SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Friday 08 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 08 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-20110708-en.mp3

On page :

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

John Rahman Kahn - Individual
Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

At-Large:
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO
Carlton Samuels - LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair
Baudoin Schombe - At-Large
Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison – NARALO
Dev Anand Teelucksingh - LACRALO

ICANN staff
Karla Valente
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:
Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair
Sebastien Bachollet – ICANN Board
Alex Gakuru - NCSG
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large
Andrew Mack - CBUC
Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Tony Harris -ISPCP
Elaine Pruis - Mindandmachines

Coordinator: We are now recording.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's JAS Call on Friday, the 8th of July, we have Rafik Dammak, Carlton Samuels, John Rahman Kahn, Carlos Aguirre, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Eric Brunner-Williams, Avri Doria, Alan Greenberg. From staff we have Karla Valente, Glen DeSaintgery, and myself Gisella Gruber. And we have apologies from Elaine Pruis, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Michele Neylon, Alex Gakuru, Andrew Mack, and Evan Leibovitch mentioned his name. And we will get that buzzing sorted out. Sorry.

If I could just remind you to please state your name when speaking for transcript purposes, thank you. Over to you Carlton and Rafik.

Carlton Samuels: Hello everybody. Nice to have you on this call. You see the agenda sent out there, and if you are in the Adobe room, it's on the bottom left-hand corner of the screen. We have three matters, an update and a couple of procedural matters. We're going to go to the update and the funding model for funds and process aspects and then we're going to go to the methods, parameters, and terms for ICANN services. You will notice that we are trying to flush out the outstanding items for the final report. That's what we are zeroing in on here. Is there any objection?

Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes I'd like to understand how we're going to usefully use the time allocated to Elaine's work when Elaine is not on the call and will be available after the 11th. Could you explain please?

Carlton Samuels: Well because Elaine has posted the work and she has asked some specific questions Eric. And if you look in the report and you look at the mail, you will see that there are specific questions asked. I presume that we could begin to answer the questions without Elaine's prompting.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Who put it on the agenda Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: I'm sorry.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Who is responsible for placing this on the agenda?

Carlton Samuels: I did.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I see.

Carlton Samuels: I did. The questions are there. I will ask the questions in Elaine's stead just like she has asked them on the list. And if anybody has anything to contribute they can contribute. I (doubt if it has to wait) until Elaine comes. I mean it's written in plain English. At least that's my opinion.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well thank you for sharing your opinion Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Anybody else have any objection? Alan you have the floor.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not raising an objection, but in the past I think we've found that when the person who wrote the document is not there we end up deferring significant parts of the discussion until they can come. So I to some extent agree with Eric.

Carlton Samuels: Yeah I quite understand that Alan. But to the extent that we can discuss, or (throw questions) up, and put it on the wiki like she has asked, I just thought we would get a head start on that given our time constraints.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: But again, if people don't have anything to say, we will just simply leave it alone. Okay so we will start off with the two updates on the procedural matters - the two issues.

The first one is the letter to Kurt Pritz. We have sent the letter to Kurt Pritz. We also tried to reach him by telephone, but Kurt is on vacation. He will be back sometime next week. When he is back in the saddle, we will again attempt to talk to him on the telephone about the letter. That's the first one.

The second one is the question of the support criteria for government entities. You will recall that there was a question in the Milestone Report 2 about whether or not support should be extended to government entities. The GAC was (asserting something) in there that should be the - we took it on advisement. We've been trying to get some qualification and clarification from the GAC - sent a note again to the GAC liaison to find out more about it. It has not been forthcoming, so we are again waiting on some response from GAC interest about what should be included here.

Alan has his hand up.

Alan Greenberg: I thought this was one of the issues that was being looked at by the small ALAC GAC group that was - the side group that was put together in Singapore. Am I incorrect or did they not come back with an answer?

Carlton Samuels: No, it is more than that one Alan. To my mind, it was a little bit more than that.

Alan Greenberg: I understand that. I said that was one of the items that they we were looking at I thought.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: So they have not come back with an answer.

Carlton Samuels: No they have not come back with an answer.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: And we connected with Tracy and he has not provided an answer either. So we are still waiting for an answer. It is a substantial piece of the puzzle that's left outstanding. We have it on the same timeline as these two (unintelligible), so we just have to try to kick start it and see. That's the issue there for that.

