

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)  
TRANSCRIPT  
Friday 11 February 2010 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Friday 11 February 2011 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20110211-en.mp3> □

On page ;

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page) □

**Participants on the Call:**

**ALAC**

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair

Evan Leibovitch – At Large

Alan Greenberg – ALAC

Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large

Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair

Cintra Sookanan – At-Large

**GNSO**

Andrew Mack – CBUC

Alex Gakuru – NCSG

Tony Harris – ISPC

Andrew Mack – CBUC

Chris Tshimanga – Individual

**ICANN staff**

Karla Valente

Glen de Saint Gery

**Apologies:**

Carlton Samuels – At Large co-chair

Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachine

Michele Neylon – RrSG

Avri Doria – NCSG

Coordinator: Please go ahead.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the 11th of February.

And on the call we have Rafik Dammak, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alex Gakuru, Tony Harris, Baudouin Schombe, Alan Greenberg.

And for staff we have Karla Valente and Glen DeSaintgery myself.

We have apologies from Avri Doria, Carlos Aguirre, Elaine Pruis, Michele Neylon, Carlton Samuels. And we are trying to dial out to Cintra Sookanan.

So may I remind you please to say your name.

Tijani Jemaa: Put her number on the chart on the Adobe Connect.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks so much. Could you perhaps send it to me Tijani? That would be kind of you.

May I remind you please to say your name before you speak for transcription purposes? Thank you and over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Glen. Hello everyone. Thank you for joining today call.

So (issue) I will- I would like to ask everyone if there is any update of his or her SOI or DOI?

Okay hearing none we can go as we agreed to make reports of each work teams. So we may start with the first work team A and B about defining the criteria for eligibility.

Please Tijani can you start and to report what was- what are the progress since the last call?

Tijani Jemaa: Thank you Rafik, welcome. I don't have a lot of thing to report today because I didn't work on the - on my document this week - a lot of things to do at the same time. So I apologize.

But I begin. It's not - we have the (road) but I begun to work on it just a little bit. And I am incorporating with Cintra who is helping.

I repeat my request to any - to all the members to provide any source of information that they can give. And if you want to contribute also they are welcome. Sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Just to check, did - is the document shared in the wiki or not so maybe it will be helpful for everybody? I'm not sure that people...

Tijani Jemaa: Yes, I understand. Not yet. We shared it on the list...

Woman: Hello?

Tijani Jemaa: ...by - so - (informal) the Google docs. But to put it - we will put it on the wiki as soon as we arrange a little bit document because it's a mess now. It's everything together so you cannot - if you read it sequentially - and the - in this sequence you will not understand a lot of things.

So we will try to make a little bit - we tidy it up and then I - we will share it on the wiki page.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thank you. Okay maybe we try if I can join the - our joint work team I hope that I can help as much as I can.

Any comments from the working group members?

Is Cintra in the call or not?

Cintra Sookanan: Yes I'm on.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Cintra.

Cintra Sookanan: Hi.

Rafik Dammak: Hi Cintra. Do you have any comments that you want to share with working group members?

Cintra Sookanan: Well with regard to this document I just put everything together. So it's just release of (goals) from now (and see) which aspects of which criteria we really want to keep, which ones we want to delete.

Tijani has started with the introduction and that kind of thing because I hadn't incorporated anything from the interim report. So that's the stage we're at.

It's a lot of work to be done and as many I - (enhance) as possible but we appreciate it.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cintra. Okay try maybe to get more comments from people on the call that may be helpful. But okay I...

Tijani Jemaa: People are quiet today.

Rafik Dammak: Yes we don't have many people as usual and they are quiet too. That makes things complicated.

So maybe we can go to the - now to move to the work team led by Tony about fees. Tony do you have any update that you want to share with the working group members?

Tony Harris: Yes. I'm still working on the draft because it's kind of a hard thing to - you know, to put in writing and propose since we already have a rejection from the board to any concept of reducing application fees.

