SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 21 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 21 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-jas-20100921.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
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC
Baudoin Schombe – At Large
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large

GNSO
Andrew Mack – CBUC
Avri Doria – NCSG – Co-Chair
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison
Eric Brunner-Williams – Individual
Alex Gakuru – NCSG

ICANN staff
Gisella Gruber-White
Karla Valente

Apologies:
Carlos Aguirre - At Large
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And no message about dropping off if you don't like it from

                  (Michael). I always love that message.

                  Okay Gisella could you do an attendance reading please?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely, good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Tuesday the 21st of September 2010.

We have Avri Doria, Evan Leibovitch, Alex Gakaru, Rafik Dammak, Baudoin Schombe, Alan Greenberg, Sebastian Bachollet, Eric Brunner-Williams.

From staff we have Karla Valente, myself, Gisella Gruber-White and we have apologies from Carlos Aguirre and Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

I hope I haven't left anyone off the list, if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. And apologies, yes, Tijani will be joining us in about 15 minutes. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you Gisella, this is Avri. Before getting to the agenda I want to go through the SOI-DOI stuff. So first of all I'd like to ask if anyone has any updates that they wish to make or have recently made to their statement of interest which basically covers their employment, their involvement in ICANN, et cetera, the basis for which.

So does anybody have any comments on additions they wish to make to their SOI? Okay hearing none, I would remind people that should you need to, please sent a comment to the list as soon as you need to. And then please mention it at the following meeting.

Going to the DOI, I'd like to ask if anybody has a declaration of interest relating specifically to any of the topics we might be talking today? For example if someone were to have a specific interest in applying for bundled DLDs. And that's a topic that we have on the agenda for today.

It would be, we, it would be appropriate to mention that. And of course that applies to any of the topics that are expected to be on the agenda? Does

anyone have a declaration of interest on any of the topics that we expect to have on the agenda today?

Okay hearing none, I would remind everyone that should we hit a topic, for example if we go into an area that we weren't planning to talk about. And you find yourself in a situation where you do have a specific interest in plan, please be sure to flag it. And let the rest of the participants know that you do have a declaration of interest to make.

Having gone through that, move to the agenda. I - and I apologize for doing it so belatedly. As I said, I am just now catching up with the part of my life that is not ITF.

So I basically figured that we're in a regrouping point now of needing to figure out exactly what we need to do to finish up the work in our current charter and such.

So what I wanted to start with today was a discussion of where we're at and our - what our approach should be to finishing up our work as soon as possible.

I figured that one of the things we need to do that we can do today was we walk through any of the remaining open issues. Karla presented a list below. Look - and once you sent out the notice on the document, see if everything is there.

And if, you know, something is there that shouldn't be, whatever. Just go through the list. Make sure it's complete. And make sure we know what we're up against.

Then my recommendation would be at the next meeting, we go back through the comment response document. Confirm that the answers that are in it are as they should be. Make any changes that need to be made.

Make sure that we have a correspondence between the answer we're giving and what's showing up in our recommendations. And try and basically finish that document or get close to finishing it.

Then after that, go back to the recommendations. Go back to that final document. And make sure that it is right and complete.

And then after having done all of that create a proposal for, you know, anything that we think is a charter expansion. So if we believe that this group should have some re-chartered goals to continue working on this stuff, fine.

Then we need to put a proposal in. If we don't believe that that's the case, and we believe the work should be done somewhere else or somehow else, that's fine too. Then we just recommend closing the group.

And then basically the next thing was to start the walk through on the issues and start having discussions. And trying to close those open issues would be sort of the first item that we go back to for today is start talking about items.

Now also Karla mentioned one thing to ask some question, as it were, regarding the document, the excerpts that were sent in to (Ford). So I'm not sure, that may be a good first thing on the agenda if no one objects.

Okay is that agenda work for people? I don't know how far we can get in the next 45 minutes but is that a fine agenda for folks? Okay.

Andrew Mack: Yes Avri this is Andrew Mack. I just joined. I'm sorry I'm late. I couldn't get on line earlier. What was the agenda that you proposed?

Avri Doria: Well it's written and if you look in the Note 5, it's essentially written there. But it's basically an agenda to regroup. And also I sent it in the email. So it's

possible, if you could get access to the email or such, I would prefer not to go through it at this point.

Andrew Mack: Fair enough. I'll take a look.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Okay so I guess the first thing is, you know, Karla if you could A, just tell us a little bit about the documents you sent out. And then bring up the questions that you wanted to bring up about the document that was sent to the board.

