SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 24 September 2010 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Friday 24 September 2010 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20100924-en.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
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large
Carlos Aguirre - At Large
Baudoin Schombe – At Large
Dave Kissoondoyal – ALAC

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

Tony Harris – ISCPC

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachine
Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

ICANN staff
Gisella Gruber-White
Karla Valente

Apologies:
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Michele Neylon – RrSG
Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS

Workgroup call on Friday the 24th of September we have Avri Doria, Evan

Leibovitch, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alex Gakuru, Rafik Dammak, Carlos Aguirre, Tony Harris, Eric Brunner-Williams, Elaine Pruis.

From staff we have Karla Valente and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Sebastian Bachollet, Alan Greenberg and Cheryl Landon-Orr.

If I could also please just to remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. And Dave Kissoondoyal has just joined the call, and Eric Brunner-Williams has temporarily disconnected. Thank you. Over to you Evan and everybody.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, before we go any further, is there anybody whose statement of interest has changed between the last call and now? If so, please just indicate that in the next few seconds.

Okay, hearing no answer to that, we will assume that everything is exactly as it was last time. In which case we will move on to this meeting.

Now, as you know we've sent a snapshot report to the board, but that is not our final report. So in order to complete that, as you may have heard before we started the recording, Karla has produced a draft document that we will be turning into a final report. We will be sending that out over the weekend, pending what happens on this call.

What we were hoping to do in this call is essentially try to start tying up the loose ends; things that had - did not receive consensus the first time around. And we need to determine whether or not we have consensus and it goes in the report, we don't have consensus and it goes in the report as an issue that we had divergence on, or something that gets left out.

So we've got a number of issues. I'm currently - what I'd like to do is, is there a way Karla to put up on the Adobe Meeting (unintelligible) just of open issues?

Karla Valente: Okay, I - this is Karla. Let me see if I could hear because there was noise. You want to put...

Avri Doria: Okay I - or Karla I can do it. I can turn the list into a PDF and I can upload it, the list that you sent to the group.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, I'll take care of it.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: So essentially, this is a very well done - thank you Karla. It's a very well done list of essentially what our loose ends are.

And before we can really come up with a document we can send, we need to either figure out if we have consensus. Or if we don't have consensus, if we put this in as having divergent views and so on, moving forward.

Okay, now...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes Tijani? Go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I have my hand on. Okay, I hope that the document that will you upload on Adobe Connect will be the one that Karla sent last night.

Evan Leibovitch: Correct.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: That's exactly the one we're talking about.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, very good.

Evan Leibovitch: And some of the points on there have to do specifically with the comments that you gave.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Now, while that's happening, what I'd like to - based on a conversation Avri and I had, one of the things we'd like to see if we can get out of the way first is the issue of bundling.

So Tony, you're on the call. So the bundling discussion; we want to try and come up with a consensus that promotes more access in under-served languages but also doesn't - you know, there have been mentioned of unintended consequences and of, you know the issue of if bundling is going to be something that's offered to everyone, it's outside of the scope of this document.

Is there a way that we can try and, if not bring closure to this, at least try and get a feel of the consensus of this group? Is this something everybody wants? Is this something that we put in has partial but not complete support? Can we - this is I think what - and I'm hopefully speaking for Avri here in saying, "We'd like to try and get some resolution to this."

Now can I - can we get a show of - a Checkmark with Adobe Connect, at least from the people that are in Adobe Connect, of which of you, based on the proposals...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...in so far, are comfortable with the idea of putting in bundling provisions into the report of our committee?

Okay, I'm not seeing a whole lot of Checkmarks. Okay now, Tony you're not on - are you on Adobe Connect?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Are you - Tony, are you on Adobe Connect?

Man: No, no, I'm (unintelligible) now.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm sorry?

Man: I'm (unintelligible) country.

Man: He is not under Adobe Connect.

Man: Please, I don't - I don't understand very well, your question.

Evan Leibovitch: No, no. I was asking Tony.

Avri Doria: I don't see Tony on Adobe.

Man: No.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right, so what are the feelings of everybody?

And I really want to try and get a feel for all the people on this call of what your feelings are about the issue of bundling; whether or not this is something

(unintelligible) for our committee, or this is something that should be promoted maybe as an addendum at the end of our report as something that came up that we could recommend but might be useful for all applicants? Or is this something that belongs in our report?

Avri do you have any initial comments on this?

Avri Doria: Do I have any initial comments on the bundling?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Avri Doria: I don't think I know what the consensus of the group is on it yet. I have my personal feelings, if that's what you're asking.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm asking for - I'm asking right now for the personal feelings (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, my personal feeling is that it encumbers the document -- it takes it further than we should at this time.

I think it's a complicated issue that goes perhaps beyond our scope. And I have this fear that it becomes the focal point of the document and makes people miss the critical stuff that can be done in terms of the pricing.

I know that that's a minority position, and as co-chair I sort of support whatever the group does, but my feeling about it is one of nervousness with including it. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Badouin, what are your feelings?

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Badouin?

Man: Can you...

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, go ahead.

Badouin: (Unintelligible) I am online, yes I am here. Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, but I'm asking what your feelings are - I'm asking everyone individually what their feelings are about the bundling issue. Carlos, I see your hand up, I will get to you.

Carlos Aguirre: Thank you Evan. My personal view and my idea is to support the Alan and Andrew proposal when they say the bundling discount should not apply to corporate applicants who clearly have sufficient funds to pay the regular application fee.

                    I completely in agree with that statement because the idea is to give support or aid to the needy applicants. No for who has sufficient funds. Yes? Do you understand?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. But part of the proposal was to offer it to everybody.

