

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)  
TRANSCRIPT  
Friday 01 July 2011 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) Friday 01 July 2011 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.

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20110701-en.mp3>

On page :

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

**GNSO**

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison - WG chair

Avri Doria - NCSG

Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Alex Gakuru - NCSG

Andrew Mack - CBUC

John Rahman Kahn - Individual

Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

Fabien Betremieux – Individual

**At-Large:**

Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

Carlton Samuels - LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair

Dave Kissoondoyal - (AFRALO) - At large

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large (Adobe Connect)

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large

Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Alain Berranger - Individual

Michele Neylon - RrSG

Tony Harris -ISPCP

Coordinator: The call is now recorded. Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber: Wonderful. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Friday the 1st of July. We have Rafik Dammak, Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Carlos Aguirre, Baudouin Schombe, Alex Gakuru, Avri Doria, Eric Brunner-Williams, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Dave Kissoondoyal.

From Staff we have Karla Valente and myself, Gisella Gruber, and apologies today from Alan Greenberg and Evan Leibovitch. If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you very much Gisella. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon, good night everybody. Thanks for joining us on this JAS call. It's good to have you all again together. We have posted a draft agenda. It's on the Adobe Connect room. For those of you who haven't seen it I am proposing - we are proposing that we have a short discussion to confirm the timeline for the Final Report, to look at the redline MR2 Report, again ten minutes.

And then we should have some conversation on what we should do in terms of the Registry/Registrar support needs and that's about 15 minutes. And then for the rest of the time we have to take a decision and what we're going to do about the funding, especially what we have proposed to use the \$2 million fund for. So are there any objections to this agenda being adopted as agreed?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, it's fine.

Carlton Samuels: I think Cheryl has spoken for everyone. Seeing that there is no objection the agenda is adopted. Might I remind all of us, if you have SOIs or DOIs still to be completed and signed up, would you please do so?

It will be most important. Thank you. So let's look at the first agenda item. So the first agenda item is actually coming off the Board resolution from Singapore and Karla has very kindly put it in the notes space on the Adobe Connect.

But let me read it for you because it's - kind of tries much of what we do. Board resolution - it goes as follows and I am quoting. "A program to ensure support for applicants in developing countries with a form structure and processes to be determined by the Board in consultation with stakeholders including -- A, consideration the GAC recommendation for a fee waiver corresponding and the 6% of \$185,000 U.S. Dollars evaluation fee; B, consideration of recommendations of the ALAC and GNSO as chartered organizations of the Joint Applicant Support, JAS Working Group; C, designation of a budget of up to \$2 million U.S. Dollars for seed funding and creating opportunities for other parties to provide matching funds; and D, the review of additional community feedback, advice from ALAC and recommendations from the GNSO following their receipt of a Final Report from the JAS Working Group, requested in time to allow Staff to develop an implementation plan for the Board's consideration at the October 2011 meeting in Dakar, Senegal, with the goal of having a sustainable applicant support system in place before the opening of the application window."

So that resolution constrains the timeline for the Final Report. We are then proposing - or Rafik pointed out that if we are going to make that timeline, including the GNSO approval timeline, which has to happen by the 8th of September which is the large GNSO Council meeting before Dakar, and we have to give the GNSO in practice two weeks I think before their Council meeting any piece of work that we expect them to put up.

It gives us until the end of August practically to have a Final Report. Does everyone agree with this timeline?

Karla Valente: Yes, Carlton could you repeat - so the GNSO meeting is September 4, which means that the Final Report must be ready by...?

Carlton Samuels: Well I understand it's the 8th of September. So Rafik has his hand up, I mean, Rafik, probably you could clarify the GNSO side of things for us.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. So in Singapore during the session of - the GNSO Council held discussions about the timeline for the JAS Working Group in order to meet the Board request.

So we - in the GNSO Council we have calls every three weeks, but for a motion to be adopted, discussed or approved we need to do that eight days before the Council.

So how they calculate is not me but it's more the GNSO Council, so if the - we want an implementation plan to be adopted in Dakar, I think my understanding is that the Board needs this two weeks before Dakar, and then also that it needs it in time for the ICANN Staff to work on that.

And then the best time for the GNSO Council to consider the report is the 8th September hoping that there won't be defer or delay. And then we need to submit the motion with the Report to be considered for approval (sic) at the end of August.