Eric you have your hand up.

Eric Brunner-Williams: That's correct Carlton. I'm confused. Is this s a procedural matter?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: So are the two matters that I thought we should bring to your attention. We are still trying to reach persons who could help us take care of a couple of things. You will hear more as soon as we know more.

So we move to the second item, which is the update on the funding model's funds and process aspects. Avri is online, so Avri.

Avri Doria: Hello. Okay I see that Alan you put some comments on, so we probably should talk about those comments. So there were two. And you may want to say them as opposed to me saying them, but that's up to you.

Carlton Samuels: No you can go ahead and say them Avri. I've seen them, but you can go ahead with this.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Let me try and get them in front of me.

So the second one was an easy one, which was in terms of the funding that they should be looking at. They should be looking - one of the items should be a matching fund line item. And yeah that seems like just an omission on my part.

I'd like to actually present a counter case on the first point that you put in - the first two bullets about figuring out what indeed ICANN could do as a foundation and the other one, requirements for creation or funding.

Certainly I actually don't see it as micromanaging partly because for over two or three years now every time a fund or foundation comes up, the subject is immediately blocked by that's hard to do in California. I don't know if you could do that in California. And that's where it always stops.

I've asked a couple of people who have lawyers in California. One day they say yeah, yeah I will have my lawyer check into it. The next day they come back and they say well you know it's complicated and I can't afford to spend that much on it. And so obviously it will be the ICANN legal staff that is doing it. So perhaps supervise the doing of it, but it's definitely a topic that needs to be resolved by somebody so that every time the issue comes up it's not we don't know what it takes and then you drift off for another half year.

Alan Greenberg: Well my - I won't call it a rebuttal, but it is. It's that I agree with you that we have not gotten anywhere on it, but the inclusion in the Applicant Guidebook of the concept that the fund should - the auction funds - the windfall funds from auctions should be put into a foundation or a fund for doing good things, which essentially is what it says in a big paragraph.

It implicitly implies they are going to have to address these issues whether it's a California corporation, or one chartered in Delaware, or you know Afghanistan is not necessarily one of the things they are going to have to look at. But I think it's implied there.

Avri Doria: But aren't the modalities of that something that this group should pay attention to?

Alan Greenberg: Well I think these are legal issues of what's the best way to do it, and our function is to say what to do with the funds that are made available through whatever the mechanism is. I'm giving my opinion.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Yeah the only thing I would say to that is this is not our function; this is something created by the board to make recommendations to the board and not only the (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I understand that, but I don't see how one could create a foundation or fund without doing those things. So I think okay I've said enough.

Avri Doria: Okay well you know if the chairs decide there's consensus on taking it out, I will certainly take it out. I just wanted to argue for why I put it in there.

Alan Greenberg: It may be worthy of a footnote, but I would not put it in - included as the bullets on the same par with the other ones there.

Avri Doria: Okay other than that, so there's a question for the chairs there. Other than that, I don't think I've gotten any other comments on any of the stuff on the two notes that I have in subgroup 2. And I don't see any new notes, so that would be it unless somebody has got something new or wants to add to this conversation that Alan and I have been having.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. I see Eric and Eric you have the floor.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Avri. I was going to ask where is the - what's the - could you put into the chat the URL of the relevant page.

Alan Greenberg: It's in the agenda Eric.

Carlton Samuels: Again, it's in the agenda, but I will put it again.

Avri Doria: Somebody else got there before me. It's there twice now.

Carlton Samuels: Okay they have it.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

Avri Doria: So I guess Rafik you have a hand up.

Carlton Samuels: Rafik you are up.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, okay so I just understood that Avri only has two comments, so Avri what do you think about next steps in your subgroups? And so we have to check with what we can do in the next week.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: So yeah.

Avri Doria: I would think after you guys decide that there's been enough discussion and we have resolved any of the issues that get opened like the ones that Alan just opened that it starts to get fit into the final document. And then we go and further refine it, et cetera. But I think we are at the stage now whether it's a write in contribution now under

your supervision - although with me doing it the group is going to reach consensus. Yay, nay, change it, put it in, don't put it in, throw it away, burn it.