Carlos Aguirre: Mm-hmm.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So you're okay with having it as a recommendation from the document. Okay. That was Carlos, right? Was that Carlos who spoke?

Carlos Aguirre: Sorry?

Evan Leibovitch: That was - was that Carlos who just spoke?

Man: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Badouin are you - can I get your opinion on this?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Badouin are you there?

Badouin: Yes, I'm online here. But (unintelligible) probably did not work. I did not understand very well the question you asked me.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I'm asking everybody on this call individually, "Do you believe that the issue of bundling is something that you agree with, and that should be included in this recommendation document?"

Badouin: (Unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: So what's your view on this? Okay, do you want me to come back to you or just have you down as undecided?

Badouin: I think (unintelligible). I ought to...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, we'll come back...

Tony Harris: Hello?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tony Harris: Hello, sorry. This is Tony Harris, I was called away a moment from the phone. I don't know if you called me, but I'm here if you need to.

Evan Leibovitch: As a matter of fact I was going to get to you next.

Tony Harris: Oh, I'm sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: So Badouin, we'll come back to you. Tony while you're (unintelligible)...

Badouin: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...the question on the table right now is we're trying to get a view of this group on the issue of bundling. And so I'm asking each person on the call, whether or not you support the idea of bundling as it has been proposed by Andrew and Alan -- neither of whom are on this call right now unfortunately.

But I'm trying to get a feel for whether or not you support the inclusion in the document and the - and suggesting the proposal that was made by Alan and Andrew.

Tony Harris: We're talking about bundled pricing to promote build-out in multiple scripts, right?

Evan Leibovitch: Correct.

Tony Harris: I'm not too happy about that actually. I would probably tend to think that would complicate things, as far as when this document is presented. It seems to open -I think it's a little beyond what we were originally doing with things. I mean other people don't have this advantage. It seems a little excessive.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tijani I see your hand up, but I will get - I'm going to get to everybody on the call. So don't bother putting your hands up. I'm going to get to everybody on this call (unintelligible).

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay sorry. Sorry, sorry, sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay next, okay I have Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Alex speaking. I believe the proposal should be included, in view of the fact that the applicants will have already been vetted as deserving. And therefore it is not the word bundling, that the perception and the meaning it has with the other bigger players who are there.

These are people that are needy. And because bundling as it were, will assist them to have more capacity to roll out (unintelligible) scripts and languages and communities, then I believe for that reason that if it will help them in their capacity, that it should be included for this group.

And we continue (unintelligible) bundling to get a more (unintelligible) so that we don't get modeled with what they are calling bundling of the other large industry stakeholders. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, thank you.

Tony Harris: Can I get in queue again; Tony?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay quickly. I've got a lot of people to go through.

Tony Harris: I can talk?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Tony Harris: Yes, I just think that perhaps one way to address this would be - I think first the applicant should show success with a single string. And if this is the case, if he applies to expand this into other scripts...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I don't (unintelligible).

Tony Harris: ...at that moment perhaps he could get the benefits.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, I don't mean to cut you off. Right now I'm just trying to get a feel for the people in this group. I didn't really want to engage in a discussion at this moment. I'm just...

Tony Harris: I'm sorry I thought you said go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: I just want to go - get a snapshot of where the group is now.

Tony Harris: Okay, sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: (Unintelligible) next I have Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, it's Rafik.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, what's your feelings on...

Rafik Dammak: This - I talked with Andrew (unintelligible) so I understand that the idea is to encourage maybe even (unintelligible) it's hard to apply for in the (unintelligible) script. But maybe I am for bundling but with more reserve if we can relieve (unintelligible) to not allow gaming. So I think we still need to define that.

((Crosstalk))

I am with - I am - sorry?

Evan Leibovitch: But the core question (unintelligible) believe that we should be addressing bundling in our recommendation document?

Man: What?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, we should. But with real - how to define the limitation of that (unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Thank you. Tijani I have you next.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, I don't know if Andrew is here now, because it's a pity that we discuss this point without Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Actually, hey Tijani I am here. I'm sorry, I was late on the call.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, very good. Very good, very good.

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So I have produced with Andrew a document to make - to let the group, our group, perhaps support the bundling principle, but outside our recommendations. Because I don't think that we should recommend the support of the bundling as a group, which is which mission is to find ways to support the needy applicants.

So that's my position. I still have the same.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Next I have - thank you. Next I have Elaine. Go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Good morning. I do not support bundling being in our document, as it's written. And we're...

((Crosstalk))

Elaine Pruis: ...support needy applicants. I think the way it's written it goes outside of that. Bundling has been addressed, as far as the applicant guidebook goes, and the other comments. So it's already on the table for the board to consider in that way. And I think it's outside the scope of our work.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, thank you. Next is Dave. Can you - are you - can you come - are you on mute? Or can you - do you have (unintelligible).

Dave Kissoondoyal: Yes (unintelligible). I do not support bonding. I think that it will be too much complicated. I think we have to vote for the single string first. And so for me, I'm not very much comfortable with bonding.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, thank you. And next I have Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Chair. I'm unclear at this point whether or not we're discussing the original Andrew proposal, Andrew and (Richard) which had bundling - or pricing available to all applicants independent of need or if we're discussing the proposal of the form that I offered, which is only available to the applicants who have demonstrated need?

Evan Leibovitch: As of right now, what's been on the table is the proposal that Andrew's put forward in discussions with a bunch of other people.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Which would be available to all applicants, correct?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm opposed, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Andrew you came in on the call late. Essentially one of the things I've been trying to do is, we've got a list of outstanding issues that we want to try and put to bed and figure out the best way to put into a final document. I've been trying to find what level of consensus or divergence we've had on the bundling proposal. And the group is clearly split.

There's some people - I'm going to assume that you were in favor of your own proposal.