I hope to have something for you by Monday. And I'm also very attention to about what's happening with this Belgium meeting and particularly the document which was sent to the GAC by the US government since I think that may signal some changes in the way our applications will be dealt with.

You know, I don't know if everybody has read it but it's quite interesting. That's all I have today.

Rafik Dammak: Oh thank you Tony. But I didn't get to point out (unintelligible) statement maybe should change in - from our perspective. It - you mean that it wish maybe change with the GAC meeting as a whole...

Tony Harris: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: ...application process or just something specifically from our perspective for the Jazz working group?

Tony Harris: Well since apparently that there is some interest in having the power veto on any new gTLD application unless I misread what is being put forward, I think there may be some changes in the way people - applications are handled or let's say approved in the initial stage.

And I think that it also opens let's say consideration to perhaps what we are trying to achieve may eventually get some support from that sector but from the GAC. It's just a thought. It doesn't mean to say that I can't write the draft because of that. It's just I'm taking that input into consideration okay?

Rafik Dammak: Yes thank you Tony. I think the GAC how to say it, made some in the - I think if I remember well in previous communiqué they really emphasize its

importance of how to say it, importance for different applicants from different (countries). And then they - I think they supported our work.

We can use that into our (grief). I think you - that's a good idea, not sure for other members, so for our working group if they agree, what they think.

Tony Harris: Well we need to see what happens in Brussels I think. But I'm just keeping that in the background. It may give us some more, let's say more scope of action in the future.

Rafik Dammak: Well the question I have seen suggestions from (Sebastian) that we can maybe to have how to say, like statement something that we can share with the GAC members on the - during the GAC and board members and presence.

I know that they are quite late for that. But maybe if we can draw something that we can distribute there and to - just to remind people about the work, the work being done in our working group.

Tony Harris: Well actually Rafik if I might suggest I think they probably didn't read what we submitted originally and which was rejected. And perhaps that same document might be of interest to them at some stage and what's happening.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Maybe I'm not sure the whole document but at least maybe in executed summary it sounds like more...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: ...would get an (easy) to summary it can get attention of - oh (Sebastian) is saying that it's one of the 12 items of the board GAC meeting (presence).

Maybe if there - (Sebastian) you wanted to give a small detail, something that to clarify that point?

(Sebastian): Yes except I don't have too much information more than that. It's in fact you - if you remember well the GAC is communiqué set up a list of item to be discussed with the board. And it's one of the items.

It's item it's something like providing opportunities for all stakeholders including those from developing countries.

And there are currently - they're a small group with GAC and board member, one in each or two in each side discussing to prepare the Brussels meeting.

And I think if you have something to - on this item manage the global working group item. But if you can give something prior to Brussels or in Brussels it could be given to have that and to distribute it in one way or another to the participant.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think that's one of agenda items that we can work on before the Brussels meeting. And about the date, I think it's at the end of this month.

(Sebastian): It's the 28th of February and the 1st of March. And I am not object the board member in this - is this team.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, yes. Thank you anyway but it give us more, let's say insight prospective. Thank you.

Anyway so if there is no more let's say comments from Tony or about succession of Tony we may move to the next work team.

Okay it's quite silent call today. Okay so let me - we have also (Andrew) in the - okay (Andrew) yes?

(Andrew): Yes Rafik I'm sorry. I'm - my apologies. I got stuck a little bit on the way here. The discussion that Tony was talking about was about the - what's going

forward with the meeting between the GAC and the board specifically about the new - specifically about the Department of Commerce statement and the unified GAC position that's going to - that's being developed. Is that what I'm understanding?

Tony Harris: Can I answer that?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

(Andrew): Yes please. I just - I'm sorry I - my apologies for being late but I wanted to just understand where you're going with it.

Tony Harris: I was just referring to what the US government has submitted to the GAC as a US government position. It's a new document and it's in circulation. I mean it seems to be most people have it everywhere.

(Andrew): And Tony is it your sense that this is going to affect our target population substantially? And again, my apologies for (unintelligible) but did - was there discussion of potentially putting forward something about this, a position or an advice or just a comment?

