SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Tuesday 09 August 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) Tuesday 09 August 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-20110809-en.mp3

On page :
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison - WG co-chair

Avri Doria - NC

Andrew Mack - CBUC

Krista Papac - RrSG

Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Alex Gakuru - NCSG

At-Large:

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

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large

Cintra Sooknanan - At-Large

Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

Sébastien Bachollet - ICANN Board

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Seth Greene

Wendy Profit

Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

Dev Anand Teelucksingh - LACRALO

Alain Berranger - Individual

Michele Neylon - RrSG

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

John Rahman Kahn - Individual

Dave Kissoondoyal - At-Large

Elaine Pruis - Minds and Machines

Coordinator: Thank you for holding. The call is now being recorded.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you very much, (Bryan). Shall I do a roll call for you Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Please. Please do, Glen. Thanks.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you. With pleasure.

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the 9th of August. And on the call we have Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alex Gakuru, Cintra Sooknanan, Carlos Aguirre, Sebastian Bachollet, Eric Williams - Eric Brunner-Williams, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Evan Leibovitch, Alan Greenberg, Avri Doria, and Krista Papac.

And from staff we have Karla Valente, Wendy Profit, myself -- Glen de Saint Gery -- and we have apologies from Boudoin Schombe, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Elaine Pruis, and Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

If I've left anybody off, please tell me.

And may I ask you please to say your name before speaking for the transcription purpose?

Thank you very much. Over to you Carlton, and we'll see if we can get Rafik on the line now.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. I just had a note from him saying he's trying - the operator's trying to get it. He's still having some issues.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes, that's right.

Carlton Samuels: So I will start the conversation.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Can I just say maybe Seth Greene has been left off?

Carlton Samuels: I was about to say that.

Glen de Saint Gery: Sorry, Seth.

Carlton Samuels: Seth is on the line. I was about to say that exactly. Thanks Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, yes everyone

Carlton Samuels: Hello everyone. Welcome. My co-Chair is going to lead this discussion, but he's unfortunately having some issues getting voice contact, so I'm going to start until Rafik comes on.

Thanks for showing up for this call. You see the agenda. Today, we are proposing to look at the proposed support for eligible applicants. That's the main item on the agenda today. Just to mention for those of you who still might not have lodged your SOIs, you know the rules. You know the drill. Please send it to staff so that it can be properly noted.

We are 11 minutes after the hour, so I'm going to go straight into it. The content for today, proposed support to eligible applicants. You have the link in the email. You have the link in the JAS in the notes section. You can go and see the entire report. The content is actually loaded in the notes section of the Adobe Connect room. This is the focus for today's call.

So the floor is open for comments/concerns.

Oh before you say that, let me just reinforce we are really trying very hard to help our script writers and staff to get this thing sorted out. If you make a comment here that is substantive or you believe is substantive, I'm still going to ask you to make the comment. To comment on the Wiki because that's the easier way for process for the writers to get to it and try to make sense of it. So whatever you say here on the call, if you feel it's substantive, if you feel it's important - it's material to the outcome, please just put it on the Wiki.

Seth, you wanted to say something.

Seth Green: If I may Carlton, just take 30 seconds to point out everyone received an email regarding where on the Wiki these comments - we'd appreciate the comments going if that's possible. Rather than just actually editing the text of the final draft that is on the Wiki, we're setting up a page to correspond to each section that we review in each meeting, and that's - the link to that is right on the front page, the landing page of the Wiki. When you first open it up you can see that. It's also in the chat room here, and it's also been emailed around.

So if you were to click on that link, you'll then get a series of dated Wiki pages that correspond to the changes being reviewed in each meeting. And at the bottom of each one of those, we'd appreciate you using the Add Comment function. So you just click on Add Comment, and then at the bottom you can write whatever wording you suggest or whatever substantive changes you suggest and we'll be sure to review them.

That's much easier than if you actually go into the actual - the text that's in the body of the Wiki and change it around without indicating where the changes are. This way we'll know exactly where they are.

Thanks very much Carlton. I appreciate it.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Seth.

So you have more clarifications for us to go on. So the Pages 17 to 19 of the current draft final report, if you're looking at the big report, for those who are not on the Adobe Connect. If you're in the Adobe Connect, you can just look in the notes section and scroll through it. This is what we have.

The floor is open. Alan, you have your hand up, sir. You have floor.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I have a question regarding the important dates that are listed at the lower left of the Adobe. There was some discussion of - I think of Olivier writing to the GNSO and asking can they be more flexible in their dates and - so we don't have to have the report into them for the 1st of September and still have them give their answer in time for the (Deckhar) meeting. Has there been any action on that, or are we still working to that date?

Carlton Samuels: Well Olivier has his hand up. He's on the floor, so we'll wait for him to answer.

Olivier, you have the floor, sir.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. Thank you Carlton. Olivier for the record.

Yes, I have spoken or rather emailed Stephan Van Gelder with Rafik carbon copied on this. There is a discussion where Rafik would probably have to make a formal request to the GNSO where we could replace or maybe delay the GNSO's meeting and have some kind of Webinar that would advise GNSO Council members on the actual report itself when it's written, so as to shorten the amount of time that it would take them to read it.

The question is still really up in the air at the moment, and I don't believe that Rafik has affected it yet. And, I was going to follow-up with him right after this call so as to try and see what we can do to give it a

little bit more time. Maybe five or ten days more to the JAS group to finalize its report. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Because according to normal practice, the GNSO, if it was delivered for the September meeting, probably would not vote on it at that point if one of the stakeholder groups requested a delay, as they almost certainly would if they've only had a few days to look at it. It won't be approved until the end of - or beginning of October anyway, which is think is one - their next meeting is one day before the publication deadline.