Karla Valente: Okay. So I sent the addendum which was, there was some update. Then the current draft final report, there was not much update done there. And the...

Avri Doria: I have a question. On the draft final report, did you stick the Section 2 back in from the excerpt? I haven't had a chance to look at it.

Karla Valente: No I did not. I wasn't sure about...

Avri Doria: No that's something that would need to be done. In other words what we did is I took the excerpt out of there, having edited it, we should put it back in there.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Karla Valente: And then I sent the excerpt itself, the one that you prepared for the board.

Avri Doria: Okay. Any questions on those pieces of document?

Karla Valente: So there's the two questions on the excerpt. Like for example, on the Recommendation Number 2 regarding sponsorship and fundraising.

The clarification question from staff is what is the proposed use of the funds? Is that to offset the cost reduction in Number 1 or to create some kind of scholarship?

Avri Doria: It's the latter. I don't know whether it would be called a scholarship or an assistance program. But it is not to offset Number 1. Does anybody wish to correct me on that?

Andrew Mack: That's the way I understand it.

Avri Doria: Right okay.

Man: Sorry Avri, could you repeat the question?

Avri Doria: The question was basically we talked about a fundraising program. And the question was from staff is any - are those funds that are collected, that are fund raised, are they to be used to offset the recommended cost reductions? Or are they meant as a fund - a further funding source for applicants, scholarships, et cetera.

Man: Yes definitely B.

Avri Doria: Right, thank you. That was what I had thought it was. That's why I said it so quickly. But I wanted to make sure that people would correct me if I got it wrong.

Okay, yes, any other question Karla.

Karla Valente: Yes, and then on the Recommendation 2 and the Bullet 2, is ICANN giving the list of parties that provide grant? Is that expectation of the group?

Avri Doria: Okay I'm not sure I understand the question. Could you give me a line number first of all?

Karla Valente: Okay, oh that's great. I don't have line numbers on this document.

Avri Doria: But you do on what you're showing on the screen. We have the excerpts for draft final report showing on the screen.

Karla Valente: Oh we do. Hold on. Give me one moment.

Avri Doria: Sure.

Karla Valente: Yes, it's the second bullet point, hold on.

Avri Doria: So many bullets.

Karla Valente: I know, hold on. It's this one, from external funding agencies, 62 on to 66. Is that the expectation that ICANN gives the list of the parties that provide grant?

Avri Doria: No. I don't believe so in external funding. No, that's basically one of the things that we talk about in the continuing is putting together a group that somehow is contacting those organ - certainly any recommendations from ICANN I believe would be more than welcome.

                But it's basically an effort then to go out and make outreach to funding organization. And bring them into discussion. So I don't know. Perhaps the fundraiser might be doing some of that.

                But (unintelligible), I don't think there was any assumption that ICANN would be solely responsible for outreach to external funding organizations.

                So of course any contacts they had for example, you know, earlier, you know, you all had made a recommendation that you bring in some experts on external funding and we talk to them.

So certainly that would be part of the effort. But I do not believe that there is any intent that ICANN is responsible for finding the external funding agencies.

Karla Valente: Okay thank you. Is the development direct or - and that goes on Line 70. Is the development director expected to be part of ICANN staff?

Avri Doria: And this is my guess at it. I believe in relationship to ICANN staff. Now whether it's (our kind of faulting) or whether it's an external set up relationship, it is an ICANN hire.

It is an ICANN arranged thing if I understand correctly. Please correct me the rest of the group.

Man: This was the fundraising person?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: The devel - yes that's an ICANN hire.

Evan Leibovitch: Hired, contractor, whatever. It doesn't necessarily have to be staff. It could be, you know, I mean there are third party organizations that do fund raisers.

Avri Doria: Right.

Man: I don't think we're giving instructions as to the contractual form of the relationship between ICANN and the individual.

Avri Doria: That's why I sort of said it's an ICANN related position.

Man: Yes.

Karla Valente: And regardless of whether or not they're full-time. If ICANN, somebody from ICANN still would need to be managing that relationship.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Karla Valente: Okay and the $10 million that is stated on this bullet, what is the basis for that number?

Avri Doria: I'd like, I, that I don't know. I think it was a good number to build - to start a fund with. I can't go further than that. Perhaps somebody else can contribute.

Man: The reason I picked that number was because I want a real goal for development director. Now American political campaigns typically run for house races, a quarter of a million dollars and up.