Tony Harris: Actually no. What I was - what I just mentioned that this may open up a new scenario because well of course if you haven't read the document it's difficult to explain.

But there will be some much stronger government intervention -- let's put it that way - in the proceedings and application process.

And if the governments have taken an interest in other - in certain aspects through this document, for instance in proper - intellectual property protection and there's reference to community applications and geographical and so forth and morality and public order, the question of what we are about might



creep into their agenda also as they move forward as something which they might be sympathetic to.

I'm just mentioning that since I have to address the - in my sole working group, I'm one man working group, I have to draft something on the question of the application fee.

So we're just sort of putting some thoughts in the background there.

(Andrew): Okay well if I could just give you the - what the benefit of some - a couple of conversations that have been directed my way.

There was - a couple of people came to me and said hey, I know you're working on this group. Are you concerned about this?

And I said well a little bit but I'm not sure. What's your concern?

And the people that I spoke to were concerned that the way that these - that the new proposal was structured it may make it very, very difficult for people who come from less resourced parts of the world to respond under the terms of - the way that I understand it they have a shorter period of time which to respond.

So I don't know if that's something we care about. But I was concerned that perhaps in cases of dispute it might really - it might affect our group - you know, our target audience a little bit. Does that make sense?

Tony Harris: It's a good point, yes. I'm not too sure how it fits into my specific task here but I think it's worth considering, sure.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thank you (Andrew) and Tony. (Andrew) can you please - think that we don't have any further comments about the work you needed by Tony?

Okay thank you Tony for the report. And so I think that will be very helpful.  
And we will wait for the document in Monday.

Okay (Andrew), can you please that we can move to now to the work (you needed) by you can you please report if there was any progress in the IDN work team or even we can after go later to the - about fundraising? But now if you have any update on the IDN side.

(Andrew): Right. Rafik I'm sorry. This - it's been a really, really busy time. I was not able to - I'm still waiting on some comments from people.

So I don't have anything really big to update you on on the IDN side.

On the fundraising side you can see that Avri is putting in place some structure so that we can gather in data and information.

And I guess all I can say is that the things that we have been talking about before we're getting more and more confirmation of, this need to try to make sure that our - we make an economic argument as much as possible to get in to work with the donors and that this multiple donor approach is a very good way to go.

And also that the impressions that we're hearing about the fact that wrapping IDNs in as a part of our fundraising as all of those things are being confirmed. But nothing new besides that.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you anyway as I don't think there are any comments about the IDN because there was not so much progress.

We can move to the fundraising even if we don't have Avri. That is if you can - you already started to how say you to report about that if you - maybe you can expand if there is any other progress.

And we may also ask I think - I think that (Olivier) sent and he may after that he ask that people in (ISOC) maybe we can how to say, we can give an answer to that.

So (Andrew) do you have any further comments about the fundraising?

(Andrew): Why don't I pass it to (Olivier) and then we'll jump in a bit later if there's anything that's new that we wanted to talk about?

Rafik Dammak: Okay (Olivier) yes? Please.

(Olivier): Thanks very much Rafik. So I've gotten in touch with (ISOC) to find out how the funding programs were working.

I've been told that the community funding only raises up to \$10,000 at a time which I gather is probably much less than what we would be looking at with regards to JAS support.

But the - she will ask - the person that I've spoken with will ask whether there is a wider program possible. But it's certainly not something in this year's financial plan. So it would have to be something to take into account in next year's financial plan. And I'm still awaiting a follow-up on that.

So hopefully by next call I'll have some more. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you (Olivier). I also saw that you ask two question if this - was this club already (fund) with ICANN and/or additional bodies? And who will administer the fund?

It's one of the tasks that we need to respond to. So I'm not sure that at this table we can answer that. But...

(Olivier): Sure.

Rafik Dammak: ...as you say that - yes, as you say that we will need to wait to the - what the hierarchy of (ISOC) will think about the idea.

Tony Harris: Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Oh yes (Andrew)?

Tony Harris: Hi. Can I get in queue to make a comment when we...