So we have exactly two months for - to work on that. I know it's not easy. I think some people are - will be on vacation and holidays this summer, et cetera. So it's challenging but I think we can do it. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Rafik. Are there any other considerations that might raise here?

Karla Valente: Yes, this is Karla speaking. So we have the GNSO meeting on September 8, which means that the GNSO has to have the Report in hands two weeks in advance, so that's what Rafik mentioned?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Surely not.

Carlton Samuels: Well it's at least a week.

Karla Valente: One week in advance. Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, that's my understanding of it. Eric has raised his hand. Eric, you have the floor sir.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. All right. Karla were you finished?

Karla Valente: Yes I am.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay. The September 8 GNSO meeting with eight days in advance, so that's September 1. So we have basically July and August, a total of eight weeks.

Eight weeks is sufficient to get work done, but it also means that if that's a Final Report that we have no opportunity after the 1st of September to improve our work product.

And the actual application open date is not until, what, the 12th of January, so that's approximately two weeks deep into January plus four weeks in December, four weeks in November, four weeks in, you know, so we're basically getting something done and then not having an opportunity to improve it for about four times that amount of time.

So I think the - whatever we provide, it should be better presented as a first version of a Final rather than a last version of a Final. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Eric. Avri, you have your hand up. You're next.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Actually you - when you were talking about documents on the list, you were talking about a Final Report and then you were talking about the companion document that was the actual instantiation/implementation of this program where we would work with Staff and however.

So I'm wondering whether - if the Final Report restricts itself to the well fleshed out proposals. At the moment there's still - in the Milestone Report there's still open issues, but does - so it closes those.

It makes decisions on recommendation. There will be an exit. Does that - what doesn't get into the detail of, you know, how that plan is put together by the - by January 12.

And then afterwards the Group continues working on that. The Final Report has gone. There could be a draft of that other thing or not, but I think it's actually important that we get the Final Report - is the - which is the implementation recommendation on the Board's schedule, even if the work to produce the implementation of that thing itself takes longer. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Eric, I see you've - you want to speak again.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, thank you. A very good point Avri. Actually what we ought to know is the - assuming that a policy - well wait, we don't do policy. We just do implementations.

Well in any event, let's call it policy. Assuming that the policy document is completed by September 1 to the GNSO and the ALAC at that date for their respective approvals and it's approved by them prior to the Board meeting in - at the end of October which is almost two months later, there's still the implementation work.

And for that what we need to have I think is the Board's schedule from Dakar on to - into the month - to the end of December. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Eric. So we - I think we have a consensus that we are going to have the Board's schedule - Final Report to fit in with this timeline by the end of August, but there is another document that we were - we are going to continue to have some play with, and that is the document where we call a Needs-Assessed Guidebook which is - which I call the NAG.

This is a document that has to be provided for the public to give them step by step just like the DAG about how to go through - I see Avri say that she - it's the word NAG and I just call it that Avri.

Don't - let not your heart be troubled. So we are all agreed. We are all understanding that these are two separate documents. The first document, the Final Report, which is the one we have to work on now to complete starting with MR2.

And then we will have this Guidebook which we are going to - which is going to be most of the Final Report reformatted, reconfigured to look pretty much like the DAG.

So I guess we all understand that this is what we're working with, and that need not be ready for August but definitely should be fairly well done, put together by Dakar.

That's where we are with this, so we are all agreed on that. Are you all still with me on this?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Eric. Avri just raised her hand and...

Avri Doria: Yes, I've got a quick question. Does fairly well along or whatever phrase you used with that secondary document, the crone document, by Dakar it means

that there's a draft of it by then, or does it mean that you think that one should be final by then?

If you mean that there should be a first draft of that one by then, I think that's a great goal. If you think it's done by then I think that that extra month wouldn't necessarily be, you know, enough to get that done.

But certainly to have a good draft of the cron document would be great.  
Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. No, that's what I meant, have a good draft. When I said fairly well along, I mean to have a good draft. I don't mean that it is going to be a finished product. Andrew Mack and then Eric.

Andrew Mack: Yes, quick question for you. I'm sorry. I'm - maybe I'm lost in the pronouns, but which document by when draft? Avri, what were you thinking?

Carlton Samuels: Let me explain it.

Avri Doria: I was thinking that the NAGing document, the second document, is the one that had to have a draft by Dakar, whereas the final document was the one that had to be delivered a month before that.

