into smaller sentences and makes it a little clearer to read.

IS that okay? All right, moving on, Point 2.3 okay, so we are now on Lines 84 to 95. Okay, Avri's made a comment, she's not sure on how much support there was for the paragraph in Line 91 to 95, is it okay if we state clearly there was no consensus but some support?

Okay, Eric go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I prefer to strike it. Thank you.

Elaine Pruis: I agree.

Evan Leibovitch: What's the feel of the rest of the call? Okay, there is Eric and Elaine have made the point to strike Lines 91 to 95. it's an exemption based on vertical - an exception from vertical integration rules.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Should they exist?

Evan Leibovitch: Alan, Andrew, Carlos, what's your take?

Man: I have no problem, I do have another question though related to...

Evan Leibovitch: Let's get through one thing, right now I've got on the floor do we get rid of 91 to 95? Andrew are you okay with getting rid of it?

Andrew Mack: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: My preference is to keep it but I can live with getting rid of it.

Evan Leibovitch: Well again, Karla put it into angled brackets we will come back to it at future meetings but for the snapshot going to the board it comes out.

Karla Valente: Okay, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Carlos, do you have a point on this?

Carlos Aguirre: I don't know, it's complicated, the response. So I - no, I have no opinion about this.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right then okay, so Karla what we're going to do is we're going to remove 91 through 95 in the version going to the board.

In the version that we will come back to later in future meetings just put angle brackets around it and we will revisit to see if we can nail that down.

But it will not be going in the version to the board.

Karla Valente: I made the note. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Everybody's okay with that? Moving on to 3.4, so we are on Line 96 to I believe it's - okay to 119. So 3.4, okay so this goes into - so we've got some things.

On Line 97 do we care about either the word main or the word sole?

Man: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, go ahead.

Man: Yes, I'm not sure this - I understand why those are there but I don't think that they're the right words. We've established that as our initial priority right, that's the first test to post kind of thing.

But there are other criteria that we have down, for example that we've mentioned the people have a viable business - you know viable sustainability plans, things like that that are - that wouldn't make this make sense.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so the word there is main and we take out sole.

Man: Actually I think - so the primary or something like that, yeah. That's really the first priority.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so we take out main, sole and replace that with primary? Is that okay with everyone? Okay, I see a check from Andrew, Elaine said she's okay.

Does anyone have a problem with the word primary there?

Man: No.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, the other italicized - the other red line edits on Line 98 seem minor. Okay, from Lines 101 to 102, we have attracted or other need, does that stay or go from the version going to the board?

Man: So if it's primary we don't have a single one so we can now leave this to be plural, so the or other needs to remain.

Evan Leibovitch: Once financial or other needs have been established, we're okay with that? Okay so the wording of 101 to 102 will go to once financial or other needs have been established.

Is there any dissent with that wording? Okay, moving on, so we are now on point all right, we are now on Point 3.5.

Okay, you have a changing capitalization, are there any comments or proposed changes to 3.5? Now on Line 131 we have the bracketed word community, do we really need to put that in there? Elaine go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Yeah Evan I think you skipped a part here, we've haven't discussed line - in particular the one I'm concerned about, 113 through 116. And my point would be to remove the bracketed version for this excerpt that's going to the board.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Man: Say it again?

Evan Leibovitch: All right, Elaine's proposing that the bracketed material in 113 to 115 be removed from the version going to the board. Is there any objection to taking that out in the version going to the board?

Man: I'm just curious why?

Evan Leibovitch: Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: To me that statement indicates that a brand or group that doesn't have financial need but is in a market where - yeah, that's in a market where there's not a wide enough support for making a profit. So to me it's sort of - it muddies the criteria that we're putting.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm personally not sure I would agree, Eric go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm in favor of removing 113 through 115. The mention of brands assumes something that's not in evidence which is a single user thing.

And there's a - if you read this so that the contra positive is present then we're basically allowing brands that are in small markets to seek the money that we're trying to give to deserving communities.

And that's not what we should be doing. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan, I agree with Eric to remove those three lines.

Evan Leibovitch: Andrew?