(Andrew): Tony go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Tony please.

Tony Harris: Yes. Actually I think - I've been thinking about the fundraising issue since I'm working. I'm on the board of a global knowledge partnership now. And we are re-launching that worldwide network or social inclusion.

And one of our immediate aims is to establish a fundraising foundation in the United States. Because that makes it easy for a lot of donor organizations and foundations from large companies, corporate social responsibility programs to be able to contribute.

But it has - I mean the question is who are they going to give the money to? If they give it to ICANN that might be a little complicated because ICANN is really on the evaluator's side of the equation and not on the applicant's side.

And administratively I don't know if that might be a little complicated. It sounds like it.

And I think traditionally donor organizations in my limited experience of foundations, they don't sort of give blanket sums of money to be used for - multiple applicants. It's usually a one on one negotiation.

So we would need one centralized entity representing the program to deal with all these organizations.

From what we seem to have been able to find out in the United States you can set up this type of fundraising foundation for as little as \$5000.

But as I say I'm just, I've very much in the initial stage on this to speak with a lot of propriety about it. That's what - that's my comment.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Tony. Sounds (complicated) but at least even in the case we may that - to redirect applicants to those foundations so at least to help them to get funds from them.

So not sure yes, no it's - yes...

Tony Harris: Yes I'd like - to your point I might add something else is the complication that if they're going to give money for this purpose, normally when a donor gives money the money is supposed to be applied successfully.

And the thing is what happens if the application is rejected and the donor has given out the money to the specific applicants? That's something else that has to be thought about.

And so if you have a foundation in-between the applicants and the donor organizations it wouldn't be so complicated because that money will go back into the pool and be available for somebody else to use.

So I think really there has to be a - sort of an intermediary entity between the money that is coming from donors and the actual applicants. That's just the thought of course.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Tony. If I remember well in our (minus) Tony report one of the recommendation was that is this (targeting) - how to say (targeting) for the fees, payment so for each how to say, for each level that the applicant will pay a part, not to pay the whole fees at the beginning, so maybe to how say to decrease the risk of in the case of no taxes, but not sure that it will respond for that problem. Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes Rafik, I wasn't quite sure I got that last bit except that I think I understood that you were talking about the idea that every applicant will be responsible for raising at least 50% of the funds that they need, which I think we all agreed was a good idea so that we didn't end up with people who are unviable from the start.

I was actually going to respond to two things: one of the things that Olivier said and one of the things that Tony said. The thing that Olivier was questioning was around what - who would run this and whether ICANN would run it.

Given that ICANN has a kind of financial interest in this whole thing, I think it probably is preferable from our perspective and given that ICANN is, you know, has its own structures and everything, it strikes me that it might be preferable to have it outside. It might be easier to raise money as well, in part because...

Rafik Dammak: Hello? You are still on the call?

Tony Harris: Hello? We've lost...

Rafik Dammak: I think yes, we lost Andrew. Okay, oh yes. So we may wait a little bit that he back to the call but okay, any comments and in the meantime that we are waiting for - okay. Olivier, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Oh, Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Yes, Andrew's back. My apologies. I have no idea why the line dropped but, you know...

Tony Harris: You were saying that you thought it was preferable to have this handled outside of ICANN. That was the last thing I heard.

Andrew Mack: Yes, I think that there may be some - both in terms of being able to get more fund raising, you know, in terms of the perception that ICANN is a well-financed organization and so why would they need additional resources.

But also in terms of the ability to do transparency and frankly the fact that ICANN I think if I understand it correctly has a little bit of a horse in a race financially, for all of those reasons it may be preferable but I agree Tony that there needs to be some sort of an apex organization such that, you know, a clearinghouse where you can go and get information along the lines of what Elaine was talking about, as well as the funding.

My understanding of where we are is actually that there are - that there's a two phase - to your question about whether or not people will get the, you know, what will happen if they - if applications are denied?

My understanding is there's actually two phases of this work, right. One phase is getting people ready to make an application, and then the other phase would be if they make an application and it is successful, getting them up and running.