                   So I'm thinking that in terms of a funding goal, this person, this task, has to reach into at least the seven-figure area. So 10 is the lowest, more than seven figures budget goal or fundraising goal. A hundred would be nice for who.

Karla Valente: Okay and the last question is are we going to define financial needed method in this cycle of work?

Avri Doria: I do not believe so. I believe that that is one of those things that is going to be recommended or could possibly be recommended as a charter extension item of work.

Karla Valente: Okay thank you. These were all the questions.

Avri Doria: Okay because basically on, but thank you, because specifically on that one
                that is not, I don't know if that is specifically in our charter. But that's certainly
                a lot more work.

                And I'm not sure that we wouldn't need some experts. I see a couple hands
                up so Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I'd like to go back to the $10 million for a moment.

Avri Doria: Okay, sorry I didn't see your hand up sooner.

Alan Greenberg: It wasn't up. I didn't get it up till we've been past it. How many different
                organiza - or, you know, applications do we think that's going to cover? Or
                what kind of amount are we dreaming about per applicant?

                It strikes that that number is large enough that if we're talking 100,000 per
                applicant, that's 100 applications in - covering $10 million. And I'm not sure
                that's the message we want to send to the board that we're expecting 100
                applications that are eligible for support under our definition.

Avri Doria: Alex would you like to respond to that now or should I collect all the
                questions?

Alex Gakaru: Well sure. The assumption has been the one in five, which amounts to 100 if
                there's 500 applications. So if we accept the information we have from staff.

                So if they are expecting 500, and after 500 of course they're going to adopt a
                different kind of regime, a cohort mechanism. But 500 is their expectation.

                What is wrong with a one in five assumption about the applicants who will be
                in need?

Alan Greenberg: I don't know if there's anything wrong with it. It's a higher number than I was, then I had always imagined when we're having these discussions. That may be just me, I don't know.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. By the way, I've put myself in the list with the hand up because I want to make a non-chair comment, Andrew Mack.

Andrew Mack: Actually Alex, I think Alan said basically what I was going to say. I think it's - I think we send it, we may be accidentally sending a signal to the board that we're expecting a huge number of these applications or that we'll accept all of the ones that come in with 10 million.

I love the idea of having a target for a fundraiser. I, you know, I just don't know if we need that much. But if we can get it, that 's fine, it seems to me that it's very much, that was the same question that I had.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I'm now calling on me sort of chair hat off and then there's Evan. I got two comments on this fundraising. One is I think 10 million, you know, you always set the goal high, you know, meeting 100% of your goal. Meeting it all in time for application, et cetera.

I think also that there may be, you know, distribution post application in terms of, you know, helping cover fees or what have you that could be conceived of.

But another thing that I didn't get into when we were putting this together but does concern me is ICANN actually administering such a 10 million fund. And I do believe that this needs to be somehow separate from ICANN.

So it needs to be related to ICANN. But I believe that any foundational entity that comes out would need to be something that was set up by the board, but set up as a separate and independent from ICANN organization.

Such as any corporation that, I mean any benefactor foundation is set up separate from the agency what is using the money.

So, and I know I said that badly. But I hope I got the meaning across that basically while I think this fund should be set up, and I think it should be related to ICANN in it's first enhance.

I think the intention should be for there to be a separate scholarship, funding, loan, what have you organization set up that has a whole set of conditions yet to be defined.

But this should not be money that is in ICANN's budgets anywhere. And now I go back to chair role, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm just asking if maybe we aren't over engineering this a bit. I mean we're here to recommend policy. And I'm wondering if setting specific targets is starting to get into implementation details is my concern about whether or not we're really sort of over engineering.

And starting to get into (niggly) implementation details. Grant it, the targets aren't necessarily (niggly), but at the same time I'm wondering in terms of the quality of the recommendation we're going to put in.

If, you know, if we're really getting into a level of detail that doesn't befit the kind of recommendations we're being asked to do.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And if I could ask, your recommendation would be, obviously we've already sent this to the board as part of what I'm calling Snapshot 2.

But you're saying that we should reconsider whether we want to include an actual figure in the final report.

Evan Leibovitch: It's not something I can get worked up over either way. It's just, you know, given Karla's question and staff concerns, you know, is there a specific reason why we think that number?

Well, you know, it looks like a good one that's going to be helpful. But it's kind of hard to objectively fact that out.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I'm commenting on your comment Avri. Although I agree that should there be a pile of money, it should be managed in the way you describe.

