

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Friday 05 November 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 05 November 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-20101105-en.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call: ALAC**

Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair

Alan Greenberg – ALAC

Sébastien Bachollet – ALAC

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair

**GNSO**

Avri Doria – NCSG – Co-Chair

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison

[Andrew Mack](#) - CBUC

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachine

**ICANN staff** Karla Valente

Gisella Gruber-White

**Apologies:**

Dave Kissoondoyal – At Large

Tony Harris – ISPC

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large

Carlos Aguirre - At Large

Alex Gakuru – NCSG

Michele Neylon

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

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Friday, the 5th of November.

We have Evan Leibovitch, Avri Doria, Rafik Dammak, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Sebastien Bachollet, Elaine Pruis, Alan Greenberg.

From staff we have Karla Valente and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. And we have apologies today from Tijani Ben Jemaa, Carlos Aguirre, Michele Neylon, Alex Gakuru, Tony Harris.

As a group they want to please just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you over to you Avri.

Avri Doria: Thanks. This is Avri and I'll be in the role of Meeting Chair again today.

First I want to go through the SOI-DOI stuff. SOI, statement of your relationship to ICANN and sort of what it is you do and why you participate. Does anybody need to update their SOI at this point?

Or has anyone made a recent update to their SOI that they wish to point out? Okay, hearing none.

The other is the DOI which I understand may be short lived. But anyhow at the moment it still exists. And this is a description of any particular interests you may have in the issues being discussed at today's meeting.

Does anybody wish to make a DOI statement or an update to any previous DOI statement? Okay, hearing none I'll assume that we all have the SOIs and DOIs we always have.

Remind everybody to update them if and when they should need it.

Okay and I see (Andrew) has joined.

Woman: He just disconnected.

Avri Doria: Oh, he just disconnected. Okay so he was here but now he's not. But I assume he'll be back.

In terms of today's agenda, what I am suggesting is one, discussing the meeting schedule plus timing of future meetings. We are hopefully today finishing the two items and putting in motion delivering them.

We are going to discuss later in the meeting, if we get there, future charter objectives. But two questions come up. One is do we need to make a change in the time related to the fact that we're going through the daylight to summertime where the summertime to daylight savings changes?

Or do we stick with our meeting as scheduled UTC. We live in the world where we live in the world. And there's the breaks. Or, you know, and the other thing is meeting schedule.

We're going to go through a set of change work items. It may be a while before those are approved. But I think we sort of accepted that, you know, we're going to keep working. But do we need a two-a-week-meetings schedule at the moment?

Do we drop back? And if we drop back, do we drop the Tuesday or do we drop the Friday? So that's one item.

Then I wanted to walk through the addendum specifically the public comment summary and analysis. So of course if there are any issues anybody has in that hopefully we can get that finished. I can then put that through a two-day call just to make sure we're fine.

My assumption is that while -- and please correct me if I'm wrong when we get to this point in the meeting -- that while one is being translated, the addendum isn't necessarily being translated though I don't know that that's a correct assumption.

But the other assumption I have is that both are going out at the same time. And so we'll have to deal with that particular issue. Then we've got the immediate announcement that Karla wrote up and sent out. And that I understand at least Eric had commented on.

I see Alan has joined us. Hello Alan. And so the media announcement and whether there is any editing or issues with that.

And then should we get there, start discussing future charter objectives. And one of the issues that we have there is how soon do we want to do that? For example, if we want the GNSO to have it on its agenda or at least introduced onto its agenda at its next meeting, then (Rusty) would need to be able to put in a motion by the 11th.

And what I did this morning was just a very quick first estimation of the charter objective motion. Though it's rudimentary and it's really just there for a placeholder for people to start, you know, beating up on and seeing what we end up with at the end of day.

Okay, any issues on the charter? Anything I'm missing? I thank Eric for making a mention on the list of the media announcements because I forgot it's on the charter. I mean on the agenda.

Are we fine to proceed on this agenda?

Woman: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay, hearing no nays, seeing no red Xs. Anytime anybody objects to something that's being said, get out the red x and, you know, and we'll figure it out

Okay, so the next thing is the first thing is the meeting schedule timing. I already sort of gave an intro to that. Anybody want to comment on that?

Nobody?

Crosstalk

Avri Doria: Okay. So I guess my first question is do people think we should continue on our two-meetings a week? Okay Elaine, yes please.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. I would love to see a poll with the new timing options. It's very difficult for me to be on Friday at 7:00. That's when I'm trying to get everyone out the door to school and work.

And 6:00 am on Tuesdays is brutal too. So I'd love it if we had some new options.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So that's on the answer of on timing. Do you have a viewpoint on the maintaining the two meetings a week or dropping back to one while we're working out the next level of stuff and perhaps escalating again to once we have enough stuff to talk about?

Elaine Pruis: I am concerned about dropping to one meeting because we, this working group, seems to be very light on the mailing list usage. So maybe if we use the mailing list then meeting weekly would be okay.

But otherwise I don't think we'd get very far very fast.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I'm countering just about everything Elaine just said. I think at this point, we probably can drop back to one. If it's going to be one of the two it should be the Friday not the other one.

I guess that would support Elaine's hassle of getting people out the door at 7:00 am on Friday. And in terms of the timing and re-polling; fine go ahead. Try it. Make sure it doesn't clash with anything else.

But do realize, of course, when you move later in the Northern Hemisphere space, you move from what it's now 1:00 am in our time here, 3:00 am in New Zealand or even more difficult times in Asia-Pacific to even earlier.

So it will end up from, you know, 1:00 to 2:00 to 3:00 am. You know, it is one of the problems of a global work group. So if it's a matter of undue hardship for various others at various times, could I propose that you do a rotating roster where everything is moved on 8 or 12 hours. And then everyone shares the pain equally.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Cheryl, I'd only like to help, and please me forgive me, correct you on one thing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes?

Avri Doria: We don't have a North-South issue. I think it's an East-West issue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh well, whatever. I'm in the Antipathies. So I'm definitely south.

Avri Doria: Oh, yes. But the timing...But anyway. Okay. So there's those two points.

One issue I'd like to bring up in terms of the two meetings a week, is that and some of this work as people have looked ahead to some of the future objectives, and of course, those were the items contained in three, we could conceivably have some teamwork. And perhaps one meeting could be used for particular teams and not be a full-on meeting.

And perhaps that would both deal with your issue of dropping back and deal with Elaine's issue of that. I have always been very supportive of the rotating eight hours or rotating the pain maybe eight hours isn't the quite right number. It might be ten and seven sometimes just to see how things fit into slots.

I have generally seen that every time we've polled on the idea of rotating, rotating loses. And I'm not sure why. I'm certainly not, you know, basically as one person has just said on the chat, (Nan) said the schedule reduces ability to participate on calls. And I guess that's true for many people.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That is a big issue. I certainly admit that. But if we were doing undue hardship for some, then it's something worth considering.