Andrew Mack: Yes. But also I'm just, you know, willing to continue working with it to come to a closer consensus if that's helpful.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm going to make a suggestion and you - and get your feeling on this, as well as other people in the group. What about the idea of having this so that it is in an appendix, but not in the report itself?

There is significant divergence within the group about the idea of whether this is in scope in the document. Is it possible perhaps to have this in an appendix saying that there's significant support for this within the group, but there's divergence on the applicability.

But we will still think that the - that it should be considered moving forward, not necessarily as a way of - you know, not necessarily as a way of providing additional support to certain applicants, but as a way to increasing a different objective of the gTLD rollup program.

Are you - it's not originally what you wanted Andrew, but are you okay with doing it that way perhaps?

Andrew Mack: That'd be my second choice, Evan. My first choice would be to continue to try to work on it a little bit and get - to see if we can't tweak it to address some of the concerns that people have suggested.

If you'll allow me a little bit more time to understand those better, I will continue to work on it. And if that's the fallback position that we need, I want us to move forward with the rest of the recommendations, for sure.

Evan Leibovitch: Can I suggest, based on what I've just heard, that maybe you want to - may want to go offline with Eric and combine...

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...some of his suggestions into what you're putting forward? Maybe that'll address some of the issues as well, and make it more relevant to the specifics of our goal.

Andrew Mack: If he's willing to do that, that'd be great. Sure.

Evan Leibovitch: Eric, you okay?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I raised my hand Evan because you were referring to the bundling proposal in the singular, which meant that there really was only one, not two.

I have no objection to try and making it so that there is in fact one. But I would prefer not to start from the presumption that there is only the Andrew and (Richard) proposal.

Evan Leibovitch: No, no, no. Don't - okay, sorry. Don't read into what I was saying. Essentially...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: ...what I was hoping is you have an approach to this, Andrew has an approach to this; let's see if you two can go offline and come up with something that satisfies both of your needs, that...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...more acceptable to this group than what is currently on the table. You okay with that?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Eric Brunner-Williams: One quick comment please, or a question to Elaine, which can be done offline. Elaine a pointer to where you believed this was adequately addressed in the (Dag) at present. Thank you very much.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, since Elaine has her hand up maybe you can answer that, as well as address what you were originally going to do. Elaine, go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks. To Eric's question, there were several comments submitted about bundling. And I think if you just go through the comments submitted in the last applicant guidebook, you would find them there. I don't have them separated out and I don't have hours and hours to go through and do that.

The second thing is...

Eric Brunner-Williams: (Unintelligible) they weren't part of the (Dag), they were part of the comments to it.

Elaine Pruis: Right.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay.

Elaine Pruis: The second part of that is, I thought the community working group on Recommendation 6, they put together a table of the proposals that were brought forward in that working group. And the proposals were listed, and then there was a column that showed if there was support, non-support, divergence.

I think that would be very useful in this situation with bundling. It seems like there are different levels of support for different concepts (unintelligible)...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Elaine Pruis: ...issue. And it doesn't seem to me, just from your polling right now Evan that, I'm not clear on which proposal we're talking about and who is fully in support of bundling overall, or bundling based on need, or bundling based on building out scripts.

So I think that would be a useful way to proceed, rather than come back with some different language.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I understand where you're getting at. Both Avri and I were part of the committee, so I know the approach that was taken. What was involved at a certain point was putting out a number of specific recommendations and then doing a Doodle poll to the members of the committee saying, "Do you agree or don't agree?"

And then they were able to use that to determine what had full consensus, what had significant support and what had divergence. Ultimately it's my hope to do this.

There were like at least 20 Doodle polls that were sent out along with that - as part of that committee. And I know I, and I think Avri, found that to be a bit of overload.

So I'm trying to come up with something that's a little more workable. I wanted to try and fine tune things to the point where we could come up with, you know, just one or two major polls where we're able to go and say, "Here is specific wording; do you agree with it or not?" And take it from there.

So we're very cognizant of what's going on with that, with the style that was done. There's certainly elements of that I want to take from it. But there's also a number of things that they did that were a bit mind boggling.

Eric, go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Question for Elaine; Elaine do you recall - and I appreciate you don't have the hours to go through this, but to the best of your recollection, were the comments directed toward the issue of variant characters within a single script?

Or were they addressing the issue of the necessity for multiple scripts in order to obtain the non-confusion to the users of presenting a - well, to the best of your recollection, what were the comments addressing?

Elaine Pruis: I don't know the specificity off the top of my head.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay if there are no comments to do specifically with the issue of bundling, at least in what we're doing, then I'd like to move on to another issue that is in Karla's list.

And that is - let's go to Number 1; is there a regional basis for receiving aid? And so what I would like to do, at least as a straw poll, is get a feeling for the people in this call of what you feel for this.

So on the very specific question, "Is there a regional - is regional basis a criteria for receiving aid?" Okay, I'm going to phrase it slightly differently. Please put your hands down for a second. I'm just trying to get a feel for the - for what this group wants.

So on the issue of, "Is the regional basis a major criteria for receiving aid?" Please do a Check or an X in Adobe Connect. And if you're not in Adobe Connect...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, Evan please; I want to speak.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, nobody said that the regional basis is a major criteria for receiving aid. But when I see that you - in the document that was sent to the board, you said that the aid will be a given regardless the regional origin of the application. I have to say that is not right...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: ...because in the Recommendation 20, already...

Evan Leibovitch: Tijani you're getting ahead of me, this isn't just a single question. I'm trying to get to the hub, to the nub of where the consensus is in this group, so please bear with me.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, but nobody proposed it, you are asking a question that nobody wants to - not to know what is the answer. You do what you want.

