

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

Friday 02 September 2011 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Friday 02 September 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/gns0/gns0-jas-20110913-en.mp3>

On page :

<http://gns0.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 - NCSG

Andrew Mack - CBUC

Krista Papac - RrSG

At-Large:

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

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

Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair

John Rahman Kahn – Individual (AC only due to connectivity issues)

Sebastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

ICANN staff

Kurt Pritz

Rob Hoggarth

Seth Greene

Karla Valente

Glen de Saint Gery

Wendy Profit

Apologies:

Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Cintra Sooknanan - At-Large

Alex Gakuru - NCSG

Dev Anand Teelucksingh - LACRALO

Michele Neylon - RrSG

Gisella Gruber: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Tuesday, the 13th of September. We have Rafik Dammak, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Krista Papac, Alan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond. From staff we have Karla Valente, Rob Hoggarth, (Wendy Profit), (Seth Green) and myself, Gisella Gruber. Apologies today noted from Carlos Aguirre, (unintelligible), Alex Gakuru, Dev Anand Teelucksingh. We're currently trying to join Sebastien Bachollet and Carlton Samuels to the call.

And if I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Avri Doria has also joined the call. Thank you Avri. Over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella. Thank you everybody for joining this call today. So just going to remind you, if you have any update in your SOI or DOI please do so and send that to Glen.

So for today we have a quite light agenda if - compared to what we had before. So first for the - maybe to have updates about the reports, (Seth) and (Walt) wanted to correct and making a form I think and editing and waited for comments and corrections from working group members.

I think (Seth) just can you (talk) update if - so what are the next steps I think that we should have, the latest and final version soon? (Seth)?

(Seth Green): Thank you very much Rafik. Certainly. (Seth Green) for the record. Yes, as Rafik just said, we hopefully are literally just hours away from having it completed. The steps that have to be done at this point are largely formatting and very much editorial.

For example, we each had, as we've discussed in the workgroup, the attendance information for workgroup members. We need to have (Lynn

Latinski) in communications just look at it. She's been kind enough to volunteer to just look at it one last time for formatting and different tasks like that.

Hopefully as I say, it's - we certainly have targeted today as the day that we'll be discussing the final report with anyone who's going to help us with these last steps and then be finished with it.

I think that's everything. The only thing that I suppose I should point out, the only change that - small change that we've noticed that has to be done is since talked - since the last meeting is that in consulting with some of the other staff people regarding the way that attendance is added to such reports, if it's all right with the co-chairs and the workgroup, we're going to certainly list the workgroup members in an appendix to the report and a summary of attendance along with the names.

However, we're going to actually put the details meeting by meeting data on an Excel sheet that we will link to and have on the Wiki much the same way the workgroup decided to do the frequently asked questions.

So if that's all right, we'll proceed in that way. It seems to be the - very much the easier way to do this, to make this kind of data available. I think that's everything Rafik. Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you (Seth). I think for attendance we heard that before in the first milestone report, if I am recalling correctly, and so just for the final report, so the (concierge) which means (Carotone) and me, will make a final review and then we are going to send.

So we don't have so much time. At least I am going tomorrow to send the motion for GNSO council and the deadline is tomorrow. So the reports would be submitted also in time.

I think (Erica) joined us and we have co- I think comments from Alan. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just something akin to what you just said. The GNSO deadline is tomorrow. If the report gets delayed for any reason, and I'm not proposing that it should be, but if it is, some version must be submitted to the GNSO council tomorrow even if it's not a clean, perfect final one. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. I think we will get the final, final (impression) today.

Alan Greenberg: I'm assuming that but I'm giving you contingency.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I was thinking maybe some pressure on (Seth) and (Robert), I think they can do it. Yes (Seth).

(Seth Green): Yes, I was just going to say that Rafik, that I think that that's fine.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes, that's good. Yes, I'm trying to read Cheryl's comments. Okay, I think Cheryl was agreeing what - with what Alan's - with what Seth was saying about the attendance. Okay so (Carlton).

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Rafik, I'm here.

Rafik Dammak: So I think it's now - I'm handing to you this - for chairing this call. And so I think it - we just discussed was just an update about the status of the record and then I think we can go for a discussion about the public comment answer.

Carlton Samuels: Summary.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Okay thank you. Is Karla on the call?

Karla Valente: I'm here, yes.

Carlton Samuels: Hi Karla. So everyone, I'm sorry I got in a little late. We had a little technical snafu. The substantive work this morning is to respond to the public comments that were made on the second report. As you know, we are proposing that this is a part of the (corpus) of documents and information that we provide with this report.

And staffers made a summary of the public comments and we want to look at them and ask for your help in ensuring that the responses are in keeping with the full (in fear) discussion of what transpired as well as any information that you can give. So the summary in Alex's text has been place in the notes (section).

Karla Valente: Yes, (Carlton), this is Karla speaking. I am not going to be able to cut and paste the whole text because there's too much. So I placed it in the Wiki for people to see it now.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. You're not changing the link to the Wiki for that Karla because it's already there.

Karla Valente: Yes, it is already there.

Carlton Samuels: Okay great. Okay, so there are actually four. Karla, could you just go over - give an overview of the basic summaries that you put in because there're summaries about timeliness, general comments and so on, if you could just give some guidance on that.

Karla Valente: So what I basically did was I looked at all of the comments that came in through the public comments and tried to group them by categories of profit because people often talk about the same things. So this is what you see. So in general comments, for example, you will see the comment and then at the very end of the comment, at least in the original documents in italics, you will see the source or the comment of who originated that comment.

So in general - oh maybe - the general comment we will have things like we agree with the working group or we agree with this initial table. We disagree with this initial (table) and this is why. And then we'll talk a little bit about the timetable too.

And then later on, you're going to see a little bit more specific topics, like for example, people will talk about eligibility for support, you know, and also maybe additional alternatives or comments specifically on something the second milestone report had that they agree or disagree.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Karla Valente: Yes, so one way that we can go about that is we can look at, for example, start with general comments and look at the blocks of feedback. So, for example, the first block of feedback that you see here and the general comments you support.