And then once you guys say no that looks like it goes in, then I think the drafting team that's putting together the final book moves it from the subgroup places with the proper cutting and pasting to the appropriately places in the book. And basically starts to merge ideas in. that's kind of how I always envisioned this would work is things get written, they get talked about a bunch, and then in some form or other or not they get put in the document once the chairs coordinating decide there's consensus to move forward with it.

That would be my suggestion.

Rafik Dammak: Avri my question is not that how we proceed, but it's more about substantive points. I mean that if you think there is other points that we need to explore, but let's do it for the consensus -reaching consensus. Consider that process that we follow, but more interested to know if we need to explore other parts.

Avri Doria: Okay sorry. I answered the wrong question.

I don't know. In fact I was just thinking about it earlier in the meeting when Carlton brought it up as this is the work to look about filling all the gaps. Did you guys - did anybody ever create a table of all the gaps so that we actually know all the pieces that we need to be filling out?

I can certainly go back. And I don' know. Do we keep track of action items? If we did keep track of action items, I could take an action item

to go back to the writings and see if there's anything else in this topic that I think needs more work. I don't know if you guys have a running list somewhere of all the pieces that need to be done, but I will certainly scour and see if I can think of any others that need to be taken care of under this heading.

Carlton Samuels: Avri this is Carlton. Let me just - Alan I will come back to you in a minute. Just let me say that the MR2 report that - these aspects that we are dealing with are the glaring gaps in it because they did not address them. They pretty much left them out. They weren't addressed. So that's why we are spending time on addressing that.

And in the MR2 report there was also a requirement to go look at the GAC concern about the admissibility of municipalities and government entities for funding under the needs assessment. So what we are actually dealing with are those gaps. What we are trying to do is to gain consensus for some of the ideas that you have written and the others who are leading on these things. So you are quite right. That is the process that we are following.

I'm hoping that Alan has looked at your suggestions and raised two issues on them that we've heard from Alan. We hope that there are others who have something to say on them, and that is what is going to give us guidance as to whether or not the issue is sufficiently (aired) to move from the work into the report writing stage. So we are still waiting.

Alan you have the floor sir.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. It's directly in relation to what you were just saying. I mean anyone can tell from the timing of my comments that I just read the document now and those two comments that I made were the first ones. I plan to go over it again.

I feel uncomfortable however making a decision that the - what Avri or anyone puts there is acceptable by the whole group based on silence. We - you know in writing any of these reports in workgroups, there's a long record of people don't bother doing their homework. And then when the final document gets put together and is almost frozen, people start coming up with new ideas, and complaints, and worries about what's there.

We really need some level of acknowledgement saying yeah I'm okay with it, not just silence. I don't know how to extract it from people who are all I'm sure as equally busy as I am and up to our ears in tasks, but we really need to get some level of buy in at this level before it gets integrated and wordsmithed into the document because people always do come back at that point. Thank you.

I see that as a problem and not a solution, but...

Carlton Samuels: I totally agree with you. Thank you very much.

But as you noted it's up to the members of this group to make the call. And then that's why we give everybody time to air and report on this so that when the decision is taken we think there's consensus. Then there's a basis for it in terms of time and attention paid to it. So I hope everyone noted that we have it on the agenda for discussion and we zero in on them precisely because we want to bring attention to them

so that folks can have a say. Even if you don't write it, at least you can have a say if you read it. So thank you for that.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah my hand is up again.

Carlton Samuels: Yeah okay. You want to follow up.

Alan Greenberg: I would really suggest that someone send out an email listing the URLs of all of the pages that we are looking for comments on and the email messages like Elaine's so that we have - right now it's an issue of each one of us has to navigate the tree and try to find the new parts and that's a time consuming effort that not all of us need to do.

If we could send an email with the URLs of all of the pages that we are looking for comments on or pages and emails, I think we'd be in a much better position for someone to say yes I've looked at them, or I will look at them tonight or something like that. The tree navigation is just too onerous a task to assume people do it and do it properly. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: That's one of the things we're trying to do in putting not just the agenda item but the link to where you can look at them.

Alan Greenberg: I know, but we have about ten pages or so or certainly five or six that Avri did plus other messages. If we could get them all in one place at the end of each meeting perhaps or at least certainly as a checkpoint now you know over the weekend, I think we would be in a better position to ask people to look at them. If we don't make it easy, people aren't going to do it. That's it for me.