(Ed):   Evan this is (Ed). I think I understand what Tijani's getting at, I don't think that anybody proposed this as a defining characteristic. The only question was whether or not it would be a - one of the determining factors. And whether there would be any geographic limitation right?

Evan Leibovitch: Right, okay well I was going to do this in multiple questions so it sounds like there's a presumption that is it's - okay, so can I get through Xs or checks, do you believe that location of the applicant should be a factor in whether or not they qualify for assistance/reduced costs.

                  Please a check or an X in your Adobe Connect, if you're not in Adobe Connect then I will get to you through verbal configuration. Please use a check or an X.

Okay, I haven't seen yet from Baudoin or Rafik on Adobe Connect and of the people that are not on Adobe Connect Tony what is - where do you stand on this? Is it a factor or not?

Tony Harris: I think it should be a factor, yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Rafik? No you're on Adobe Connect.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Evan, just for clarification, if I understand we are asking if you will take the original as factor but you are not limiting the assistance to those needy applicants from the - for some region.

Evan Leibovitch: What we're just saying is the location of the applicant a factor in whether or not they're considered for assistance. Yes or no.

Rafik Dammak: Yes because I'll say maybe I'm sorry for that but because how you say, a reservation is not really limiting, the reservation 20 of the body is not really limiting to some regions.

Even in the beginning they said about developing commission but the (unintelligible) itself document to specific region so it can be yeah, it can be a factor maybe for prioritization but it's not a factor to limit the assistance to applicants from this specific region.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I'm trying to get a feel for the consensus of this group whether or not this is something that we should be recommending. So far I'm seeing a lot of check marks.

I have not seen a single X and I still have yet to get to other people that are not on Adobe Connect. But it looks like - okay. So Rafik you are against including regional okay.

So we have near but not complete consensus on this issue of the people that are on this call. If there is anybody else who is opposed to having the location of the applicant as a factor please either speak now or put an X.

I have one from Rafik so we do not have unanimity but I'm still trying to see if there's anybody else on this call who has something to say on this.

Okay, so what we will do is based on what we've heard on this then we will move forward, Karla, Avri and I will try to get together on the wording that indicates the tone of this.

So Rafik you are of the viewpoint that the regional - the location of the applicant should not be a factor.

Rafik Dammak: If it's really need to the applicant it's regardless, it's revision and state for the resolution is not truly limiting to specific region. Even in the preamble maybe of the resolution they explain that the reason is because some applicants from developing region can have some problems to apply for the (unintelligible).

But in the reservation it says which is - the basis of our work there is no limitation for region.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right so we'll take this forward with the wording but as I see it right now in the group we have rough consensus but not complete unanimity.

Okay so we'll carry this forward and mention in the document. Okay, now do we - on number two on the development director role that's been mentioned earlier, this is not necessarily - well what is the feeling here? Do we want to say if this is a staff hire or full time resource?

Do we even want to get into that level of implementation detail or do we simply say there needs to be a development director? Is this something that should be contracted out, is this something that should be ICANN staff?

Or is it a thing that we just don't even deal with the details of and say that's an implementation issue. Does anyone have comments on that issue right now? Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, I don't think we have to go in deeper on those details. We just recommend that it would be a development director, that's all.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, thank you, Andrew? Andrew you had your hand up.

Andrew Mack: Sorry, I was on mute. I was in the process of lowering my hand and putting up a check mark for Tijani, I agree.

Evan Leibovitch: Is there anybody here that disagrees that this is an implementation detail that we should not get involved with?

Avri Doria: I did get my hand up, this is Avri.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think that it is an implementation detail but I do think we may want to consider making a note that says that this cannot be an in line ICANN activity where the budget is - where the moneys are commingled in ICANN's normal budget.

So I think we have to indicated that there's some kind of separation from you know the normal. So I don't think we have to say how they find one, but I think we do have to say something about it as an organization.

Evan Leibovitch: Is everybody okay with that, I see one checkmark from Andrew, is there anybody who doesn't agree with that? Okay we will - all right, I see lots of check marks, I see no Xs.

Rafik I see an X from you, is that still carried over from the other one or do you disagree with what's being said now? Okay. So Karla Avri and I have some direction on that to move forward on.

Okay, now the proposed development funds, what is the basis for the $10 million? That was a very open ended thing that we were trying to discuss about you know trying to have somebody working towards the development fund.

Clearly there was consensus that some of this should come from options but that won't happen until subsequent rounds.

Can we get some clarification on what we want to do with the discussion of the development funds and what happens with that?

Is there anybody - who on the call was advancing the establishment of a $10 million development fund, I forget that right off the top of my head. Eric go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: To answer your question that was me, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. What is the view of the people on this call about that? Is it something that we have consensus that we should be putting forward and that we want to establish a target?

Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes, just I guess a point of clarification, is the question whether we think the $10 million is the right number or do - is the question should there be a

target? If it's the latter question, certainly fundraising with no target doesn't get you much fund raising.

I'm not sure about the $10 million but I'm open to it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Tijani, go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, I think that the potential target is a very good thing and $10 million, why not?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so do we have consensus in this group, is there anyone here who is opposed to having wording in our recommendation document of setting a target of $10 million for a development fund.

Is there anyone on this call who is opposed to that? Okay. So we will take that recommendation moving forward with the document that will go out as a draft.

Okay, the bundling issue needs a little more work. Okay, in Karla's document, issues number five to seven. On underserved scripts, Andrew, Rafik, Richard's not on the call do any of you have - does anyone here have any comments about issue 5 in the document on the issue of underserved scripts?

Andrew Mack: Evan, this is Andrew. Actually I was hoping to get Rafik's perspective on this because if I recall this is one that he was bringing up, talking about the challenges around defining who's in a script community.