Avri Doria: Okay. So where do we go from here? We could certainly do a couple of doodle polls. We can do the poll on rotating. But if we do that, I'd like to ask everybody to sort of try and consider it not only from their personal perspective but from the perspective of pain sharing.

And then certainly and that would of course be the thing. Okay, Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I just wanted to point out that hardship is one thing, losing people is another. There are very few people who actually participate in this thing throughout most of its life.

And if one or two of those disappear because a hardship becomes unbearable, the group's dead. Unless we can attract a whole bunch of new people and very quickly and I'm doubtful that we can do that.

So it's something to factor in and a doodle will hopefully show that. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. So do people think we should do a doddle? I mean one of the problems with a doddle on this and one of the reasons it works so rarely is it is a tyranny of the majority issue in that we have very few participants from Asia.

We have very few participants from Australian and New Zealand time zones. And we have a majority of participants from the North American and European time zones. So whatever, a few participants, as both Alan and (Unintelligible) know this.

How should we proceed on this? I mean there's the possibility to just keep everything where it is. Let the UTC remain where the UTC is. Don't put us through the pain of rethinking it.

And I mean if we retain the UTC where it is, that would change the timing somewhat for those in California but it would make it 5 and 6 as opposed to 6 and 7.

Yes Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, a motion changing the time in effect is a question about submission. But we have also to take into account the fact that there are all bunch of other working groups and time already setup for other working groups.

And it's a general picture when its (unintelligible). The only ones who have such it's given them. My concern is not really the time. It's if we change can we attract more people?

If yes, then let's change even if it's the middle of the night in Europe; that's okay with me. But that's the main goal not that's to have a time that's okay for one or the other. It's more to have more people. Thank you.



Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So that almost suggests that we have a poll with two questions. And then we put off having this discussion again until we've gotten the poll. Is one is, how do you feel about a rotating time schedule that shares the pain?

And the second question is, and especially for those that are on the list that no longer participate on the calls or perhaps never did, is, if this was at another time, would you be able to participate and find out about that.

And then, you know, yes, we would have to rely on Gisella. One question that I have for you now, Gisella, and then hopefully we can move on, one question I have at the moment is if we stay at the same UTC as we are now, do we conflict with anything?

Or if we stay at the same, you know, how do we do it on one hour either side? If we end up not staying with UTC but rooting ourselves off of, you know, the same time in post-daylight savings time when both have shifted?

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay I believe -- this is Gisella -- if we go for the Tuesday, we currently have it at 1300 UTC for one hour. If we want to maintain at 1300 UTC we then have the option of actually having a call even for 90 minutes if you like.

There's no conflicting meetings there. The meeting that is after this which would have been conflicting has been moved one hour later UTC.

With regards to Friday, we've got a clear slate. If it fits...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry, except for the Tuesdays when we have the (Alac) meeting that will then start at 1500 UTC. But if we were to change the Tuesday meeting to 1400 UTC, it will definitely be limited to 60 minutes with regard to the (Alac) members.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. It's actually limited more to 50 minutes because they need to start driving out.

Woman: Gisella, what about the...I mean I'm on the Geographic Region, I finish the Geographic Region's call at 20 past 12. Where does that figure in all of this on a Friday?

Gisella Gruber-White: The Geographic Region's call is not a set date and time. We usually try and do it at 12 UTC. That may potentially become 1300 UTC. But...

Woman: Yes.

Gisella Gruber-White ...there's not a fixed date.

Woman: So that could influence the, yes, then this will. Yes.

Gisella Gruber-White Yes, the Geographic call used to be on a Wednesday, more on a Wednesday. So I'd like to hear from (Rob) with regards to that. But as it stands now it's on no fixed date. I was just trying to get an idea of...

Woman: Sure.

Gisella Gruber-White ...what was working.

Woman: Might I say, it's a huge argument to fix dates.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. So let's do the polling. I suggest that for the coming Tuesday and probably the coming Friday, if, you know, assuming we need those and we don't decide to cancel them, let's leave them as they are, rooted in UTC.

And then we'll make decisions based on what comes out of doddle polls. Does anybody object to doing that? That we'll stay fixed with UTC for next week. And over the week, we'll figure out what we're doing going forward.

And part of that will depend on our last substantive topic of today's discussion assuming we get there. If not, we'll be having that on Tuesday. Okay, anybody object vehemently?

Man: Nope.

Avri Doria: Okay I'm especially looking for those on the call because that's means at the most that will be an hour earlier next week for some, I guess Europe doesn't shift over. So for the US, it will be an hour earlier next week.

I don't know; I'm confused.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: In UTC, whatever it is. Okay. Anything else on that before I move on? This will be a topic we come back to. Okay.

I'd like to move onto the walk through of the addendum especially Section 4, Public Comment and Summary and Analysis. I just liked to check and see whether there are any comments we have to deal with in one, two, and three?

I don't think so. I mean because they're basically transcripts and records of what has gone on previously. So...

Karla Valente: A...

Avri Doria: Yes?

Karla Valente: This is Karla. There was a problem with the numbering of the section. So I just want you to know that I corrected that. And I also added Eric to the list of meeting members or the list of members of the group because he wasn't there before.

Avri Doria: Right, he joined part way through. Okay thank you. Okay so should we begin and so it's properly Section 4 at the moment, talking through the objections and the attendance records, okay. It's not filled in yet. It will be.

Okay. And so I'm moving through the document trying to get back to where we were. And then we had our provisional report in there. What are the objectives and then there was the transcript from the....

I'm looking at it slowly. The numbering is still problematic. Because I see through 63, full transcript, (Russell's) meeting session which is good. Do we have the blog thing that was put out?

Woman: We have the blog.

Avri Doria: Okay so that's where?

Woman: And the book. They have the book.. They have (unintelligible) resolution.

Avri Doria: Okay, so yes, we still have the numbering problem. We have 389, for our public comments, summary and analysis that's obviously five. And the thing before it can't be both four but I'm not looking at it clearly at the moment.

And then looking at the numbers underneath it, it's three. So we'll have to fix that numbering. Okay. But that's where we're starting here, at Line 390. Is that correct? So then we have an overview at 396 that lists the submissions from eight different parties.

Then we have summary of comments and working group discussion. So 331 starts from ICANN African community. And so it's basically 416 through...

Okay so we get to the yellow. So basically the yellow is the information that needs to be commented on which starts at 464, Working Group Discussion and Summary.

So is 464 through 495 an adequate answer for people? Does it need further work? What comments do people have on that response? Is it acceptable?

Man: Avri, when you scroll, we're all scrolling and it's hard to read it if you're moving it at your rate.

Avri Doria: Oh really. I'm sorry.

Man: No, no.

Avri Doria: So the synch is wrong.

Man: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Sorry, thank you for mentioning it. So okay. So we're...

Man: If we all read it at the exactly the same rate and remembered the same parts it would have been fine.

Avri Doria: I never thought that was the case.

Karla Valente: Avri this is Karla.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Karla Valente: In addition to these corrections to the numbers and sections and I'm also changing the name that is final report to milestone report.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Okay so nobody needs to bring up final report versus milestone report.