Carlton Samuels: Are you okay with that now Andrew Mack? Andrew Mack? He's gone. Eric, can you go ahead please? And we have to move on with this.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sure. Thank you very much Carlton. The application window opens on the 12th and it closes either 30 or 90 days later. I have forgotten which it is if someone can tell me.

The implementation of support actually is going to take longer than any particular near-term event, so I think that we actually need to think about



coordinating with a longer term Board schedule on implementation issues that arise out of the third recommendation.

So that's all I really had to say is that the timeline for implementation is actually longer than the 12th of January. It extends into the - into 2012.  
Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Eric. I think that is understood unless somebody raises an issue. Andrew Mack are you back with us? Do you want to say something else? This is going to be the final on that document.

Andrew Mack: No, no, sorry. I - my hand fell up. Apologies.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. All right, thank you. So all right, we are pretty much clear on that. Can we move to the second topic, which is the MR2 Report? As members you will remember we have all agreed that the document needs to be fleshed out in certain areas.

We've also agreed that the document as presented principally covered the work of qualifications group, which is a Subgroup 1 and that is to say it has established a criteria and it - there is some sense of - there's a proto mechanism that has been defined in that document.

Some work needs to be done. The issues about financial donors and funding is still pretty much out. In-kind services - Elaine has done some work there. We've seen the work that Elaine has done.

It has not got much of our comments on the list. And then we have the final one, which is the Subgroup 4 for IDN support. And we are still waiting for much more work in this area as well.

Does anyone need - I see Andrew Mack has his hand up. Does anyone need anything else on this issue? Andrew Mack.

Andrew Mack: Yes Carlton, a question for the group actually. You - Carlton, you mentioned that the question of fundraising has been put to one side. Is that a done deal?

The reason I ask is because I was approached by a Board member who's going to be in Washington later this summer with the thought that they might go to the World Bank and to other donor sources to look for matching funds for the fund that - with the \$2 million fund that was contributed and was asking questions about what we had done so far.

And I mentioned some of the conversations that I'd had and some of the notes from the conversations that Avri has had so much with (Ann Herdiman).

I don't know, I mean, have we made a policy decision that that's off the table for us to participate in, or are we in that and if so what are people's thoughts about, you know, how that would play itself out over the summer?

Carlton Samuels: I don't think we are done with that at all Andrew Mack. What I've just mentioned is those are still outstanding issues, but Cheryl has her hand up. Cheryl, you have the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much Carlton. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. In response to your issue there Andrew Mack, I think what we can do is write into our draft report something that accounts for the probability of matching funds and to utilize very generic language with any recommendation we make on what we believe the funds would be best applied to and how.

I think as a sidebar it would be appropriate for that Work Group involved in those issues to look at how effective such choices would be. In other words we could be advising the people who are knocking on the doors and interacting with the potential additional top up funders so that they have clear advice or at least strong suggestions from the Work Group that says, "If we are going to implement this type of program with such funds, the bucket

needs to be this much bigger than \$2 million versus this much bigger than \$2 million for some other purpose.”

So I would like to - that that's something we'd still be actively involved with, but we also don't want to have too many people knocking on the same doors, so I think there'd need to be a coordinated effort. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. As a matter of fact that is one of the items on this agenda, because I thought it was important to raise it now and probably get some heads going about this.

So we're going to come to that in another few minutes actually. Andrew Mack, you've raised your hand again. If it's about the fund can we defer the question or the comment until we get to that?

Andrew Mack: Perfect. Will do.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you sir. So we - I don't see anybody else raising any issue with what we think needs to be done on the MR2 to finalize it to get to a decent Final Report.

So I'm assuming that we are all agreed on where the holes are, and we have a list of persons who are going to lead in terms of filling these holes. We have them up in the note page on Adobe room.

For those of you who might wish to familiarize yourself and can't see Adobe room, we can always send it out again. This was sent out earlier on the list. We could then move to the next item.

And I don't think we need to - Cheryl has raised her hand again. Cheryl, you have the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, that's an error on - my laptop does have a mind of its own sometimes.  
I was actually trying to type.

Carlton Samuels: Not to worry. Okay, so can we then move to the next item and this is the one about Registry/Registrar support for Needs-Assessed Applicants. That - this issue got some traction in Singapore and on the list.

Just let me summarize what the - this - what I think the emerging consensus is. There is a consensus that there would be need for Registrar provider services to enable effective launch of a Needs-Assessed gTLD.

