SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)

TRANSCRIPT

Tuesday 10 January 2012 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Tuesday 10 January 2012 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20120110-en.mp3

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

The mailing list public archives can be viewed at:
http://forum.icann.org/lists/soac-newgtldapsup-wg

Participants on the Call:
GNSO
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison - WG co-chair
Avri Doria - NCSG
Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council
Andrew Mack - CBUC
Alex Gakuru - NCSG

At-Large:
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO
Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison - NARALO
Carlton Samuels - LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair
Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair
Dev Anand Teelucksingh - LACRALO

Katim Touray
Sebastien Bachollet – ICANN Boards

ICANN staff
Seth Greene
Karla Valente
Gisella Gruber-White
Silvia Vivanco

Apologies:
Krista Papac - RrSG
Michele Neylon - RrSG

Gisella Gruber-White: Lovely, thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone on today's JAS call on Tuesday the 10th of January. We have Rafik Dammak, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Carlos Aguirre, Sebatien Bachollet, (unintelligible), Alan Greenberg, Avri Doria.

From staff we have Karla Valente, Gisella Gruber, no apologies noted, I have (unintelligible). If I could also please remind you to state your name before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Carlton and Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella. Thank you everybody for joining our call in the first one in 2012 and after a long absence.

So we have quite short agenda for today, it's mostly to - as response to the - what the staff proposed as implementation plan. So first we'll start with your JAS response which we need by Avri, and then we will go - we'll move to the JAS application support program outline.

I think maybe was due for December SARP which Karla sent a link I think yesterday or today and I - the last item, it's about registry service provider (unintelligible) and it will be - this will be lead by (Katherine).

So let's go through the first item. Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah thanks Rafik. I guess I wasn't completely positive what the area of JAS response to date other than perhaps just a chronological of what's happened and a little bit on the JAS sub group without going into the SARP, without going into the ASP itself.

So what has basically happened and I believe that I've written to the JAS list several times is shortly before they came out with the applicant support program for (rap B) the board and staff combined groups.

Basically came through too I believe the chartering organization chairs and it filtered down to Carlton and I on the at large ALAC side and to Rafik on the GNSO side to basically inviting a group of JAS working group participants to form a sub group that would work with the board and the staff in terms of A, having a first review of this, commenting on it.

And then B, continuing out longer term. So I had been asked by Olivier with no apparent objection from anyone else to try and get that quickly organized because they wanted to talk to us now.

So the first suggestion I came up with was that the chairs from the JAS group, Carlton and Rafik and myself as chair of the at large new gTLD working group and Evan as the liaison to that group from ALAC were proposed first.

Then there was basically Carlton deferred his feed on that to Cintra and Evan deferred his feed to Alan. I may have it backwards but anyhow so that first group was Cintra, Rafik, Alan and myself.

We had one meeting with the board and the staff, brought up a few issues and basically you know and then they came out with their program.

Now we're at a point where the board has basically come back and they want to have another meeting. There is this group, one of the first things I want to suggest, and this was already discussed yesterday in the new - in the at large new gTLD working group was that we want to add a member to this group.

And the suggestion I made there which was accepted by that group but I'd also like it to be reviewed by JAS. Because one of the requirements is that these need to be JAS members.

And we had various volunteers at points that weren't JAS members and we said no, there's been very specific, they want people that worked on producing the report.

So partly because the board has five people, partly because I believe there's a deficiency in our analytic before at the moment, or not a deficient but a lack is they suggested that Tijani join the group and bring it up five because he has been one of the strongest voices for clarity in the financial criteria.

And if you look at the comments that are being suggested by the at large new gTLD working group and the ALAC review that went in on the preliminary is one of the things that we feel is a real problem with is defining these criteria.

And as you talk about the work leading up to the SARP you'll see that among the things that they plan for this sub group to work on is basically the training materials and SARP handbook and I'm hoping at least until we've had this next meeting it's hard.

But one of the things we've been pressing on is that JAS working group members, not only their sub group but others as become necessary get pulled into this to help the staff develop the handbook and the training materials for the SARP members.

