**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)**
**TRANSCRIPT**
**Friday 15 April 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 15 April 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. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20110415-en.mp3

On page ;
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
GNSO
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair
Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council
Andrew Mack – CBUC


ALAC
Cintra Sooknanan – At-Large
Tijani Ben Jemaa -  AFRALO - At Large
Alex Gakuru – NCSG
Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair
Alan Greenberg –  GNSO Liaison – NARALO
Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) – At Large
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison -  APRALO
Dev Anand Teelucksingh – At Large
Dave Kissoondoyal - (AFRALO) – At large

Elaine Pruis – MindandMachines
John Rahman Kahn  - Individual
Alain Berranger - Individual

**ICANN staff**
Karla Valente
Glen de Saint Géry

**Apologies:**
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison -  APRALO
Carlton Samuels – LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair
Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Fabien Betremieux – Individual
Tony Harris –ISPCP

Alice Munyua – GAC

Tracy Hackshaw – GAC

Baudoin Schombe - At–Large


Coordinator:     The conference call is now being recorded.


Gisella Gruber-White:      Thank you, (Tim). Would you like me to do a roll call Rafik?


Rafik Dammak:  Yes, please.


Glen de Saint Gery: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the 15th of April. And on the call we have Rafik Dammak, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alex Gakuru, Cintra Sooknanan, Carlos Aguirre, (John Ramancan), Elaine Pruis, Evan Leibovitch, Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, (Dev Anand Teelucksingh), Dave Kissoondoyal.

And for staff we have Karla Valente and myself Glen de Saint Gery. And we have apologies from Michele Neylon, Carlton Samuels, and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Have I missed anybody from the call, or have I missed somebody who had sent apologies?

Hearing nothing, may I remind you please to say your name before you speak for the transcription?

We have just been joined by Andrew Mack. And then over to you. Thank you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Glen.

Hello everybody. Thank you for joining me today call. So as we discussed last call about that if all or update (unintelligible) or any kind of - not to be sent to the Board. And we were still discussing about that, and we had volunteers working on drafting a new proposal.

I think there was some progress and also updates about - and also about that request (unintelligible) get some discussion and I think in GNSO and also in the ALAC. For that, I think maybe if Olivier is in the call, maybe he can give us update about that. And then we can commence the discussion.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes. Can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh. Fantastic. Thank you. As I don't want to spend too much time on this because I think we've spent much time going in circles in

the last call. The bottom line is that a request was received through an informal channel for an update on what the group was doing.

This has triggered a chain of events because it actually goes against the charter of the group itself, where there is a specific clause that says that any reporting of results will be directly to the GNSO Council and also to the At Large Advisory Committee - to the ALAC. And those chartering organizations will then provide information to any third parties that wish to have information on the progress, et cetera, et cetera.

So I have written an email to Peter Dengate Thrush to advise him of this fact. And in light of the fact that we've got so much work in this group, I would imagine it's going to be a real diversion to write a status report. I have just said that the progress was going - coming along well.

I have asked as one of the - as the representative of one of the chartering organizations, that we be given a timeline of when the final report should be required. Because, we have to start working backwards from the time that the Board requires the final report.

There is hearsay that the Board might require a report before the Board retreat, but rather than having hearsay and working on who said what and wasting time on that, I'd rather have a clear statement from the Board as to when they require the work to be finished and completed and the report to be written, and then we can work backwards on this. Because obviously for the report to reach the Board, it would have to be going through two separate channels which I believe don't work in series. They work in parallel.

So the GNSO Council is one channel, the ALAC is another channel, but both of these chartering organizations have procedures that they need to follow so as to actually vote the report.

And so, that takes time. The GNSO Council and the ALAC do not meet on a daily basis. They meet on a certain amount of time and they also need to leave their members enough time for them to be able to read the report. And so, we really have to work backwards as to when does this group, the JAS group needs to have a report ready.

At the moment, there is no date because we don't have a data at which the Board needs to get the report by. This will probably be thought out in the next few days, and hopefully that part we have a set date by which the work needs to be completed.

I'm open for questions. Thank you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Olivier.

Any comments? I thought that Elaine raised her hand, but - okay, Andrew. Please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Thanks Rafik, and thanks Olivier. When we spoke in San Francisco, and based on the conversations that I had heard, I was under the impression that the group had agreed on a date when we were going to try to have something available, and that that date was before the Board Retreat. So I think it was the 17th of May would be working date that we had been working off of, if I recall correctly.

I know that that date has been -- I think it's that date -- has been referenced a number of times in our conversations. So, that was what - at least to myself that was what I was expecting we were working off of in terms of a target.