I think there's consensus that that is going to be a requirement. The question arose as to whether or not this was a part of our charter, and the tendency was, and I use the word tendency, that the charter itself if read - well let us say read with a discerning eye seems to embrace this position.

But we feel that if we are going to take it up now it would be a distraction. While it is important it would be a distraction to the Final Report, so the proposal is we defer this after - until after the Final Report and if need be, if members are still not satisfied that it is covered in the charter, we will go back to the chartering organizations and ask for it to be included as a matter of urgency. I hope I summarized it as best as I can. But Avri then Eric, you are online.

Avri Doria: Yes thank you. A couple of things. I think in general I sort of agree that Registrar - and I think there's a third element - that the Registrar services, the Registrar function is necessary and as you said for the launch.

And the argument that I had made I think on the list and in conversations that it wasn't necessary for the application. So leaving aside whether it is in charter or isn't in charter, it basically isn't a gaping issue for the immediate work.

One thing that we could do, whether we think it is charter or not, is if the Group has consensus on it needs to be in place by the launch, is certainly to put a recommendation in the Final Report saying that this needs to be there before the launch and whether it's part of JAS or some other thing, work must be done so that that schedule can be met.

So I think there may be a middle position between saying it is or isn't in our charter and spending the next month fighting about whether it is or isn't in our charter with our chartering groups and everyone else.

I certainly think adding a paragraph that says, "The Group recommends that more work needs to be done on this," is fine in a Final Report if we have consensus on it.

But I think actually getting into the work of doing it in these next four months when it's needed for launch, which is at least a year away if not 18 months away, when we've got such a strong application driven set of requirements would be misprioritization. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Eric, you have the board sir. I see you - your hand up.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Carlton. Eric Brunner-Williams for the transcript record. We are in effect discussing when businesses or nonprofit organizations that currently don't exist can start making revenues selling dot com domains.

And it's important to keep in mind that the Registrar's principal stream of revenue is unlikely to be a - the sales of the inventory of a qualified Registry some one to two years from now.

So it is one of the defects of the Vertical Integration assumption that the Registry is its own Registrar, but you fail to recognize that the Registrar function of that Registry is probably going to make more money as a

standalone business unit selling dot com inventory than selling the Registry's own inventory.

You know, the form of Registry support, and given that ICANN's just increased the cost of Registry application, is something that could be affected by policy today, that is for needs qualified or for developing economies the requirements - the fee requirements to ICANN could be reduced just as quickly as they were increased, that is overnight.

So the issue I think that we should be discussing is not when the applicant receives a benefit by the existence of a Registrar, but rather when do we turn on Registrars which will assist our - the qualified applicants and do we do so in a way that does not cripple them the most that we can imagine, which would be to turn them on the day that the Registry becomes available with its inventory?

So that's - the point I wanted to make is that we're actually discussing something that could be started significantly before Registry sunrise, that it's really the existing legacy inventory of Registry product that will be the principal source of revenue for these new entities which are critical for our Registry applicants to succeed not merely at its launch time, but to be sustainable enterprises. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Eric. I - well Andrew Mack, you are up next. You have the floor sir.

Andrew Mack: Thanks Carlton. Eric I - the first part of what you said made perfect sense to me and I think it's really smart and bears repeating that realistically, unless something is very different from our assumptions, that any of these new Registrars are unlikely to be financially sustainable based on the inventory that they have from new gTLDs, especially not new ones that we would support, so that makes good sense.

I'll be honest. I wasn't quite sure I understood the last part of it, but what it suggest to me is that these are - as Avri said this is that these are - that they're related issues but certainly in terms of the sequencing I think that we really should focus on the stuff that we've already got on our plate.

I wonder whether given what Eric just said about the kind of sustainability and the ability of these new Registrars to sell things outside of what we're touching, I wonder whether it's something that we want to pick up at all but I'm happy to defer that decision until later.

Perhaps Eric you could explain a little - the back part of what you said a little bit more because I didn't quite follow it completely. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Can I ask Eric to - Eric made a - put something on the wire, on the list which explains it very well Andrew Mack. I - because we're time constrained here I would just ask you to have a look at that, and if there's any other questions...

Andrew Mack: I'm sorry. I'm not completely caught up because of the travel.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I figured as much. So - but he did put out something and I think I understood. Even when I read it I understood what he was saying. I just want to make one suggestion.