And also actually getting involved in helping select the SARP members that it seemed critical that we add someone with that very focused financial issue - financial criteria issue that Tijani has been the primary banner for.

So I wanted to propose that to you and you know obviously it's for you chairs, for this group's chairs to figure out yes, you guys accept that or not.

But that's the proposal I've put there. So there have been responses, today is the last day of the comment period on the application support program within the new gTLD working group and at large.

We have put together a set of comments. We're going through a last 24 hour review on it at the moment and I'll get those submitted before the end of the day.

I think I've already given you all the URL for those, it would be good if JAS had submitted comments but we haven't.

Of course most of the members of the at large new gTLD working group all were members of JAS so there's a lot there.

So it's ongoing, it's a working group notion that we proposed, is I think being accepted. It certainly - we're talking with the board, we're talking with the staff. To what degree we actually manage to have an effect on the SARP training materials, the background, the guidance remains to be seen.

But being a creature of eternal hope I'm assuming that if we insist on doing it we'll get to do it. I don't know if I covered what you expected me to cover but you know I'm open to questions or whatever.

Oh and by the way I said I could only make the first half hour of this meeting, that still may be the case but my other meeting that starts at the half hour has not been confirmed yet so I may end up staying on the whole call, I don't know.

Am I still there?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. So is there any objection, it's not for me to call but perhaps the chairs can call, is there any objection of adding Tijani to this JAS sub group that's working with the board and staff?

Rafik Dammak: None from me.

Man: None from me.

Rafik Dammak: None from me at all.

Avri Doria: Then I'll send a message to you Karla but if you could accept that - yeah, I'll - I think the only new member that we're suggesting unless JAS is going to suggest something other is that at this point we'd like to add Tijani to the group and so that there will be five JAS members participating in that regular sub group.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you.

Avri Doria: So unless people have questions for me, you know.

Man: Yes Avri, I understand that you were asking if the JAS working group can make a comment but I think it's almost impossible because time constraint but my understanding that there is ALAC working group, new gTLD working group statements.

Avri Doria: Yes there is and I'll put the URL and the thing, I've got one more change to make to it that just came in from Alan that I haven't made yet.

                  And then I'm basically going to you know in a few hours before the deadline send that in. Now if as the JAS chairs, you know JAS wanted to just say they agree and endorse those comments I think that would be a good thing, so then it would have the JAS (unintelligible).

                  But I don't know if you can do that, if you have time but certainly that would be a good thing.

Man: You know we can make calls just to see if people - let's be across the chair statement and if they have objections or not. But what is the deadline because I always miss.

Avri Doria: Deadline is midnight, is 23:59 tonight UTC time.

Man: I think it's in eight hours.

Avri Doria: Yes, something like that.

Man: We don't have - the best is to - okay we have Alan in the queue but I think the best is to...

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, given that we're supposed to be working under GNSO working group rules the most we could say is the people on this call supported the statement, since otherwise you'd have to take some sort of poll on the mailing list and I don't think there's time for that.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan for pointing that out, I was about to make that out.

Carlton Samuels: But I think that works. So Avri do you have any specific questions?

Avri Doria: I guess as a last thing I'll certainly take it as - because I'll be doing it anyway for the at large new gTLD working group I'll certainly take it as my responsibility to keep JAS informed of what's going on both on the email list and during any meetings that you guys may call.

                  But certainly you know I'll keep the issues flowing into both mailing lists.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. And so we are supporting this part for 50 minutes, but I think we can overlap the second item, which is more outline about the JAS application support program and I think Karla could probably give more - give us more update on that matter.

And sharing with the last update about this SARP proposal. So if there is no objection maybe we can move to that so we can - because that's the hot topic now. Maybe if we can some discussion it may be helpful. Karla?

Karla Valente: Hi Rafik, so you want some discussion about the SARP or the overall what we're doing?

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, just really short - I'm not sure if everybody could read in time the proposal so a short overview and then people can maybe give some feedback, it will be helpful to show you this week as we have that call.