Carlton Samuels: Eric you have your hand up.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Carlton. Eric Brunner-Williams for the transcript. Avri I would like to address some of the substance of the text and I'm sorry that I too am a late reader.

But for the availability of funds, I am reading that it is improbable that a foundation could be created in time to assist applications directly with funding and then the sentence continues.

Avri Doria: Where is that?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I don't think that's a necessary statement and I also don't think that it's necessarily true. So perhaps that crystal ball portion of the prognostications could be...

Avri Doria: Excuse me. Could you tell me where you are? I don't...

Carlton Samuels: Availability of funds Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay it is in probability.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: You are right. I should just take that out.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

Avri Doria: I think that was left over from an older version. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Eric can I ask you just for the record to make the note on the - like Alan did on that page so that we have a record of it there?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Carlton if the request is that I have to annotate the wiki in order to point something out to the author whom I have just spoken with, I have to say categorically no.

Avri Doria: It's deleted. It would be useful if somebody did collect action items and put them in the notes of the meeting. That would be a useful thing.

Carlton Samuels: Can we ask staff to connect some notes on this for us please?

Karla Valente: I will do so.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Karla.

Karla Valente: So Carlton since I'm going to start notes now, I will wait for the transcript to do what happened in the meeting so far.

Carlton Samuels: Yeah that could work as well.

Avri Doria: Okay I guess I'm done for now, right. And I put the first two bullets in brackets so that we know there's an issue there.

Carlton Samuels: Okay Cheryl you have your hand up. You have the floor please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Carlton. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record.

I'm just wondering. It's very nice to have the links in the agenda, but to help discussion while we are doing discussion regardless of who is

leading it, perhaps we could make sure that we are all sharing a view to that particular page. I've been in any number of Adobe Connect rooms over the last few years and in a number of the calls we are - everyone who is on the call is literally led to the page selected by one of the presenters.

So perhaps in the future if we are going to try and prioritize and gain some sort of protocol such as we all share a discussion, we discuss and do it live. You know a call to a discussion point that then goes for a period of consensus with online interaction, but over at least two meetings before it might be declared for a third, which is just one way forward that I put into the chat.

That if we were all herded also to that page that would be good. Now that would mean doing things like when Avri is leading us through discussions from her work team that she's probably a presenter, or whatever, but we have to have a situation in these AC rooms where like it or lump it we are all taken to the shared page. That might also help as well. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. Eric you have your hand up.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. Cheryl that was a very good point. The subject matter, the participants, the contributors who have something really should be providing the link to the working page. But this is a comment. I've raised my hand to make one more comment on the fundraising page - funds and foundations page.

And Avri this is a suggestion that the discussion of auctions creates a sense of time, but it doesn't create the model of the foundation as an

ongoing activity with multiple new gTLD rounds and when funds become available. There's a suggestion of when funds become available in the sense that the auction period takes place after the application period in the first round, but there are some - and what I'm struggling with.

And I'm sorry to be so disjoint, but this is a call after all. It is that the presentation is sort of a - as if there is only one moment in time really when we're really talking about an ongoing entity that lives much longer than just the 2012 round. That's all that I have and I will try to put that coherently into comments later on in the call. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Can I respond?

Carlton Samuels: Yes. Yes Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay yeah I see what you mean. And if I understand what you mean it's that it basically only talks about auctions here in terms of their effect on this round.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Correct.

Avri Doria: And maybe adding a second sentence that says beyond using auction fees to replenish the reserve in the risk fund, the funds would be available to the foundation for future rounds funding, et cetera, kind of thing. Is that what you meant Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes it is.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Now with the point being that there are moments in time in which needs have spikes and moments in time in which available funds have spikes. And part of the problem is to smooth those as well as to achieve a sustainable model. Thank you. And now I don't hear a thing.

Avri Doria: I'm sorry. Yeah.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Eric. I was waiting for you to - if Avri had something else to say.

Avri Doria: No I was just typing a note in the text so that I could go back later and put some words around that.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Alan you have your hand up. You are next sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah that last comment in fact plays against the previous comment of Eric and Avri where Eric said he didn't agree with something and Avri took it out immediately. I had a hell of a time finding it in the wiki because it disappeared on my screen.