So...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Alan, Olivier again. Does this make it better for us then in such a way?

Alan Greenberg: No. No.

Man: No.

Alan Greenberg: No, it means we're going to have to rush to have it done by the end of August, and then it will probably sit there for a month with nothing happening. Probably. I can't guarantee that, but...

Carlton Samuels: That's what I understand, Alan, to be saying. I'm not so sure it's so.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Olivier again here. Would you like me to inquire with Stefan and of course with Rafik copied so - as to what's likely to happen, so as not to rush the JAS group into something which will then sit on a shelf and gather dust?

Alan Greenberg: Well, I mean I'm not sure...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That would be good. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...gathering dust is the right word. But I would think a conversation at this point since the email hasn't proven to be extremely effective.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. All right, will do. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Regardless of that through, might I just suggest that we continue with this kind of pace?

Alan Greenberg: Of course.

Carlton Samuels: Just to make sure. So it's a good thing that we asked that, but I would also suggest that we just continue with this pace and we just have more time to clean it up at the end.

So can I just ask some leading questions on this - I'm presuming that if we look at the fee reductions portion of the report as it is now, there is full consensus for waiving the program development costs. Full consensus for low risk contingency costs. Full consensus that we are demanding a review of the base cost, full consensus that we - while we are suggesting that there be cost reductions to encourage the build out

of ideas in small or underserved languages without specifically suggesting how. Full consensus on lower registry fees.

Is it the sense of this group? Exemptions or deferment of (IV6) - (IPV6) implementation requirements?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Evan.

Carlton Samuels: Evan, your hand is up sir.

Evan Leibovitch: Hello there.

Carlton Samuels: Evan. Hey, how you doing?

Evan Leibovitch: And it's nice to be back after having missed a bunch of meetings. So forgive me if I seem out of step in a couple of places.

I wanted to address this, and wondering in the light of the recent ALAC (axe) statement that doesn't give a lot of explanation but just says the fee should be reduced to $47,000 without necessarily giving a whole bunch of background information. Would it be possible or is it considerable - like is it worth consideration for us to put in some kind of wording that says we support the recommendation and want to - I'm not thinking the right words, but essentially we want to effect the cost reduction as requested in the GAC/ALAC statement. Then rather than giving dollar figures, besides lower risk contingency cost, cost base, and so on.

So rather than saying review the cost base and give specific dollar amounts, and saying we agree with the GAC/ALAC statement on

reducing fees to $47,000. And without giving dollar values, saying here are the areas (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: The areas we think you can reduce in.

Evan Leibovitch: ...is possible.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, that's the statement on the board. Rather than go through and enumerating the reductions, we just say we want to reduce it to this level and we just identify some areas where we think the slack can be removed.

Alan, you have the floor. You're on the board, and then Avri.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Thank you.

We spent a fair amount of time at the last meeting talking about whether we say the fee shall be or the shall be no higher than.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: And you know, with the thought that if someone can - says they can afford $100,000, do we demand that we give that - that we only charge them $45,000 or $47,000? And you know, the original issue was brought up in the light of no matter how the funding of this overall thing is done, the fee reduction and other support, there's likely to be a finite amount.

And the - you know, do we want to follow the GAC advice...

Evan Leibovitch: No. I'm sorry. I don't agree with that at all about saying there's a finite amount if there's an ability to reduce the fee.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Evan...

Evan Leibovitch: And not only that...

Alan Greenberg: Evan, may I finish please?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: All I'm saying is at the last meeting, there was a strong feeling that it should be no less - no higher than, or...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, I don't remember the exact wording. We agonized over the wording, "the fair amount," and someone came up with a proposal. I'm just saying are we changing that or are we going with that? I was asking a question. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: That - this is to Alan's suggestion. There was in fact some talk on this and it went on for awhile. But let me - let Avri jump in here before I say what I think I understand is shaping up.

Avri, you have the floor.

Glen de Saint Gery: Sorry. This is Glen. Just a quick note to say Rafik is on the call. Thank you. Sorry Avri.

Carlton Samuels: Oh, good.

Avri Doria: Okay. No, thank you.

A couple points. One is I think there's a distinction between what we were talking about last week and this GAC/ALAC (unintelligible). What we were talking about last week was in terms of requirements for aid, we were only - you know, we were saying that it wasn't necessary that they only be able to pay $47,000, but being able to pay more, et cetera, didn't necessary bar them. And yes, implicit in that was perhaps that they would end up paying more.

Another piece of the GAC/ALAC is I am not sure that there's complete coincidence between the people that this program serves and the people that are the specific classes designated by GAC/ALAC. I haven't really thought it through because there's were - certainly from the GAC, it was specific country designations. It was much more focused on that I believe, versus the slightly wider group of developing economies and indigenous peoples, and so on and so forth. So there may not be a complete overlap in the categories.

The other thing that I wanted to say and that I think may contradict or may be complimentary to what Evan was saying in terms of just saying, "Reduce it. That's the end of it because GAC and ALAC have requested," was the inclusion of some form of the contribution that I put in on why we also think they can afford to do it.

Because one of the things the Board was always come back with, and I don't think the GAC and ALAC recommending that they drop it gets the Board over this issue is, "Yes. But how do we do that and still meet the GNSO - cover the costs?" And I think that you know part of what I wrote goes to explaining that to some extent, or at least makes a possible story for explaining that.

And I would think we still need to give the Board that, because while I very much am in favor and very happy that GAC and ALAC said what they said, that is not necessarily the end of the story. And, I don't think this group - just like I don't think this group should be chasing after the Board to find out what they've decided, I don't think we should presume that the Board is going to necessarily accept the GAC/ALAC, though of course I hope they do. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Alan, you're on the board and then Evan is on the board. I am going to hand over after this to Rafik, who is going to be calling the shots on this.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Yes Avri, thank you. You answered the question I was asking. What we were agonizing over last week was the criteria. And just because someone can afford more than $45,000 doesn't mean that they're charged more. I mean VeriSign can probably afford a million dollars per application. They're still only going to be able - only going to be charged $185,000. So that was the differentiation which I was in my semi-stupor right now -- it's still early here -- I've missed completely. Thank you.