Karla Valente: Oh I see. So staff posted for public comment a proposed process and criteria for the applicant support program.

So the applicant support program has financial support and no financial support elements. No financial support at this point is the website we have to - where people that are offering some kind of support and applicants seeking support can basically find each other.

We are maintaining this web page, I have to see how many parties we have now but we didn't have really that many parties joining that page, so it would be helpful if the JAS working group could help us to spread the word about that.

All the parties that are there we believe are legitimate, we tried to confirm people and not simply just put a name there when they register.

So there's still a confirmation process to authenticate basically whoever is submitting a form wishing to be part of this list. So this is one part of it, of this program.

And the second part of this program is basically financial assistance so we incorporated and embraced suggestions from the JAS working group to have this produced.

So we are using the $2 million that was the seed money provided by the board to be able to reduce the fee to qualifying applicants or candidates from $185,000 which is the main evaluation fee to $47,000 that - yeah, so basically that's it.

Because we have $2 million and you know this is a set number the idea is that we can help about - let me see, my math at 6:00 am is lacking here, about 14 applicants or candidates.

There are certain scenarios that we consider so for example you know a candidate qualifies and we see high points and therefore we see that the grant - there is possibility that the qualifying candidates might not receive a grant though because we don't basically have the money you know from the $2 million.

And if this happens we give the candidate to proceed either coming up with you know their own money or to draw in which case they would receive $42,000 refund.

The difference between $47 and $42 is the $5000 TAS or TLD application system application or registration fee which incorporates initial administrative tasks that take place.

So the $5000 are never refundable to any new gTLD applicant. So let me think, and we didn't have anything right now in the process and criteria that has been proposed by staff that we lack.

The requirements that you see in the new gTLD applicant guide book, there was not quite enough time to come up with you know different things and make some substantial changes.

We are updating the handbook or the draft handbook that was posted for public comment is being updated now.

Some of the public comments are being incorporated or trying to look how to best incorporate you know some of the comments in a way that doesn't change much other than (unintelligible) the launch of the new gTLD program.

When we developed this applicant support program we wanted to facilitate as much as possible for the applicant itself. But there was only so much changes that we could make to the TAS application system without compromising the launch because of their development cycle and security and some of the other things.

Doing more than what we're doing right now, would have been risky and complicated. So right now a candidate that is willing to ask for financial assistance, they would register like any new gTLD applicant to the TAS system.

Then they will find a button that will ask them are you seeking financial assistance? And they should acknowledge saying yes, so there's some specific terms and conditions that come with that.

So once they say yes they would have access to downloading the application form. Right now this form will be in Word document and is a fillable form.

So the candidates for financial assistance will fill out all of the forms and then upload back into test a PDF or any other format that you know basically cannot alter the content.

So we recommend PDF if they can. So they upload back the forms that are filled out and any additional documents that they believe helps to build their case for financial assistance, like letters of endorsement and so forth.

We need to see two forms, the reason why there are two forms is because there is the confidential part of the application and then the non-confidential. The non-confidential is the one that is going to be posted on the website, the confidential basically is the financial contents that those candidates are going to submit.

And this is only going for the SARP. The idea is that the SARP is going to receive besides the forms and the supporting documents, also some information from the new gTLD application itself.

Not technical, nothing that really doesn't pertain to the financial assistance case that the candidate is good but maybe financial assistance or financial information that is provided on the TLD program.

So it's still discussing about that. The SARP recruitment didn't start obviously, we have shared with the board recently the idea of how this would work so basically we're incorporating also the suggestions by the JAS working group final report to have a mix of expert and community members in this review panel or evaluation panel.

This group we're thinking about having maybe two or three third groups so in case there's a conflict of interest, in case there's something that needs to be further reviewed we can use the different groups to do that for an application.

We plan on starting recruiting SARP members soon, we're working on an RFP or not necessarily an RFP but we're working on having an announcement and start doing this kind of recruitment pretty soon.

Let me see what else. I think Rafik that pretty much sums it up. Avri would have anything else to add, did I miss anything?