So I'm assuming people have looked at these before but of course that's not...So do people accept this answer?

Man: Just one second, if you could.

Avri Doria: Certainly.

Eric Brunner-Williams: There's little niggly, tiny details but nothing I can get in a knot over.

Like I would take out the words from Africa and write for 76 but that's just, you know, that's trivial.

Man: On 47, you don't mean deepening. You mean depending.

Karla Valente: So I have to apologize because I made the changes, my lines go completely out of focus.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Man: Karla, where I'm looking it says, it's the line that begins in the thing that's up on the screen, parenthesis (NGOs may differ deepening on the jurisdiction) and in fact that should be depending I think.

Woman: Yes, that makes sense.

Woman: Yes.

Avri Doria: And with Evan's issue which was at Line 476 in the version on the screen is there any objection to dropping from Africa? Even though this is a specific response to the African comment?

Woman: Nope.

Avri Doria: Okay Elaine has raised her hand and Eric has raised his hand. So Eric, you raised your hand first so please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Oh wow, a race condition.

Avri Doria: A race condition but it's orders...The attendees' list orders the hand raise for anyone.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I suggest leaving Africa in while I can still speak. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Agreed.

Avri Doria: Okay. Evan, are you okay with leaving Africa. And you said it was not a big issue for you?

Evan Leibovitch: It's a big deal to me. If there's preference to keep it then keep it.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So any other issues on this response?

We've left Africa and we have changed deepening to depending. And that takes us through...Okay (Andrew) says okay. Eric, you still have your hand up. Thank you. Any red Xs?

Okay a couple of ticks, I see a hand up. (Andrew)?

(Andrew): Yes, really quickly Avri, what I have as 490 and we're talking about NGOs, this is just a translation issue I think but around the world hasn't...When we talk about examples of NGOs around the world that have healthy economic status, I think that's just a translation issue.

To say that they have a healthy economic status isn't probably what you would say in (unintelligible).

That have adequate resources or something like that.

Avri Doria: Examples of NGO that have...

(Andrew): Adequate resources.

Avri Doria: Does anyone object to changing healthy economic status to adequate resources?

Woman: I think that's a good catch. I certainly support that.

(Andrews): It's a direct translation. I totally understand it.

Avri Doria: I understand. Any red Xs?

(Andrew): It's an English nuance.

Avri Doria: Any red Xs? Any objection. No red Xs. Okay do you have that one Karla?

Karla Valente: So I'm changing from having, have a healthy economic status to have an adequate resources?

(Andrew): Have adequate resources.



Avri Doria: Yes. Okay thank you. Are we are okay to move to 332, (George's) comment?  
Seeing no objection. Okay (George's) comments...I mean the response starts  
at 503 and extends to 517.

Any issue with the response? I'll give people a couple of minutes to review it.  
Yes Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well thank you. I stop at Line 503.

Avri Doria: You'd stop at Line 503 so you would drop the rest?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Avri Doria: Id like to hear other people's comments on that suggestion. Alex has his hand  
up.

Alex Gakuru: I would add a last part to the sentence saying, in our particular case, we have  
listened to input.

Woman: Yes, fair enough.

Avri Doria: Well okay. I would probably suggest changing to, and in the case of this  
working group has listened to.

Alex Gakuru: Yes, sorry. I wasn't trying to give you the wording. I was giving you the intent,  
yes.

Avri Doria: Does anybody...I assume that you would not object to Alan's amendment of  
your suggestion.

Woman: Change the amendment yes.

Woman: Where is this amendment going?

Avri Doria: Okay, well first of all, I'm sorry, basically it would be dropping Line 504, what is 504 on the screen through 517. And it would be amending 503, this comment is not directly to the working group proposal or work. However, it should be noted that the JAS working group has responded to comments.

Yes Elaine?

Man: Has indeed.

Avri Doria: Elaine, please.

Elaine Pruis: I was just reading the text that follows. It sounds like we're just explaining when we've listened and how we've listened. So could you tell me why you would want to drop that?

Avri Doria: Okay Eric? Okay I see Alan's hand up and Eric was asked a question, Alan, since Eric was asked...

Alan Greenberg: I can give my reason very quickly.

Avri Doria: Okay, please.

Alan Greenberg: He's put this comment into every one. It was not targeted at ours. We're going through the pro forma business of responding. But I don't think it needs to be belabored.

Avri Doria: Okay. Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams:: Thank you. Plus one to that and (George) has become a variation on (Dan Summi). He's just a crank, thanks.

Avri Doria: I not sure being a crank is a reason not to enter their objection but okay.  
Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Okay I didn't realize it said the context. The actual content or who the author was so I understand that. Is that a personal response then rather than a professional response to the official commenting situation?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Elaine, I don't think he's commenting about our work. So if he wants to engage us in a discussion of the weather it's kind of silly for us to be engaging him.

Avri Doria: And I would like to point out that the 503 comments to say it's not related to the work. And that, you know, this working group has responded to comments, you know, is responding to events or it's not a personal dismissal. It's a response.

It's just not detailed like the one we have now.

Eric, is your hand still up or is it new? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just for the benefit of those who haven't participated in a lot of working groups in the last couple of years. His comments are relevant and appropriate for what has happened much of the time.

Woman: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: And if one reads the AT-RT report or draft report, it's brought up there in spades. But we don't need to focus on it since I believe we indeed have spent a lot of time and carefully analyzed the input we've gotten.

So since we're obligated to answer, we are answering. We're not treating it as spam advertising, you know, for jock straps or whatever. But I don't think we need more than that.

Avri Doria: Okay. So does anyone object to removing 504 through what was it, 517?  
Please put an x up if you object to removing it. Okay.

Does anyone and let's just try and get the wording correct for the extension.  
Is it the extension of the sentence or second sentence. It should be noted.  
Right.

It should be...

Man: I would put it as a however and...

Avri Doria: However.

Man: ...whatever parsons properly.

Avri Doria: However.

Karla Valente: And I will tell you what I got?

Avri Doria: Please do, yes.

Karla Valente: This comment is not directly related to this working group's proposal or work.  
However, it should be noted that the working group has listened and  
responded to comments.

Avri Doria: Works for me. Is that fine with everyone? Anyone object to that?

Man: That this working group.

Avri Doria: That this working group.

Woman: Yes.

Avri Doria: Everyone comfortable? I see a green check? Any other checks? Any big red Xs?

Okay in which case that's done. Thank you.

Moving onto 333 from New Star and Black Night solution. There's a review of their comments. And there's a review of the Black Night solution. And then we get to the comments at 550. And they extend through 563. Eric, I see your hand. Go ahead Eric. Are you muted?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you for reminding me that I'm muted. The two comments are actually quite unrelated. I would propose to answer them each individually. That's all I have. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Karla, can you, as you grouped them together, can you sort of give a reason for having combined them how you saw them as similar?

Karla Valente: I have to read them through. Yes, I doctored the header. I'm sorry. Wait a minute for just one second.

Avri Doria: Sure.