And so perhaps that's a useful distinction for us to have, you know, the early stage would be to help people make an application, and then the second stage - and then in that stage it's effectively there's no guarantee, right.

And then in the second stage is where you might run into the problem that you discussed Tony. Does that make sense?

Tony Harris: Absolutely, and I might add that if what is being discussed now and with - between the GAC and the ICANN Board on the subject of new TLDs, if the GAC has its - apparently what is its intention of fulfilled and they do get a power of veto on any new TLD, perhaps in that second stage where the applicant has already been prepared and goes to present his application, we would probably have to think about them asking governments if they're okay with it before he takes the plunge and puts some money up.

Andrew Mack: Yes, but I think that the key thing is, is that we have a relatively clear protocol so that whoever - on the fundraisings - on the donor side whoever's giving money knows what they're contributing to.

Tony Harris: That's fair enough, yes.

Rafik Dammak: So if I understand correctly, so maybe to refuse the application before giving any kind of money to the applicant before they - he go to - into the whole process of a new gTLD application.

Tony Harris: I'm sorry, did you ask me that, Tony, or...?

Rafik Dammak: I'm just trying to understand what to - yes, what Andrew and you - yes.

Tony Harris: No, no, I was just reflecting on a possibility like don't worry about it, which might come up where we have - where you have to have a governmental approval for any and every application but that hasn't happened yet. It seems to be coming in the wings.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. And also on the other side about ICANN that would manage the funds, I think when we talked in the first stage of our working in the Working Group that one of the recommendation, it was just to - maybe to talk about



the foundation and then that ICANN shouldn't be in the - so ICANN shouldn't be on the charge to manage or to handle the funds so we may avoid any problem that ICANN to be in both as evaluator and also managing the funds for the needy applicants. Olivier, you are on the queue. Please go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you very much Rafik. It's, I mean, this question of who will control the fund is something which I think is going to be quite fundamental for anyone bringing funds in.

There is a precedent which is actually I would say rather different because of the source of the funding, but that's what Nominet has done by taking some of the funds that were brought in through the domain name services under dot uk and putting it into a separate or semi-separate organization that is the Nominet fund, and that fund is then being used for projects and to support the community.

So what they have is some kind of Chinese wall between the two sides which are Nominet and the Nominet Foundation, and in fact they might be entirely separate.

I'm not exactly sure of how the system is arranged, and I wonder whether this should be an ICANN foundation. But, you know, maybe that goes - I'm just speaking out loud.

Maybe that goes further than what ICANN is ready to do. And of course, you know, setting a new organization would need employees, would need budget, would need all sorts of things, so that's all. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Olivier. We have in the queue Alex and then Alan. Alex, please go ahead.

Alex Gakuru: Okay yes, thank you very much. Alex speaking. There - when we have ICANN also managing the funds and it's also going to judge like you said who

is going to - whose application is passed through that will definitely be a conflict, managing the same donations that it will also judge on the application.

The second point is that we've seen the people that we are targeting to be donors or people who are going to donate to this project. There is perception that under the entire new gTLD program the total amount of money ICANN will make, and I'm not saying rightly or wrongly, that it's going to be a lot of money.

That's a lot of income to ICANN by the projections that have been made. This leads to the sad point that some donors are uncomfortable. In fact some have - many have stated that actually they don't want to give money to ICANN.

But if it is another organization they are willing to allocate their funds which are meant to help people, but they would not want to be seen to be giving to the institution that is going to collect so much money from the entire program.

So that's something we have to be alive to, and then finally an independent foundation to me still remains the way to go and whether it's going to be independent in terms of - and a fresh outfit, or we look out to institutions where we can house ourselves, you know, we look out like a suggestion we give last time so that we cut down on possible costs.