So you have several, you know, parties that said, yes, we support this initiative. And then the second block is on timetable, et cetera. Those blocks are underlined, you know, so you can do it, the group, the discussion based on that and then at the very end of this block, just say, you know, then (Alex) (heard the) response from the working group is, and then you know, give a sentence or two.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, thank you Karla. So the entire draft, the second draft, is on the Wiki and if you go to the landing page, you will see - you can pick up where it starts. You'll see the blocks of comments so can we just agree to go through it block by block? And some of the (unintelligible) kind of comments.

No big thing to it. Under the general comments, the supports, we see the business communities made comments a couple of times. The data's right

there. You see comments from the GAAC. I didn't see anything that jumped out at me.

Would anyone want to say anything against it? Alan, you have your hand up sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, as Evan pointed out in the chat, we're doing this a little bit backwards but nevertheless we have to do it. I don't think we have any choice. This is far too large a document for us to do in one meeting under any reasonable circumstances, all the more so because it's not for some reason summarized very readily to ma- to give us easy things to respond to.

I would suggest that any of the ones that say we support, unless we have changed the item from the second milestone to the final, that we just skip over it and, you know, have a (tacid) thank you to anything you - that is supported that is still there and not spend time even raising the issue in this meeting because an hour, hour and a half is not enough to do this properly, you know, lets make it as speedy as we can and not focus on the ones where people are agreeing with us. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Alan. That's exactly how I think it should go. As I said, most of them are (unintelligible) the kinds of comments. I don't see any great big thing about them. That was the invitation from me to say, yes, that's nice. Move on.

Can I have this response for the support, the ones that are gathered on the support. They're all there. We all believe that we have covered all of them quite well.

This is one area where we think we can say, yes, this is true. Move on. Do we have any objection? Cheryl, you have your hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you (Carlton). Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcri- record. Not an objection but I just want to make sure I was perfectly clear. Listening to

Karla's proposal about how we could perhaps respond to these and the blocking that she has done in the analysis, surely what we should be discussing and therefore, example, this support category is the words (unintelligible) of a response sentence that basically says, you know, insert the text as I'm looking at in the notes ten section on the Adobe Connect room.

The JAS workgroup note the aforementioned comments - public comments - and support for the process. And then just move on and then deal with each of the other sections in turn with the appropriate text so sort of block it up and create a single response to it.

Carlton Samuels: Response, right. Thank you Cheryl. Yes, I think that is the preferred way to go about this. I am inclined to take your text for the support option as good and sufficient.

Anybody will disagree? No disagreement, let's move on. So we are next with timing. This part of it is also in the chat table. Note then (person). Yes, we all agree that the main concern here was that support be ready and included for the first round. This is the government of the response here. And since that is what the (unintelligible) group has full consensus on, can we just say that we are - we agree with these - with (Jas) workgroup take on these comments and the- our own and we thank the respondents for their support of this position? Cheryl, you have comment?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you (Carlton). Cheryl for the record. In general, yes, my rec- my remembrance of the conversations and the discussions we've had in the workgroup, are in synch with most, but not all of these. When I read it, and I'm just trying to find it now, there was a proposal for a different time course for one of the (Jas) workgroup...

Carlton Samuels: (Unintelligible) on the group, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, and I did not have any remembrance but then again perhaps I was in a (fugue) state at the time with the JAS workgroup discussed that or and did agree to it.

So I think we'd have to, in my view, consider removing some wholesale support to some of those. In other words, as they are bundled together, I think there is one at least and there may be more that we do not just have a higher (unintelligible) thank you for your comments, response too.

And the one that sticks to my mind is the - yes, longer application period to develop...

Carlton Samuels: Yes, for developing economies, yes. You I saw - that was you I saw comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, and I actually think that - I don't remember having that discussed, and what I do remember having discussed, if not predominately agreed to by the majority of the JAS workgroup is that we should be treating applications that are JAS sourced versus other sourced once they enter into the actual application procedural phase absolutely equitably. And that's a counterpoint to that.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. Alan, you have your hand up sir. You're next.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I'm a little bit confused. I thought we were doing the section with the underlined timetable hi- heading and the one we've just been discussing is the next section, at least as I read the report.

Carlton Samuels: Well it...

Alan Greenberg: I know it has a time implication but...

Carlton Samuels: Yes, it is but it is actually there. What - I think what Karla did was to underline that to make sure that we see that that as a slight difference in its perception of timing.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: So Cheryl's comment is well...

Alan Greenberg: I'm not arguing with the comment. I'm just argu- trying to understand what we're doing because...

Carlton Samuels: Okay, we...

Alan Greenberg: I withdraw.

Carlton Samuels: All right.

Karla Valente: Yes, I'm sorry Cheryl. This is Karla. Could you please repeat what you believe the response should be?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, I do not believe there is enough JAS workgroup discussion, if any at all let alone agreement on any proposal to change the time course for JAS work group application timing, therefore, that particular one under the timing subset I would not be just doing a wholesale thank you for your comments, we agree with your support of our concepts because I don't believe that was a concept that came out of the JAS workgroup.

I think that's a concept that was proposed by UI (folk) but we, to my knowledge and memory had always said that JAS supported applicants and any other applicant going into the (assistance) should be treated equitably.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. Avri, you've put down your hand. Is that - was that voluntary or you just...

Avri Doria: Yes, it was voluntary. We talked about timing a bunch and we never came to any conclusion and, you know, I think that one almost should get an answer of, yes, we considered timing. We talked about timing. And given the short time and the dependent schedule, you know, there's really nothing we can do about it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that's right.

Avri Doria: Because that's pretty much where we were. I mean, and we couldn't even agree among ourselves whether it should start immediately or it should start as I was at least one to recommend, that it should start at the beginning of the application process and that they should actually submit the application, at least join the (caz) before starting.

And we had some discussion on that and we never even came to an agreement on how that worked and basically, you know, it pretty much left timing up to the staff.

Carlton Samuels: So can I just ask, so you are actually agreeing with Cheryl's modification of the response to say, yes, we thought about it but.

Avri Doria: I - yes, I think I am going further then she did on the - actually I'm not sure I'm agreeing. I'm agreeing that it isn't part of thank you and we love you sentence.

But that I think that I'm disagreeing with, A, that we never talked about it. We did talk about timing, perhaps not the specific suggestion that (to me). We did talk about timing. We weren't able to come to agreement on timing.