Avri spoke about, you know, a middle ground which is to say in our Final Report we mention the Registry/Registrar issue and point out very definitively that this is something that is a sustainability point for new gTLDs, Needs-Assessed gTLDs.

I wonder if we couldn't refine it a little bit more with some of Eric's information just for the Group. Do you think that would be useful?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. Avri you've raised your hand. Can you go?

Avri Doria: Just quickly, that's like the - what he said fleshed out a little bit is what would definitely be a good thing to include as part of the final report product with still having not jump into the detail of how it's done.

Woman: Here, here.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, that's what I mean. All right, I see there are at least two members - Andrew Mack giving support for that idea as well. There being no persons online saying no, I think we can make that a consensus that we will include some content about the importance of registrar capabilities for (unintelligible) applicants and we will flesh it out. Perhaps I could ask Eric to take the lead on that specific area.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sure.

Carlton Samuels: When you work with the draft.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Eric. All right, we have to close up this one now. We're going to move to the final item. And this one will take some substantial time because it's about the funding elements. If you recall, there - the subgroup two, which is the financial donor's group and that group needs to be reconstituted.

I still believe that Avri would be very useful and helpful in adding that group. I'm appealing to her to rethink our position and probably join that group all over again.

We have an additional item. The board and the resolution throw in \$2 million of seed funding and the question was and, Cheryl did make a very interesting



- well I think it's explanatory - point earlier on in the conversation. Maybe I'll ask her to say it again to kind of start everybody off.

Cheryl, you want to reprise what you said earlier on about how we might look at that fund?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. It won't be anywhere near as long as the first time I said it. Put simply, I think one of the things this workgroup should be doing is suggesting that those that are knocking on the doors and trying to seek additional top (off) funds have some advice, and not necessarily, you know, fully fledged report but some indicative advice, at least, from our work that says if we're going to do this particular thing, recommend this particular activity with these funds, then the number of dollars required is in this order of magnitude rather than the \$2 million versus for some other purpose because people seem to think \$2 million is a lot of money and, of course, it's not in this term at all. Thank you (Tom).

Carlton Samuels: Yes, thank you Cheryl. So, yes I think it pretty much kind of framework what we're going to discuss here. Andrew Mack, I see you are on the board sir. You - you have the floor.

Andrew Mack: Yes, thanks Carlton. Now is the time to talk about the fundraising outreach so all - let me get to the point that I was thinking of (earlier). The - a couple of things - I agree, Cheryl, it's - well, first of all, \$2 million is piddly for the size of the task that we got, I believe.

I think it's not going to be - you know, if you think about both the internal things that we're going to need to do in terms of helping to set up the system and also any money that might actually be available to an applicant, that's going to be willfully inadequate for the task in my estimation.

That said, I think it may be difficult for us to go - let's say we have a meeting with the World Bank. I think it's going to be difficult for us to say this is exactly how much money we need and this is exactly the way that we're going to propose to allocate it because I just don't think we have all of that data yet.

But I think based on the conversations that we've already had, and the results that we've already had, and the interest that other people in the ICANN community, including ICANN board have expressed and - of their willingness to either go with us or on behalf of this initiative to look for funding, I think we want to get out in front of that.

So with that in mind, I would like to propose that we do something like this and see if this makes sense to everyone. First of all, obviously to the extent that we can be a part of any of these outreach efforts, some member of our working group, I think that that's beneficial so that we don't reinvent the wheel and so that we are united or at least coherent in our approach to the outside world.

That would be number one. Number two is if we have these meetings that are being set up to the extent that we can inform the group at least as a, you know, some sort of an advance warning that we're going to go out, I think that that's useful so that we get the benefit of anybody who knows of these - about these institutions and those might know the people that we're meeting with and things like that.

And then the third thing is I think it will be very valuable if anybody has these meetings over the summer to try to - or for that matter, as we go forward, to report that to the group where things are even if it's just, you know, still in the mushy stages.

It'll help us one - there were - things that we learn along the way will help anybody else who is trying to raise funds for the initiative. Yes, those are my thoughts. Does that make sense to everyone?

Carlton Samuels: Well it makes sense to me Andrew Mack. I see Avri's on the board. Avri, you have the floor. Avri?