To me that remains one of the real possible and probably the most cost effective, because I also tend to feel like inasmuch as we may want to have it on the World Bank, it will also be extremely expensive to have this kind of a thing managed by World Bank, kind of an entity because of their usual very high staff cost and overhead. Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alex. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I just wanted to comment on what Olivier said regarding the Nominet example. We of course have talked about foundations for use of the - any windfall profits from auctions and things like that, but in terms of using revenue from regular gTLDs, you know, at a 1% tax or whatever that would go into a separate fund to help this kind of thing.

My recollection is that the GNSO recommendations that were accepted by the Board, the policy recommendations included one that's saying, "Regular gTLD users should not cross-subsidize the new product - the new gTLDs."

So I believe that at least at this stage is not something that's likely to be in - within the books. Obviously it's something ICANN could do in the future should they choose to, but there was a very specific statement not to do that at this point around.

Rafik Dammak: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: So you...

Alan Greenberg: Go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: You can continue. Please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: No, no, I was finished.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. I think you was talking about the auctions that - how to manage the auction that we can have after the first round of the new gTLD process. I think for the foundation it's more - we talked about the foundation I think toward the idea of the \$10 million suggested by (Eric).

And then it's actually just one of the possible income of sources for this foundation, but...

Alan Greenberg: No, I understand that. I was just pointing out that the concept that Olivier pointed out of using essentially a tax on regular revenue could put aside as Nominet has done.

It's something we probably could not do at this point because there was an explicit recommendation not to do that.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, from GNSO Council. Yes, it was one of the how if I - yes, I remember it was one of the reasons that there was a strong opposition from the many Stakeholders Groups in the GNSO Council about that and about the foundation itself as a concept or also using the auctions for that.

Alan Greenberg: Right. The issue of a foundation wasn't an extension there. It was just that the - this program should be self-funding and shouldn't rely on revenue from existing domains to cross-subsidize the new domains.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thank you. So we have Olivier, Andrew and Alex. Please Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Rafik. I think I might have been misunderstood. I never suggested that there would be cross-gTLD subsidies. I'm well aware that this was rejected outright and it's actually specifically for this that I put a question mark over the Nominet system, because the Nominet system with the two organizations effectively bring cash from one side of the organization to the other side of the organization, whilst in the ICANN case I just put a question mark over why would there have been an ICANN foundation if ICANN is not going to put any money into it?

Does it need to be an ICANN foundation? Should it be something that is separate from ICANN? That's the question I asked from everyone. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Olivier. If there is someone who want to reply - to answer?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I - Alan. I was going to reply to that.

Rafik Dammak: Please Alan, go ahead. Sorry Andrew. So it will be Alan...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, and again we're - by talking about whether it's - ICANN foundation is separate from ICANN, something called an ICANN foundation would have to be separate from ICANN in terms of control and management of it, otherwise it wouldn't be able to be classed as an independent foundation.

You know, clearly there's a linkage because the name is there and an intent is there but, you know, I - it's not ICANN. In terms of legalities it would have to be a separate entity just like, you know, the Bill Gates Foundation is not Microsoft or not even Bill Gates. Okay, thank you.

Alex Gakuru: It's still on the same if I could jump in so that the continue - to continue Rafik. Alex, yes.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, just - if you just - yes, if you will to want to reply, yes, so it goes by Andrew.

Alex Gakuru: Yes, sorry Andrew. Yes, this is a follow up to what Olivier and Alan have just said. Okay, even with the stopping of the cross-subsidy which was quite explicit in the resolution, we recall earlier one of the potential donors have been identified last year and we mentioned about them several - during several calls who are assisted TLDs, and we mentioned a good number of them.

Now with that resolution then it's obviously they cannot directly put money into that. I just have a question that which maybe Alan and others could help me understand.

Now that GNSO resolution talked donations from ccTLDs coming into a foundation which we may set up, because then there would be just a regular foundation. I just want to understand how that may play out. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Alex, you mean ccTLD?

Alex Gakuru: ccTLDs yes, various like dot uk, like Nominet, like (kenick), like uno, dot - or all those other...

Rafik Dammak: Yes. As far as I know not all ccTLD operator are giving any kind of fees. It's more for entry fees that they give to the ICANN, so I'm not sure if they said that we can use such fees for the - for foundation.