Avri Doria: Sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Editing on the fly where things just disappear and you have to start going into the change log is going to make this whole thing impossible.

Avri Doria: Okay I will put a line through it next time instead of disappearing it.

Alan Greenberg: Or put it in brackets, or a color, or something like that please.

Avri Doria: I'm sorry. My behavior...

Alan Greenberg: No but in relation to the substance, if you look at the note in the Applicant Guidebook, it talks about a foundation, or a fund, or whatever with multiple uses not all related to gTLDs and presumably multiple sources not all related to auctions.

And I agree with Eric that if we are - ICANN is not likely to set up 14 foundations. They are likely to do it with a general one. And then the board of that foundation or whatever will decide you know how to get more money into the foundation or whatever it is and how to disperse it and that will vary over time in both of those directions.

So there are parts that are not going to be available in the first round, you know, and there are parts that may well be available in the first round. So I think the wording - if we're going to have any wording that relates to that at all, has to make it clear it's not a black and white issue. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan. Can I just ask a clarifying question? Are we not speaking about funds earmarked here for needs assessed applicant support? I mean, would that not be - fall in your...

Alan Greenberg: I think that's what we're talking about, but I don't think that's going to be the limit of the foundation should one be created.

Woman: Yeah, exactly. I think I was - I would agree. I probably - I should have put my hand up. But yeah, I don't think we're talking about just that.

We think the foundation needs to be set up. We think this needs to be of highest priority, but it's up to the people setting up the foundation and the Board to figure out its full scope.

Carlton Samuels: All right, thank you. Eric, you have your hand up again.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Not intentionally.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, you're still on the board with a hand up. Are there any more comments on this area? Okay. Can we go to the second one?

And I just put in the chat, the two areas that (Elaine) is looking at. She asked us to review and update on the work accomplished, our idea for going forward. And the first one, propose an establishment that's for applicants to seek out assistance to be given by a back-end registry provider, top-level domain consultants, translators, technicians, et cetera.

This is a whole bunch of in-kind knowledge services that she's making reference to. And she asked - some things that she said are accomplished - staff will publish a list of organizations that request assistance and organizations that state an interest in assisting with additional program development. And there's a Web site that was supposed to be up for consultative - with (Kurt) and she wanted to know whether or not there was any interest in adding any information in this area.

And on the second one, she wanted to address the issue of coordinating the assistance, so the first thing is that you figure out what assistance is required. You beat the bushes for people who are going

to provide the assistance and then you coordinate the assistance and in this case, she said that we had to discuss the methods, parameters and terms from matching applicants with providers of assistance. And she also says, "Well, you need to make sure that we have all types of assistance defined and then the mechanism, the process by which this assistance would be given."

So to my mind, the first one is fairly straightforward. They want to make sure that there is a list. We have examined every possible kind of in-kind assistance that could be possibly required, enumerate them and then set up some mechanism to solicit providers of that assistance.

And she needs to know, from this group, whether or not her idea of having a Web page set up for this purpose is sufficient, and I see Alan has a hand up.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl had her hand up first, does she want it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I ceded to you, Alan. I'll step in behind you.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Two points - number one, regarding the mock-up Web site, I thought I heard at one point that it actually exists. If it does, can we have a URL so we can see what we're talking about? Maybe an answer to that before I go on to the second?

Carlton Samuels: Karla was involved in this, perhaps Karla can help us with this?

Karla Valente: Yes, we did start the mock-up of the Web site. However, this is when the Board decided on this $2 million seed money and all started discussing that. So all of the content of this Web site has to be redone

because that, you know, what was there before doesn't really work now.

Alan Greenberg: I would suggest that sharing it with this group would not be harmful in any case, even if it's about to - going to be revised. Because I think the concept that was there before is still applicable, even with the $2 million. So anyway, that was point number one.

Point number two is - my experiencing (Elaine) asking a whole bunch of questions like this and then raising them in an open meeting is not likely to yield a significant progress. I think someone needs to take the bull by the horns like Avri did on the other parts, and draft something. No matter how wrong it is, it's a lot easier to correct and adjust things once it's drafted than to just toss questions out to a, you know, in a meeting like this. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl, you had your hand up?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Carlton. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I'm glad I stepped in behind Alan, because the question about the mock-up for the Web page is going to be useful in complement, I hope, with what I'm going to suggest. I'm most concerned about this speech, and I'm more concerned about this (speech) since the $2 million USD for seed funding, which is ICANN money, albeit matched or otherwise by other parties, which I can see a clear use and nexus for reducing risk and indeed, also affecting the cost of entry into application processes for needy assessed applicants in the round.