Andrew Mack: I'm not sure I didn't - that Tijani had mentioned in multiple emails, he believes fairly strongly and I think he may be right that there are private - you know there are private entities that probably would qualify under normal circumstances for this in some markets.

And I don't know, I - perhaps I'm misreading this.

Man: Removing that bullet does not preclude private enterprise from getting these applicants. It - we're using a double negative there.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Man: We're saying don't fund brands except for those who are in bad markets.

Eric Brunner-Williams: And remember we've already laid the primary criteria of need. So before it even gets to this we've gone through a litmus test of needs.

Carlos Aguirre: So even - Carlos I want to say something, yes, I think the first - in the first bullet brand groups should be self supporting company it's complete.

For me the text that is needed in this point not the other text in the brackets. For me it's complete, the first part. We can't not to fix the each case or exceptions, is my point of view, sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: That goes counter to what Andrew had said Tijani has been saying and I'm not sure we want to take that decision if some people disagree then we leave it out of this version and red line it for future discussion.

Evan Leibovitch: And that's exactly the point, we have to come to a consensus of what can go out the door today. And so we could put this back on the table but for right now we're trying to come up with what we have consensus on now.

And 113 to 115 does not and I agree with Alan that the double negative wording is kind of clumsy. So we have an exception and then we have an exception to the exception.

Alan Greenberg: If you want consensus on this call the three lines disappear and we're silent on it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Karla take them out on the version going to the board, red line then in the version that we'll be taking about in future meetings.

Karla Valente: Okay, so just to make sure that I got that right Evan, from 113 to 115 take out everything that is in italics under brackets so remove from the board report but will still be discussed by the working group.

Evan Leibovitch: No not just italics, take out the entire bullet point.

Karla Valente: The entire bullet point. Okay, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay and red line it in the version that we will be dealing with on our own later.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, any other comments on 3.4? Going once, going twice. Okay, 3.5 starting at Line 20. Okay there's a capitalization that Avri has done, okay. Back to Line 130, I don't think we need the word community in there.

It's in brackets, I don't think it's necessary. And there's been a couple of changes, changing money, revenue is everybody - what is everybody's...

Man: Evan the brackets are indicating that Avri made - put it in italics.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, what is the view of the word having community in there? I don't think it's necessary.

Man: Well I believe by putting it in italics the sentence is saying the receipt of some government support should not disqualify a community applicant but it might disqualify other kinds of applicants.

Evan Leibovitch: Exactly. What's the feel of this group? Do we have consensus on limiting this to community applicants? And it's okay for community applicants to get government money but not okay for a commercial body to get a government subsidy to do something.

Andrew?

Andrew Mack: In many, many companies that might qualify with some - I can see instances in where - in which this would be very limiting, I don't know what other people think.

Some government ownership would preclude that.

Evan Leibovitch: My personal view is I would take out the word community here and not necessarily constrain it. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I agree. The reality as Andrew says in many countries is that their government hands are everywhere. Almost impossible and that to remain non-disadvantaged countries as well. Everyone gets subsidies of some form.

Evan Leibovitch: We have consensus to remove the word community from Line 130.

Alan Greenberg: Certainly on this call we do.

Man: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right, Lines 132 to 133 there's been some minor changes they don't look substantive. Okay is everybody okay with the wording in the brackets on 133? Okay, going once, going twice. All right, we are on to 3.6.

Okay, that's just capitalization, that looks non-threatening.

Karla Valente: I'm sorry Evan this is Karla again. So was the direction to remove the word community for the board?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Karla Valente: Okay, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, we are now on 3.6, 3.6 appears to be non-controversial, any complaints or comments?

Man: Evan going back to the 133 area, can someone read to me what it's supposed to be saying? Because when I read the words on the page it doesn't parse.

In cases where supported gTLD's make revenues significantly above and beyond the level support received through this process comma cost, comma recipients would receive to...

Evan Leibovitch: It's about costs.

Man: Say that again?

Man: I think it should be revenues and costs so where they make revenues significantly above costs or significantly above and beyond costs.

Evan Leibovitch: Got it, okay that's why it was in brackets. So take out the phrase the level of support received through this process, put in costs. So there's two places within the square brackets, what's the preference here?