Agreed that were not - you know, we have - we've done a lot of work this week - an incredible amount of work, but also we're not in a position where we necessarily have something that we want to send along in any kind of a formal way. But am just under the impression that we did have dates. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:     Rafik, may I answer this?

Rafik Dammak:  Yes. Please.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:     Thank you. Thanks for this (precision). It's good to know that a date was discussed. I have not seen it anywhere in any of the documentation. I think we need to make sure that this date is suitable with the Board and that it gives the Board enough time for them to read the documents before they go on their Retreat.

And as you mentioned, there were discussions, but this work cannot go with just discussions. It needs to actually be properly tabled and properly recorded so as for anyone to be able to come into it and say exactly - and find out what the status is. That's the problem with it. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak:  Thank you. (Unintelligible).

Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry?

Rafik Dammak: Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh, well I just wanted myself to mention that Olivier's letter I've actually forwarded to the JAS mailing list, so you can see exactly what was said.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Evan.

Is Elaine still (unintelligible) or not?

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Elaine? Still there?

Elaine Pruis: I'm here. Are you saying Elaine?

Rafik Dammak: Elaine. Yes.

Elaine Pruis: Okay. Sorry, you sound like you're under water, so it's hard to (understand) if you're saying Evan, or Alan, or Elaine.

(Unintelligible) and again, as I said last week, I really want to focus on the content (unintelligible). But I do feel the need to say that I'm very deeply disappointed in the fact that we've really got off track again and it became quite personal I think. Ultimately, the object of what happened last week was to get something on paper to discuss.

And I don't know if it's included in what Evan has just put forward on the list, but I don't want to discount the work that was done there and the intention to actually have something done. And I'm reading Olivier's note to Peter and I want to take issue with the last paragraph that says, "We're enjoying significant progress."

I'd like to - I don't know where you got that idea, because I don't feel like we've moved forward in months. And that's all.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Thank you. I had two points. One of them was can we see the letter that - or the note that Olivier sent, so thank you Evan for forwarding that.

The other issue, and I think Olivier implied it but I think it needs to be said. I can't speak on behalf of the ALAC, but as a former ALAC member, I would not want a report like this, which is going to be substantive, passed on to the Board without the ALAC actually having an opportunity to look at it and formally approve it.

And given that there's currently an ALAC meeting scheduled I believe for the 24th of May, the timing that was just described by Andrew is certainly problematic. And if the ALAC is to have to vote on this and approve it before the Board retreat, which is the 21st, and give the Board members at least a day or so to read it, this group is going to have to have an - work on an awful tight tie line. And, the 15th of May is probably not early enough. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan.

Okay. Alex, please go ahead.

Alex Gakuru: Thank you very much. Alex Gakuru. I think I'm in support and I think I like the way Olivier is resolving this, because I think its introducing clarity to the document flow. Because despite the issues that were discussed last time, we have not been having certain documentation.

And I want to go back and say even if we discussed that date in a lot of conversation on several issues at San Francisco, that meeting in San Francisco was never recorded in terms there are no transcripts. Okay, sort of report was written, but I think we discussed quite a lot more.

So in essence, I do think by establishing a clearer way of how we are going to communicate in - (as a big) document, I think it's important for that even the date of submission we now have it on record. So I'm quite in agreement that it's necessary to do that. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you.

Okay. I think we're talking about the process and what we should do and how to do that, but I think we need really now to work on the substantive part of our work. We have now a (problem). I'm not sure how it could be written in the report, but maybe it can give us some guidance and maybe we can discuss that.

I think I can't say maybe that there is confidence we are not going to send a date now to the Board. And if we are going to do that, we need

more -- how to say -- a formal request (unintelligible) formal request. And also, to go - when are going to send our report to go through our (unintelligible) organization.

So as we are not at this level now, let's work on the problem and to see how it can be included in our report. I think it can (prosper) the task that we need to do. Any comment about that? Can we proceed like that or not?

Okay. And I see Alex agree. How do you think that we should describe this document going - that -- how to say -- if someone - Evan or Andrew want to lead that and to explain quickly and then we can discuss if they have a real specific question or comment.

So who wants to volunteer? If Andrew...

Evan Leibovitch: I'm perfectly able. Cintra and Andrew are also both on the call, so essentially the intent of going away and doing this document was to come back and try and focus the group on questions that are still unanswered, reminding the group of consensus points that have already been agreed to, and trying to get some common thinking on the big picture issues as well as then determining the details of how all this is going to be implemented.

So since the last call between then and now, there've been the three of us -- Andrew, Cintra, and myself -- that were working on a Google document that incorporated as much as we could bring in of everything from the previous milestone documents to the comments that Avri put in at the beginning of the week to pretty well everything we could find.