Eric Brunner-Williams: If I may Karla, the new circled responses, here's some money and help. So the Black Night's response is one size fits all is the wrong approach. These are quite different.

I'm not saying either one is wrong or bad; they're just very different. So it's hard to respond with one response to two categorically different kinds of responses.

Karla Valente: Yes.

Avri Doria: And it looks like the first paragraph might be an adequate answer for the first issue if it was divided. While the second paragraph pertains more to the second one size fits all. Do you see it that way Eric?'

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes I do. I'd respond to the first one but thank you very much. And I respond to the second one with, we agree in spades. However, we can't change this.

Avri Doria: So do people object to splitting this into two? One that is just new star that gets as a response a version of the "Thank you" paragraph - the "We agree and thank you," and that the second paragraph or version of it is applied to the Blacknight?

I see Elaine's hand up. Yes, please, Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: So we put this together some time ago and I'm pretty sure there was discussion about how it should be responded to and the way we would write it. I think it's fine the way it is. We want to call out that they have offered to provide support to the applicants. And I don't want to spend, you know, however long it's going to take to rewrite something that seems adequate to me at this time.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Eric, would you be averse to leaving them together even though you think they'd be better split?

Karla Valente: I think you're on mute.

Avri Doria: Eric, are you muted?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes I was and I couldn't find my keypad. So I can live with it.  
Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So does anyone object to following Elaine's recommendation and leaving this response as it is? Thank you, Elaine, for saving us from extra work. And thank you for - Eric, for the suggestions.

Karla Valente: Well not really. I was changing.

Avri Doria: Oh sorry.

Karla Valente: That's okay. That's okay.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible). So can we move on?

334, American Red Cross and the comments are - I'm not there yet. I'm scrolling. Comments are 3 - 639 and extended through 653. Any issues? I realize these have all been discussed before so, you know, I'm not surprised that there aren't. Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Yes, just quickly, we talked a little bit about this not on the basis of its legal status as an NGO, but just on the ideas of trying to reach out to support underserved communities as with the IDN stuff. And I'm wondering if we - there's a way that we can - and there - that - I'll grant you that that was a minority opinion, but it was one that we've had throughout.

I wonder if there's a way that we can include something that says, "By dint of your status as an NGO, you wouldn't qualify, but that there is some support for the idea that you might qualify on the basis on the support that you're offering to communities in need even though you may not be an applicant in need."

Avri Doria: Somebody's sleeping on the call? Okay anyone wish to comment on Andrew's comment?

Karla Valente: Nope. No.

Avri Doria: So basically you're ask - you're basically suggesting that there be a paragraph added?

Andrew Mack: It may even be just a line...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's just...

Andrew Mack: ...added.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...sentence...

Andrew Mack: Go ahead, please, someone was jumping in.

Avri Doria: Is that Cheryl I heard with a comment?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just said I think a sentence would do.

Andrew Mack: Yes, I think a sentence would do and I'm happy to go ahead, when we're finished, and to shoot you that sentence.

Karla Valente: Please and if you can also put it in the chat room right now, so I can update the documents right now.

Andrew Mack: I will try. I'm trying to listen and write at the same time, but I'll and do that.

Avri Doria: I think - with the way this call's going, I think it's good if you can take the two-three minutes while people are thinking about it and actually just try to put together a sentence.

Karla Valente: Yes, not...

Andrew Mack: Okay, yes.



Avri Doria: And Eric asked a question. Eric had two suggestions in the chat: one asks a substitution of "individuals" for "application," I'm not sure in what line, and asks if we agreed to prioritization, and then suggests removing the last two words of 652 and all of 653 unless there is agreement on prioritization.

So while Andrew is trying to come up with some wording, please look at Eric's comments. Maybe Eric wants to - if he's free, unmute himself and...

Eric Brunner-Williams: That's a broad example...

Karla Valente: Yes, I am...

Avri Doria: Explain.

Eric Brunner-Williams: So it's just the concluding sentence in the response to the Red Cross comment...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...where we have the problem of individual versus applicant, and then the - our agreement with them for our expression of a belief that it's reasonable to prioritize, and I think this is something we've stumbled on in the past. I could be wrong.

Avri Doria: Well we did prioritize on need. We did prioritize on need, so I'm not sure whether that - yes Elaine? Oh, Elaine's hand went down.

Eric Brunner-Williams: It's not so much that we prioritized on need, but rather that we said that need was the single most important factor, but we don't have a prioritization between two or more equally needy applicants.

Karla Valente: So you're saying remove the last sentence to avoid confusion?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm just suggesting that if we haven't agreed to prioritize...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...equally needy applicants, for instance, favoring those from India over those from Europe, then we're - well, this is just a statement we don't make to make unless we've already decided that we are making it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Remaining silent could be a good thing.

Avri Doria: Okay, so there's a suggestion to drop the sentence. Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Thank. Yes, I lost track of what we decided about prioritization, but I did want to bring to attention the recent Board resolution that says the Board encourages us to provide specific guidelines on the implementation, such as determining the criteria for eligibility for support. We will, when we continue this discussion next week, consider if prioritization is part of that request from the board.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks, yes. So we will need to get to that. But leaving that sentence out now, so do you see that as doing any harm at this point and...

Elaine Pruis: No.

Avri Doria: Okay. So does anybody object to dropping that last sentence, please put an up - X up. And put green checks up if you want to support dropping it, but put an X up especially if you don't want to see that sentence dropped. Okay I see a check and I see no X's.

Okay, Andrew, have you had a chance? He's probably concentrating and/or muted.

Andrew Mack: Sorry, I am concentrating and/or muted, my apologies. I'm just trying to make it one sentence compact.

Avri Doria: Okay fine.

Andrew Mack: If you'd give me a second, we can go on, and I can come back to it if you'd like.

Avri Doria: No, I'll give you the second.

Andrew Mack: Okay thanks.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Sorry.

Avri Doria: That's okay.

Andrew Mack: I'm listening and watching and writing at the same time.

Avri Doria: I appreciate it. I'm trying to make this a one-pass deal so we finish today, so please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes okay.

Avri Doria: We are halfway through the call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Multitasking is not that easy, Andrew. We all recognize that.

Andrew Mack: It isn't.

Avri Doria: Please don't talk...

Andrew Mack: Yes, well I needed more time that's all.

Avri Doria: Please don't talk.

Andrew Mack: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: For those that are waiting, the next one will start at 673, and so you can start your reading early.

Andrew Mack: Okay, Avri, let me try. See if this gets where we were. Can I read it?

Avri Doria: Please do.

Andrew Mack: All I was trying to do was capture the edge of our opinion. It says, "Within the working group, there was some sentiment that support might be offered to groups that provide assistance underserved communities, including in rare cases for applicants that might otherwise not qualify on the basis of need."

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I see Eric with his hand up and I'd like other people to comment on that. If you could type that into the chat, it would be good, so people can see the wording.

Andrew Mack: And if you see an error, I'd be happy...

Avri Doria: Yes, okay, no, that's great.

Andrew Mack: ...I'm absolutely happy to change it.