I would envision if we have that pile of money, it's likely to come from auctions during the first round or something, not from fundraising.

My image was, and any substantial amount that we can fund raise are not actually going to come to us in cash. But be commitments that the external organization is going to make to make money available for this purpose.

So, you know, if the - we keep using the World Bank. The World Bank isn't going to give us a million dollars I don't think. The World Bank may commit to putting a million dollars into this kind of project.

So I'm not sure in the short term there is a lot of money to manage. There might be small donations which, you know, may add up to something. But I don't think the bulk of it is actually going to be in cash. Not the way I've been envisioning it anyway.

Avri Doria: Yes, (unintelligible) myself again. I think you're probably right. But any of it that is cash should have those conditions applied to it. But I think you're probably right.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay so now having gone through that, seeing no other questions, and we'll be coming back to all these issues.

I recommend that we move on to, let me see, what was - what was the agenda again? So we talked about where we were. And oh yes, let's go through the list of remaining open issues.

I don't know if it's possible to put that up. Oh yes, it is possible to put it up. We could just cut it into the comment space. So let me cut it into the comment space.

Okay, and there, and there, good, okay. So in comment space the issues that are still open, and I guess we should add to the issues that are open is the one that just came up about development, directors and development funds and sums.

So I would add that to the bottom of the issues. And Karla if you can keep an issues list and add that one, I'd appreciate it.

The first issue we had and the one I wanted to get to today, oh, Tijani I see your hand up please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you Avri. I am sorry for being late. Before we go to the comments I have sent some comments about the text that you sent to the board.

I know you have it already sent. But if we have been appropriated to discuss, at least to see if my concern is shared by the other members of the group.

Avri Doria: Okay although I do believe to a large extent your comments were included. Although I'd have to go back and ask Karla to find out exactly to what extent they were in the final edit. But certainly...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Did you include them?

Avri Doria: I believe that certainly Karla looked at them while doing the inclusion. Karla and Evan who were finalizing, can somebody fill us in on to what extent Tijani's comments were included in the document that was final - the document that was sent?

Evan Leibovitch: In the last snapshot we had pretty well no time to put in Tijani's comments.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Due to time constraints. So the idea being is that we would make it clear in the snapshot that it didn't include everything. And then come back and work on...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Sure.

Avri Doria: Okay so we should include therefore Tijani's comments in this list of open issues.

Evan Leibovitch: Correct.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: There was some comments regarding the syntax, the language if you want. But there is a few comments about the content.

Avri Doria: Yes I wouldn't, if it's okay with you, I wouldn't worry about the syntax and such. I would just ask Karla to sort of look at those and take them in, you know, assuming that the text is still as it was.

And just look to add your substantive issues to the list of open issues if that's okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: I mean because, you know, we're going to be cleaning up the document for a while. It's too late to connect, collect - it's too late to correct the syntax of what went to the board. It either got corrected or it's gone.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: So, you know, the syntax in terms of those errors remaining, they could be caught at a later time, but certainly in terms of your substantive. So at the end of this list now, I've already added one which had to do with development.

And that, once I get through this list that's here, perhaps I'll ask you to name your substantive comments so that we can add them to the list of open issues if that's okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: I'll come back to you at the end of the list.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay so the first issue that we have open, and we're not going to discuss it yet. Now we're just making sure that the list is correct is the issue of bundling and the scope of our work, that there had been no unanimity.

And so we need to discuss bundling A, whether it belongs there. And we need to come to a level of consensus on it belonging there. And then assuming that we have some degree of, you know, consensus for it belonging there, then we need to decide which of the two or what variant of the two or what is there we can find levels of support for.

And it 's quite possible that we could end up in a situation where we indicate that, you know, we sort of do an analysis, break the recommendations down a bit in saying we have, you know, full consensus on Point A.

We have partial consensus on Point B. You know, there's some support or there's strong support for C and D. And we are divided on E and F. You know, if we have to break it down to that level to understand where we are on those, that's an exercise that we can and I believe should go through.

And, you know, that - and how we arrive at that we can discuss later. Evan and I have been through a very interesting exercise in the (MOPO) group where various opinions on whether the chair used polling techniques effectively. He was in a position where he had to make very quick decisions, did way too much polling that made me very uncomfortable but a lot of the group seemed to accept it has having worked.