Avri Doria: I was doing the mute thing. I actually - I'm not sure that I totally understand or perhaps agree. I think that - and I'm fine, you know, doing subgroup two stuff again and (unintelligible) up and sticking little recommended bits of writing in the middle of most of the subgroups over the last week. So that's no problem. That was something you had asked at the beginning.

In terms of actually going out and fundraising, first of all also, I want to get on the record that as a seed into a fund there's nothing piddly about \$2 million. Certainly it isn't all that we need in a fund. I think in MR1 we put a, you know, our goal down of, you know, I forget - what was it? Ten million or 100 - I forget the number.

But we did have a number in MR1 and I think the \$2 million should be very much appreciated as a seed which is what I think they called it. So it was \$10 million, okay - so as a seed and getting 20% of the way on the goal we asked for with that contribution I really don't think we should apply the word piddly to it anywhere.

It's a wonderful generous start and that. Now, in terms of more fundraising, I don't see that necessarily as a goal of this group. We have to define our recommendations for how a foundation might be set up, what process they should go through, and what sorts of things the fund can and should (produce) on and perhaps even make recommendations about who should be outreached in terms of fundraising.

I think fundraising is a wonderful activity for those of us that have contacts and can do that as a separate activity and can use, you know, the wonderful story of the seed to that fund as part of our narrative but I really don't see it as

this group's goal to actually do the fundraising. So, of course, all the people in this group that have contacts should. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Just before I ask Andrew Mack and then Cheryl to go, can I just point out two things? In the board resolution it didn't make the case that they still need to (concern) the GAC waiver of fees as part of it.

Might it be useful for this group to consider and because of the funding and the - what we think is the shortage of funds - might it be useful for us to consider and endorse a fee where we fully - to say that well with this fund plus a fee waiver, we might get more people (under their tent).

That's the first question. The second question that we might take into consideration, recall at Singapore, (Dennis Jennings) made the case that there are foundations, there are existing foundations that have well defined funding and relationships and applications that support the (prophecies) that we might - it might be useful for us to have a go at and we thought it will be a good exercise if we had some staff support to do this research. Is that still viable? Those are the two questions I want to ask as you think about this.

They - back to the board now. Andrew Mack, you are up, then Cheryl and Avri again. So Andrew Mack.

Andrew Mack: Sure. Thanks Carlton. In response to Avri, I want to clarify. My choice of words may or may not be particularly important in this one. I think that the amount of money is piddly.

When I heard the announcements in the context of the larger ICANN budget and discussions about the amount of money that was spent on travel and all these other things, it felt like a very small number to me especially given the size of our task.

That is not on any level to suggest I or I think anybody in the working group doesn't think that it's important and doesn't think that it's appreciated. Quite the contrary, I just thought in the scheme of things it's a pretty small number given the size of ICANN and its budget.

I think it's absolutely essential to have some seed funds if you want to (get anything) done or because one of the first questions asked is always what skin in the game does the sponsoring organization have?

So I couldn't agree more that that's important. Carlton, to your point, I think that the fact that we have - that the sustainability package for this has and must be a combination of funds raised and price and fee adjustments. No question about it.

I think that we could - should continue to make that case so that it doesn't get lost on any level. In terms of whether or not fundraising is central to our group, you know, that's a tough one. I think that we - we're going to strengthen our case an awful lot and make it more likely, put ourselves much more in a position to have a lot of our recommendations taken seriously if the (real) as this all feels and becomes, and certainly if we can raise some additional capital, that's going to make that more possible.

So, you know, it may be that this is something that we have to do in - on the side. Either way, I just - I think it's likely to make us more successful with the rest of the things that we're trying to do. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Andrew Mack. Cheryl, you have the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Carlton. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Let me start first of all by saying I will - I'll try and interpret the incredibly bad number of typographical errors I put into the chat so you might - will be able to understand what I was on about.

But I'll come back to that and answer your two questions first. Carlton, I agree 100% with Andrew Mack on the first part and that question that yes, it - I think it would strengthen greatly if we - in our report we work on a (hoveredization) that a reduction of the fee in line with the GAC recommendation means that we can do far more meaningful assistance to obviously greater number of appropriately qualified applicants so that the first (fee) is differently, yes.

On the second one, I - perhaps I didn't understand your question as well as I might. As I understood what (Dennis) was saying, we could look at this two ways and we could look at it from a workgroup point of view and - or we could look at it from an ICANN point of view.