But I cannot see a clear nexus as to how ICANN could use such funds to go into some form of competitive or compulsory arrangement with

back-end service providers out of ICANN's (remit) to do that. I could go on for some time about that, but I don't think now's the time to do it. What I'd like to suggest is that we need to actually have a single purpose call specifically to this topic, because I think since the first (unintelligible) report, we've recognized this is a hugely important part of what we believe is the necessary support that needy applicants will need.

But we actually need to get the back-end service providers on the call. I really, really, really think that now's the time to see where the good citizens, the good corporate citizens in industry, should they exist, are going to come from. And we need to, as a work group, try and explore opportunities and possibilities that we can then have become recommendations in our report that are workable, and at least have been socialized.

Otherwise, we're going to put out off of this inadvertent comments really good ideas, and they're going to, "Well thanks for that, but we don't have to do it, nor will we," or "Where did that come from?" I really - this is a huge one - to me it feels like a sword of Damocles, unless it's done right. Thank you.

Oh by the way, on that call, I would strongly suggest that we try and encourage both the ICANN Board attendees, so that everyone knows what everyone is talking about.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl. Eric, you - on - you have your hand up, you're on the board.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you very much, Eric Brunner-Williams, for the transcript. Cheryl, if I understood you, that's a call specific to the new problem effect, in a sense, that the $2 million fund and the additions creates. Previously we had no money to think about, and so all of our thinking was constrained by the maybe there will be money, or the support that doesn't require money.

So if I understood you correctly, this is a call about making choices or rethinking a problem with $2 million. And I'll stop there for a moment so that you can answer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Eric, I was actually typing desperately but that's fine. More than just that - Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record - I just don't - yes, I agree that needs to be done. But I also just don't see how ICANN can do other than say yes, JAS working group, we too think this would be a really good idea, and hope somehow that industry and back-end service providers will come play nicely.

We actually need to - they can't force that engagement. We need to interact with the possible providers of these services, and I'd like to do that proactively rather than reactively or not at all.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yeah, I agree that we can't force existing RSPs to provide services for qualified applicants, that ICANN can't compel that within the existing contractual framework. It doesn't - it didn't leave itself room in the (DAG) to place assistance requirements on the applicants who are qualified - excuse me, not qualified in our sense that possess existing registry service provider platform capability. Okay, so with that I want to go on to the question I had which is actually directed towards staff concerning the Web site.

I want to be sure that the Web site development activity is not budgeted out of the $2 million seed fund or - and really that nothing is budgeted out of the $2 million seed fund without our awareness of it. I don't want us to inadvertently create charges against that fund without actually knowing that we're doing so. And that's all I have to say, thank you.

Karla Valente: Hi, Carlton, can I address that? This is Karla.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Karla, please go ahead.

Karla Valente: Yeah, the $2 million has nothing to do with the Web site.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, that's short and direct. I think Eric still has his hand up - a residual hand up. Alan, you have your hand up, sir, you...

Alan Greenberg: If Eric is finished, I do.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, with regard to the who's funding the Web site, my recollection is the Board many, many months ago allocated something like $50,000 - and I don't remember what the exact value was - to investigate things like that, and to use money for administrative work associated with this. So I presume at worst it would be used for that. It would be good to have an update of what that number is, though, and is anything being done with it at this point? Is it being charged with anything?

With regard - oh God, I just lost my thread now.

Carlton Samuels: Don't worry, take your time.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry...I just had a blank, I'll put my hand down. I don't even remember what the item is.

Carlton Samuels: It doesn't matter, that's fine, yeah. It's about in-kind services.

Alan Greenberg: Oh yeah, oh yes okay, now I remember. You know, without making any preannouncements or commitments that I am obviously not empowered to make, an example is, it was raised at the Singapore meeting that we desperately need to get a few more registrars in Africa. VeriSign has had a very successful program, or at least I understand it's successful, trying to get registrars' consciousness-raising and put together registrars in Latin America.