Avri Doria: Okay that's great. Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm dealing with the Arab comment, so I can wait.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So...

Andrew Mack: I'm trying to copy it in, but it doesn't seem to want to copy. Okay, I have to type it, yes?

Avri Doria: Yes, okay, we can do typing.

Andrew Mack: It should...

Avri Doria: Anybody with comments? Well, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It should copy.

Andrew Mack: I'm sorry. I tried it, didn't seem to go.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Let me try again.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Karla Valente: Avri, where exactly is this sentence from Andrew wants?

Avri Doria: This sentence - I believe this sentence would go in the place of the one that we just removed.

Karla Valente: At the end -- at the very end.

Avri Doria: Yes. So...

Karla Valente: It's going to be the last?

Avri Doria: ...and all 652.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Now my - sorry, the screen is frozen now.

Avri Doria: Oh.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Avri Doria: Well, then just...

Elaine Pruis: Gremlins.

Andrew Mack: Okay, and now it went away.

Avri Doria: But it sounded like a good sentence to me, so I don't it to get lost.

Andrew Mack: No, no, no. Okay, all - again, the only intent is to be consistent with our IDN comments and also to leave out that possibility in the rare instance where the value of the assistance to the community is going to be high enough.

Okay, and I'm sorry. It's going to restore. I lost my agenda - my Adobe Connect.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, no.

Avri Doria: Okay, well, let's - I think we've read it.

Andrew Mack: I've got gremlins galore today. I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: Okay. Why don't you send it out on the e-mail list, and we'll come back to this at the end to read the sentence? I think people got the idea. Does anybody object to it without having seen the words? You'll see the words and get another chance. But to accept that what was said in principle is there any objection?

Okay, "Could you read it one more time?" Elaine asks.

Andrew Mack: Sure, and then I'm happy to adjust the text, you know, if you'd like that. "Within the working group, there was some sentiment that support might be offered to groups that provide assistance to underserved communities, including in rare cases applicants that might otherwise not qualify on the basis of need."

Avri Doria: Thank you. Any objections to that in principle? And you'll see it written shortly. No? Okay. Then I suggest that we move on and at the end if it's been sent out, we can take one last look at it, assuming we've still got time after we have finished all the comments.

Okay, any objections to moving onto 335 from Arab team? No? Okay. Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well, thank you, Avri. The response in yellow is quite a bit longer than it needs to be and it also doesn't address the second point. So the first point that the Arab team makes is that a ban on all participation by government is overly broad, and we've already dealt with that. Their second point is that the continuity instrument is actually a serious impediment to applicants and I think if we point to our future work, we can deal with that. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Okay. Did we actually have a continuity instrument in the future work specifically? I know we had it as - something that was mentioned, as a possible remedy, and that is discussed in the document.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It has explained that...

Avri Doria: Oh, Andrew's sentence has shown up now, so people, please read it and we'll come back to it.

On Eric's point, anyone have a comment? No comments? Do people believe we need to, A, add a reference to the fact that we did discuss - that this has been discussed in the current version of the guidelines and then perhaps add a sentence, and in the continuing work of the working group that is being suggested, that is one topic that can be, you know, further worked on? That seem like a reasonable response?

And do we need 679 through 681? Was that also part of your question that we don't really need to go there, or am I misinterpreting what your response was?

Eric Brunner-Williams: No, you're correct.

Avri Doria: Okay, so you would suggest dropping 679 through 681? How about 682 through 684? Is that a useful sentence?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, there's nothing in my mind that's useful after the first paragraph and the response and that still doesn't answer their part B of their question, which is about the continuity problem.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay, so you're suggesting that, basically, we remove from 679 to 694. Does anybody have a comment on that, positive, negative? People want to agree with it, please give checks. People disagree with it, please give red X's. People that have a verbal comment, please raise your hand.

Elaine has her hand up, yes? Please Elaine.



Elaine Pruis: Unless it's inaccurate, I prefer to leave in explanations, because we did discuss it and we did consider it and explained why we're taking, you know, the position we're taking.

Avri Doria: Okay. Any comments on that? I see Evan agreed with taking it out.

How do people feel about Elaine's comment in favor of leaving it in?

Evan Leibovitch: I can withdrawal my - I mean if - I don't feel very strongly about this either way.

Avri Doria: Okay. Eric, do you feel very strongly in terms of removing it as long as we add something else?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well, the add something else is mandatory or else we're just ignoring their part B.

Avri Doria: Right. No, and in fact, I'm typing a suggestion in the chat at the moment.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Then the part A response, whether it's short or long, is immaterial.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Eric Brunner-Williams: The absence of a response to part B is material. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay I typed something. "In terms of the continuity instrument," of course somebody would have to fix my spelling, "The working group did discuss this issue and recommended some possible solutions. As part of the continuing work being considered for charter expansion, this will be looked at further."

Does that work? Is that sufficient? Insufficient? Leaving aside my by ability to in - my ability to inspell (sic) - my inability to spell. Thank you. Does that work for you, Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Does anybody object to adding that sentence? Expansion, yes, thank you for that second correction spelling - spelling correction. Thank you. That's what happens to a brain that's trying to timeshare.

So, okay, so does everybody...

Karla Valente: Avri, this is Karla.

Avri Doria: Yes Karla?

Karla Valente: Just to make sure that I understand the changes here. So I keep the first paragraph that talks...

Avri Doria: You - no, you keep everything. You keep everything and add this last sentence.

Karla Valente: Oh, so we are decided to keep everything? Okay.

Avri Doria: Yes Eric basically said that as long - if I understood him correctly, Eric basically said that he would - as long as we put in the extra thing, he didn't really mind if we kept what he thought was too much info. But he could live with it as long as we put in the last sentence, then I see a yes. So just add this last sentence but add it correctly with instrument and expansion spelled correctly.

Karla Valente: Yes it has been added and I also added Andrew's sentence.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes. As the last sentence in the previous section?

Karla Valente: Correct.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. Okay. Can we move on from here to the next one? Thank you.

So the next one is from Danny Younger, the NGO domain proposal, and the answer shows up at 730 and it goes through 743. Any comments? Give people a second to read.

I'd like to note that we are now at the hour with 30 minutes left.

Okay. Is there any objection to leaving this as is? Please put up a red X or your hand to speak.

Any objection to me moving on? Yell out, "Don't move yet." Moving on. Okay.

The next one is 337, also from Danny Younger, ongoing costs to new events of registry failure of business measures, with the response starting at 776, a one-liner. Does anyone have any comments on this one? Any objection to it?

Yes, Eric has raised his hand. Eric, please.

Eric Brunner-Williams: You know, I think this is actually a comment that we should remove because it is directly related to the proposal and we have grappled with the financial instrument problem. So I'd say, "See above," and reference the...

Avri Doria: Reference...

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...335.

Avri Doria: Okay. Any objection to that solution? Basically replacing this with, "Please see the response to 335." Okay.

Good luck, Elaine, with your divided attention between driving kids to school and staying on the call.