And I'm preferring to that latter, that it should be an ICANN point of view. First of all, in terms of recommendations that we as the workgroup might make for models of foundations, et cetera, obviously getting something that's boiler plated, tested and operational as an example or a sample is clearly an advantage and I think we should be looking to those types of organizations to seek exactly how we do this type of funding to propose well tested models rather than try and create some interesting new will with (unintelligible) that we might, in fact, come up with particularly an initial period of time.

As to the - do we go to such funding bodies to seek out some of the top (out) funds or additional income that we know we all desire to make this work, I am less convinced that that needs to be a function of the workgroup then I am it needs to be a function of ICANN.

I would think that if we find highly likely and probable sources that in our report we recommend them as highly likely and probable sources but informally in the back channels we make sure that they're properly fueled by whoever's task it is in ICANN to make sure that there is coordinated highly efficient and professional approach to seeking these additional top out funds.

I don't believe it is the place of the workgroup to do this. I think it would be destructing if we have me knocking on someone's door at the same time as someone tasked from an ICANN hit off of somewhere around the world to do the same thing.

I think it would be extremely useful to make sure whoever has the coordination role for negotiating, given the details and the - actually getting (more) of a contractual relationships that are required, sort it out with potential additional to our funders, needs to be available to us and be a liaison with us and that we should have their name and contact available for when we trip over someone with a very large purse of money in a restaurant one night.

And this is not to say that we shouldn't be out there using our own resources but I think it is something that needs to be very carefully coordinated and certainly not anywhere dispirit sort of view. I'm sure we can all do some of the softening up but we need a single and I think very well identified name or set of - small set of names, you know, ICANN to do the actual dealing. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. Just to mention, the relationship to the (Dennis command), I think you've just clarified what I intended to say. I just intended it should be some staff effort on that side. Avri, you're next up.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes, I totally agree that existing funding models should be what we use as opposed to trying and invent the wheel. I also agree that, you know, reaching out where we know someone, I think we have to be careful in terms of how much we say.

I know in the efforts that I've been talking to people about, until they've gotten the agreement of their boards and their oversight and their this and their budget, these are not things that they're ready to have spoken of all that openly.

So, you know, that's one reason why I think, you know, we should stay out of it. We should certainly - you know, as I said, we should recommend that there be somebody at that higher of two, three names, whatever it is, doing this work and we should certainly turn over whatever leaf we have to them when they start working and so on.

And I wish that the board starting to put together it's foundation fund super group, you know, didn't have wait for a final report to get the mechanisms rolling but, you know, that's beside the point.

On the fee reduction, I think that, you know, this group has had, at least in the past, a consensus that there must be fee reductions. I think using the fund as a possible supplement to those fee reductions for some particular designated group or according to some particularly designated conditions to get to the GAC's recommendation of, you know, applicants from our least developed countries being able to achieve 100% reduction is a good idea.

But I think we should be careful to not make the one dependent on another, that we should be absolute about the, you know the re- the recommendation that any and all (Jas) qualified applicants get the initial, you know, get this 86 or 87 reduction.

And that, then, further reductions can be, you know, obtained, applied for, however we want to put it but not comingle the two in that way. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, so that's one way of looking at it Avri. Thank you. Can we go to Eric. By the way, we have another eight minutes on this call so - and then we have Rafik after Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Carlton. I think I just put what I wanted to say into the chat. So I don't need to take time repeating it.



Carlton Samuels: Okay, well what Eric said in the chat is that we should recommend a policy and some implementation, details as part of the response to the board resolution 20. It is the board's responsibility to say yay or nay and if yay, it is Rod Beckstom's job as the chief executive to execute the task of initiating ICANN's fundraising partner search.

That's what he said. I quite agree. Rafik, you're up. And I see Avri and Cheryl have agreed with Eric on that one. Rafik, you're up sir. You're on the board.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thank you Carlton. What I'm just trying to summarize the - what I'm listening and hearing (unintelligible) and trying to give my thoughts about that. So first I think that we need to focus on the next two months on the - our report and we have that red line part that we need to work on the (dates).

I think that the fee issues we have discussed about that a lot and now with this seed funding I think I agree with Avri about this point. I'm not sure how we can work on that.

About the fundraising, it's not just the fundraising but also looking for a possible provider of in kind support, even these two kinds of support, but I think several people from the working group trying to - their contact, their connections and trying to look and contact some funders or also providers, that's good.