And we pretty much left it up to the staff to do the best they could with the timing but, you know, we did not recommend any special timing for JAS (obviously).

Carlton Samuels: Okay, thank you. Alan, you have your hand up sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, if we had discussed this in any substance and I agree with Avri, we didn't, I - my response would've been very clearly that is way out of our scope.

The program is designed around all applicants being processed in parallel and to take some set of applicants and give them a 12 month window essentially says the whole window would have to be 12 months, otherwise, the whole process that has been designed for the last four years would break down.

So I believe that is way out of scope and way out of anything that is likely to happen based on our recommendation and I would've discarded that way, way early so thank you.

Woman: Good answer.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Alan and that is what I was looking for. Yes, I think - I personally believe, I support Alan here. I think it is a little out of scope. I think if you discussed timing in that context, it would drag out everything else and so I think that the response ought to be, in this case the element is as we recognize that that was an issue and there was much discussion but in the end, the (respondents) of opinion is that it is out of scope and any suggestion allowed in this direction would create difficulties.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And impractical. Yes, and impractical.

Carlton Samuels: And impractical. So that is the kind of response I think would be possible here and keep us honest. Olivier, you have your hand up sir. And then Cheryl.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much chair. This is Olivier. I just wonder because from what I've just heard, it looks as though this specific statement is (scrapped) into the final report as a comment that came in. And I just wonder how many other comments might have made it directly to the document rather than being discussed on the - in the working group itself.

And I just wish to ask the staff to make sure that no other comments that were submitted this way did make it into the documents and it's a very good catch from Cheryl. So thank you.

Alan Greenberg: And Olivier, can you clarify - I don't - I see this in the summary of comments. I don't see it in the document.

Man: Yes, that's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's correct Alan.

Carlton Samuels: Well maybe Cheryl you can answer this because I think you're next anyway.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thank you. Yes, I think what we need to be clear about, that what we've got here is a clustering of analysis or summary points from the public comments from the second milestone report.

We are attempting to, in short order, which may not be a good idea, respond to that and give text that can be added into the final report. So we are (seen) to be responding in an appropriate way to show the community that we have considered their comments.

In the grouping Karla's put together for us to consider under the first subject, you know, that was all (higher solo) we'll admit and we can say thank you for supporting the support of the support of the JAS workgroup.

But on the timetable, what I would certainly be proposing is that we say several comments on timing. We've received, list them as Karla's, put them here at the JAS workgroup, you know, blah, blah, blah. Thank you (how I will admit).

And then on the matter of longer application periods for developing economies, this issue was and then insert text from the transcript along the lines of what we've discussed here today because that's the one that is an outlier.

It's sort of like what does - which of these things do not belong with the others and then that's the one.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not - it's Alan. I'm not on my computer. Can I get in the queue please.

Carlton Samuels: Yes Alan. Please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, we've been talking about incorporating this in the final report. We are required by ICANN processes nowadays to review them, to comment on the comments and to publish it one way or another.

I don't think it needs to be included in the report. So let's not try to pretend that we need to delay the report because of this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan, thank you for that. Cheryl here for the record, but the chair's introduction of the reason we were dealing with this in tonight's meeting was so that it could be included in the report. I was (god smacked) and somewhat horrified at that potential because I see it as having to stay up all night with you all. But if it doesn't have to be that way, I'm delighted.

Alan Greenberg: Given we haven't gone through the first few items in a half hour, we're not going to be finished today. Let's accept that and find a way of doing this properly. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Well, can I say that our original thinking was that it - we are including these as part of the body of documents information that is connected to the final report. That is - that's the idea. We don't have to put it in the final report, per se, but certainly we have to be able to point to it as responses to the second milestone report.

Alan Greenberg: We can point to a space on the Web which is not completed yet and hopefully will be within a very short amount of time. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, so just for clarification, this is not something that we have to type and put on the report and add it to. It is something that is - it's the part of a (corpus) of information that needs to be surrounding the final report. So please accept that as the working hypothesis. Avri, you have your hand up.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. Yes, I guess I didn't realize that people thought this was going into the report. It's sort of a norm that there is a final report and that there is something separate that - now maybe some people stick it in an appendix. I don't know. But there are some things separate that discusses how the questions - how the comments were dealt with in the final work.

Absolutely I don't even think we're doing something exceptional in not having it in the final report.

I think the only thing that might be a slight exception is because of the time pressures, the final report is being delivered before these things are published. And so someone may want to make a note of that somewhere, not in the final report.

But somewhere, but I don't even think that the final report needs to point to that, perhaps this is something that is put in the letter that is sent with the final report to the chartering organization.

But you know I don't think there's anything unusual in not including it in the final report. As I say the temple ordering maybe somewhat unusual but you know that's the only thing. Thanks.

Carton Samuels: Thank you Avri. So this is the best effort and let's just continue. So now we are at the possible overall process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hail fellow well met.

Carton Samuels: Hail fellow well met, thank you very much Cheryl. Now this one on the budget is a little bit...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Little more complicated.

Carton Samuels: A little bit more complicated. There are three elements here. The first one is really well you know you got a gift but the gift is not big enough and you want to say so.

The other one is a little bit different, it says exactly what we are saying here, so I don't think we need to belabor it too much. The third one, I don't know what to say about it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm confused.

Carton Samuels: I don't know what to say about that. And that's honest.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually Carlton I would suggest something like so noted thank you is about all we can say to that one.

Carton Samuels: I'm inclined to go along with you on that one Cheryl but let me hear what Alan says and then Avri. Alan you have the floor sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. On the first one I don't think we need to argue about it, we have said it should be more than \$2 million because we said the discount shouldn't be part of the \$2 million.

That significantly augments it so we're agreeing with them in terms of the very last one, the one on the outreach campaign. I assume they're talking about the standard gTLD announcement outreach campaign because I don't think this is a three quarter of a million outreach campaign on the working group's activities.

And this is out of our scope. So do we need to agonize over it more than that?

Avri Doria: I think we (unintelligible).