They've never exercised that program in Africa. It's - you know, it's a clear fit. You know, I'm sure there are other things like that, and I agree that ICANN cannot twist arms to do that, but I think we're going to - ICANN is going to have to use individuals to talk to, you know, use personal relationships to get these things done.

And I suspect that is not going to be limited to people on the JAS group. We may or may not have the right connections in the right places. So I think it's going to have to be a somewhat wider effort than that. Clearly, not an official ICANN effort, but trying to get people quicker rather than slower to ante up and to make commitments in this thing. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: And in response to you, Alan, just for a clarification question, would it be useful to still have a central place where any donations of this kind of capacity building initiative is included, and probably not officially embraced, but at least recognized so that we can tell the community? Would this Web site idea...

Alan Greenberg: I think once commitments are made, yes it's, you know, it's something reasonable. Each group that makes any commitment may well have its own method of deciding where it goes and who they support. So I think it's got to be a, you know ((crosstalk)).

Carlton Samuels: Okay, but that's a different issue about who they support. They could earmark who they're going to support, but I mean...

Alan Greenberg: But that's why I suggested that if there's a mock-up Web site, let's see it. Again, just as my comment on (Elaine's) questions, it's a lot easier to critique something once you see it...

Carlton Samuels: Yeah, okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...than to imagine what it might look like and come up with comments on it.

Karla Valente: Yes, can I make one comment, Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Yes please, Karla, go ahead.

Karla Valente: Yes, so we have a mock-up in PowerPoint, and I'm sending that to the group for the mailing list. We do not have a staged Web site with a link, if this is what Alan is asking, that's fine.

Alan Greenberg: I don't need it to be with a URL.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Karla. Eric, your hand is up? You have a...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Carlton. Alan, I've put in a small response to your comment about the VeriSign program, that it does look toward the issue of enabling registrations in the regions, such as Latin America, but it appears to me to be more directed towards the development of reseller channels to existing North American or out of reach registrars. And the creation of...

Alan Greenberg: Eric, if that's the case, then I erred. I understood it to be something else but I could be wrong.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Actually, it's not really an error. I mean, from - stepping back from the create a registrar task to create to these - create sustainability of registrations - it's not necessarily true that resellers of existing registrars is an inadequate response to the problem. So hypothetically, if there was a reseller of GoDaddy which is located in Arizona, but the reseller is located on Lake Tanganyika, it meets most of the requirements that we thought of for creating a registrar function that's effectively within the developing economic - or the least developing economic area or developing economies. It's too early in the morning for me.

Now I want to - so that was just a quick answer to Alan but that wasn't the reason I raised my hand. The reason I raised my hand is because if we schedule a call in which we invite GAC and Board members to be on the call, we should put out a - we should have a call prior to that. And in the call prior to that, we should float the ideas that are current, that is each person who - or group of persons - who are advancing an idea of what to do with a new problem or the new opportunity of the $2 million plus, has a few minutes to present it and the rest of us have a chance to think about it before we hear it for the first time in front of the Board and the GAC.

So that's my suggestion, that we schedule a call in which there is a request for proposals in the call. And then a subsequent call is a call with the GAC and Board invited, participation in which the presentations which we don't have adverse reactions to are presented in perhaps longer form, and take questions and answers then and subsequently from the non-JAS participants who are on that call. Thank you very much.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Eric. This will be the quick answer to Eric. The - as we understood it, there is a GAC person that is earmarked to be on these calls. That is a part of the process.

Unfortunately, that person has not joined too many of the calls. So, you know, the process itself has included this possibility of having instant response and some measure - some way of getting anything from this workgroup into the GAC and back to us. It just has not worked as it was intended because the person doesn't show up at all. But Avri, you have the board...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Just a minute, Carlton. Before you go on to the next speaker, since you've given a response to my suggestion which is actually off topic - this is not about every call. This is about a specific call. Thank you very much.

Carlton Samuels: It still holds, relative to one call or ten calls, the person wouldn't be on every call. So that's - it's peas and beans. Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah, am I mute?

Carlton Samuels: No, you're on.

Woman: We can hear you.

Man: No, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay great, thank you. I get lost. First of all, you know, there's quite possible that people do listen to the recordings of these, so we don't know that people aren't actually getting the messages. One of the concerns that I have is that we stop confounding the discussion of the $2 million with the discussion of in-kind services. I think there needs to be a fairly strict wall between them.