So could we get to a point of needing to define the careful difference between strong support and divergence? You know, we can talk about techniques for figuring that out. Hopefully we won't get - Andrew Mack, I see your hand up. Andrew Mack? Are you muted?

Andrew Mack: Sorry. I was. My apologies. I think what you propose is fine and I would just like to make the request that if we could punt this until Thursday so we could have (Richard) on the call since he's been very active in this and I don't see him.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Andrew Mack: I would appreciate that because I think he's got a lot to offer and he's come up with some good ideas that - and we've done some, you know, some work on it together so I'd like to get him involved in the conversation.

Avri Doria: That seems okay. I think looking at the clock at 9:35 and I mean not - sorry - hour 35. Forgive me for being (temporo) centric - hour 35, I don't think we're going to get very far into that topic today. So I think that's fine.

Okay, so I think that is probably one of our biggest issues of discussion so I do recommend that that be one of the first ones we tackle going forward. Next issue - so does anybody believe that that's not an issue that we need to cover?

Okay. Next issue we have is work on 3310 and - okay, I see hand. Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, in the document we sent to the board, we said that the financial support will be given to the applicants regardless their original - their origin which is contrary at the - to the registration 20 stipulation. I think the developing countries was - mentioned explicitly by the registration 20 so we don't have to remove this composite. And to say it will be done - it will be given regardless the original appartinance so the original - from where the application comes. I think it's a big issue and we have to be - to discuss it deeply.

Avri Doria: Okay so that'll be one of add. I see a couple hands went up. Although it goes - I thought we had gotten - well, it'll be an interesting discussion because I thought we had gotten to the point of saying only financial need was a criteria and everything else was secondary. Now it seems that we're bringing back in regional as a criteria. And I have no objection but it seems to me like we're going - but anyhow, (Eric), I see your hand up.

(Eric):   Yes, I can wait until we get to the substantive discussion. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Yes, at the moment I'm just collecting issues. So I guess we add the issue of is regional basis a criteria for receiving aid?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Even if it is not, Avri, we don't have to manage any, that we have to distribute the financial support regardless of original importance.

Avri Doria: Well where does it actually say that? What line?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: In...

Avri Doria: I'm just looking for it quickly.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: In the - you sent to the board. I don't remember exactly on which line.

Avri Doria: Because I'm looking here and it says main or sole criteria, eligibility of financial need, and then we say among the types of applications are being computed support, once financial or other need has been established are community based, applications geographically located...

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No it's not there. It's not there.

Avri Doria: It's not there.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It is about the financial ed. It is not about the support in general. You understand? You mean the money we will collect we have to distribute it regardless the original importance. But you didn't say that for the general support. You understand? For the - for example for the cost reduction, et cetera. You remember?

Avri Doria: I'm looking at the guide at the moment and I actually don't find the instance that you're talking about. Okay, well let's put it on the issue and then we'll go back...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay thank you.

Avri Doria: ...and find it later.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Good.

Avri Doria: That, you know, are - is aid appropriate for all regions? Karla, have you added that one?

Karla Valente: Yes.

Avri Doria: What happened to all the notes? I don't know (have) all the notes. Something's weird. Oh.

Karla Valente: I was going to copy them and send via email and use the notes page to list the open issues.

Avri Doria: Okay well I guess they just disappeared but I just cut them back in. Okay then the next was Section 3.3.10 which is not in the excerpt I guess. This numbering that you put - this is from the general document and not from the - I'm getting confusing on numbers.

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: Yes, so the number 3.3.10 was from the summary of comments.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Thank you. And that was on underserved (scripts). I guess Andrew Mack and Rafik and (Richard) were working on some text there is the issue. Somebody fill me in. Karla, you put the original note in so.

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: Yes. And the...Yes, Avri, I took that from reviewing the meeting notes for the week that I was off.

Avri Doria: Okay. So Andrew Mack, can you fill me in? Is there anything that's still pending from you guys or did you get all of your contributions in?

Andrew Mack: Rafik and I spoke about this briefly when we were in (Gilnias).

Avri Doria: Yes.

Andrew Mack: And I am - where are we now? I'm sorry, I'm a little bit behind.

Avri Doria: Okay so there's still something pending there. I don't really need a thing. It's just - it's a corr- it's correct that this is still a pending issue.

Andrew Mack: I can say yes.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Andrew Mack: I'll check in with Rafik.