And by the way, I agree that we do need in some excruciating detail and in a convincing way need to explain to the Board how they can reduce the fee without impacting the GNSO directive.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Alan.

Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So if I'm hearing Avri and Alan correctly - so there's not - so the issue here is not the fact that the recommendation from the GAC and the ALAC is not liked, but just what we're going to try and do here is explain how that can achieved. The - I guess I found the criteria, the not more than and so on, that had to do with what makes an applicant eligible as opposed to the benefits they're getting. That's why - and that sort of - what's confusing me is that was out of the scope of this discussion.

The discussion here that I'm seeing on the Adobe Connect room is what is the proposed support? And, it has nothing to do with the criteria. Assuming somebody meets the criteria, what do they get? And so I've been focusing on that rather than saying what are they able to pay or whatever, because that seems to be a different discussion.

Alan Greenberg: And Evan to make it clear, I raised what apparently was a red herring. I apologize for that. But the difference in the statements was bothering me. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

All right, so I guess what is necessary to do here is -- based on what I'm hearing from Alan and Avri -- is to go into a bit more of an explanation here that explains how through waiving costs and reducing specific costs and so on that we're able to achieve the kind of cost reduction and who you - a fee reduction that is being asked for in the GAC/ALAC recommendation, in that I'm going to have to sort of re-ask the people on this group whether or not we need more detail in these particular bullet forms? Take a perhaps specific dollar amounts, but go into more detail about the kind of cost reductions that can be done to enable that fee level that's been asked for. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Thank you, Evan.

Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Rafik. Eric Brunner-Williams for the record.

I really support what Evan initially said, which was adopt the simple reference to the ALAC/GAC joint statement. Then of course, I had something to do with writing it, so I'm kind of attached to it personally.

But the problem I see with attempting to provide suggestions as to how to realize the number is that we made some suggestions earlier against what we understand the budgets to be, and Alan was very helpful in obtaining those numbers. But, we don't actually know enough. We don't know as much as staff does about how to achieve the particular end of $47,000 as the number for the applicant. We don't really know enough about ICANN's internal budget for the application process to truly instruct them how to arrive at that number - that is to

instruct the Board better than staff is able to instruct them on the same question.

So our time spent on that is answering a question for which the Board has a better answer available to them, and the time taken away from answering questions for which the Board has no better source of information than we. So we're spending time on something that we can't actually do very well.

And Avri, if you want to explain, please do.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think that Alan wants to answer and I already made some comment (as Chair). Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you.

I think this is one of these cases where I think we need and were told we were going to get more active involvement from staff, and I think a couple of Board members wouldn't be useless either, if we're going to have an argument which is really going to be sold. There is no point in us making the argument where staff in parallel will go to and tell the Board no, it can't be done that way, so I think we need active involvement and creative involvement from staff on this one.

If we end up differing completely, then we need to say that in the report. But if we can come to some closure on it quickly, then we're far better - far more ahead than we would be otherwise. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Alan.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Yes, I think we know more than - I think the staff has put out budget figures. True, they haven't done a total breakdown of within the $100,000 on the fee structure, how it indeed goes, but the staff has put out a lot of figures. We're no longer guessing.

Second of all, unless someone is going to disagree with the proposal that I made for a method by which they could reduce this but still meet both short run cash flow requirements and long run budget requirements, and sort of want to say that whatever - it was complete nonsense and therefore we don't understand what we're talking about, I do believe there is a proposal on the table that gives at least one method of looking at the budget as put out by the staff looking at the pieces and looking at the times when certain amounts of money.

Assuming the truth and necessity of the staff's budget at $100,000. Assuming the income that comes in from the applications and the proportionality of applications that we would predict possible for this. So certainly, making certain assumptions. And, I'd definitely love to have the staff and the Board members take a look at that proposal.

But to say that we have no idea and that the staff hasn't given us figures and that we shouldn't waste time doing it - A, I think the time has already been wasted. We've done it. There is a proposal on the table and I don't think we should drop it. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Avri.

Okay, I will put myself in the queue. Sorry, but maybe I missed something in the whole discussion as (unintelligible). But recalling all the debate about cost reduction, I want to ask what we are expecting to do on this matter? I think that we - actually, was some agreement that we cannot do any further progress and that's not - or maybe I missed something.

So if someone can clarify that for me, that would be really helpful.

Alan? Yes?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Well, what I'm hearing is we have a proposal that Avri drew up, and what I'm saying is that it would be useful if staff tells us now, not privately to the - only privately to the Board later that they either think there - it's had some merit or they reject it categorically, or somewhere in between, or can help us refine it.

This is another of those cases that we don't want staff giving secret advice to the Board that the working group doesn't know about. You know, it's the kind of think that is being discussed in other forums before, and it would be useful to have some involvement on this particular, rather crucial issue. That's the point I was making.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Alan.

So we have - we had a proposal from Avri which was (unintelligible) by her in this call, but - okay, (throw) it's up to the working group members of...

Avri? Yes please.

Avri Doria: Yes. And if I can add - I mean, that's been there for a long time. I've discussed it several times. I haven't gotten you know, a lot of contradictions. I did get some requests for clarification and did some work. So yes, I think I totally (unintelligible)...

Rafik Dammak: Avri?

Avri Doria: ...on staff and Board.

Yes?

Alan Greenberg: Avri, you cut out there.