Carton Samuels: Well you know tell the truth I'm willing to go along with Cheryl's suggestion but let's hear from Avri and then Sebastien. Avri, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: I think our answer is better formed than that. I think that you know first of all we say something wonderful and fluffy like how grateful we are for the board for that gift, that we have seen it as the seed for a fund.

And have made further recommendations to the board on them setting up a foundation that can help create funds and raise more money because yes of course we agree, more money was needed and this wonderful gift serves as a the seed for the fund that is needed.

And I think we did actually respond to this in the report by saying you know create a foundation, get more money. And on the second part that's part of the work of the whatever we called our committee.

That we'll review applications, and we'll review needs for money on how the great gobs of money that the foundation are going to raise can you know help with.

And so I mean I think we did respond. We didn't go back to the board and say give us more, we went back to the board and said thank you very much for the wonderful gift.

Here, use it to grow more. Thanks.

Carton Samuels: Okay. You see Karla there are notes, quick response there in the chat. Sebastien you have the - let's look at that while Sebastien goes and see if we need to augment it. Sebastien you have the floor sir.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, thank you, it's not to comment on the decision of the board but the third bullet point it's nothing with this working group discussion, it must have been put in the comment for the communication campaign, not at all here.

And just to be accurate that's not true that budget for the communication campaign is just this amount. This amount is for one part and importantly a lot of people are taking that because it was request for proposal for this part of the communication plan.

It's not to say that there is enough money for this communication, remember that this figure is a wrong one for the overall communication. But by the way I want to repeat that it must have been put in to the comment for the communication plan in July. Thank you.

Carton Samuels: Thank you Sebastian. So we're looking at Karla's response in this area, she just penned a response there from what we've been saying.

I think it works for me. Avri I see you saying it works for you too. Do we have any other comment and take note of Sebastien's comment there especially on the last bit.

Maybe we can work a little bit of that in. Cheryl is okay for the draft Karla has proposed, thank you Cheryl. Okay, I think we're pretty covered.

Okay, the next comment in the chat and - is the one about campaign outreach geography. I personally think this one is a little bit out of scope for our work group.

We've spoken to the fact that there should be an outreach, but specific to how the outreach should work and the outreach planning we didn't think we should. And this one is really more about nuts and bolts of it, specific suggestion.

Would you agree? Avri you have your hand up.

Avri Doria: Yes. I tend to agree that we can call it out of scope and it's certainly something that you know we wouldn't have been in time to make a recommendation for anyway.

So I think that between scope and timing this - that you know thank you. Thank you but no thanks essentially. Is that - can that be another one of our hair on sale well as one and thank you but no thanks is another.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

Carton Samuels: Cheryl you would agree with that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Carton Samuels: Thank you. Alan you have you - oh you put it down sir.

Alan Greenberg: No, I didn't have my hand up.

Carton Samuels: Okay I must be seeing double here.

Alan Greenberg: Not intentional, nothing I did on my keyboard anyway.

Carton Samuels: Not to worry sir, I might have just glanced away and came back and saw something. All right, so any other comments on this?

Can we then go to Karla, thank you Karla, I think we have that covered, it's good enough, good and sufficient. Can we have comments on the next bit? Before that there was an ALAC GAC statement.

It's left the room at the minute but it's about best practices. Might I make a suggestion here that says only these best practices, we did mention that we would provide information and general ICANN help, we recommended to help users through the process in terms of application assistance and so on.

Could we in response to this, do you think it would be useful to refer to that proposal of the work group and just leave it at that? Could we - question, could we embrace this comment as part of our recognition that the support applicants might need even help with applications and application help and so on and therefore as part of that best practice, set up documents and templates might be one way to address this.

Can we - would you agree?

Alan Greenberg: Let's phrase the question does anyone disagree and if no one does we can move on.

Carton Samuels: Well does anyone disagree with that response?

Karla Valente: HI Carlton this is Karla, I don't disagree, I just would like for you to repeat for me please what do you want to see in the - as a response.

Carton Samuels: Okay, on the best practices, what I wanted to say is that the working group recognizes that there would be help, extensive help is required and part of it is how to including application help in writing the application itself.

So we embrace the concept of having templates of best practices made available to guide the process.

Karla Valente: Thank you.

Carton Samuels: So now we are at applicant training. And it's there in the chat. Alan you have your hand up sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just to go back to the previous one, I'm a little troubled saying we embrace the fact that there should be templates and stuff implying that ICANN should be doing it.

ICANN is posing the questions, I don't think ICANN's job is to recommend what the answers be. So I think it needs to be framed of you know we support the concept but we don't believe it's ICANN's responsibilities to do that.

Otherwise ICANN is telling you what the answers are to the questions, why should we bother answering them, asking them?

Carton Samuels: So noted sir, Avri you have your hand up.

Avri Doria: Yes, I think that this one also, I mean to go further on what Alan said that you know the report does propose that community members with skills, talents, wherewithal and whatever do come up with ways to help.

And these are some excellent suggestions and you know we hope that the authors will be involved in helping the community develop such assistive instruments.

Alan Greenberg: That's as far as we can go I think.

Avri Doria: Right. Did we say anything about - I'm forgetting, I know stuff was proposed and stuff, did we end up saying anything about continuity instruments?

Alan Greenberg: Only that the period should be shortened I believe.

Avri Doria: Right, okay, we never got to the point of like supporting the registrars insurance fund or anything. You know we can also perhaps point that on the continuity instrument there have been other suggestions in the community at large dealing with process like the community instrument discussion and you know the JAS group is supportive of all attempts.

But again it was not seen as a JAS only issue, but a much broader issue for the community. And we did, I mean that - because we did have various proposals that we talked about ad nauseum or maybe just at length.

Alan Greenberg: Ad nauseum.

Avri Doria: Huh?

Alan Greenberg: Ad nauseum.

Avri Doria: Okay. We should do this, we should do that. We should do the other thing. But in general I think that that the general consensus to use a non-deferring term was that this was a larger topic, that's just us. And so we made the easy recommendation of shorten it for these guys.

Man: Thank you Avri.

Carlton Samuels: Karla has put something in the chat there that is attempting to collate the (unintelligible). Avri if she hears could you comment on that and see if it's good and sufficient?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Carlton Samuels: Yes Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: It is a good start I think, a couple more words could be added about Varia's suggestions having been made in the report of types of community aid. And I would actually say, adding something and as community members encourages you to, you know, help with these materials insofar as you can, or help, you know, or generalize it but, to go beyond that...