Avri Doria: Okay so it's - once you've got some more information, you know, send it in to the list so that we - so that Karla can sort of amplify this item on the list so we know what we've got to do. Okay then there's 3.3.11 which is guess is also from the comments. Identif- indenti- identify as needed, wording, rewording but last email exchanges agree no further language will be proposed. Alan, with help from (Richard) and Andrew Mack, Karla, can you fill me in on this topic? Hello?

Karla Valente: Hi Avri. This is Karla. I have to get the doc.

Avri Doria: Okay. The disadvantage of having of having your doc- your numbers while working (unintelligible).

Karla Valente: So 3.3.11, that was the comment from Daniel Younger about the register, registrar separation. So there was some discussion in the working group and

(Richard), Alan and Andrew Mack were supposed to work on some language for the proposed response from the working group because what we had in the draft is that the working group believes this comment is not directly related to the proposal. So there was a discussion whether or not we should expand that response.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So Alan, (Richard), Andrew Mack, how is that going? Is that something that's done and submitted or is that something that's still pending? Alan, your name was first.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, I just - I dropped off. I'm back on now but I don't know what it - what my name is first for.

Avri Doria: Okay, we're talking about in the comments Section 3.3.11, comments relating to Danny Younger's proposal about registrars and registry, I guess, it was separation integration issues and I guess a brief answer saying out of scope for this group, but you guys were talking about creating a more substantive response or something like that.

Alan Greenberg: That sounds vaguely familiar which I didn't do.

Avri Doria: Okay so it's something that we keep on the list as pending?

Alan Greenberg: I think so.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. That's really what I'm looking for.

Alan Greenberg: And I will add it to my to-do.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you very much.

Alan Greenberg: Was it me with someone else or just me alone?

Avri Doria: It was Alan with help from (Richard) and Andrew Mack.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Avri Doria: And the previous one we talked about, the underserved scripts, was Andrew
                   Mack with help from Rafik and (Richard). Okay and then we have 3.3.9.
                   Karla, I'm assuming again that this is the comments document. Add wording
                   regarding policy and its impact on current CLDs not aligned with self-funding
                   policy (gall). Can you explain?

Karla Valente: This was again the new younger comment on registrar tren- transition fee.
                   Support for this advantage, new GTLD applicants. There was a comment
                   whether or not we should add the reference to the GNSO policy and specific
                   language that this would not impact or should not impact our penalized
                   current GTLD.

Avri Doria: Okay so is this something you need language from someone on? I see (Eric)
                   with his hand up. (Eric).

(Eric):   Thank you Avri. I was raising my hand over the previous item.

Avri Doria: Oh please go back.

(Eric):   Thank you. I'd like to arrive at the point where we finally decided what it is
                   we're going to say about vertical integration and not revisit the subject again.

Avri Doria: Okay, you wanted to do that now or is that what we do with this item?

(Eric):   Oh, I just want to make sure that eventually we kill this subject, we reach
                   closure on it and we don't have to revisit it every other meeting.

Avri Doria: I believe that at this point going through this list we have to reach closure on
                   each of these meetings - on each of these topics because at this point we're

in the end game. And this is a list of the topics that we need to close. So that's why I'm trying to get a fairly complete list of topics and then I think we work through them and close them and then make sure we have correct language everywhere.

(Eric): Thank you Avri. I thought we actually did close on this particular issue, the vertical integration reference in the previous call so that's...

Avri Doria: In which case we may be closed and we just need people to write that language down. I wasn't on the last four calls so I'm not quite sure, you know although I did listen to the tapes. I don't remember closure on vertical integration but perhaps the people that are writing the language do remember the closure. Yes, Andrew Mack?

Andrew Mack: I was just going to - I actually agree with (Eric). I thought we had kind of come to closure on this one.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Andrew Mack: Do we really - do we need additional language? I mean, we can put that script together if it's necessary but I thought we were done.

Avri Doria: Okay well...

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Maybe I'm just remembering wrong.

Avri Doria: I think if...

Man: Yes, I'm...

Avri Doria: ...Alan, who's the crew that's writing this and Evan all believe that the
                     language that's there, the decision...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: I do remember that we put this away. I'm just struggling at this moment to
                     remember exactly how.

Karla Valente: Yes, so the notes - Evan, this is Karla. The notes you asked Glen to put on
                     the document was that the working group believes this is a reasonable
                     observation and are currently discussing ways to consider it. And then after
                     that there was some discussion whether we should be working on a language
                     - on a very specific language - including the summary analysis in response to
                     Daniel Younger.