Does anybody object? Please put a red X or raise your hand to comment. Eric, I see your hand is still up, but I assume that's just a remainder. Anybody object to basically saying here, "Please see the response for 335"?

Okay. Seeing no red X's, seeing no hands, I'm going to move on. Shout out if I shouldn't yet. Okay, moving on.

Next one is 338, also from Danny Younger, cultural and linguistic GTLDs, proposal for support and new fast track program. This one says, "To be completed."

This one I would suggest, "Was out of scope for our working group", but does anybody else have a different answer? Eric, you're agreeing with an answer that says, "This was out of scope for our working group"? Anyone else agree with that response? Anyone disagree with that response? I see a couple agreements.

Karla, could you change "To be completed" to "This was out of scope for our working group" or "For the working group"?

Karla Valente: Done.

Avri Doria: Our...

Karla Valente: Done.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I see a yes from Eric, thank you.

Okay, moving on. Shout out again if I'm moving on too fast. 339 from Danny, registrar transaction fee support for disadvantaged GTLD applicants.

Response starts at 806 and goes on to - goes on to - oops I went too far - goes on to 822.

Any issues with this response as written? Give a couple seconds for people to read it over. Please put up a red X if you object to it or your hand to speak to it. Of course, if you support it, please put up a green check.

Okay. Seeing no checks. Seeing no X's. Seeing no hands. Is it same to move on from this one? Does anybody object to me moving on at this point? Please shout out. No shout-out. Okay.

Going to 3310 from (Unintelligible) and Danny Younger, funding of applications, reduce fee proposal, and the response starts at 88 - 845 and goes on to 853.

Any issues with this response? Any checks, X's or comments to be made? Is it safe to move on? Anybody object to me moving on, shout out.

Andrew Mack: Avri, this is basically cut directly from our report, right?

Avri Doria: Yes, it looks like it. I'd have to compare line for line to say that it was.

Karla Valente: That's correct.

Avri Doria: That's correct. Thank you, Karla.

Andrew Mack: Just to make it clearer, you might want to say there's are minority view from our recommendations or from our report.

Avri Doria: In fact, it might be good on this one and the previous one based on your recommendation to actually give a reference to the section number.

Karla Valente: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Right, if any time you've quoted it if you could give a reference to the section number that would probably be most helpful.

Karla Valente: Will do.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Any other comments on this one? Any objection to my moving on to 3311 from Danny Younger? Shout? No shouts.

Exception to registry/registrar separation for certain groups, 3311. I see Eric's hand up. I could almost guess what I would say here. Eric, please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Can you read my mind, Avri?

Avri Doria: I think on this one it's a - this was seen as out of scope for this group (response)?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Gosh, I wish I could say that. No.

Avri Doria: Oh, sorry, I didn't read your mind. Forgive me.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay, I can live with the - I don't know about consensus but I know there are people with the view that where market power is not the issue then block. The exemption after four years and five years, this confuses time with need. And our - we don't actually see need - I mean, time, we seed need. We don't know that need will have gone in five years or four years.

So in so far as the - that there is market power language in the GAAC's recommendation, I don't have a problem with putting a reference to something I don't believe should exist here, which is the vertical integration. But if there is vertical integration here, I don't want to see us substituting time for need.

I don't think that the five years language that beginning at the end of 8.6.7 should be present. Thank you.

Avri Doria: You don't think that - okay, so basically 867 through the end there is basically what you're objecting to? You would suggest removing? Correct?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, because I don't know about time.

Avri Doria: Okay, I understand.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, (it's decline) but a commitment to a five year schedule independent of need is independent of need. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, who...

Alan Greenberg: Can I get in?

Avri Doria: Yes, please, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I'm having a sense of déjà vu. We had this discussion, Eric made the same point, I thought we agreed to change wording.

Avri Doria: Right.

Alan Greenberg: Is this really what the report says in the second we're talking about it?

Avri Doria: I didn't think so.

Alan Greenberg: Does anyone know where that is so we can look at it?

Avri Doria: Yes, Karla, I don't remember the lines up now but I'll get - I'll bring it up. It is - okay, I've got the report. Because maybe, Karla, you just have the somewhat older version. I don't remember.

Alan Greenberg: Or maybe we didn't change it, but I thought we discussed it. I don't remember what we came up with, but I thought we came to closure on it and we all agreed.

Karla Valente: It's possible, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Karla Valente: It's possible because this event, the last time I worked on that was (two) weeks ago.

Avri Doria: (Specialized exception). I should know this thing by heart. Yes, it has been changed. There was a (contested) - and this is 423 - well, actually, I'm not sure if I'm looking at the right copy. There was a (contested) that in case of full market powers, not initial applicants have met the requirements, first of all it would be granted a special exemption from the requirement for registry/registrar separation.

The special exemption could be reviewed after five years. During the period of the exemption the ICANN Compliance Department function would, at its own discretion, review it to insure that the exemption was not being abused. The recommendation takes into account, etcetera.

Alan Greenberg: That sounds exactly what we wrote.

Avri Doria: Huh?

Alan Greenberg: I said that sounds like what we wrote.

Avri Doria: Right. So yes, Karla, if you just substitute what's in the report now for this one with a reference back, Eric, would that work for you?



Karla Valente: Can you tell me the report where you read from, please?

Avri Doria: I'm at Section - I'm looking at 22-1 as opposed to 22-3. I didn't bring up the right report. But it was around line 423 in that one. It's Section - no, it wasn't 27, it's 37. Yes, I can later make sure that I have found the actual section.

Alan Greenberg: If you scan for the term "five years," (did you) five years, you'll find it.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, is that reasonable to everyone? After this basically what's going to happen is basically Karla will put out the revised one as she understood all of our discussion. We'll take a look at it, and then I'll do the same last call thing that I am doing on the final report. So people will have a chance to look at the actual wording just to make sure that it is correct.

Karla Valente: So just to make - this is Karla, just to make sure that I'm doing this change correct. So you want me to remove everything that we have right now in yellow and replace with what we had in the (Myerson) report which I have as an exception to the rules requires separation of the registry/registrar. There's a whole paragraph including reference to the GAAC. You want me to copy and paste the...

Avri Doria: I don't think we need to put the whole reference to the GAAC. I think we could start - stop before that.

Karla Valente: Okay. So I'm going to just copy and paste everything that I have here and replace with is now in the addendum.

Avri Doria: Right.

Alan Greenberg: And it'll point you to where the full text is.

Avri Doria: Right. And you say this - I mean, you could leave the sentence in, you know, the recommendation takes into account the advice given by the government, you know, but not actually quote the advice.

Karla Valente: Okay, perfect. And don't worry about the references; I have to clean up the document.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Karla Valente: You know?

Avri Doria: Thank you. Is that okay with anyone? Does anyone object to that solution? Any comments? Green checks? Red X's? (Does it say I'll have a cast) to look at the text again? Okay.

And moving on down, shout at me if I'm moving too quickly.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think there is anymore.