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Avri Doria: Because that is something that we are recommending that the community come to the aid of Jazz, I mean, of Jazz qualified applicants in the non-financial assistive mechanisms - assistance mechanisms.

Carlton Samuels: Okay so...

Avri Doria: Specifically say that would be good.

Carlton Samuels: Okay so we definitely (unintelligible) the community could from that point on we just add it to the sentence to what Karla's added here.

Karla Valente: Okay so I'm going to put the new sentence in the chat, I'm going to beautify the grammar and everything a little bit later, just so we move forward.

Avri Doria: Yes, right no, I think that this is Avri again, I mean, I think it'd be great, and then we'll probably need to do a walkthrough, you know, of the answers at,

you know, on lists, and at another time, but I think, I don't think that Karla needs to wordsmith everything at this point.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Are there any more comments in this area?

Can we now move to the second, the whole bunch of them on community awareness and developing economies? This one kind of pulled together all of the things it says earlier, you know, it's good that you're helping with people have to know that you are willing to help in the first instance, and so community awareness and the government of most of these responses is that it takes longer to make the community aware in those communities that we wish to help.

That's how I'm reading it here.

Woman: (Unintelligible) that community awareness and developing economies, is that the one?

Carlton Samuels: My comment will be as it might take a little longer but we don't know how long, but we're insisting that it starts and we work with what we have from the first. It's going to be multiple tiered, we're assuming, and we're going to go on based on what we have. The timing itself of this informs our response and we are not supposing that this going to be a perfect awareness campaign but something along the lines.

Alan, you had your hand up?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I think we need to simply say that we're aware of the issue but we did not feel it's within our scope or ability to delay the overall program. And, you know, that's constraint on us. I don't think there's much more that we can say on that. And in terms of the last paragraph, they're saying that we should

define a final cost, and we have actually done that exclusively with regard to the fees. So (unintelligible) can go on.

Karla Valente: I'm sorry Carlton, this is Karla speaking, where are we?

Woman: Yes, where are we?

Carlton Samuels: We are at communications awareness in developing economy.

Karla Valente: So we didn't do the (unintelligible) training? That comes before?

Woman: (Unintelligible) training.

Carlton Samuels: I'm sorry. I skipped over that, sorry about that folks.

Woman: But we're almost finished communications awareness in developing economy, so maybe we should finish?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, can we just finish the communication awareness. I am pretty much (unintelligible) same thing, I'm in the same frame of mind as Alan and could we have any other responses?

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri.

Carlton Samuels: Avri go ahead please.

Avri Doria: I think though there's a almost a stock answer that perhaps Karla can craft on any of these outreach things, training things, non-financial support things. Is something like, you know, part of the Jazz solution rests on the, you know, good graces of the community to help in outreach, in assistance mechanisms, in training, in whatever, and as part of the, you know, what did we call it, the staff clearinghouse on non-financial assistance, we encourage, you as a knowledgeable member of the community to help put together proposals for

outreach, community, and whatever, that can be done by the members of the community, as forms of non-financial support for these applicants.

Obviously something said with greater grace than what I just blurted, but basically to take these answers and make them an appeal for, don't just comment, come and help. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Cheryl, you have your hand up, you have the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Carlton. (Unintelligible) over the transcript record. Just a minor modification proposal to what Avri was just saying. That's with particular reference to what the Pacific Island Chapters of (Unintelligible) which of course is a at-large structure of AP Rallo with some 38-member countries involved in it, so a significant part of the Asia Pacific space at least in our view.

And I think Avri, what you said in terms of text to be tarted up is fine, but I think (unintelligible) and to some extent other parts of at least AP Rallo, and the Island in its whole states possibly would fall into line if they would like to see a clear commitment and facilitation by ICANN of these activities in their local and regional areas and activities. Which is slightly different to the come and help, it's work together as opposed to come and help. Just a thought there.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. So if you look at the text that Karla's put in the quick response text that Karla's put in the chat, what Cheryl is saying is that we could add a clause to this which really says, you know, we are encouraging community, we understand that these are needs, they are non-financial and by-and-large with the weights and training of these issues we fully accept community help in creating the conditions to make this possible in helping. But we can also say the facilitation - we can recognize the facilitation rule by ICANN in this. I believe that's what Cheryl is saying.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Cheryl here for the record, what Karla's put that perhaps, marrying those sentences together and sort of giving them a little bit of prettying up looked fine. I think the point is that it needs to be a partnership interaction not just a one way in either direction.

Woman: And that's pretty much what was recommended in the report.

Woman: Yes, right.

Woman: That the staff was going to build an environment for helping this to happen. The whole clearinghouse notion is a place to form partnership.

Carlton Samuels: Cheryl is just saying that we need to point that out in the line, and I agree. With a little work, we can get it...

Okay, so can I ask you, now we started out for things like training and (unintelligible) and all that should give a template of how we could respond to that. Would you think it'd be sufficient guidance for us to not go back to the applicant training issue?

Avri Doria: I think so, I think that, you know, again, it gets crafted to say, you know, yes. Having a group of experts build a program of volunteers is a wonderful idea, lots of wonderful ideas are needed and that's what the clearinghouse and non-financial support is all about, so yes. I mean each one of these canned answers gets customized, but yes, I think it's the same answer.

That's what we mean by the non-financial support and the Jazz working group isn't in the position to determine all the possible ways in which, you know, the community can help what we have proposed is a mechanism by which there can be bottom up discovery of both the need and the capabilities. Blah, blah, blah.

Karla Valente: I got the blah, blah, blah.

Carlton Samuels: The answer to that, you're best effort in interpretation Karla.

I'm sure Avri don't mind. So we're done with that.

The next two, and this, I'm going to need guidance here on this, protection for Islands and other small states, culture groups, (unintelligible) access. They're actually parts of the same color, I'm thinking, and essentially, it's bouncing the rubber, to me, because that was one of the main reasons for developing this work group is to encourage and support equity of access.

Would you not agree and therefore is it one of these things that we can say the work group is fully cognizant of and essentially it's output is, the intent of the output is to ensure equity of access in like manner?