Man: Okay, now I see, okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Thank you for catching it.

Man: Yes, cost is better.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, any dissent on using the term costs? So be significantly above and beyond costs. Going once, going twice, good catch, thank you.

Okay, on to 3.7 starting at Line 141, this is the bundling proposal. Okay now we have a wording change that we talked about at the beginning of this phone call that will replace the wording from 143 to 146.

If I recall correctly that wording essentially says there was consensus within this group to provide such support for qualified applicants.

The group has not achieved consensus on whether this should be recommended for all applicants. Is that in keeping with our conversation so far?

Man: It is. Now the - go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Is - okay Andrew and Elaine are you both okay with that? Andrew first, go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Sure. We had a bullet below that is - that talks about the level of discounts. I think that's - that may make sense to put in, what's the consensus of the group?

Evan Leibovitch: Well okay, I'm on one thing first, right now I'm on a change of Lines 143 to 146 to the statement that we had earlier in this phone call. That's what I've got on the floor right now making sure everyone's comfortable with.

That we achieve consensus on offering this - that offering this support to qualified candidates under this program there was not consensus on the desire of this group to recommend the program for all applicants.

Elaine Pruis: Evan can we just go with the first part of your sentence and drop - leave off the we've now reached consensus, this should be proposed for applicants?

Man: I don't agree with that. Sorry. Evan I don't think what you're proposing goes with the words that follow.

Evan Leibovitch: Well we're going to have to wordsmith this a little bit as we go forward ,because we have to make it clear to the readers of this that we had consensus on a bundling proposal for qualified applicants, not that there have been suggestions but no consensus that this be extended to all TLD applicants.

Accurate with what we were saying earlier on the call. So what I'm trying to do right now is to put in wording that makes it clear to the reader that we are recommending the bundling program for qualified applicants according to this program.

Man: Okay but I think that's what Option B is saying right now.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Man: Assuming 3.4 is our criteria for support. I thought we already agreed on language on this or the gist of it.

Evan Leibovitch: Essentially what's happening is we have achieved consensus to agree on Option B, it has been recommended but we have achieved no consensus on Option A.

Man: Okay, I see what Andrew was saying. Option B - Option A is saying there's a discount structure for multiple scripts, Option B says they're all the same application, one price gets you all.

Andrew Mack: They're very different things. Option A, the way I understood it, we had originally talked about bundling and then through the work that we sat down with Richard and did we moved that recommendation to just be discount for any number of applications.

If we want to go back to bundling, that's fine. I think that that was the initial proposal.

Man: Okay the problem Evan is having is Option B says it's only for disadvantaged applicants, those who meet 3.4.

Evan Leibovitch: Correct.

Man: Option A makes no such restriction and he's trying to apply an overall restriction. I think if you were - I think if we remove the if an applicant meets in Option B and put that in the preamble I think that addresses what we want.

Evan Leibovitch: Well that's what I was trying to do at the very beginning.

Man: I understand but Evan I'm saying you have to also remove it from Option B so it applies to A and B as it reads right now it would not apply.

Evan Leibovitch: Agreed, so what I was trying to do was craft a note that indicated where we had consensus and where we did not in the note from 143 to 146 and then tune the subsequent wording accordingly.

Okay, so from 143 to 146, just saying for the following program there has been consensus to apply - to - sorry, there has been consensus to apply the following program to applicants that meet the criteria in 3.4.

It has been put forward but there is no consensus yet on the offering of this program to all applicants. We put that in the note here and then we'll fine tune the rest to OLAP.

Is everybody okay with that?

Man: That seems reasonable.

Evan Leibovitch: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yep.

Evan Leibovitch: Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Give me a second to think about this. The problem with saying that there's been no consensus reached yet, that this program should be put forward to all applicants to me indicates that in our paper or in our thinking we're offering these suggestions for support or discounts to all applicants.

Where I think that's outside of what Resolution 20 which is define support for disadvantaged applicants.

Evan Leibovitch: Elaine, it is accurate to state that there is significant support but not full consensus for that position. All we have to do is accurately reflect this group.

Man: Not necessarily significant support based on the use of that terminology.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. But Elaine what I'm trying to get at is that there is significant support within this group for putting forward all applicants. We have not achieved consensus.