Avri Doria: Oh, okay. Am I back in?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Avri Doria: As I said, it's been on the table awhile. I've made some edits based upon our discussions and I agree with Alan. I'd really like to get some feedback from the Board and staff on the practicality of it.

Now I'm not saying we need to do that before we put it in the report, and you know I have no personal objection on it being you know an appendix perhaps and not in the mainstream of the document. But I do think that it is a proposal you know, and I personally think it'll fly. And, no one in this group has given me a reason why it wouldn't fly. The only possible reason would be, as far as I can tell, is for the Board or

staff to say, "No. We don't want to do it that way," and then there'd be a problem.

But other than that, I have not heard any reason why the temporal shift of funds that I suggest becomes problematic. So I'd love to hear some feedback and I'd love to see it included in our document. Even if it's not in the main flow of the document, but you know footnoted and then an addendum. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri.

I think it can be in the -- how you say -- in the - you said addendum. Domain report, not just in as an appendix or footnote. Just we need to show the level of agreement from the working group. So there can be accommodation but to highlight the level of consensus for that matter. I think that makes more sense because I think this just appendix - yes.

Man: Is another short cut?

Carlton Samuels: So Rafik, you actually said what I'm glad we agreed on it. I think what we should do is to put it in the body of the report. What we should probably try to elicit here is the level of support for it.

But also this is something Carlos suggested - we can push to ask Kurt specifically in reference to Avri's proposal whether or not we can expect an answer from inside. So I'm suggesting that we take Avri's suggestion and make it grounds of the question to Kurt. And I'm also suggesting that we solicit opinions and Avri's suggestion because the proposal now is to make that a part of the official report. Thank you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. And also I think we were confusing that (from that side) (unintelligible) - okay. I think we have agreement about that, hearing no objection. Okay. I think we can move and continue the discussion about the proposal I suppose.

Evan, do you have any comments because I'm reading your notes in the chat. Do you want to express some objection?

Evan Leibovitch: Rafik, I'm just thinking we're talking in circles and frankly I'm getting tired of trying to mind read either staff or board or whoever. Yes, input would be nice but the milestone report too has already been out.

If there were comments or feedback or issues of practicality or whatever, if there was any kind of interest in helping us do this job we would have received that information already. So I think we have to proceed as if what we have is what we have. Stop trying to mind read, stop waiting on other input and just make the recommendations of what we think the community needs. That's what we're here for.

If information comes later that's fine. But at this point everybody including the board and senior staff knows about the compressed timelines and I think we're spinning our wheels needlessly.

Rafik Dammak: Yes but just a reply, you are not against that we put the recommendation and the report just to?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm not against offering a rationale of how we think that the fee reduction proposed by the GAC and ALAC could be realized. It is to our benefit to try and demonstrate how that fee reduction can be

maintained while at the same time holding true to the GNSO mandate of cost recovery.

That is useful, that is important. But going beyond that into trying to divine the current feeling or trying to figure out what's best maybe or may not be telling the board privately or whatever. This is mind reading. Any kind of feedback I think that would have been given we would already have in our hands especially since everybody knows the compressed timelines.

And I think we just need to work with what we have. We may wish for more information but we don't have it. So you know, we need to move on.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thank you. Anyway, we can send that email (unintelligible) - asking for clarification. Okay. So I think we can move from the discussion about cost reduction and (unintelligible). Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Can I say Rafik, there was some discussion about the staggered fees. I recall some that we just need to make sure that everybody agrees there is some consensus that the concept of staggered fees even if we don't agree on the details is accepted. So I would ask that question directly of members.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes.

Carlton Samuels: There were long discussions about timing and so on with respect to the question of staggered fees but if we just tie down the fact that there is full consensus on staggered fees.

Rafik Dammak: I think maybe we are not asking if we have consensus about the staggered fees as a concept but more how it will be perceived.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Are staggered fees nearly as relevant if the fees have been lowered 47,000? Remember before we said stagger the fees in the same way as they are refunded in the application does not go all the way through.

That algorithm does not make any sense any more unless we simply say prorate and I question whether the need is nearly as large as it was when the number was 185 we were talking about. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Precisely. Thank you Alan. You answered my question sir.

Alan Greenberg: I asked a question. I'm not sure I answered.

Carlton Samuels: Well, that's the question I'm asking and I don't think it's important any more. I'm not sure everybody will agree with me.

Rafik Dammak: I think Avri wants to comment but she - Avri.

Avri Doria: No. I was just trying to agree that it doesn't seem like it's relevant as long as we've got the reduction in fees. It was an alternate procedure. So in the respect of expectations that would get the reduction in fees, I was completely agreeing with it no longer being a relevant issue. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: It would be relevant to say should the fees not be fully reduced that that staggering is mandatory. It weakens our case by saying it but it may need to be said in light of what may ultimately happen.

Carlton Samuels: Can I tell you Alan, I would prefer not to say that but that's just me.

Rafik Dammak: So we should - we can keep that part but just to make classification that it's conditional. Yes, there is no fee reduction then. Okay. Okay. Okay, I think someone needs to mute his line.

Woman: I can't. It's my husband snoring. At this hour I can't (blame him for that).

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Sorry. This one tops the snake.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: This one tops the snake.

Woman: However, I've knocked him on the shoulder for you Rafik and he's rolled over so he'll...

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible) - okay. So I think we will keep this part but just maybe to add some rewording that it's conditional to the fact if we have or not fee reduction if I understood correctly what Alan was suggesting. Ivan, do you have any objection or something? Okay. Avri - yes, Avri. Avri, you can speak.