Avri Doria: No, I think you covered it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, we have Andrew and Tijani in the queue so Andrew?

Andrew: Yeah, first of all thank you to everyone who's obviously put in a tremendous amount of really great work pushing all of this across the finish line. I had a couple of quick questions about the SARP process.

                And they may not be answered yet or they may be things that are there that I just didn't see, but one of them was whether the assumption was that all the awardees are going to get the same amounts.

                And another one was whether the assumption was that we're going to do all of this as one big batch and if so what's our time limit for how long we're going to leave our batch open?

                So those are the two procedural questions. The third question was is that I'd very much like to be a participant in this in some way but I think that the concern that we discussed before about being an all volunteer army, and the amount of time that's being requested is a lot.

                I'm wondering whether there's a possibility that you can make it possible with a little bit - slightly lesser time commitment so that some of the members of the JAS who really do know these issues and really are committed to them can also participate without you know - it's a lot of hours a week if I read it correctly.

                Like to get everybody's comments, thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Andrew. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, now it's okay. What I wanted to say is that for people who are - who meet the criteria and are not supported because of lack of money they will pay $5000 which is a (tasis) and it is for me it's a very big problem.

They are needy, they proved they are needy, they meet the criteria so why we don't refund them completely? Thank you.

Man: Your question is for Karla?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, it's for Karla especially.

Karla Valente: Yeah, so I think that there were a few questions from Andrew Rafik and from Tijani, I could address all of them if you're okay. Yeah, so Andrew you asked whether or not all of the candidates were going to receive the same amount, the qualifying candidates.

And the answer is yes, all of them would receive $47,000. It's not that the money changes hands meaning you know we're going to give a candidate $47,000.

Basically what we are doing is we are waiving the remainder so instead of (unintelligible) $95,000 they pay $47,000 and they pay that in two different stages, at the beginning registering TAS, the $5000 non-refundable fee and then they pay $42,000.

So basically this is it. We are developing also from the (unintelligible) to work and the elements of the fund raising. I have not defined yet so for example if we come up you know and our success in fund raising of TBT is done by MA we would see another $1 million or $2 or $3 million or whatever.

What do we do with that money? Do we use that money for the - to have additional candidates and the fees reduced or do we use this money to

maybe give (unintelligible) support, financial support to the 14 or something qualifying candidates.

It's hard to know since we don't know exactly how many candidates we're going to have. So for now it's a set amount of financial assistance based on the $2 million but again if we are - if we have this fund raising activity that we are developing right now successful and we are able to raise money we need to look carefully on how we can help even more or have basically distribute this money still in the first round to the qualifying candidates.

So I think that's one of the questions that I remember Andrew, the other one was oh Tijani, the $5000 non-refundable fee is to cover the administrative costs. So there is costs to - once somebody registers in TAS all of the applicants will go through administrative costs for completeness and background check and things like that.

So the $5000 are operational costs to be covered. And basically they are non-refundable for any new gTLD applicant. And I must say that we need to be very careful with that line.

So right now the candidates for applicant support would follow the timelines that are on the new gTLD guidebook so the opening of the new gTLD program which happens this week, you know the 12th if I look at California date, actually is 11th California, but it's 4:00 on a Wednesday.

So it happens at the same time so candidates would apply for financial support in this - in the opening window of the new gTLD application. We need to be careful because the TAS registration deadline is earlier than the deadline for the final application.

So basically need to register in TAS and once you do that you have some time to you know complete your application. I think Rafik that I covered the main points of it that Andrew and Tijani raised I think I covered.

Rafik Dammak   Yes, thank you, Karla. I think Carlton wanted to ask a question. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: thank you, Chair. There are two issues I wanted to raise. Karla noted - and I'm glad she did- that the task application deadline is before the general GTLD deadline and I'm concerned about the promotion effort that has gone on to make possible applicant support, applicants know about the program and this piece of information.

I wanted to ask Karla if she has any update on the marketing, the promotion program for the applicant support, how that is going. That is the first thing. The second one I wanted to note was the SARP. There's always been the - well, we had hope - and I'm going to use one of Andrew's terms -one of those persons who members of the subgroup would include people who were, let us say, knowledgeable about gaming and the methodologies used for gaming.