It is accurate to state that. There is people in the group that believe it is within scope, we have not achieved consensus on that. Is that not accurate? Okay, so Karla could you read back what you have as the wording from 143 to 146?

Karla Valente: What I have is there has been consensus to apply the following program to applicants that meet Criteria 3.4 but there is no full consensus yet to offer this program to all applicants.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I would modify that a little bit in the latter part in saying there is support but no consensus to apply this program to all applicants.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Man: Did we move from significant support to just support there?

Evan Leibovitch: Right at this point.

Man: You just mentioned it, those are your own words.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, we don't even have all the people on this call taking a headcount of how significant the support is right now, doesn't make a lot of sense.

Man: Fair enough.

Evan Leibovitch: So what I would like to do now is go through the wording from Line 140 forward and just make sure that this makes sense given what has just been said.

Okay, so yeah, so the paragraph in 148 to 154 seems very clumsy because it's saying okay there's one proposal that is for need and one that is not for need which we have just covered in the note.

Okay, so all right, I'm going to suggest taking out Lines 150 to 154. So based on recommendations within the group and from comments that we have no consensus but two proposals for building to support minority language applicants.

We take out 150 to 154 and we go right into the two options. The two options talk about process, not about who qualifies. Is that reasonable to everybody?

Karla Valente: Evan this is Karla, I'm sorry, as I make the edit the lines get a little bit changed so do you want me to take out the whole sentence that starts with based on recommendations?

Evan Leibovitch: No, the sentence, the following one starting with in one opinion to the end of the paragraph and remove that.

Karla Valente: So remove from everything that starts with in one opinion.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, leave in the...

Karla Valente: So everything that follows up to application.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, take out everything from in one opinion to the word...

Man: Just for the record in one option.

Karla Valente: Sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, in one option, the rest of the paragraph up to the words in the application.

Karla Valente: Okay, done.

Man: Two sentences get removed.

Evan Leibovitch: Right, so we go right from the sentence the two proposals for building to support minority language applications to two proposals for bundling are discussed below.

And then okay, in Option A we have 159 and 160 two choices, I would change the second item TLD to further IDN TLDs, simply - that simply takes out the restriction from two.

Okay, is there any other comment on Option A? Okay, for Option B, Line 174 and 175, okay Eric go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yeah I'm sorry, Adobe Connect was kind of slow, when you asked if there were any comments about A, the numbers just don't seem correct to me, but that's a point I made in the last call. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, again this is a snapshot, of course there's going to be more work. Okay, all right for Option B, all right so 174 and 175 are kind of redundant given what we've just said so I would start the sentence for the purpose of application fee calculation the two or more strings shall be considered as a single application.

Is that reasonable wording for that paragraph from 174 to 176?

Man: Yep, I think so.

Evan Leibovitch: Karla do you have that?

Karla Valente: No, could you please repeat? That's Option B?

Evan Leibovitch: For Option B, if - so take out everything between if and the words then.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: So the sentence becomes for the purpose of application fee calculation the two or more strings shall be considered as a single application.

Karla Valente: Take out resource.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Karla Valente: Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, sorry did somebody else have a comment? Okay, the wording for the rest of Option B, are we okay with that?

Man: I don't think that's Option B, I think that's the general statement.

Man: Agree. The formatting may not make it clear but in reading it, it applies to all options.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so Karla to you - that paragraph that we just mentioned right there, could you indent that the same way as the Option A has been indented?

Karla Valente: Sure, so you want me to indent the working group advises and then...

Man: The Option B. Option B gets indented like Option A.

Evan Leibovitch: Option B for the purposes of application fee calculations, that sentence.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Man: Actually Evan Option A is not indented. To fix the problem we should indent both Option A and Option B.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Man: The bullets in Option B were indented. If we indent both Option A and Option B it works.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay now, Elaine has raised an extremely valid point in saying that considering a high level nature of this document, that getting into specific discount amounts is problematic and I think I would agree with that.

So for the lines that actually say you know for scripts with this position any native users, is this not a level of detail that we can avoid in this snapshot going to the board.