Avri Doria: No, sorry. I was typing something and doing something screwy.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Because - okay, that was funny. (Unintelligible)

Evan Leibovitch: I'm saying let's move on, stop worrying about the speculation and we've now got some information to go with.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So the next part is the part partially from any action proceeds. Okay. Maybe Avri has some comments on that matter. Okay. Eric, you are in the queue. Please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Rafik. Eric Brunner-Williams. I have a clarifying question. Are we referring here and then I'm sure the answer is we're referring to something else. But the clarification might be useful.

Are we referring to the proceeds from the auction in which the applicant who is supported is compelled to participate in and apparently has won since they have paid the auction winning bid has been paid by the applicant to whomever, presumably to ICANN? Or are we speaking about the proceeds from auctions generally, not necessarily involving this or any JAS qualified applicants? Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Eric. Maybe Avri can answer that. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. Hi. I don't believe we ever talked about and certainly not in this context, the notion of it being about fees for an auction the JAS qualified applicant participated in.

In fact, I'm not sure we even covered the notion of how a JAS qualified applicant participates in an auction other than by having outside funding. I think what was being referred to here was repayment from the general deep coffers of wealth that we expect ICANN to get control of based upon auctions for the very valuable names that people are going to compete on.

And in this case my suggestion would be that this is something that is perhaps referred to when we speak about thinks that the yet to be formed board committee on how to handle auction monies should also look at as opposed to declaring it as a thing that we want done with that money. My view and opinion on this is that the auction monies are something we're asking the board to take auction monies and come up with a way to use them in support of our community especially the JAS qualified applicant community and going beyond.

So I would think that this would be a bullet moved to that section of recommendations of things this committee could, should, might look at. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: In line with that Avri, just a follow up question - when we were first going through this one of the feelings that I got from conversations that I had had with board members was that the original anticipation is that fundraising.

Whether it was through auction or establishment of a fund or something like that would be used to subsidize fees, which would not be lowered. That is, applicants would still have to pay the 185 but

eligible applicants would have access to pools of money achieved through auction and funds and other methods.

Since we're now saying in the discussion we've just had that we are advocating a fee reduction, would it be appropriate perhaps to be able to change this slightly and say we have no problem with ICANN maintaining or retaining some of its auction proceeds in order to recover some of the revenue lost from the fee reductions? This may be a different way of doing it.

Avri Doria: Can I answer that?

Evan Leibovitch: Well, I asked it. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Right. Yes, but I mean jump the queue to answer it.

Woman: Rafik, can she reply?

Avri Doria: Yes. I mean I'll just jump the queue.

Carlton Samuels: Go ahead Avri. Rafik may be off.

Avri Doria: First of all, that's already - there are two parts. One, we had a discussion I think it was last week where we said definitely that any monies to do with the fund and all of that were separate from you know, the revenue reduction.

But two, as part of the recommendation made on how the ICANN can afford to reduce these fees that I wrote is included using a first portion of the auction monies to refill the reserve fund and risk fund that is

borrowed against by having these applicants not pay it. So indeed that usage is already included in that proposal.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Rafik, you are on, you dropped off? Maybe Rafik has a difficulty. Andrew you are on the board so let me just call in while Rafik comes back.

Andrew Mack: Thanks Carlton. Andrew Mack from the transcripts. I guess a comment and a question - the question is for Avri, I'm not quite sure I followed the very last part of what you said.

So perhaps you could explain it. The comment is that whether we have - I think the fact that we're hoping to get fee reduction doesn't change the fact that we need of additional resources to cover all kinds of things that are part of this program including the administration of the program itself. I think everybody realistically knows that it's going to take more than $2 million to do this over the longer period of time.

And the most logical, at least for me the most logical source of constant funding for that over the long term would be some of these options like these. So I don't know that that comes in addition to other funding that we might get from other sources or whether it's enough and it's easy enough to get in that it would cover all the costs of the program.

But either way I think that we shouldn't be walking away from that as a potential way of supporting the administration and some of the other

costs that are going to be a part of this program. Make sense? Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: I think Rafik is still having a difficulty. So Evan, you are on the board next and then Avri.

Avri Doria: I think Evan's left. (The buzzer's me).

Carlton Samuels: Okay. That's Avri. Avri, you're on the board please.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes. I think that the quick answer to Andrew would be yes. The suggestion was that auction monies at first be used to repay monies that didn't come in but then part of what is being recommended for the auction funding and for this yet to be formed fund is indeed finding ways to help people with funding the programs.

Remember we talked about the possibility of the registry service provider fund you know, or program and we talked about various other things that are things that these auction monies could indeed be applied to, the program and whatever else. But we have tried to move those all into a big pile that says auction monies and other funds raised here go to the fund administrators.

And they figure out based on 100 different suggestions of what is a good idea for them what the really best ideas for them are. That's not something we get into but anything of those whether it's registry support program, maybe some day registrar support programs - I don't know. Whether it's supporting the fund, whether it's helping people run IPB6 - I don't know.

There could be 1000 good proposals for ways to spend money to help JAS qualified applicants. That's what the fund administration group does. The auction monies and any other monies raised go there and then they figure out what is a good choice, what is a not good choice, what is a gaming choice - what is a whatever. So yes.

Woman: Fair enough.

Andrew Mack: So the long answer was yes.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Rafik is back so he has the pillar again. Rafik.

Woman: He's on mute.

Carlton Samuels: Would you please unmute him? There he's back. You returned sir.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. So (unintelligible) - discussion. So can we move forward or is there any other further comment on what Avri said? Okay. So I understand this discussion and people's program development faction if I'm not mistaken, I'm sorry. I have various problems today with my life. Can we move to the next part? I think it's about (unintelligible) - by externally funded agencies. (Unintelligible) - call of one hour and a half.

Man: (Unintelligible)

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Any further comment? I am alone on this call or something.