And so he's obviously done some thinking about that. Rafik did I get that correctly from our conversation in Afilias?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Andrew Mack: What did you have in mind?

Rafik Dammak: So what do I have in mind now about the issue?

Evan Leibovitch: Well on number 5 do you guys want to go back and rework this and come up with something specific?

Andrew Mack: I'll follow up with Rafik because it doesn't sound like he's got a good line today.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, could you do me a favor and try and do it for the weekend so that while Avri and I are going through the draft document to put out to the committee, and then we can incorporate something?

Andrew Mack: I will get him on either Skype or email as soon as this call is over if I can, okay?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Number six is sort of requires Alan's help and he's not on this call. Okay, number seven who raised the wording regarding gTLDs not aligned with self funding policy goals?

I don't remember that. There's nobody's name put to that, okay Eric go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Actually I wanted to comment on point number five but I believe point number seven arises from Danny Younger's comment.

Evan Leibovitch: Did anybody want to - did anyone propose any wording or have any because we were going to do the reflect back?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Not to the best of my knowledge or recollection.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. We'll have a quick revisit of that over the weekend and see if there's anything worth doing.

But unless there's anybody on this call who's got some comments on it, (Ron)? Okay. The next ones are to do with....

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'd like to - on point five.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry Eric did you have more to say?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I raised my hand originally about number five but you moved on.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: What is the - what is number five about? Is it the suggestion that the underservedness of a particular script is an alternative to economic need? Is that the sense of number five, to explore that subject?

Evan Leibovitch: Andrew would you like to answer?

Andrew Mack: I'll try, it's been a while since I've seen the actual text.

Rafik Dammak: May I answer the question, this is Rafik? It's about bundling of applicants, reduced fees proposal.

Andrew Mack: No, no not number five.

Rafik Dammak: It's 3310, number five is related to 3310.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I think that is the correct answer. So that should be in whatever is done about bundling.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Eric Brunner-Williams: And not be (unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, that's reasonable.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so we are moving now to number eight. Okay, if everyone has that in front of them, funds should be distributed special consideration for applications coming from development countries.

Now so this goes to the geographical location. Now earlier in the call we received almost but not complete unanimous consensus on geographical location.

Tijani did you want to - your hand is up so if you'd like to speak to this go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you. This is to be the position of what was put on the text and to the board because on the text sent to the board it was written that the fund should be distributed regardless of geographic origin.

So this is to say that we don't have to put it like this. If we have to prioritize someone, those are people from the different countries that we have to prioritize because as it is management and distribution, they speak about applicants which - who need assistance, especially from different countries.

So it is especially from, that's why I say we don't have to say regardless first, and second if we have to answer to something it is people from the developing countries.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Now with the exception of Rafik who is against geographical delineation at all so we know his view, did the people who had (unintelligible) geographical component to this?

Can I get some opinions on where everyone stands on what Tijani is suggesting, is this wording - should there be wording of this kind that goes into our recommendation?

Alex go ahead.

Alex Gakuru: Thank you, Alex speaking. I think we can ground our recommendation the fact that of the existing data or the location of where the - you know ICANN has the data on where all those people are located.

And therefore that's a good basis of showing them if we cite the number that exists in developing region, and so that's the issue we are addressing so they cannot be greater stakeholders in the internet in achieving their objectives of a resolution.

So that would be a good basis of grounding our geographic core and developing regions should be explicitly given priorities. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Eric go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, I would prefer to see the words economy rather than region or country. To give two examples, the occupied west bank in Gaza, are they part of Israel or are they a distinct economy? The UN views that they are a distinct economy.

But if we were to consider them as part of a region we might not be able to distinguish between the economically well developed state of Israel and the not economically well developed state of Palestine.

Another example would be to compare the Emirates, the United Arab Emirates with Pakistan, they're both in the same region, of course United Arab Emirates and Yemen are both in the same region.

Yet they are very distinct economic - very distinct economies. So for that reason I'd prefer to see economies emphasized rather than regions or state identity.

Evan Leibovitch: Well I wanted to follow up with Tijani with a question on how specific we should get. I mean my background is a little different from Eric's in the thought that developing regions can be very, very vaguely applied.

I mean do we actually go to things like the United Nations list of least developed countries? I mean which is something that we did not create which is made by a third party but is something that we could use.

Do we want to get that specific, is that something worth doing so that we can say not just a vague term of developing regions but refers specifically say to a UN list of least developed countries?

And that definition does exist. Andrew, got your hand up and a checkmark Tijani. Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes, Evan while I understand, I think where Eric is trying to go and I think it makes some sense, I think it will be difficult for us to - it may be difficult for us to do if only because how big an economy is depends on how you ask.

Is the economy of downtown Washington DC different from the economy of the suburbs, things like that. I think we have to come up with some sort of definition.

I'm inclined to go with someone else's definition so that we don't have that responsibility and the one that you mentioned sounds fine.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Tijani I saw a checkmark from you, you're okay then with the idea of like the UN list of least developed countries?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I am okay with this or even with the developing economies or something that point to the needy economies, needy regions, the developing regions. It is very important as a concept.

Perhaps that is the confusion when you say developing countries or developing regions. We have to find the right wording. But the concepts have to be there.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, can I ask a question?

Evan Leibovitch: Go right ahead.

Avri Doria: When we say needy economies or regions are we including or specifically excluding economies that are within - and as let's say a needy economy that happens to be situated and isolated within a well to do economy.

Would they be included or excluded in the definition you're proposing?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: May I answer this question?

Avri Doria: Please, that's why I was asking.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, I think we have to include them because it is not a concept of region or certain people. Everyone who is really in need of the support, every economy wit a need of support for to enter this industry of gTLDs, we have to help them.