Now I thought in terms of the allocations of monies and judgments of things that, you know, perhaps there was going to be more work, there was going to be some sort of committee that decided when monies were allocated to whom and how. But perhaps some of that pre-work will be done here. In terms of the in-kind services, first of all, I think it goes beyond just registry service providers.

It could be IPv6 tunneling, it could be licenses for software to run things in-house. There could be all kinds of things that could be offered as in-kind services or donations that, you know, aren't necessarily just to be your registry service provider. And one thing I want to be really careful of when we're talking about soliciting in-kind services, is that in-kind services don't become a means by which someone gets their hands on the money that's in the $2 million pot.

Woman: Here, here.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Avri. That is one of the issues, as you recall, that was part of a question that was put to the group, whether or not we should ring fence the $2 million and assign what kinds of services could be paid or could make a call on that fund. That was part of the discussion earlier, so I'm glad to see that there's some flesh being with it now.

It's 8:57 by my watch. We have another three minutes to go on this call. The - we spent a lot of time on the first portion of (Elaine's) submission, and if she goes to the record she will have a lot of questions and a lot of things and hopefully (Carla's) keeping track of all of the issues raised, so she will have some work that she can sink her teeth into for the first time, at last.

And so she had a second point, and the one was that she wanted help to see whether or not we could ensure that all of the possible in-kind services are identified. And she had a list of them, and most of them were on a spreadsheet. Is there any sense that she's left out any important ones? Cheryl, you have the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Carlton. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I actually thought we had spent a lot of time discussing this part of her question as well, but specifically to the question you raise, is there anything missing - on the first read, probably not. But we always find that more minds bring more things forward.

This is exactly the sort of conversation I suggest not only should we be having with a wider set of actors, but we need to reach out to the potential providers of these services at least with a sort of an unofficial, this is what we've got listed and our recommendations and reports would be suggesting are the in-kind services that would be needed, dear friends and industry. Have we got it right? And then do that in the type of interaction that some of us have been proposing. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl. Eric, you have your hand up, sir?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Carlton, Eric Brunner-Williams for the record. In response to your question, is there anything else, I've scheduled a call time after the 11th of July with (Elaine) when she returns from her vacation. If there's anyone in the group who would like to participate in this call, I'd be happy to make the arrangements. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Eric. Any other comment? No comment. I think we can bring this call to a close.

Before I go, can I just say something? Because it is - I don't like when things discombobulate me and I don't say it out front. And probably it's not the most diplomatic way to say it, and I don't feel very politic this morning.

We are trying to get folks to share - give their best shot at filling out a set of needs that were drafted by some of our colleagues. Now if we provide you with tools and opportunities to add to it or delete, it is because we feel that that is the best way we can advance the conversation. And it really bothers me when the tool that we are used to using, all of a sudden becomes inadequate.

The fact is that the reason why we use the Wiki is the Wiki provides a kind of permanent place for the report writers to make use of in writing the final reports. So for example, if you have a question and the question is asked and the Wiki is written, then when they look at it and they look at the transcripts and even look at the responses on the Wiki, there is a wake of follow the argument, without actually hearing it. This is why the quick response on the telephone call is so important.

But you can get those from the transcripts. Now, instead of spending another hour waiting on the transcripts and wading through them, we just thought it would be quite useful to add the comment on the Wiki, which is a more permanent and direct place. You can look at it, you see it in exactly two milliseconds.

I think that is still a rational way to proceed. And I might be in the minority here. But to the extent that it is available and to the extent that I see it necessary, I personally, and I'm saying Carlton Samuels personally, will not go and look at every single page and send a list out of every single URL.

I personally am not going to do that. So you have to forgive me, but I believe that is an important thing to say so you understand what my headspace is. Thank you very much.

Woman: Thank you everyone.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: For the call?

Woman: I think everyone just left.

Woman: Oh okay, well, goodbye everyone, have a lovely day everyone.

Man: Bye, you all.

Woman: Have a wonderful, day, evening, night.

Woman: Bye, have fun.

Woman: Happy Friday to you.

Woman: Goodbye, have a nice weekend everybody. See you all.

Woman: Thank you, bye-bye.

Man: Bye, you all.

                              END