One of the things that I know, you know, would not (express) but I would certainly would want to have the chance - and this is something I'm proposing - have a hand in this altogether.

And I was proposing whether or not one of our own JAS persons would not be admitted even as an observer into the group. And I was going to propose if you think that is useful because I think as laymen we might having another laymen to watch brief help us to understand even better than normal.

I was going to propose that Andrew Mack if he's willing to take up the mantle here be allowed to be on a watching brief in the (sharp) panel. That is what I would propose to this group. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Karla, did you want to - do you have any response to that?

Karla Valente: I'm sorry. Did someone say my name, Karla?

Rafik Dammak: It was Rafik.

Karla Valente: Oaky. Sorry Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: I'm just asking if you have any comment about that. If I understand correctly, Carlton, he was suggesting that Andrew can maybe be observer but my understanding that at the first step there will be work on the training material, et cetera, to fall before forming this up and selecting people. So maybe it's a little bit early to discuss if you have - we need observer or not but I think this comment is noted and it's suggested that we can approach this in the next call.

Karla Valente: Rafik, this is Karla. Can I make a comment on what Carlton just said?

Rafik Dammak: Yeah. Go ahead.

Karla Valente: Yeah, so Carlton Samuels make two comments. One is about a communication effort. So the communication effort I understand the communications team has done some ads in developing countries. There was an announcement with some update done on January 6th on our Web site about this effort.

In addition to that we're going to have the handbook translated or available in the six United Nations languages as soon as possible and distributed. So basically everything that goes out that is about the new registry program is going to have this applicant support element in it.

So all of the new registry program communication effort, you know, are kind of a (mandate) to incorporate the applicant support program efforts. So this is the extent of the details that I know.

In relation to having an observer from the JAS working group I think it's in general a good idea. The only element that I urge you to consider is confidentiality in the financial - especially in the financial aspect of all of the candidates (which is hard).

Once we develop that group and it's, again, this group is supposed to be a mix of efforts like people are able to judge things that are financial et cetera. And community groups, we need to be careful to have in this group people that do now have conflict of interest and truly deal with all of the applications with confidentiality. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Karla. Any comments?

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton. Yes, thank you, Rafik. This is response to Karla and the communications effort. I'm glad to see that the communications effort is going to be one that is embraced by the general communications for the GTLD program.

I am still a little bit concerned though that maybe we couldn't do something extra in the areas where we expect applicants who might be seeking a support to be.

So if you go with the proposition that the GTLD communications effort is global and worldwide I'm just suggesting that maybe in the areas where we expect applicant support participants we might do that little bit more and emphasize them.

I am also suggesting that in those areas the traditional methods by which you access and get to people is probably a little bit less involved and I would not wish for the communications team to overlook the role that radio plays in these areas.

And I would suggest to them that in the areas of the world where they expect applicant support they might broaden their communication channel choices by adding radio as a part of the mix and emphasizing the applicant support program in fitness for a radio kind of channel. Thank you.

Karla Valente: I will pass that onto them, Carlton. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Carlton. Thank you, Karla.. So do we have any further comments on that matter? I think we have really good feedback and will be really helpful. Okay. Sebastien, please go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yeah, I am quite concerned with the way the discussion is going on on some topics. I am not sure that I understand the same thing that Karla tell us when I am in other group. And I don't how we will (unintelligible) at the end because we have now three different subgroups working on the same issue and I don't know who is passing the information.

My understanding - and I may be wrong - but it's not the same as Karla and I don't know who is wrong. But my understanding was if we raise more money than the two million from ICANN it will go for the next candidates who are on the list, the 15, 16, 17.

And if we use all the money - no, if we give the money to all the applications on this list and if there is some money left and that's another question we will have to talk about one day but for the moment the question is how we divide or help as much as possible the applicants.

And I don't know who is right but I don't want to leave here something that each - from my point of view it is not settled. And I am as Carlton very concerned with the communication, not just for the applicant in generally speaking.