Avri Doria: Okay, so if for example it was the Roma population within Europe that would fit even though they're within a developed region.

Evan Leibovitch: See to me this is starting to get a little - at that point then it becomes very difficult almost to judge. And it starts getting more and more subjective of what defines a region.

We're already going to be talking about cultural issues. The issue of regional, I pasted a link to a Wikipedia section and if you follow that link it takes you directly to a list of countries identified by the World Mart International Monetary Fund as emerging and developing economies which is the term we used.

Rafik Dammak: Evan? I think the example that Avri brought is a really good example of the program because we have the communities really underserved community within development region.

And then it's just to get geography as a factor we will have to say we will be - it will be in the favor of many - want to be in favor advantage for many communities.

I thought that an important factor that we discussed a lot about it was that needy, that needy applicant maybe for some underserved community regardless of the ratio. Because if I think here in Japan we have the (Ino) communities, we are in Japan I think is development economy.

But that community is not really - it's really underrepresented and underserved. Why we add insult to injury that we say no, we cannot help you because you are from a developed region. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Karla go ahead.

Karla Valente: I only wanted to make a point that earlier on when we had new gTLD policy development there's a guideline that says that they can be put in place if fee

reductions came for gTLD applicants from economies classified by the United Nations as least developed.

I just wanted to point out there was a basis on the policy implementation guidelines for that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so for instance there is - sorry, there is another - there is actually another list from the World Trade Organization. Actually Karla from what I'm looking, the UN - okay.

So I will commit to sending to the list a couple of the criteria that exist out there for developing countries. And essentially we can pick something or suggest that they use some kind of objective measure.

But it seems that there's consensus on this call about dealing with - about having some kind of wording in here. Carlos go ahead.

Carlos Aguirre: I heard different words in different comments. For example we are talking about developing regions, developing countries, developing economies and markets.

But they are different concepts in each word. So we need to define very well what means different words. So it's not the same, region, country, economy and market.

I agree with Tijani in define or put in the comment or statement or - this expression. But I think it's development countries or developing countries for me the word, the correct word, no region, no market, no one other expression.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. The last link that I put into Adobe Connect is for a very specific term called least developed countries. It actually has a definition -- about 45 -

between 45 and 50 countries that are in very specific criteria fall into this category.

Almost all of them are in Africa and Asia. There's only one in the Americas, and that is Haiti.

And there is none in - I don't believe there's any in Europe. So I mean we could - there's a couple of different ones.

Over the weekend if we could start a small discussion on this and just make sure that we have at least some ideas of what kind of definitions people would like. And if we can't agree on definitions then we can just send it in our report that the - whatever the decision is made that the list should be objective and preferably created by a third party and not just a list that's done by ICANN on its own.

So anyway we are near the top of the hour. So I'm hesitant to get involved in other things.

But Tijani's got two other comments. Just maybe we can get through at least one of them quickly.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Moment, moment. I have my hand up.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I - now I understand your worry when you said it begins very subjective. And I agree with you - we have to use an objective third-party specification.

That's my comment. Go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right. So in the document we are at Number 8. And there's some other loose ends.

We're at the top of the hour.

Woman: I hate to say this but I actually think we have a 90-minute slot. (Unintelligible) can you remind me?

Evan Leibovitch: (unintelligible) Yes, yes, yes.

Man: Okay.

Woman: Am - I just want to make sure I'm correct in remembering?

Man: You are right.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, sorry. I'm just looking at it. Okay it's 90 minutes.

So all right. We're moving on.

Woman: Apologize.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So on Issue #8 Tijani - sorry, on Tijani's Issue #9 in the document -- Tijani could you elaborate a little more on this?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes. It is - this comment is done on the line from 67 to 69 telling that applicants can - the head can be done to certain - to applicants, to needy applicants. And those needy applicants can have other support from other agencies.

And I say that the effort of support is common. And we don't have to low someone getting support from our group, from our efforts plus support from -- I don't know what bank and any other agency while other applicants cannot apply because they don't have money.

Evan Leibovitch: Rafik go ahead. Rafik you have the floor.

Rafik Dammak: I'm not sure but can be contradictory what - to something that you asked that applicants show that he tried to have some funds. Because we are not going to help them for the 100 person on the (unintelligible).

And then we ask him to get funds from other sources. So maybe it can be contradictory that if he's getting from help - assistance from other organizations so we cannot assist him.

It just is maybe we should clarify that comment.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Exactly.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Any other comments? Tijani do you have some specific wording to suggest that we could put into a recommendation that would make it a lot easier for us?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I don't have the text in front of me, the Adobe Connect. That's why I'm just...

Evan Leibovitch: Well Tijani since you're the one that proposed this do you have some specific wording that you'd like to recommend?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I don't have the text on either in front of me. But we don't have to give the - because we gave explicitly the possibility of the supported applicants to get support from other agencies we don't have to put this sentence. That's all.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Rafik is your hand up? Did you still want to talk?

Okay. So - all right. I'm not totally sure what to do with this in terms of change that we need to make.

So Tijani I'm going to have...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It is...

Evan Leibovitch: To do...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It is on the excerpt.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It is on the excerpt.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. If there's some specific - if there is a specific wording change in the document...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Just remove the phrase or the sentence that give the right to the applicants to get supported by other agencies. The supported applicants.

Evan Leibovitch: Is there any opposition to Tijani's suggestion to take out that phrase?

Woman: Specifically what phrase are we removing?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: The one that gave the supported applicant the right to get support from other agencies.

Woman: Any why - I don't understand why we want to take that one out.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Because we will have one or some applicants that have support from our effort and from other agencies. And others that don't have any support.