And so, what you have on the Wiki right now is actually an attempt to distill most of this in what we're hoping to be reasonably plain language intended not only to focus our own ability to discuss this.

But also when we actually come out with the report, we want to produce a report that will be sufficiently clear and concise that it won't have to be redacted by third parties. And that's been a constant problem that we have had in - you know, in making sure that our intent is properly conveyed to the parties we're trying to reach.

So essentially, what you have now on the Wiki is I'd say about two-thirds of the whole. There's still a significant amount that is not on the Wiki, specifically the parts about the evaluation procedures and process. Dev has been doing a huge amount of work on the flowchart, and so these things are still yet to go in. It's my hope to have some of these things finished over the weekend, but mainly as a starting document, not a final document.

Obviously, you have three people going there doing this. It may - it was hoped that it would reflect the direction of the working group. Even if it doesn't, that's okay. That's what we're here to try and figure out, to go point-by-point through the document and make sure that the group is in synch with what it says, or that the document has to change to reflect it - things.

And you know in the process, you know we'll know - have a really clear picture not only of what we're doing, but that anybody looking for a snapshot of what we're doing will also get a clear idea of our direction.

Man:             (Unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Andrew? Cintra? Did either of you want to pipe in and add anything?

Man: Just Evan, I think it's - that's a really good summary, and you know thanks for all the hard work. Everybody was working on this really, really hard really late last night, and - I don't know. I think we're making some nice progress actually.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. We have (unintelligible) comment from Tijani and Elaine. Tijani, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Thank you. First of all, I would like to thank the team - the (unintelligible) team, or the drafting team for this work, and they did it in a very short time, so thank you very, very much.

Second point. Evan had mentioned it. A clear and concise report. I want to emphasize on this point. Clear and concise. So I propose to walk through this document and to try to find the consensus about all the parts of the document.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Elaine?

Elaine Pruis?

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. I'd like to support what Tijani just said. It makes sense that we go through this document and see where we're at. I've just looked at it on the Wiki and I see three points already where I think we don't have consensus or what has been written is in conflict with what was previously (unintelligible). I'm happy to point those out now, but perhaps you want to go from the beginning to the end point-by-point.

Evan Leibovitch: This is Evan. There's a couple of different ways. We'll certainly be - you know, I'm hoping this will be discussed on the call. But at the same time, there's also a comments area on the bottom of the Wiki. It's certainly not my intent to have this document go against the consensus of the group. So if there is an error, either in fact or in intent, either it can come out on the call or it can be written in the comments area.

And I'm more than happy to incorporate it, even if it's to say that there's an area in which there is no disagreement - there's no agreement or in which the original document got it wrong.

Rafik Dammak: Just to maybe I missed the point. Is this document on the Wiki already or not?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. Did I not send the message around earlier that had the link?

Man: Yes you did.

Rafik Dammak: I think you send message earlier like a Google doc, but I'm not sure (sent) about the Wiki.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: On the reminder for the - for today call, there is a link to the page.

Rafik Dammak: On - in the reminder. Okay. Usually I don't...

Karla Valente: On the document - this is Karla speaking. The document, or what is the content that is on the Wiki is also on the Adobe screen right now.

Man: (Unintelligible) with the Wiki, you can take a look at the screen.

Man: And Evan sent a message about it a little over an hour ago which also has the link.

Rafik Dammak: Oh, okay. Okay. Okay.

So but I don't think there is already comment in the Wiki there already, no?

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, we have some - someone is talking in the - okay.

Okay. I think let's go - Alex ask if you could go section by section? We have already some comment there, and then we can comment or color into some - discussion about actually if we can reach some - try to shape that or at least if we can reach some consensus later.

What do you think?

So Evan, did you all give - or you - that Cintra - and Andrew you work it of - on all these part? Or if it is like that you divided the work between - amongst you? I don't know some - if we can have some leadership by section and then we can discuss that?

Evan Leibovitch: Well, I'm certainly open right now to having the document open for editing this moment and doing real time edits based on what we do in this call. There's no problem at all doing that.

Rafik Dammak:  Okay. So - okay, we have comment from Tijani. Please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:   Yes. Evan, I do think that we have perhaps to walk through the document. And if you don't want to do so, I have some points that I want to discuss with you. So if you want, I or Alan can begin and give our points for the document.

But, I think the best is to walk through the document so that everyone would comment on everything.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh, I couldn't agree more.

So if you'd like, we could go point-by-point through the issues. Rafik as Chair, it's up to you how you want to proceed. I'm more than happy to start dealing with this point-by-point and making sure that what is in the document accurately reflects (unintelligible) the group and where it doesn't.