                     And this was what we last added according to my understanding of the
                     transcripts is that we were going - (Richard), Alan, and Andrew Mack were
                     going to propose in a very specific response.

Evan Leibovitch: My recollection - and it is vague and I apologize for that - is that we were
                     going to say something to the effect of - that the working group believes this
                     would be of - would be helpful to some applicants who meet our criteria but
                     we are leaving it to the VI working group to fully address.

Avri Doria: Sounds good.

Man: That's what I remember as well. Something like that.

Avri Doria: So if you guys produce the language then I think we'll be able to call it closed
                     as per (Eric's) request.

Man: We will try.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I hope your voice is okay. Okay, back to 3.3.9 and that which was also - so use for the wording required on that.

Man: Sorry Avri. What is 3.3.9?

Avri Doria: Three-three-nine was a Danny Younger comment related to...

Man: Oh right. (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: ...the affect on current...

Karla Valente: Registrar transaction (face) support for disadvantaged GTLD applicants.

Man: And that was the voluntary one?

Avri Doria: Yes. I think so. So do we need - for the wording on that we do not have a volunteer for that but then again if we make it clear what we want to say, Karla could possibly produce the wording. As I say, that is an issue.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: We can come back so we didn't need to resolve it right now. Do we agree that's an issue that needs further work?

Man: I actually can't remember what we came down to. I do remember my own personal feeling and I don't know whether I said it or not - was that's something we could certainly say has merit although how would it - you know, the cost of administering it and the process to administer it sounds unweilding.

Karla Valente: So the comment that was raised for transcripts was that the GNSO policy was very clear that this program would be self-funding and, you know, we

should not do anything to penalize the (covent) TLDs and the structure that is in place now.

Alan Greenberg: My recollection is the suggestion was registrants can voluntarily fund it.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure...

Avri Doria: Leave it on there and let's go back to it.

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: At the next meeting but it ne- I put a note that it needs to be checked and the issue of cost on administration. Then okay, seven. We've only got ten minutes left. Regarding Alan's comments, questions on the issue of delegation versus actual TLD use via registry. This is what we have on the base agreement regarding the issue and then a long quote. So...

Karla Valente: Yes, Avri, maybe - this is Karla - maybe I could clarify that...

Avri Doria: Yes please.

Karla Valente: The discussions that I - in the last meeting, one of the issue raised was whether or not there was something that we are going to enforce a registry to launch basically, you know, to have the GTO available and whether or not there was any kind of mechanism.

And Alan raised this question specifically to me so what I did is I looked into the base agreement, I talked to our legal staff and we do not have - although it is intention of the program that all of the TODs would be operational - we do not have an enforcement mechanism in our current base agreement to do so. The only enforcement mechanism is the one that I copied here.

Avri Doria: Okay. So do we need to do any work on this or is this purely informational? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: My recollection was the issue was that we said if you don't get the thing operational, that you have to repay the money or I don't - you know, or you're not eligible for ongoing things. But my recollection at the time was there is no mechanism for even recognizing that. So it wasn't a practical term and Karla's confirmed that all we're checking is that it's in the root not that it's a going business.

Avri Doria: Okay. Correct. So I basically take it that there's nothing to be done on this one.

Alan Greenberg: We can put a suggestion in but again it's one of those things how - you know, if we can't imagine how to implement it I'm not sure we have a reasonable expectation it's going to be implemented.

Avri Doria: Okay I guess I would recommend that people think about language and we'll leave it on the list. We'll come back to it later and see if anybody has any recommendations for changes to be made. And if they don't at the time we'll just leave it and more on. Is that a reasonable suggestion?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Avri Doria: So if anybody can think of a way to deal with it, please write it down and suggest it on the list. Then I guess the last one here was sentence brackets to 45 through 46. Is this also in the comment documents Karla?

Karla Valente: I'm sorry, which one are you on?

Avri Doria: I'm on the last one I guess which is sentence brackets through 45 through 46. One possible change, the recommendation to prioritize affect linguistic and

cultural groups is valid from the current round and possible future rounds. I think we started making a change on that in the excerpt and if that ex- and that change remains, that has to sort of percolate through all the documents. So that would be more of a consistency check then any specific recommendation change, correct?

Karla Valente: Yes, that one is not on my list.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. That just showed up here. Maybe someone else (unintelligible).

Karla Valente: I wonder if this is part of the notes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Then we have the one that was added which was development fund raising issues. And that was both amount and practice. Then there was the Tijani issues and the first issue that Tijani brought up was - I'm losing my mind - so Tijani...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes it was...