Woman: No you're not. If we have a comment we will jump in or we will put our hand up, I can assure you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. Okay. So if I see that we don't have maybe just (unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: I see Eric has put something in the chat.

Rafik Dammak: Eric, do you want to make some comment?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sure. So we've been addressing the question of what to do with the auction fund from a conception that this is a possible source of revenue to fund the program. I'm actually thinking about a different question which is the situation of the applicant who finds their application is in a contention set.

And should the applicant not be part of a community based application and also not meet the 14 out of 16 metric or not be brought by a party with a right to the name for which it is applying such as a government other than a central government, then this applicant though qualified for support in submitting an application receives at this point no support in dealing with the other members of the contention set, which are better funded as a necessity.

They didn't qualify for support in the first place and though it's not necessarily so, are speculative in nature or for some private interest, which is external to the qualifying, the non-financial criteria for support. So in this case we have a qualified applicant addressing some social purpose whether it's linguistic or cultural.

But it arrived at the moment of allocation by auction with no resources that arrived from support. And so this is - we haven't dealt with the structural. The disadvantage that is faced by applicants from developing economies and that any applicant who meets the recommendation 20 criteria are still structurally disadvantaged by the auction process.

And we haven't come up with anything that addresses that. Thank you very much.

Woman: That's a very interesting point.

Carlton Samuels: It's a very interesting point and this is the third time and my count is raised that.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm not keeping count.

Carlton Samuels: It's the third time I'm keeping count. When it was raised the first time Cintra made a note on the list Eric and she says well, you know, for legal support then they're assuming that is some kind of support they would get, legal and we'd name it out there.

But I read this thing to mean that it's a little bit more than legal support that you were referring. And I didn't think it was fully answered then. But I wasn't so sure what else because I mean in the auction thing you are in the list, you're in the line. You show up for the auction, you win and you get some support to pay for the costs and so on.

But they might be other things that would be involved you know, marketing, all those things. I don't know. But I think it is a real.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well, one possible mechanism, one possible choice is to change the allocation mechanism. So let us assume there is a contention set that consists of two or more applications, one of which is JAS qualified and the other one is not.

If the allocation mechanism is unchanged in its auction and there is no support to the JAS qualified applicant for auction then we can assume that the auction will go to the nonqualified applicant. And we can assume that as a general rule that any contention set with a JAS qualified applicant in it will be the string will be allocated to the non-qualified applicant and all such JAS qualified applicants will lose their application at that point and all investment made by the program as well as by the applicant would be lost at that point, subject to some possible refund with conditions.

If we propose to the board that this allocation mechanism cannot be fixed or an alternative is to change mechanisms for instance as the allocation done by a lottery, by random or toss of a coin, then there is no structural - there is no certainty that the JAS qualified applicant would get it in the outcome. And I think what we want to do is address the problem of the certainty of loss.

Carlton Samuels: If there is contention I absolutely think so. So if you had some kind of drawing then it's a 50/50 chance or many of them they are in there, you'll break it down that way, the risk.

Eric Brunner-Williams: There is no certainty that the JAS qualified applicant will lose when attempting to acquire a string for which they're in some other party that wants the string. So to use the shoe example, not that it's a very good one, but it's likely to have two or more applicants.

All such strings will go to non-JAS qualified applicants unless we solve this problem.

Rafik Dammak: Eric, I have a question for you. So yes we - in case that many applicants will go for an auction for a string, but which make this string valuable if it's - and so I'm just wondering if it can be really of the case of community based, something like that, application because what make a string really valuable?

So, you know, if it's really business oriented that is - I think it must exclude any kind of support for applicant for that string, as we also highlighted the public interest criteria.

So I'm just wondering if we can really have such situation. Maybe it can't be really an exception or really specific.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well if that's the question Rafik, it seems to assume that all strings applied for by JAS qualified applicants...

Carlton Samuels: I'm not.

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...will fall outside of the universe of strings for which there are other applicants. And I don't know that a social purpose applicant from the - Central Africa won't pick a three character string in Latin, but

it's also sought by a - independently sought by a for-profit business in North America.

I don't know that that won't happen and I think that what you're assuming is that that can't happen.

Rafik Dammak: No, I cannot really say actually that it won't or not happen, but just asking in which cases, so especially what is the criteria that where we set up. Anyway just more question. I'm not assuming anything. And too we have Alan and Evan in the queue. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I mean - sorry.

Cintra Sooknanan: Sorry, this is Cintra. Can you please add me to the queue as well?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, the issue that Eric brings up I think is relevant. I'm not sure how we address it. Early on in this process we said I think definitively, but I won't guarantee that, that we were only looking at applicants to be eligible if they are looking at non-contentious TLDs.

Now that doesn't stop someone from having the same letters but having two different meetings, and therefore it's not a contentious TLD in terms of the intent.

And we're really in a problem in that if we're looking at granting support prior to application, as we implicitly are if we're saying the fee is

reduced, then there's no way to predict ahead of time that we're guaranteeing that there is no contention.

So early on we said that we should only consider those with no contention, a situation which is impossible to predict at this point. So I'm not - I don't have any sense on how to answer the issue, but I think the fact that it could occur is something we need to address or someone needs to address. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm going to have to defer to others that may actually be more familiar with the DAG at this point, but I was under the impression that if there is a contention between a community application and a non-community application, that the community application automatically gets preference. Is that correct or not?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Only if 14 out of 16.

Carlton Samuels: Yes that's - that was it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so as far as I'm concerned personally I'm happy to allow for that to kick into place to deal with this issue, because most of the JAS qualified applicants are coming in to try and serve an underserved community or an underserved language or an underserved culture, and aren't just trying to be a conventional gTLD but they have - they don't have the money to do it.