I am concerned we'll once again have a lot of communication in Washington in two days and we don't have any plan for any communication elsewhere in this world and that's not the right way we need to go.

We are an international organization and I know that I am not at the right place and the right to say all that but I wanted to share with you my concern and to tell you one additional point.

I am currently in Trinidad in Tobago. I was invited by (Isaac) in Trinidad and I make press conference yesterday and I will make other speech and I speak about the (unintelligible) problem but also very much with the problem the applicant even if it's not yet settled. Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Sebastien. I really agree with the issue about the communication but (unintelligible). It would be good if ICANN cooperated with the community in the different countries to raise awareness about the initiative program. Maybe it's a little too late now but if we can fix that somehow it will be great. Alex - no, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. My understanding was similar to Sebastien's in terms of if we raised additional money that the primary intent is that it go to funding a larger number of applicants.

The only provisor to that is if a donor says their targeting the money for some specific part of applicant support then clearly we would have to honor that. But the first priority would be to increase the number.

So I believe Sebastien's interpretation is certainly the one that I had as well. Thank you.

Karla Valente: Rafik, this is Karla. Can I comment?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Karla Valente: Sebastien and Alan, I thought that is what I said and if it was not I'm sorry. But my understanding is that it will go to more candidates but since we don't know the number of candidates and if we raise more money I think the idea was what do we do with this additional money.

For example, we have only ten qualifying applicants. And I thought I said the same thing. If I didn't, you know, I'm sorry.

Alan Greenberg: My understanding - it's Alan speaking - my understanding of what you said is we would decide later if it would go to more applicants or other things. And I agree with what you just said right now. If we end up with more money than we can use with the applicant pool that has passed the criteria, that's a different question.

Karla Valente: Right.

Alan Greenberg: But the first priority will be simply to increase the number of applicants if there is no additional funding. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. So we have 16 minutes left on the call. Any further comment or questions? So otherwise we can move to the next item if (unintelligible) is ready. Is (unintelligible) on the call?

Carlton Samuels: He might be. This is Carlton. He was muted.

Man: Yeah, Rafik. I was actually on mute which is why it took me a bit while to respond to Rafik. Good day and good evening to everybody and Happy New Year to all. It's good to join your call again. And thanks very much, Carlton, for inviting me to join the call.

And just very briefly (unintelligible) this idea I first actually broached to Carlton and (unintelligible) in the car because what I think I was thinking about was

that one problem we could solve is the problem of getting registry services for many applications especially those from developing countries.

I thought why not have these needy applicants come together and instead of not-for- profit organization but provide them the registry services. They would own themselves and then they would pay these organizations based on their use of the services of the organization.

And further I would also like to see this on a (unintelligible) framework kind of endeavor whereby maybe we can have some of the more well to do developing countries or emerging markets countries - take your pick - would be able to provide some of the expertise that they have to some of the (unintelligible) developing countries.

I have actually in the course of the call, during the call, cover together a very short email which I shared with you on the list and feedback from (unintelligible) and so that's basically is a (cost) of an idea.

Basically we are not-for-profit independent organization and then also I suggested in the meantime this is pretty much on the line to what Carlton suggested to me a couple of days ago that even before this not-for- profit is settled maybe this (unintelligible) services by an existing organization, one which would be the (unintelligible) or some similar organization.

The idea here would be that we have a relation that would sort of like host these services or organization before it's properly constituted. And of course the question that we ask would be we don't even know who the needy applications would be, how many there are going to be. In other words, do we not pull the cart before the horse.

And I think maybe what we can do is have an organization provide these services and once the (needy) applicants have (decide) and those that are interested (have said so) they can begin do the legwork themselves in setting

up the organization and find what entities would be able to provide them and services they would need until they are not-for-profit organizations and (unintelligible) well the services would be.

So again this very briefly is idea and it's open to suggestions and comments. And if you think it's something worth pursuing we can discuss the (unintelligible) in actually moving it forward.