Andrew Mack: If I can jump in Rafik. This is actually a point of conversation when we were in Nairobi if you remember. And one of the things that the ccNSO - they had a - well I think (Rod) mentioned this.

And if I remember Chris Disspain mentioned this as well that there were a very small number of ccTLDs that were actually contributing money. There were very small numbers of ccTLDs that have formalized relationships with ICANN.

And so I, I mean, I sense that there's not a lot of money there. If I had to guess I would guess that there are two big pots of money, right. One is on the development side, whether that's governments or that's foundations or donors along the lines of the international donors.

And then the other one are corporates, right, and whatever we want to do, I mean, I personally think that if ICANN - all money is spongeable on some

level and we may not - ICANN may not want to set up a quid pro quo that suggests that, you know, that auction proceeds go or that somehow or another the new gTLD process is going to subsidize this activity.

But in point of fact money comes into ICANN, more money, you know, in theory a fair amount of money and it would seem a little crazy that there would be none of it available to support needy applicants.

But if we leave that off to one side and whether or not there should be an ICANN contribution, it still strikes - I think - I still sense that the - that this group believes that any financial arm, any foundation, whatever it is that we were talking about, shouldn't be housed within ICANN.

And one thing that we haven't talked a lot about is how can we incentivize corporate foundations that might be interested in this? What's in it for them and how can we potentially make a good pitch to them, because I think that that's - that is the group that in the short term might have the ability to come forward with some cash. I'd be interested in hearing what people think.

Rafik Dammak: Any comments? Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks Rafik and I was actually going to type it in the chat. It's a very interesting point actually that's been raised. Asking for a voluntary contribution from Registrants when they register a domain in the same manner as when you purchase an airline ticket, you're asked whether you want to make your flight carbon neutral and you can give a few more cents towards making your trip carbon neutral.

Would this something be that flight, because that voluntary contribution may be something that then gets put into the fund, even if it's a few cents here and there?

When you look at the number of domain names worldwide that could help.  
Just a thought. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Olivier. Well it will be more of the Registrant who would do that,  
not the Registrar, no?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: I meant - I said Registrant. Registrant, sorry. Maybe the phone  
line is wrong. Registrant, the person that registers his name. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thanks. Yes, we - many forget about the Registrant in the whole  
ecosystem of the domain names. Okay, any comments? Any suggestion?

Andrew Mack: I have a question about that I guess, which is that I thought we had actually  
discussed this at some point in time and had moved away from it. But the  
mechanics of it are a little tricky because if we decide to do this then we have  
to get large numbers of people to agree to do it simultaneously.

And while I think it's a great idea, I think it's probably not, I mean, part of this  
is about which do we do - which things do we do first, right? And I think in the  
initial phase we still need some sort of a seed grant to get this program up  
and running.

In order to sensitize the world's population that this is something that they  
want to do it might take us a few years. But I don't think it's a bad idea. I just -  
I'm still wondering where that first \$1 million is going to come from.

Rafik Dammak: Olivier, your hand is still raised or you want to answer?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: I'll put my hand down. That's - it remained from before. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: But if you want to comment you can. Okay, you want to comment? Okay, any  
further comments or...?



Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Well if I may just say Rafik, you know, this is the path. The voluntary path is going to be a long path as Alan I think thinks as well, and maybe we should sort of move on.

I don't know if there's other things in the agenda but the subject here is now starting to go a bit in circles.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Olivier. So we still have nine minutes on our call. It's a problem that for the Work Team (TEEF) leaded by Alan and he's not here and I don't think that there is any members of this Work Team present here, so I'm not sure what - so that we will have in the report. Yes, Alan, yes. We could stop early.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it's a good idea.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, for me it's - it would be good because it's almost midnight here but anyway, so if there is no further comments we may, yes, we will adjourn this call for today.

Tony Harris: Thank you Rafik. Thank you everybody. Bye-bye.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thank you. Bye.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Olivier.

Tony Harris: Bye-bye.

Rafik Dammak: Bye.

END