Avri Doria: Oh, there isn't anymore. Okay, are there any comments on any of the ending material that is in this document at the moment? That's basically the letter that's there, and then the excerpts that were sent just as a record keeping, etcetera. So any other comments on this?

Alan Greenberg: The only comment I would have is looking at the page number on the last page we should go back and add one more - a few more words to the answer to George. "They note the responses to the comment in this report." You know, something 42 pages.

Avri Doria: Well, that's actually wasn't all 42 pages aren't all. It would actually be shorter. But...

Alan Greenberg: Well, yes, indeed, but whatever.

Avri Doria: Andrew, you have your hand up.

Andrew Mack: Yes, just a quick question, Avri. The - on 957, number 6, the excerpt from the draft final report.

Avri Doria: Yes?

Andrew Mack: I'm confused by that. Is that - did that not get in the - is that not up higher in the report?

Avri Doria: What, you mean higher in the addendum?

Andrew Mack: Okay, this is an addendum, right?

Avri Doria: Right, this is an addendum that is not only listing the responses to the comments, but is - and one thing I was going to ask about the organization of it, but is also listing basically everything else that we put out. It's a complete historical record of the work of the group.

Andrew Mack: Got it, and so this excerpt from the draft final report was the final report that we were working at around the time of...

Avri Doria: Right.

Andrew Mack: ...I guess it was (the only)?

Avri Doria: Yes, and we should probably be more specific saying that this was an excerpt from our final report delivered at such-and-such a date.

Andrew Mack: I would suggest delivered at and delivered to whom and that kind of stuff.

Avri Doria: Right.

Andrew Mack: And just so that it's very, very clear that there's no - I wouldn't want people to read this and say, "Well, wait a second, is this a repeat? Does this not -, " you know? We want to make sure that they know which supersedes what and that kind of thing.

Avri Doria: Yes, makes sense. Is that okay, Karla?

Karla Valente: Yes, I'll do the report right now.

Avri Doria: Be more specific on - and perhaps that note will apply to anything. Now, one question I have, while we have these things in chronological order, should the response to comments be in the chronological order? Is that the correct thing to do? If nobody has any objections, leave it as that. I just - are they visible enough there or should they be before all of the record documents? Any comment on that? Is it just me feeling that somehow it gets lost in the middle and people might not see it?

Karla Valente: This is Karla, Avri. I - this is one of my comments for the group today. I think that the order of this could be improved and I also want to make a note that the summary and analysis we'll post it as a send along separate document in the summary and analysis public forum section.

Avri Doria: Okay. I don't think we need to reproduce that since you reproduced it in sort of cut form. But you may want to reference it. What I would suggest is - and let's see if other people are fine with it, that Karla, you - if you think a better orientation is better that, you know, you present one and then we can go from there as opposed to trying to talk about it now on this.

That, you know, we've talked about the most important content which is the response to comments, but if you have a suggestion for a better organization just do it and we'll look at it and talk about it on the list. Is that okay with people?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Karla Valente: Avri, my only suggestion is to move the summary (as per two). So have the working group members, this summary, and then in chronological order all of the different publications.

Avri Doria: That works really well for me. Does that work for others? Great. So I say do that, that works for people.

Karla Valente: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Should we move on to the media announcement now? We have basically 14 minutes left in this meeting. It's obvious we're not going to get to the future charter objectives. So we can take that on the list and talk about that next Tuesday.

But I'd like to - is it okay now to move from this document to media announcement? Anybody object? Thanks, Karla, can you bring up the media announcement? Is that in the - do you have that in...

Karla Valente: Yes, I don't have it, just give me one moment to have that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Karla Valente: And we received two comments, one from Sebastien and another one from Eric. My apologies if there was any other comment I didn't see.

Avri Doria: (I understand). I mean, basically we have some more time on this document. One other question while she's doing that. Is my assumption correct that the addenda is not translated? Or am I giving it (less than) comments, or am I wrong about that? Is it to be translated? Are there any comments? Sebastien, please.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, my comment is about translation the following. We need to translate in more languages the summary and less - and not full bunch of long document. And I think that this addendum at least didn't need the translation.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Sebastien Bachollet: And that's my (what). Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. So as we are translating the Milestone Report we're just not translating all the addenda. In this case it's longer than just a summary, it's the Milestone Report is being translated. So I assume how you might think...

Karla Valente: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Excuse me?

Karla Valente: Yes, just as a clarification point. So the intent is to translate the Milestone Report, translate the summary analysis because it's also going to be a standalone document, and translate the announcement.

Avri Doria: Okay. And does that work for everybody? I see a check from Sebastien. Does anybody object to that? Okay, thanks. I just wanted to make sure that we were clear on that.

Okay, to move to the milestone, I guess I'd like to ask Eric and Sebastien both to sort of discuss their issues. Who wants to go first? Okay, I'll call on - okay.

Sebastien Bachollet: I can go.

Avri Doria: Okay, Sebastien. Thank you.

Sebastien Bachollet: No problem. (Certificate) to have both my document and the other, but I have - would like to argue the fact that just the second - at the end of the first line and the second line it's, "How should ICANN help new generic top level domain names, IP (can't)?"

I think it's a (reduction) of what we are doing. It's not just ICANN who helped, but we try to have other helpers and even if it's just a title, it's misleading from my point-of-view and I would like to suggest something more (open) to add after ICANN (help). So, "and/or set up a program to (help) new generic top level domain names."

Then it's read, "How should ICANN (help) and/or set up a program to (help) new generic top level domain." Thank you. That's the first one.

Avri Doria: Okay. What do people think on Sebastien's recommended change? People accept that change?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I agree with the intent, I'm not sure I like the wording.

Sebastien Bachollet: No, but that's another point. I am talking about idea, not about words.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Sebastien Bachollet: It's not (unintelligible) the world and it's not my language, my first language, no problem about that, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. No, no, I didn't think you were going to argue, I'm just saying I don't think we should capture those words as such. I think we want to find ways in which ICANN can facilitate the application or whatever.

Avri Doria: Right, would it be...

Alan Greenberg: With ICANN putting the money in or someone else doing it, it's ICANN taking some action to see that it happens.

Karla Valente: What if we removed the ICANN, the reference to ICANN as being, you know, the action, and say something to the effect that, "How to help," or, "How to better improve the ability from applicants from developing countries"?

Avri Doria: Right, one way to do it would be to turn it into a passive sentence which I know...

Karla Valente: Exactly.

Avri Doria: ...very often it's sort of, "How can new generic top level domain applicants from developing countries be helped?" And then we could go further if we wanted to, a clause, "either by ICANN or with ICANN's facilitation by others."

Alan Greenberg: Either directed by ICANN or - yes, I like that.

Avri Doria: So would that work for people?

Sebastien Bachollet: That works for me.

Avri Doria: Okay. Karla, was that...

Karla Valente: I've got it.

Avri Doria: Turn it into a passive sentence. So, "How can new generic top level domain applicants from developing countries be helped either directly by ICANN or indirectly with ICANN's facilitation?"

Elaine Pruis: Avri, it's Elaine.