I prefer that people that wasn't supported by our efforts can get the support of the other agencies. Better than have the (unintelligible) both support deferred.

Avri Doria: Okay. I don't have a personal view on this. But I do remember that we had a very long conversation, a frequent conversation on this when we were talking about the issue of you have to - you can only get a 50% from an ICANN-led effort.

And one of the things that was talked about was that we should be explicit that how they came up with their other 50% wasn't anyone's business. And it could be from other grantors.

And they could raise their other 50% any way they wanted. Now it's - that is sort of the basis of this kind of statement that sort of says, you know, how you do your fundraising -- whether you get it from rich investors that write big old checks, whether you get it out of your own banking account or whether you get it from an investment agency was not something that we were going to take a point of view on as long as they didn't get more than X% from our efforts.

So that's what that was trying to express. And I think that there was a large amount of conversation on that.

And so I would want to do a more, you know, a more in view of -- especially since we've lost a couple people off the call already -- on whether we really do want to go back from what appears like a real, at least near consensus at that point. That the other 50% was none of our business.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It is not our business so that we don't have to make any mention about it. That's my point.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right. Since we don't have a full complement of a committee on this call I think we might need to take this into e-mails just to find and to see. It seems like we've got - so right now Avri you're not agreeing to this and...

Avri Doria: Right. And it's not for personal. I do agree that the wording can be changed so that it's emphasizing the - how the other 50% is not our business -- whether it's made up of A, B, C, D and sort of decrease the emphasis of other funding sources inside that.

But I do believe that we had a consensus -- or at least a near consensus -- on it being none of our business and that we should say something to that effect. So it's not a personal view it's a -- I think we need to check further view.

Evan Leibovitch: Is it possible for somebody to actually do some specific wording and so that's - so that basically we can either look at, accept or reject?

Avri Doria: That's certainly something I'm willing to take up as I go through the document this weekend.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay thank you. Good.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Now also with Issue #10 -- entrepreneurs coming from and serving and developing markets. So this is sort of subtly different in a sense that you could have a TLD that has applied for say a British or an American firm but is meant to serve an audience in a developing country.

Should they be eligible for the kind of reductions we're talking about? If I read this correct Tijani I think that's what you're getting at?

That this is not simply the location of the applicant but the application of the intended audience.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay let's see.

Evan Leibovitch: (unintelligible) country. But if the audience is in a developing economy then they should still be eligible.

Do I have interpreted your comment correctly?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, Evan. Yes you did.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay what are comments about that? When we're talking about the regional issue are we talking about simply the location of the applicant or are we talking about the location of the community to be served?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: May I explain more my point?

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. For example, I give an example -- VeriSign can serve an emerging country or a developing country or an emerging economy. Shall we give him the support?

That's why I said coming from and serving. You get my point?

Evan Leibovitch: Absolutely.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: I would imagine and I know I personally would not be crazy about a situation in which you had a company like VeriSign that was trying to receive subsidy from ICANN for a business opportunity that they saw. On the other hand if that subsidy made the difference between the TLD existing and not existing is that a goal that we care about?

So what are the feelings of the people on this call about that? Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Sorry I was just on mute. I think I understand exactly what Tijani is saying.

And that was part of the same kind of ethos behind the initial bundling proposal. I - the only question is whether or not it's - how easy it will be for us and under what position do we - would we set up to say that this is something that is - it passes our test because it supports the - a specific kind of developing market community.

And this is not a critique. It's more a question of how would we implement it, that's all.

So for example if it's something that would help very much in an emerging market but would also help in other places is it a different product? Is it the same product?

That's the only I would try to find - do we have any idea about how we would define the edges of this?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Okay. Alex go ahead. Dave has already commented that the application should come from the developing countries themselves.

Alex go ahead.

Alex Gakuru: Thank you. I hope I'm not on mute.

Evan Leibovitch: No I can hear you.

Alex Gakuru: Thank you. I believe I support Dave's position because I think the movement you allow -- and again I use as an example cite that VeriSign and (Alltel) and others developing - located elsewhere. But opens the possibility of giving this whole program.

And I do believe that the applicant should be located in the area they are having. Because that's the only way we can have this equitable a decision that ICANN let them grow and develop from exactly their position or area of the applicant.

And ICANN can point back at the people and the communities they were serving and how they have grown, their challenges and how they are being met. I think that's the way to look at it.

That's my position. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah hi. Just have some questions again.

So if we restrict entrepreneurs to just those that are local which makes a lot of sense do we care how their funding comes? In other words is a local entrepreneur funded by a VeriSign an issue?

Is a local entrepreneur that is a subsidiary through some chain of subsidiaries an issue? And is the whole relationship there?

I agree we should say local. I'm just not sure that that actually closes the hole people are worrying about.

And then of course one's thinking, you know, so does that matter to people? As I say I'm asking a question not trying to pose an opinion. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: So Avri if I read you right you're talking about that not only should the applicant be located an incorporated in a developing country but it also must have let's say majority ownership from...

Avri Doria: I'm asking if that's what people want to say, yes. As I say I'm not positing a view on it.

                 I'm just asking.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Of the people that just spoke what are your feelings on that? Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes Avri I understand where you're going with this. But I think that takes us down a lane that we're probably not going to - it's going to be too complicated figuring out who owns what shares in what way in what country and all of that.

                 I think it's just going to be more complicated than we could possibly operationalize. If we say that it's geographically based where the headquarters of that entity is, that's very doable.

                 But if we get into who actually owns the entity and where it's - I just don't see us being successful in that. I get the idea why Tijani wants to make it open.

                 And I have done this before. And I'm more concerned about whether people will look at this and say it's a great idea, we just can't figure out a way to do it.