But I think that we need some - because it's ICANN and we are also trying to contact organizations, there is a need for some formalization and I think it's good for working group members to do their best to outreach but at the end of the day, that ICANN should have - I don't know how we - it should proceed but the - something to manage and to (have) this to contact the (Siebolt) funders and to handle this.

So we - but if this entity or liaison or (I don't know, staff) exists, we can, as working group members, after outreach to forward to us this entity in ICANN which manage, handle the fundraising that to take care of that.

That's what I - or that's what I think. So let's focus on our recommendations that - which should be implemented by the staff later and we - I think we would have to continue work after the final report so it just would be about maybe as we discussed about the - (these two) issues, also communication.

I'm just afraid that we are working about support applicants but we need to have communication for those applicants in time even if we can't have an applicant who - a prospective applicant who didn't think about - at all about this program, the new gTLD program, who can be contacted in the next month and they can be eligible for the support. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Rafik. I agree that we have to focus and finish finalizing the report. I also agree that we should have some kind of draft content available for possible applicants. This is why I feel that by the car, we should have what we're calling the (crone) at least a first draft of a (crone) available with staff help. That said, Cheryl, you're on the board. You're next.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much Carlton. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Yes, agreed totally. We need to get on to the work we need to get on to but I think it's important that perhaps at this very early stage, we ask as an action item on staff if Karla could make the appropriate inquiries to I'm assuming Kurt that she could come back to our next meeting with the appropriate advice on the specific plans and contact points that ICANN had.

In other words, who's going to be the lead and who's responsibility is it going to be to do the actual outreach and interaction with any additional (cattle) raising for this fund and then (Rod) or whoever can be anointed to do the job.

This is hugely important. I've done this at a national level and the fact that I might know someone in a major bank that is more appropriate than the general manager of an organization who has a different layer of entree.

That's something that needs to be exchanged and then, you know, the general manager and I may go to the meeting or I may just do the (e) introduction and they know they're getting to the right point. I mean, there's a dozen ways to skin this. And I'd like to think anyone who can do that will do that. But we need to have a proper protocol to follow otherwise it's going to be ineffectual and basically - well, it'll look shabby and it just won't work. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. Karla has her hand up. Karla, do you - will you (please the board)?

Karla Valente: Yes, Kurt is on vacation until I think the 11th or the 12th. And we have a meeting scheduled after that. We have an operation planning meeting on that we can then await- meeting tentatively scheduled to resolve some of those issues on the week of the 11th. I'm not going to be able to give you anything next week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure. That's fine. We've got a date then. That's okay Karla. That's fine especially because then you can make sure it's given the appropriate time on the agenda for discussion. Not our agenda. The ICANN staff agenda.

Karla Valente: Oh yes, absolutely. But I think as soon as we know something or I know something, I'll share it with you all.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Karla. Okay folks, we are at the top of the hour. I want to just - we'll kind of pull together what we have agreed at least my sense of what a consensus is in a couple of matters.

We agree that we are going to continue to fill out the - and to perfect our - and our two reports in the areas that we have delineated, the areas and we know in kind services, financial donor's group, we have those areas to work on.

Avri has agreed to step back in and lead the charge on the financial donor's group. Thank you Avri. Very kind of you. We've agreed that the issue of the registrar relationships and their role in sustaining needs assess applicants gTLD is critical. It's interest- it's very important but we will not tackle it here, save the next step that we will ensure that in our final report we make mention of that and we're going to make some specific recommendations in that regard. Eric has the pen on that. He will help to draft that part of the report.

We also have consensus on the role that we don't need to reinvent the wheel, re the funding model for any foundation that is going to be the seed money. We will simply use one that's best of breed and staff will take the lead in deciphering and winnowing one of those from the several that are available.

We also have consensus on the fact that with regard to the funding and the use of - the funds from the foundation, the seed money, plus the reduced fee, they are part of the framework but we should not comingle them. Avri has suggested a way for us to go forward. I didn't hear any objection to it. I think we should flesh that out, Avri, and make sure everybody understands that.

So I think we've made some progress here. We are going to continue to work. We're going to depend on the leaders of the subgroups that are still in play to make as much as we can for the next meeting. Time is up on us. Thank you all from Rafik and I for joining this call. I'm declaring the session closed. See you all.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Man: Cheers.

END