It appears to be controversial enough as it is, can we at least suggest a sliding scale of discounts based on the number of users? The number of native speakers.

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Elaine are you okay with that?

Elaine Pruis: Can you please repeat that? I heard several voices at once.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, you made a very valid point about that going into far too much detail on this particular point compared to what we've done elsewhere where we've taken a higher level approach. So I'm suggesting taking out those bullet points that say you now have specific discount and specific numbers of native speakers, just saying okay.

Karla we're back on the first paragraph of Option A, okay, the first paragraph ends on the following basis. Are you there?

Karla Valente: I am here and I'm removing all of the bullet points for script.

Evan Leibovitch: We also need to change the end of that sentence, so change on the following basis to on a sliding scale based on the number of native speakers of the script.

Karla Valente: Okay, so I changed on the following basis to on sliding scale based on the number of native speakers of the script.

Evan Leibovitch: Is everybody okay with that?

Man: Did you have sliding scale or sliding discount scale?

Karla Valente: I have sliding scale.

Man: Okay I think it should be sliding discount scale and the expression native speakers of the script does not make sense in English. It's either speakers of the language or users of the script.

Man: It should be users of the script, that's a good catch.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Karla Valente: So you want native users of the script?

Man: That's correct.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Karla Valente: Okay, so the changes are on sliding discount scale based on the number of native users of the script.

Evan Leibovitch: Now Avri has just put into the chat and Elaine has agreed with her that we just yank out everything to do with bundling and put in a couple of lines saying there have been recommendations made on bundling that have not reached the level of agreement (decrementation) at this time.

I would respectfully disagree with that because we have been able to document it right here. We have not reached consensus on all of these and we've made that clear in our note at the beginning of this point.

But to say that we can't - to suggest that we can't document it sort of goes against the fact that we already have been able to.

So I'm hoping that with the changes that we've made, if everybody is okay with the idea that we've taken out this specific detail about discount levels and the number of users and essentially gone back to the high level of saying you know we'll iron out that detail later.

But we're telling the board that we have an intention I think the documentation that we've done here is sufficient. Elaine do you really have a problem with us listing these options and telling the board that we have not achieved consensus on which ones?

Elaine Pruis: The issue I have is that the significant work in figuring out what sort of discounts we would give to applicants that meet our criteria. We've not given any detail as to how we've formulated those figures or numbers.

And so you know for me reading this document in whole I gloss over the very basic, you know single point let's give decremented fee structure, that doesn't explain anything that doesn't say you know 50% up front and then 20% later and 10% later.

Where we have that sort of detail at the end of this document so I just think...

Evan Leibovitch: I just (unintelligible) all that level of detail and going back to the 50,000 foot view.

Elaine Pruis: Sounds good.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, got a couple of people to go, I appreciate your indulgence, we're already half hour over this call, let's see if we can go so we are on to next steps, Line 188, we're in the home stretch here.

Does anyone have any problems with the way that we have worded the next steps? This appears to be the one point that might be contentious is the very last bullet point, that is review the basis of the \$100,000 application fee, base fee.

Given that it was controversial at the very beginning of this document do you want to leave it in at the end and just say that the next steps include a review? Is everybody okay with that?

Man: Yeah, I can support leaving it in here.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, are there any comments, suggested changes to the next steps part of this?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Not for me, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Eric are you okay with it?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes I am.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I have Alan saying okay, I have Eric saying okay, Andrew, Elaine, what's your take? Are you okay with the next steps?

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. If that is the case I believe we are at the end of the document. Karla if you could please send out a version to the list based on the changes we've talked about, much appreciated. And thank you, we're at the end of the document and the end of this call, thank you. It's been grueling but very appreciated.

Man: Thank you Evan.

Man: Thank you very much.

Evan Leibovitch: Thank you all and I guess we'll see you on Friday.

Karla Valente: Thank you.

Man: Can we get an email confirming that there is a meeting and what time? It is not listed on GNSO and on the ALAC it's listed at the old time, not the new proposed time.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. You'll send that out right? Along with the notes from this meeting?

Karla Valente: Yes, I'll talk to Gisella.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, thank you all.

Man: Thanks for chairing.

Evan Leibovitch: Bye bye.

END