Evan Leibovitch: Do you agree with the potential for gaming?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Andrew Mack: It's certainly possible. But it's a lot of work.

                 And it probably wouldn't be worth it. I mean as you think about the amount of time and effort that it would go into I can't see it being worthwhile.

You'd have to do it on the scale that was very, very meaningful and very obvious for it to have any kind of meaningful effect on a - on the kind of large company that you're talking about is my guess.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Do - is there anybody on this call who is opposed to the idea that the applicant must be physically located in a developing economy? The definition of developing economy we'll take into further work.

But is everybody - is - I mean Tijani based on what you're hearing on the call are you okay with the sense of the group in wanting to limit this to applicants who are located in the developing economies?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Can I say this in a sense of gaining a consensus. If you were opposed to this in saying the entrepreneurs must be from anywhere as long as they're serving in developing markets then we don't have consensus on this.

Tijani what's your take on this?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I do think that to avoid gaming we have to precise that the entrepreneur should serve an emerging country or emerging economy and should come from there.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Good. I think we've got a - I think we've got some consensus. Okay?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Now the rest of these are notes. Karla did you want to - Andrew you've still got your hand up.

Did you have something to say or is that just - Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Sorry. I was putting it down.

Evan Leibovitch: Now Karla about the notes -- did you want to sort of explain what it is that you were having difficulties with?

Karla Valente: No there was some additional notes. I'm sorry you're talking about what specifically? The notes...

Evan Leibovitch: The last page of your document called Notes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: In the addendum.

Karla Valente: I'm not clear about this.

Evan Leibovitch: Not clear about.

Karla Valente: Yeah, you know, I took - I copied and pasted from the Notes section that we have in Adobe. And this last part seems to be something that maybe Avri put on.

                   But I don't really know what is referring to. What document was referring to.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah those were just notes that I took as we were talking. So I'll take a look at those while I'm working the document this weekend and see if there are any open issues when we get there.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So that's the document. Basically that's covering most of the loose end we've had to deal with.

                   I - we now have - Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes Avri please, please because I have had to look on it. And it is what we had a few weeks ago what we had.

And there is some notes marked as group discussion. And I don't find that it was what we said inside this section of discussion.

So please read it again and you would see we have to - okay?

Avri Doria: Yeah, no I'm hoping that taking everything between what I've got, what Evan and Karla have and looking at it we should be able to get a document out by the end of the weekend where we indicate where we still have some questions. And of course it'll be up to you all to flag that unh, unh, unh, we're not there yet on this one.

And if we miss any of them. So yeah it's up to us to pick them all up and it's up to you guys to make sure that we did.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, thank you, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay? Karla go ahead.

Karla Valente: Yes one of the open issues, open (unintelligible) that was discussed throughout several calls was whether or not we should create a glossary for some of the terms that we use in the document. And we never stood (unintelligible).

So what I wanted to know is whether or not we are going to do some kind of a glossary. And I can try and identify some words and put it together draft for this glossary for people to amend or add.

Are we going down that path?

Avri Doria: I think it's a good idea. Anytime people start demanding a glossary the point is usually we should have one.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: That's been my experience. That when people start asking for it there's no good reason to say no.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes two things. First of all I agree -- I think that a glossary would actually be very helpful.

And it might get - might lower some of the concerns that people who are reading this quickly would have. The second thing is just a practical question -- I think that (Eric's) already off the call and it's already Friday afternoon - or it's going to be Friday afternoon soon here.

If you're trying to get this done over the weekend and we - he and I were going to try and get together to talk about some possible changes in our language around IBM support, I'm guessing that won't happen this weekend.

Avri Doria: In which case there'll be a bracket.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Good enough. Good enough.

Avri Doria: But the sooner you get it...

Andrew Mack: We're - I just didn't want to appear to be not delivering on our part that's all.

Avri Doria: The sooner you get it the sooner we can complete what we've got. At this - I mean at this point I think we're all in endgame.

And the sooner we get our pieces done and that's also one thing I want to comment on on glossary is while I think we should do them, I expect that in some of the definitions we will find ourselves back in some of our deep discussions.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right. So we've got stuff to work on for the weekend. We've got - I guess the next call I guess is going to be on Tuesday.

Between now and then hopefully we will actually have a draft out that - another draft out that we can hammer on. If there are additional issues to resolve as (Elaine) suggested we could use the tactic of doing a dutiful and finding out of issues on which we didn't see clear consensus.

Whether or not we have broad consensus with only a little bit of dissent or whether we have true divergence. So there might be continuing a few issues on which we have to do those decisions. But I - but we've got an awful lot to go on.

So I really think at this point we can call this meeting to a close unless there's any other loose ends or issues that we need to deal with now. But I think we've got plenty to go forward with as we make the next draft document ready for Tuesday.

Andrew is your hand up on this?

Andrew Mack: No, no I'm sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So if everybody's okay - does anybody have any other comments any other (unintelligible) they want to add? We have seven minutes remaining though I imagine nobody would complain if we ended seven minutes early?

No, Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you. I think that also we have to go through the comment answers and the comment on the comment if you want.

There is a lot to do on this - in this area. And I don't know if it would be too much for your weekend.

But we have to schedule it for next week.

Evan Leibovitch: Well hopefully we will have a draft on - by Tuesday that will attempt to start on this. Obviously it will be a draft.

There will be work we will have to do on it. But, you know, it'll be another snapshot that we can then start referring to by line number and working on and getting to a form everybody likes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So if that's the case then five minutes early. The call is over.

Thank you all for coming and we will see you on Tuesday.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Evan.

Man: (unintelligible).

Woman: Bye. Thank you Evan.

Man: Bye.

Evan Leibovitch: Bye.

END