Avri Doria: ...you...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: That...

Avri Doria: We had several issues to put on that you are making. One of them we already said - and Karla, I guess you already wrote down a note on it. I just want to get it written in here.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, the point I raised was about the regional consideration...

Avri Doria: All right. Okay thank you. Yes. Regional restriction for funding.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Not restriction, consideration.

Avri Doria: Regional consideration. Thank you for the correction. Okay. Oh, I deleted too much. Your issue for funding.

Karla Valente: Avri, I added if the original basis of criteria for receiving aid and clarification on the proposed development of (ratka) and clarifications on proposed development funds. Those are the three additional items I have.

Avri Doria: Okay. And Tijani, did you have other issues?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I - I'm - Karla, I will send you by email what I sent as a comment to Avri but because you have the reference, the line number, document, et cetera, so if you need very clear.

Avri Doria: But if you could give us just a quick recap of the issues so that everyone can hear those issues as issues at the moment.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I have to come back to the document to the give you a response.

Karla Valente: So Avri, I have in front of me an email from Tijani from 17 of September in which he has the excerpt, the cover letter and then any mail listing a list of issues.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Karla Valente: Like l30 and, you know, he goes per line.

Avri Doria: Right. I wanted to...

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: I wonder if this already...

Avri Doria: Right. But if there's any substantive issues I wanted to get them added to the list now.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Avri Doria: In fact, I was told there were substantive issues and I remember there being substantive issues.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I am trying to see my email.

Avri Doria: Yes, I've got it here too. Let me get it. Tijani, writing exercise. Okay Line 31 was syntactical. Line 43 through 44, bullet point. I think that's syntactical. Line 60 - funds should be distributed with special consideration for the applications coming from developing countries.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: So Line 60, that's a specific one you put in.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: Line 67 through 69, is it fair that one single applicant get support from several parties while others couldn't apply because of their need? I'm not sure I understand the issue on that one. And then you have Line 68. I guess we'll just take these issues. And Line 68, is it our mission to recommend aid for all applicants out of the ones meeting criteria of eligibility?

                  Then there was line 110, entrepreneurs coming from and serving a developing market. I think that was just language correction.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: And then on Line 125, 126 on ongoing cost support - should. That was also a correction. So the other two issues were - and I'm just going to cut them in at the moment - were that is it fair for one single applicant to get support from several parties while others couldn't apply because of their needs. And Line 68, is it our mission to recommend aid for all applicants out of the ones meeting the criteria for eligibility.

And we got three more minutes. I don't know if that's enough time for you to go into more detail but I'll include them on the list and then we'll start working through them and we'll get back to them if that's okay. Is that okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: So I've got them on the list now and we will come back to them.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: So at this point I think we've got a list. Karla, I'd like to ask if you can put sort of a cleaned up version of it on the mailing list of just the issues that need to be resolved and then people can look at it and comment further to make sure that we do have everything and that everybody understands.

And then at the next meeting we'll start working our way through this list. Once we've worked our way through this list, we'll return to the comments document, then we'll return to the final document, then hopefully we'll have cleaned up everything so that we'll be essentially done. And then we'll look at what the future is.

As it progresses, I think we need to try and get this done in the next few weeks. I recommend that we continue twice a week meetings and that we try to get this done as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Anybody else have something to add at the end of this meeting? Evan, would you like to...

Evan Leibovitch: No.

Avri Doria: ...add anything before I close the meeting?

Evan Leibovitch: No, I'm quite happy with the way it's going.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. In which case I thank everyone for this Tuesday morning and for getting as far as we did. And so next week we'll start slogging our way through the issues again and try through whatever means we need to, define the consensus point so that we can finish our work and deliver it. Okay? I thank you all and I'll...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Oh no it's not Thursday. Sorry, it's Friday.

Man: It's Friday?

Avri Doria: It's Friday, the second meeting. I keep thinking Thursday but it's Friday, correct?

Man: Correct.

Man: I think that's what we said.

Avri Doria: Yes, yes, yes. It was my mistake. Everybody forget Thursday.

Gisella: Friday 14:00

Avri Doria: It's Friday.

Gisella: Friday 14:00 UTC.

Avri Doria: Thank you. The voice of knowledge. Okay, anybody else have any final comments? In which case, thank you all and I'll talk to you Friday.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Okay.

Woman: Thank you everyone and thank you (Maryann).

                        END