So I'm counting on the fact that most of the Rec. 20 applications are going to come in based on attempts to serve communities and will therefore come in as community applications.

And then if there is contention between, you know, a community application and a non-community application, personally I would prefer to deal with it on that level using the existing Applicant Guidebook mechanisms.

If you have two different community applications, one of which is JAS qualified and the other one is not, that may be a different question. But personally I'm satisfied with most of the mechanisms that already exist in the Applicant Guidebook for dealing with the distinction between a community application and a non-community application.

If we need to deal with something, personally I would only care about a situation where you had a non-qualified community application versus a qualified one. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Evan. Cintra, you have the floor.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you very much Rafik. I recognize what Evan is saying, but I think we also need to consider the fact that these are two processes that we're building in.

And while our applicants will fall at the community based, they still do require a certain level of support from us in terms of how to deal with contention.

And any other aspects of the DAG that they may fall into, any other truths that they may actually intend to along the process, so I think we do have to - I think that I can see what aspects of each step that become - would potentially fall into and provide some level of support, even if it's minor, at least to make them aware of the fact that contention may exist. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cintra. Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. If we had made the 14 out of 16 part of our definition for qualified support, then this question wouldn't arise but we didn't. We actually allowed for some applicants who are not - who don't meet the 14 out of 16.

In fact we made no reference, no dependency upon the 14 out of 16 as part of what it means to be qualified. So overlooking the fact that the 14 out of 16 is quite difficult, we don't even know if the .CAT application would meet it today.

We did allow that there would be things other than community-based applicant that could be supported. There was repeated reference throughout the course of the Working Group to commercial applications in small markets.

And I don't recall the language exactly but it certainly was outside of the model of a community-based application meeting the 14 out of 16. So that's one issue is that we didn't actually rely upon the 14 out of 16, and therefore our requirement doesn't match exactly with this exit scenario from allocation by auction for applications that find themselves in a contention set.

The other part of this is again the - we know - what we need to know we can't know until it's too late. So when we - not only do we not know when the contention sets or what applications will be in contention sets at the time that we support them which is, you know, at application time, but also the evaluation of the community-based application to see if it meets the 14 out of 16 criteria happens much later as well.

So we can't know in advance what would be useful to know in order to rely simply upon the 14 out of 16 in order to make the decision as to what to do. So we have a class of applicants that aren't community-based, or even if they are don't rise to the 14 out of 16 standard.

They are qualified for support and it's possible they will find themselves in a contention set with some other non-qualified application. They will lose because there's no support for them as a general rule. What do we do? Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Eric. Okay, any comments? Any further comment on that? Oh, it looks really...

Carlton Samuels: Can I suggest - Alan has his hand up again.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, the question really is, are we willing to live with that as an outcome? If we are then we have no problem. If we aren't then we need to address it, but the real question is, it's a situation which seems to be no obvious answer.

Is it a situation which we think rare enough that we're willing to live with the outcome? I'm done.

Rafik Dammak: Oh okay. Yes, maybe Cheryl want to respond.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Thank you Rafik. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I'd take it slightly further than Alan but build on what Alan has just said, and that is I see no reason why we cannot raise this issue as a hanging question, because I believe it is - it's an important one but it is one that perhaps deserves to be highlighted as an important question, not one that the Working Group was mandated with specifically answering; one that we have recognized.

If we do indeed recognize it as needing to be answered with debating and discussing in the wider ICANN community, I don't think we'll come up with something clever between now and Final Report.

It may be that something as an inverted comma's simple as in the implementation of what comes out of the JAS Work Group may rely more closely on a marking out of the 16 being met, though I wasn't being specific to what's in the current DAG there.

I'm sorry, AG, but it is something that I think we need to be aware of. Also in my mind just for the record, I've tried to keep applicant support very much to the entry to processing of an application phase.

And these discussions take us well into the processing of the application phase, so there is a sort of a pre- and a post-point. I think being aware that there are pre-points we've dealt with and post-points that we are aware of is still worthy of mentioning in the report. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cheryl. Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. Eric Brunner-Williams. The allocation
mechanism which ICANN selected, they selected because it's fair and
I put that in quotes but it's a fair mechanism or it's an allocation
mechanism that was selected because of its reputed fairness,
purported fairness.

Between unsupported applicants the question of whether or not it is the
- that its property of fairness is retained when the applicant pool that it
is making allocations among is a mixture of supported and
unsupported applicants is the question that hasn't been addressed. So
thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Eric. Okay just I want to ask Alan what he mean by the -
there - with the - the big dragon that...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: That's a nomenclature - it's a nomenclature that used to show up on
very ancient maps that mariners would draw, you know, saying, "This
part of the ocean that we haven't explored because there's dragons
there, or they found this dragon."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Unknown territory but dangerous.

Carlton Samuels: Unknown territory and they're afraid.

Alan Greenberg: The expression we found close to, "There'd be dragons there that
would show up on maps.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I learned that about 30 years ago for Christ's sake, 40 years ago almost.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Okay.

Carlton Samuels: We recommend the exact wording.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually Evan, I couldn't agree with you more. I think dragons there is just perfect for me.

Carlton Samuels: See what you did Alan? You got Evan woken up.

Alan Greenberg: It may be the only thing I've said in this whole meeting that people agree with.

Carlton Samuels: No, just a little more than that.

Alan Greenberg: Actually I think my wording is not quite right because I don't think there's two there's in the statement, right?

Carlton Samuels: No, there's no there in there but we know exactly what you mean. We know what you mean.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Action item to (Seth) - get the exact wording off an ancient map and use it as a reference point.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, well that's a little fun.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Okay guys, yes so do we suggest some rewording or we - do we need to - I'm not sure about the timing, if we have enough time to work in finding some solution or just to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay Rafik, Cheryl again without her hand. Unless anyone wants to disagree with me, what I have put on the table is we recognize there is risk. We recognize there'd be dragons there.