Alan you have your hand up sir?

Alan Greenberg: Yes our charter very, very clearly said do all of this but do not delay the program. So, you know, saying that a study should be undertaken in prior to doing something which would delay the whole program was clearly very much out of our scope explicitly so although we appreciate the sentiment, we do not feel this is something that we could do other than what we have already done of encouraging people to help and spread the word.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Alan. Any other comment on this?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, please go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would just like to extract out and perhaps focus on separately the final sentence from (unintelligible) contribution, guided training, in July, and that's the part that says the work groups should consider financial assistance to

those who are not able seek redress through channels particularly if legal costs of stakeholders are prohibitive.

It's kind of out of scope, we really should just say so noted, but it's also a matter that I guess would concern many of those who are interested in equity and the fundamentals of why a Jazz applicant support and work group was started in the first place maybe that's something that needs to be noted and put on the next steps to do. Or let's not take it off the agenda type proposal, I'm just a little concerned that that one hasn't been chewed over properly and we as a workgroup shouldn't just dismiss it as trivial. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, could you read that last sentence again because I think I have an answer but I'm not sure I got it properly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Will's specific sentence as written in the analysis presented in the Adobe Connect room by Karla so it may not be a direct quote. Dated 29 July, 2011 is, "The workgroup should consider financial assistance for those who are not able to seek redress through channels particularly if legal costs to stakeholders are prohibitive."

And that was in reference to the cultural - the unique symbols either in geographical...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...or text format.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you that...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...for cultural groups.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you. I see nothing stopping the review panel from allotting contingent legal support if necessary to applicants. So I think that's...

Carlton Samuels: Well we did embrace the fact that...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I think that's something that the review panel could in fact do. We have not specified in any detail at all what kind of financial support it could use the \$2 million plus for. And this I think is something that it could decide to do should it decide so it's out of our scope but it's certainly within the scope of the review panel I believe.

Karla Valente: I'm sorry, Carlton, this is Karla. I'm a bit lost where we are.

Carlton Samuels: We are talking - at the cultural groups, equity of access, the final comment in that group was from Will Tibben and it refers to a situation where there might be challenges to a stakeholder group that's applied for - a disadvantaged group because of trademark and other concerns there might be legal challenges. And the question is what would we do about that.

It was recommending that some support be granted. And Alan gave a response that I think would cover it.

Karla Valente: Alan, would you mind to repeat that for me?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I was saying the review group - panel, I don't remember what we called it - the SARP or something...

Karla Valente: The SARP.

Alan Greenberg: ...could decide to allocate contingent or make contingent allocation of funds to offset legal costs should there be challenges. We have not specified what kind of financial support the SARP could allow for in the \$2 million it has available to it - or \$2 million plus.

And contingent allocation of legal defense funds is something it certainly could decide to do. But we're not ruling it out; we've allowed for it. But it's a decision of the - of how to best allocate the resources better.

Karla Valente: Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Then other comments in this area? None, okay. I think...

Alan Greenberg: By the way are we targeting 90 minutes for this call?

Carlton Samuels: Yes we are, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you.

Carlton Samuels: So we are - I think we could just accept Alan's proviso and move on. I think it's sufficient. So we're moving to the next set now and they're not there in the chat yet. And to begin with lowering barriers for developing economies.

Karla Valente: Yes, so hold on I'll put it there.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Tijani has his hand up.

Carlton Samuels: Oh I'm sorry I'm on another page; let me go back. Tijani, I'm sorry, sir, I was away from the...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you. Okay, thank you Carlton. It's not a question or a comment about what we are doing now the comments but it is to - the question of Alan was really right because I want to speak about the final report; we have to finish it today. So there is a very small (unintelligible) problems or very small things that we have to fix before finishing this call, that's all.

Carlton Samuels: Okay Tijani, we will see if we can get to that in a little bit.

Avri Doria: Comments - sorry, hand up. To respond to that if we do do that and we do go back to the final report we probably need to try and get our editors back...

Carlton Samuels: Back online...

Avri Doria: ...because we wouldn't want to do that without...

Carlton Samuels: Well, yes, that would be - I forgot about that.

Avri Doria: ...then here. Right.

Karla Valente: I can...

Avri Doria: Right, okay. So just wanted to bring that up.

Carlton Samuels: I forgot about that, Avri, you're absolutely right.

Karla Valente: Yes, I can try - I'm trying to reach them now.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, we would need to have them. And, Tijani, please understand that we are only taking this on the basis that it would not make any substantive changes to...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Sure.

Carlton Samuels: ...what exists.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Sure.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, thank you, sir.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Sure.

Carlton Samuels: So we see the lowering of barriers to developing economies in the chat right now. And what this is saying is that yes it's all right that you have, you know, financial support reduction, financial support and you give fellowships for people from developing economies. But there is a raft of other initiatives that are recommended here.

And if you look on some of them you will see that they're extending some of the ideas that are included in the report. They are mainly about use - fund usage. And my response to that is that some of these we would - we recognize that there are all kinds of areas that you could give support and we didn't name all of them.

And so I think we could - well let me just ask colleagues here if you get the sense that you share this sense of what this is saying with me and therefore would give a response. Anyone.

Okay so I see no hand up so I'm presuming that everybody agrees with me that they - the things that are listed here only itemizes, delineates and be more expressive of some of the ideas that we - it embraces the concept of providing support other than those that are listed in the report that are nonfinancial here that might have financial implications.

So we think we can say here safely that the work group recognizes that it - the list of kinds of support that it is recommending is not exhaustive and

where the panel or the foundation finds it fit they can extend support in all of these areas that are mentioned. Would that be sufficient?

Karla Valente: So I will craft that better, Carlton, and send back to the group. I can also work on some of the other answers. I believe that Rob and Seth are already on the call.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Karla Valente: So they can help with additional things that were needed for the final report. I can try to give some answers to this summary and send to the working group. I just will not be able to do everything this week because I'm working on the candidate support Web page.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. There is - Karla, let me just put to the group; it's clear from what we see here that we're not going to get through on the next 15 minutes all of these responses. What Karla suggested as the working hypothesis is to start and kind of frame some responses.