And very briefly I also would suggest that we have should have an organization independent of ICANN by which I mean that it would be its own organization. ICANN can sit on the (stakeholder) if they want to provide support and whatever have you they're more then welcome to.

But the idea here is the organization is completely independent of ICANN. Of course the regulation services it provides will also have to abide by ICANN policies, rules and regulations. Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Hello. Thank you, (unintelligible).

Man: Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: So, any questions? Okay. So just to clarify, (unintelligible), are you saying not one provider but different one in different developing regions?

Man: I didn't quite understand your question, Rafik. What do you mean, like could you (play the game)?

Rafik Dammak: I mean if I understand correctly from your emails and what you are suggesting like just this server provider with support of some existing organization and also from some developing countries but it would be only one so it should be only in one region or the idea is maybe we can have several system service provider in the different developing nations.

Man: Okay, yeah, that is a very good point. The way I see this I think my mind of it is have one global registry service provider that way you are better able to learn the number of (needy) applicants from all developing countries.

But of course that shouldn't stop that one organization from having original offices that will better serve its members in the video circuit. That's one approach. The other approach of course would be like you were saying that you have original registry so it that would pretty much be along the lines of the original registries. That's one option. I think by the end of day which options take it - if any of these options are taken would be dependent basically on what the needs of the community would be and how they want to go about serving those needs.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, (unintelligible) Okay. I'm not sure it looks that - there is someone in the queue who wants to ask a question. Okay. So thank you again (unintelligible) for the proposal.

Man: My pleasure.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you very much.

Man: And hi, Sebastien.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry?

Man: I was just saying hi to Sebastien.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Sebastien, we have Carlton, I think and Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Hello, everybody, hi.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes?

Rafik Dammak: You heard the question?

Carlton Samuels: Rafik, it wasn't a question. I was just saying hi to him.

Rafik Dammak: Oh, okay.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you, (unintelligible). Take care.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry for the confusion. Carlton, go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: One of the things that have been bedeviling us is how you could strengthen the registry and find the way to have them mutually support each other to viability and we've been grappling with the idea of the service provider and building capacity in middle income countries and lower income countries in the event that we have applicants that finally get through the GTLD process by way of the applicant support program.

And I think this is just one idea that might enable the answer to that questions and I would urge other members that who believed that sustainability and capacity development in middle income and low income countries and regions of the world should be a part of the program to give us some kind of digital independence.

It is important that we have more of these ideas and it may not be a common stream in time for the applicants for a program but I definitely believe for those of us who are interested in that question and possible answers for it that ideas like these we have to float and see what people think so we can get some traction.

So that is what I want to emphasize that this idea is about building capacity in the areas of the world where we need to have greater access to this economy.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Carlton.

Man: Hey, Rafik, if I could just say very briefly.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, (unintelligible)?

Man: I just wanted - I was on the line with what Carlton was saying. Thanks, Carlton. I think what I'd like to do is give it a little bit more time. I don't expect that they will say yes or no to this right now. Let them take their time to think about it and discuss it with other people that they want to discuss this with and then take it from there.

I mean, if it's something that people feeling it's not really what we're seeing that's no problem or if we should pursue the I have to work with (unintelligible) to see how we can do that. Again, thanks very much for the opportunity.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, (unintelligible). I think we should since have just two minutes left in the call today. So just to confirm about endorsements of the (initiative) working group statement for the public comments.

So my understanding is we have no objections from people attending this call and I think also that maybe we can add a point about communications issue - the consent about the communications.

So are there any objections about that because we need to proceed quickly before the day's (done). Okay. There is no objection. Alan, yeah, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thanks everybody, I was on mute. Not an objection but about the communication because I think that if we cannot even get that communication (unintelligible) on the working group then I really fear that the (populous) online or offline because they don't have information. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Alex. Okay. So I think that we'll proceed that way so we will try to get back with a statement to endorse the new working group statement and the point about communication concerns.

                  So we should now - one hour our call. I want to thank everybody for joining today and hopefully we will have other calls to respond to different issues related to implementation planned. Thank you everybody and see you soon.

                            END