We don't try and do a solution but we do agree that a clear mention in the report of this during processing issue as opposed to pre-application processing ability to even put your application in because you aren't a valid supported applicant is one that needs to be considered.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cheryl for that suggestion. That makes sense for me. And so I think we can use - but just suggest it as exactly as that exactly wording or maybe work on that. So I hope that Wendy could take note of that. Sorry. Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Rafik. I'm not quite as sanguine or unconcerned as my colleagues on the call. I think that the - we should observe that no commercially attractive string can under our proposed implementation of Recommendation 20 be allocated to anyone other than an applicant from the first world or a highly capitalized applicant, however one chooses to express that and that is unfortunate. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: So noted Eric. I agree with you. Value is in the name - the eyes of the beholder. I agree with you 100%.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Carlton, you have Alan in the queue. I think maybe he want to comment.

Carlton Samuels: I'm sorry Rafik. Alan has the queue.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I was just going to say that I think Cheryl said what Eric said, although he said it more bluntly. But Cheryl added the concept that maybe someone will have a marvelous idea how to address it, but I agree.

I think that's the conclusion. We should note it. You know, maybe we need a section on implementation issues because there may well be other things that fall into that category that we've brushed under the table.

But I don't think we have any choice at this point but to note it and go on. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thank you Alan. I think we are at least changing the wording about that issue, but we are not sure that we can find a solution now in such a tight time. But we recognize that there will be - here be dragons.

Alan Greenberg: And it may be the case that this was simply one of the situations that we cannot fix, but if we're leaving the world a better place than when we came into it even if we can't fix everything, so be it.

Carlton Samuels: Way to go.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thanks Alan. Yes. Okay, so at least we have that proposal offering from Cheryl. Maybe if - I don't know, maybe if Eric want to propose - have the wording that it's with the outcome.

I'm trying to read what Evan is trying to relate in the chat, okay. We have still five minutes left in this call and we - so just asking if there's any follow up comment or question that we can address in this five minutes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I - sorry Rafik. I should have put my hand up.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Cheryl. Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Earlier on in the call Carlton ran down the list on the - under the Pages 17 and 19 of the current Final Draft Report under Financial Support Relief for ICANN and made a set of, "We believe this is consensus. This is consensus. This is consensus."

Can I ask that that exact set of (EIOLI) on consensus go specifically to the list between now and - the email list between now and the meeting later in the week so that those who are not on the call can weigh in on the - those issues?

If we get no response to some of them then my comfort zone is relatively significant and firm on the consensus. If we get some mulling of I'm-not-sures, then we need to move from full consensus to one of the other categories, et cetera, et cetera.

But we have not gone through what is a more formal call for consensus practice, and we don't have the luxury of time to do so because of the nature of how the report is being put together that I would like to.

And I'm not really thinking about Survey Monkey. Evan, I'm thinking even less formal on that and just to the regular email list. I think any survivor of the recommendation of this Working Group or indeed the poll survivors from the separation - Registry separation would shudder at that.

But a simple - take what is in the note section of the Adobe Connect room and say, "At this meeting it was believed that we did have consensus on the following. Does anyone disagree with that?

If so, speak now, i.e., before the Friday meeting or forever hold your peace." Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Cheryl thank you. I do agree with you actually in that matter so we will send emails now and prior to the Friday call. But just about Survey Monkey, I think we did that before and - here in JAS and what I saw as outcome left me really reluctant to use it again, because there is a risk that some people don't like the results and we questioned - make a lot of question about the survey outcome.

So let's not go in the real survey process. I think sending emails and waiting for objection or comment can be more relatable, strangely more than using Survey Monkey, which led to have some critics in the last time that we used it in the JAS Working Group. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I don't remember whether according to our charter we're bound to using the GNSO Working Group rules. I presume that we are but I don't know that for sure.

They do specify that one cannot make a full - a formal consensus call purely on a teleconference. And Working Groups over the last year or so have generally agreed that if one puts out a - an email call and don't get any negative comments, we can deem it to be consensus so I think that's a reasonable way to go. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly Alan, and I was drawing on many years now of painful experience of both doing that and building it into the draft that's now adopted, so yes.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cheryl. Thank you Alan. Thank you. So we have agreement in the process to follow and hopefully Wendy that she - if she is going to send it to the list which - so they should summarize on the notes and send them to the list.

So - and then we can use that to confirm about consensus, so if nobody object we can assume that we have the consensus. Okay, now it's - we - it's one...

Cintra Sooknanan: It's - and that...

Rafik Dammak: ...hour and - yes Cheryl?

Cintra Sooknanan: Oh sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, who was speaking?

Cintra Sooknanan: This is Cintra. I'm sorry. I just got disconnected and reconnected. Sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Oh no problem Cintra. Okay, just now it - we have one hour in - 51 minutes in our call. I think we agreed about the process to follow for the consensus, and I don't think that we have any other point that we can discuss.

And that's - this call is more longer than usual so I think maybe it's time to end it. And I want to thank everybody for joining for today call. So if there is no - any objection?

Okay, so one, two, three. Okay hearing none I can call this - yes, this call is adjourned for today. Thank you everybody and I want to say to Cheryl please be careful with the snakes. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, my snakes are no problem at all. It's much more dangerous dealing with ICANNers.

Rafik Dammak: I guess we have interesting - way less than ICANN, yes.

Alan Greenberg: But Cheryl, that's only because some of us are venomous.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yes darling. So am I.

Rafik Dammak: And she has snakes on top of that. Thank you all. See you all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Carlton Samuels: Bye everybody.

Cintra Sooknanan: Bye-bye.

Coordinator: Thank...

END