And I'm sure she's going to be guided by the comments that have gone on before especially the ones that Avri and Cheryl have made about how we respond to them. And if it's agreed we can just - I see Avri has her hand up...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: ...let me just finish the sentence, Avri. If it's agreed we can then take that route with the guidance and move on and spend the next 15 minutes dealing with the suggestion from Tijani. Avri, you have your hand up, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Yes, I'm totally agreeing I'm just saying that I and perhaps some of us usual suspects that always have something to say can be available to Karla as

she's doing it to, you know, give her any help of what we would have said if this meeting had gone on for another six hours.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Avri.

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: I'm sure that Karla will appreciate that generous offer of assistance. So I am presuming we are all agreed that we are going to take that route; we are going to allow Karla to work as best that she can in formulating some answers based from the guidance earlier given. Avri and others will be available to help for clarification. And we can move on. No objections? Thank you.

Tijani, are you there, sir? Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Do you hear me?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Yes I'm hearing you now.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay very good.

Carlton Samuels: So we want to move on in the next 14 minutes to take in account the things that you wanted to bring in as part of the final report. Can you go ahead and bring them to the floor, sir?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you. First of all at Paragraph 65 there is a typo - a syntax error - moment - 65 if I - well - for in support candidate - for a support candidate so there is an extra N here.

Seth Green: Yes thank you, we actually have seen that. Thank you, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay this is at Paragraph 68, 66 before - 66, yes, 66b - no, no, 60 - moment, I am sorry. Okay it's 66b, yes. We have...

Carlton Samuels: B as in boy?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, we put the link to the GAC and ALAC recommendation for the bundling, it's very good, but we didn't do in the Paragraph 20 for the \$47,000. So we have either to put it in 20 or to remove it from 66. Okay? The mention - if we have to give the link to the recommendation...

Carlton Samuels: Okay, I see what you're saying.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: ...of the ALAC and GAC...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You see it? Okay. So...

Carlton Samuels: Yes. I think we can put the link there too.

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: I would prefer that it does that way.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay so now going to 68, 68b - 68 - I have 68b, yes. This is - sorry to - okay. Here we are not giving a recommendation. We are telling things but they are not useful for the board neither for anyone. We say that we prefer that but the board said that and we asked the board to tell us about they will comment on our report etcetera.

So I don't think it is recommendation that we have to keep it here even if it is substantial but I am not discussing the substance I am saying that we cannot

say - we cannot give this as a recommendation. It is not recommendation.
Initially near consensus but the etcetera, etcetera. You see the - what I mean?

At the end we say nothing; we say that the JAS working group - the board
said they recommend on the JAS criteria, etcetera, etcetera. So I don't think it
is a good thing to put it in our report like this.

Seth Green: Tijani, you're talking about 68b, correct?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: B...

Carlton Samuels: B as in boy. A governmental or parastatal institution...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes, B first bullet point.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Seth Green: Initially with a near consensus...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes, about this, yes.

Seth Green: So the workgroup would like that removed, that bullet?

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: We have either to say - we have either to be silent about the question or to
give a recommendation.

Seth Green: Oh okay would you like to give a specific edit that you'd like added, Tijani,
specific wording that you'd like changed?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I don't have it now in mind but we can think about it. The essential...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Well the way it's structured here, you know, is that we are not giving a recommendation; we are silent on it.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: If you put it like this you are not silent; you are addressing the question and that's all.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I have my hand up.

Carlton Samuels: I am sorry, Alan, I was on the page; I wasn't seeing it. But, yes, sir, you can go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I think we cannot be silent on it. It was an explicit recommendation made in the - in the GAC comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: I think we need to comment on it. And besides in this particular wording we are leaving it open to further delineation if a GAC working group, you know, comes back with helping. We're making a recommendation - what we're saying here is we are not rejecting the concept we just could not come to closure on it. There's still time left before the program is formally announced...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...can be refined and I think that's an important...

Carlton Samuels: ...exactly how I see it.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: And I think that's an important statement for us to say. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. That's a better way to say it but that's how I saw it there. I - we raised the issue, we left it, we are saying the issue is still open and we left it at that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I think we cannot be silent on it; it was too important. A difference between us the GAC in our second milestone report to be completely silent. And we are - we're not rejecting the concept we're just saying we couldn't come to closure on it...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Yes, that's what I'm saying; it's open.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: And that's how it's left; it's left open.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: And does the group...

Carlton Samuels: And that's precisely how I think it should be left, open. I think it's politically wise to leave it open. We're not rejecting it, we're simply saying - we're noting it, it's there, we understood it, it's open.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Carlton?

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Tijani, you have your hand up.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay yes. I think that this is the report of the working group; not the report of the working group plus GAC. So we accepted the comment of the GAC and we need to give a recommendation according to all of that as we accepted the comment of others and yet we gave a recommendation. So the working group have to give its recommendation about this point. I don't think it's wise to put it to - to let it open. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Tijani. Avri, you have your hand up and then Alan.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think in the best traditions of diplomacy when something is perhaps beyond - and I want to say beyond our scope but I don't mean scope in the ICANN sense - but beyond our pay grade in a sense that it is best to acknowledge and - to acknowledge the comment and move on.

I mean, there's a very long diplomatic thing for when you've got something that is, you know, to other organizations, to governments, to whatever that are having a discussion on something you acknowledge the comment but you don't, you know. And so I see no harm in doing that.

And at this point since we haven't resolved how to deal with it up to now I don't see us being able to respond to it. So unless we can find something else in the document that already answers it as I think Alan was kind of indicating I think, you know, it's best to say we acknowledge the comment and move on. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Avri. Alan, you have your hand up, sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I...

Carlton Samuels: And Seth, I'll come back to you.

Alan Greenberg: I agree with what Cheryl and Evan said in the chat that she doesn't agree to removal or remain silent. Evan pointed out it's also an ALAC comment. Certainly people are talking about what the workgroup decided; this member of the workgroup feels that it's important to keep the placeholder there and leave it open. So, you know...

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: ...there are several people who feel comfortable with the wording there. We, you know, given time we might refine the wording slightly but we don't have time.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Seth, you have your hand up, sir, you want to say something here?