Avri Doria: Yes, Elaine?



Elaine Pruis: At the end of that sentence should we just say, "ICANN community"?

Avri Doria: That is - does that work as well for you, Sebastien? I'm trying to respond to your request, and Alan also, who suggested the directly and indirectly wording.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not in front of my computer right now, if you can read the sentence I can tell you.

Avri Doria: It would basically be, "How can new generic top level domain applicants from developing countries be helped by the ICANN community?" As opposed to the other phrase I had, "be helped directly by ICANN or indirectly through ICANN facilitation."

Karla Valente: Yes, so I have one comment on this which is, for example, if we have World Bank or if you have other international organizations that would be involved in providing aid to this applicant, they might not necessarily be ICANN community the way we look at ICANN community.

Avri Doria: That's true.

Sebastien Bachollet: It's why I suggest that you keep your sentence, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Sebastien Bachollet: And maybe we add at the end of ICANN, "ICANN community." But that's a whole bunch of discussion we can open, "What is ICANN?" From my point-of-view ICANN is us, it's not just about, it's not just the staff, but then is the ICANN community the same thing as ICANN, ICANN community? Then I don't care if we add this word after. It's another big discussion.

But I would like - I prefer your sentence, Avri even if we add community after ICANN. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I agree. I was going to make the same comment that Karla did, that the World Bank is not part of the ICANN community and we would like people (to know) among others.

Avri Doria: Elaine, does that work for you?

Elaine Pruis: Yes, I'm not - I don't have a...

Avri Doria: Okay, so it could be either, "directly by the ICANN community," or, you know, "indirectly through ICANN facilitation."

Karla Valente: Okay, yes, so my - I have a (unintelligible) way to simplify on the announcement. And the reason why is because media has a very short attention span, and they take things out of context in a way that sometimes is very unproductive to us.

So my recommendation would be keep it simple and say, "How can new generic top level domain names, applicants from developing countries be helped?"

Avri Doria: That - is that okay with people? Although...

Karla Valente: Because we want to drive people to read the report. We want to drive people to actually seek information and then understand the issue. The whole message, if I want somebody to repeat what this working group is doing, I think that this is what we need to achieve in the first paragraph is somebody asks, "Okay, what is this group about?" "Oh, they are trying to help

developing countries to be participants that are new to the program." You know, I'd like them to be able to quickly repeat that in a sentence.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Andrew, I see your hand up.

Andrew Mack: Yes, thanks, Avri. Karla, I think you're right on. I think the shortest and the less jargon-y this is, the more likely we are to get people to read it. And since some of the people who think - who we really would like to attract may not now consider themselves part of the ICANN community.

Leaving it open like this is probably a good thing. So I fully subscribe to shorter, punchier, better.

Avri Doria: Okay, Sebastien, Alan, are you okay with that proposal?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I agree.

Avri Doria: And Sebastien? Green check will do, you don't have to un-mute. Thank you. Okay, anyone else have a comment on that change? Okay, in which case - and Eric says, "Good point." At least I think he's referring to this.

Eric, your issue please?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Avri. This is Eric Brunner-Williams. I wrote to Karla and I'll just read my letter since that covers everything. I wrote, "Karla, I like the overall structure, the five bullet points and what happens next. But it didn't read like a press release. I always start mine with 'For media release,' or, 'Hold until date,' mostly to put me in the mind that I'm writing a media piece.

So I have some suggestions to - some changes to suggest. The heading shouldn't stress countries because that suggests (unintelligible) 166 and either cheap capture by for-profits such as .co and .so recently, and

microstates for the past decade, but rather should stress economies or simply geographical and socioeconomic diversity.

The source of the impulse is the Board resolution in Nairobi, not the innate importance of the issue which tend to show the Board in a partially deserved good light. No one knows what a Milestone Report is. So the - and the temporal context is absent. The reader won't know from this text that applications will be accepted from 1 June 2011 to 1 August 2011 and that is the urgent nowness of this report.

The What Next section of Section 5 message is repeated or repeat the content that's in Para 2 in Section 1. After the reference to the Board I suggest a para on the SOAC as being next in importance in this story.

I also wouldn't use real estate as that suggests private, not public, purpose and benefit. And all nations already have country codes. Accessibility frequently means handicap accommodation and that's not what we're about.

The working group volunteers are highly informed and publicly interested individuals, the crème de la crème of the ICANN community, not bodies from a bunch of remote places and that's puts us in a partially deserved good light.

So at the end, I think what I probably should have started off with at first, which is basically the problem that I see with the structure of this is that the substance should come ahead of the process. The meat is in Item 5, that should be Item 1. And then Items 8 and 9 can be cut.

Thank you."

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Karla, I...

Karla Valente: It is a resort and a rewriting of some portions, right?

Avri Doria: As a resort and a rewrite, yes.

Karla Valente: Yes. Yes, I think those are very good comments, Eric.

Avri Doria: Okay, so we obviously won't do that live. Karla will put on another version. I cut off Sebastien before he got all his points made. We won't have time to work through them but I'd like to give him a chance to get them said. Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, thank you. Yes, it was about the Point 2 why it is important at the end of the first line, "All nations around the world should have access." And I wanted to add, "All new (unintelligible) projects around the world," and not taking "nation" out because it's not a nation, a state will be allow it to participate, but it's our (envision) company, people, whatever. And the term of "nation" here it's not the right one and I suggest something. But once again, you may have some other idea about the English.

And my last point it's that in Section 6, second bullet point, we are missing the word, "Comments," at the end of the sentence before "received." Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. We are at 11:30 now. We've got the comments. I believe that Karla will be putting out a new version of this. I suggest that at our Tuesday meeting we start with going through this again and then go to the issue of the charter changes.

I will bring up the issue online about - in terms of charter, do we want to try and rush it into the next GNSO meeting or do we want to think through it and - because the next GNSO meeting we'd have to have - I was wrong, not by the 11th but by the 10th, they would have to have a motion in front of them. They won't have the report yet, they won't have anything. So perhaps I'm rushing things too much and we'll get back to all those things Tuesday and on the list.

Anyone else have anything else they want to add before I close the meeting?  
Yes, Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, I will try to do my best to participate but I will be in Washington in a conference and I don't know how my connection will happen. But if I am not there just apologize and I will try to (unintelligible). Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks, and if you can only participate through Adobe and not spoke, that works, too. So I want to thank everybody for all the work that's been done to bring these two documents to closure and say we have to finish the last call on the Milestone Report. Once we've seen a table, we work up this one, I'll start the last call on that one.

I especially thank Karla for the capturing it all and the constant revisions with the rest of her job is, you know, going on. So thank you very much. And Evan, did you have anything to add before I close the meeting?

Evan Leibovitch: Not at all.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. So thank you, everybody. Have a great weekend those of you for whom it's already the middle of the night of the first day of the weekend, sleep well, and I'll talk to you all next week. Thank you.

Karla Valente: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Alan Greenberg: Goodbye, everyone.

Woman: Thank you, (Louise).

END