Seth Green: Carlton, thank you very much. I just wanted to make sure that if any change is needed that Rob and I explicitly know what it is and if not that we explicitly - if you don't mind - know that before the topic is left. So as of right now I believe you're saying that there's no change to be made to this bullet?

Carlton Samuels: I don't see - this is my - my personal opinion; I don't see a change, I'm sorry, that is going to be made. I think it is politic to leave it as-is for several reasons raised here by Alan and others. Cheryl is agreeing with me. Evan is agreeing with me.

Alan Greenberg: And Tijani has agreed also so...

Carlton Samuels: Okay, great. So we move on. Thank you, Tijani, appreciate it. You have another...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, right now no. That's okay.

Carlton Samuels: Okay thank you very much. It's 9:26 by my time here. We have another four minutes.

Alan Greenberg: Maybe a quick review of what's planned for the - for the Webinar.

Carlton Samuels: The Webinar...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Most of you would have seen the Webinar email that came out from Glen to the list. If you haven't just for show we're going to have the Webinar on the...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you haven't you've been hiding under a rock somewhere.

Carlton Samuels: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, Carlton, I said if you haven't seen it you've been hiding under a rock somewhere; it's come out to every list possible.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, indeed, but since one of our staff people still thought it was Friday as of late yesterday maybe we need to say the words.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Agreed.

Carlton Samuels: Yes we are going to have the Webinar on the 19th. And it's going to be 1200 UTC and 2200 UTC; sessions are duplicates. What you need to note is that we will - how it's going to work is that we're going to use the Adobe Connect and the AudioBridge. We are going to go with a set of slides that is being finalized as we speak. And the slides are intended to answer some very specific questions and the questions are listed - about five or so questions.

We will moderate as it were - the co-chairs will moderate as it were this Webinar. We are going to depend on expert help and advice from Avri and Alan. They were gracious enough to volunteer. And...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...volunteers.

Alan Greenberg: Some of us don't quite remember that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think they were volunteered as opposed to volunteered.

Alan Greenberg: Not even with the good grace of doing it while I was on the line.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hey, look, you leave...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: My bad, Alan, my bad. My bad; I should have told you. My bad, I take that.

Alan Greenberg: I think it's called conscripted not volunteered at that point.

Carlton Samuels: Conscripted - all right, conscripted. Anyway the idea is that we are going to use the time to answer some very focused questions and we are going to take as many questions as we can and hopefully with Alan and Avri's help we will have enough institutional memory to give as much information as we possibly can about the process and about the output that we have accomplished. So there you have it.

Any other comment?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I have my hand up, it's Alan.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay...

Carlton Samuels: I have to switch back and forth.

Alan Greenberg: Some of you may know that I'm not the greatest fan of our simultaneous translation on conference calls but I support Olivier's comment that he just made on the mailing list that he is rather disappointed that this particular call is not being translated into Spanish and French. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: So noted. We did note that staff has said that it was not possible to do. This was going to be in English only.

Alan Greenberg: I understand. And he's expressing disappointment and I am echoing that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'd like to weigh in on that...

Alan Greenberg: Not that it's worth anything but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...as well. I think the importance of this is - I know this is very much a briefing from the information interchange of the GNSO Council and members of the ALAC as chartering organizations. But it would have value as a wider community resource. So that is kind of disappointing.

Alan Greenberg: For that moment as a public relations effort to say we understand the issue.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...ICANN.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed.

Carlton Samuels: Yes I do see Olivier's comments on the list and, yes, we tend to share that in general but we note the...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I was just noting it; I wasn't doing anything else.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. So thank you, sir. Thank you, Oliver, for so noting. You know our constituency is very touchy on that matter. All right I think - it's 9:31, I think I'm going to call this to a close. The plan now is for the final edits to be made to the report.

We will have a closed look at it myself and Rafik working with Rob and Seth. Once that is done we will transmit it to the GNSO and the ALAC. And we will, after the GNSO and the ALAC has made their requests, ask staff to publish it for comments. That is how we're going to go here forward.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Do we have any meetings scheduled in the immediate future?

Carlton Samuels: Not after the Webinar. Are you suggesting we have one?

Alan Greenberg: I was asking an information question; I wasn't stating an opinion. I believe we have said this group has some other tasks afterwards but I wasn't trying to influence the timing I was just asking for information.

Carlton Samuels: Rafik you - yes, sir, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: At least the Council - Friday's consulate so the next meeting if we can say that it will be the Webinar and then we decide. I understand that Alan is asking about that money or guidebook for JAS support applicants...

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Rafik Dammak: My understanding that is work that will be started by ICANN staff and then the working group...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: ...will review it, that was all.

Alan Greenberg: Okay so what we're saying is if any meetings are scheduled they'll be announced and Doodled or something like that sometime but we don't need to put anything on our calendar today. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: That's right.

Avri Doria: Right.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Avri, you have your hand up; can we take this last comment?

Avri Doria: Yes, it's the word Doodled that jumped out at me. I think that we should keep these slots open but not reserved so that if there is a meeting it can be called in the Tuesday or Friday slot with several days notice as opposed to going through a Doodle exercise. So it was just the - and Doodled...

Alan Greenberg: Fine.

Avri Doria: ...that made me jump on. I recommend we keep the slot open.

Carlton Samuels: That's good, Avri, good observation, good catch. I think that would work for me too. I think everybody knows this time slow...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: ...so we could do that.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Carlton, I think I can answer that. I think that we may not have two call per week, just one call and maybe one hour and half Tuesday. So it just to - we'll figure out and but we will keep those slots to avoid any problem with overlapping with other ICANN working groups. Already difficult to find a time slow.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it's Alan. I would suggest we may even want to tentatively keep the Tuesday one on the books to - in case there is anything we need to respond to that's raised during the Webinar and cancel it if...

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...indeed there's nothing.

Carlton Samuels: All right, wonderful. Thank you all for your suggestions. Thank you all for showing up for this effort. I think we made some progress here. I want to thank you all profusely for the time you've taken to help us get through this.

We will see you on the list and if not before on the Webinar.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, chair.

Carlton Samuels: Take care. Bye-bye.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Seth Green: Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for joining today's conference. You may disconnect now. Thank
you.

((Crosstalk))

END