Rafik Dammak:  Okay. Yes, if you can take the lead on that as you and Andrew and Cintra worked on that document, so maybe it's better. And we can -- how say -- progress more quickly. Please. So go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So just so everybody knows, as of right now I have the Wiki page open in editing mode, so any decisions that we make to change things, I can make in real time and they'll be reflected as I'm periodically saving the document.

So I guess we will start on Part 1. As you can see, we've tried to segment this to try and - into five parts, of which four are on the Wiki

right now, and the fifth is yet to come. So I guess we'll start with Part 1. Do I need to read it aloud for the record, or is everybody okay with just reading it?

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...for the record. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: We have a comment from Alan and Tijani. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Just very quickly. We only have a half our left and you know, we only got this document an hour - less than an hour ago and I haven't looked at it at all. So I'm fine with going through it, but we shouldn't take this as the definitive agreement of all the people on the call. So...

Evan Leibovitch: Again, I more - however you'd like to do this...

Alan Greenberg: No. No. I'm just...

Evan Leibovitch: ...not to put a gun to anybody's head to have this done now.

Alan Greenberg: We have a half hour. Let's try to use it productively. I'm not convinced that going over wordsmithing word-by-word is the most productive way we can do that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Well then if that's the case, then maybe the best thing to do is to give everybody the weekend to go over it. Use the mailing list and/or the Skype Chat and/or the Wiki comment area for anybody to leave specific things that they'd like to change or think they need addressed.

What I've - what I want to do is first off is - Elaine, since you seem most prepared with some specific issues that you'd like to address, what I'd like to do perhaps is deal with those.

And then what I'd want to - what I'll do then is come back to the parts that the document has marked in red and call your attention to the areas where I was unable to find specific answers or directions in areas that I think the group needs to help clarify in order to make the document more understandable.

So Elaine, if I could indulge you, why not - tell me what your concerns are and let's see how we can build them in.

Elaine Pruis:    Great. Thanks. So if you scroll down - if you're on the Wiki or perhaps we now have scrolling powers on Adobe, but...

Evan Leibovitch: I do in my editing copy, so go ahead.

Elaine Pruis:    Okay. So the first thing that stood out to me as needing discussion, because - well, there's a question in the document, and I think it's counter to what we had already come to consensus on previously, is 3.2 in the red it says, "Indeed some in the working group for consensus believe the process to evaluate eligible applicants could be integrated in the existing Applicant Guidebook processes for evaluating the community category of gTLD applications."

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Elaine Pruis:    And the reason why I think this is an issue is because we had from the start determined that our program would be developed in parallel with

the Applicant Guidebook and that we wouldn't integrate what we were doing in the Applicant Guidebook.

Love to hear some comment there.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Sounds like...

Man: Somebody on the street?

Evan Leibovitch: ...(unintelligible).

Man: Somebody's got a car in the background beeping.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think we have Tijani, Andrew, and Alan who raised their hand. Okay, we start with Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Thank you. First of all, I'd like to raise a general point. Shall we speak about things that have been already adopted in the milestone report? This is the first and the biggest point I have to - I want to raise.

I don't think that we need or we have to touch the milestone report except for reviewing it according to the comments received. But any issue adopted or if there is consensus, so we will not come again with it and add things or delete things. The first point.

Second point. Concerning the Applicant Guidebook, we discussed in our first phase of work, this point, and it's right that some said we had to do this work in parallel with the Applicant Guidebook and it has to be included then. But it was said because we was afraid that we will not

reach the - we will not have time to give substance to the Board before the Applicant Guidebook is finalized.

If we manage to give them something before the finalization of the applicant guidebook, why not? It's not a problem for me. I don't see any - I don't have any problem with this.

I don't think that the group decided categorically, you know, I mean, sharply that we don't have to include anything in the applicant guidebook. In fact it's not our own interests - the best to put everything in the applicant guidebook but if it is not possible it's not possible.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, all right, since it's in - one of the issue's in red what I'm going to - what I'm going to do then is I'm going to simply - as Alan correctly said we're not going to do a line by line dissection of it right now when you've only seen this document at the most for half an hour before this call started.

So what I'd like to do then is go through the document and call attention to the areas that are in red possibly for debate now but certainly just to make sure that you are thinking about these things as we go forward. As the authors of this document were going through it - and sometimes they were identified as areas where there was either a lack of consensus or a lack of clarity or perhaps the group didn't even tackle some of these issues.

And so the reason they're in red is exactly because these things do need some consideration. Where you do see, you know, the words consensus or whatever in red it's simply a matter of saying I wasn't - as

I was writing this part of it, able to determine if there was consensus, no consensus, divergence or whatever.

So - and after some discussions, Elaine, it just seemed to me to be the case that at least some people - and I guess I'd include myself amongst them - believe that it may indeed be appropriate to have certain parts of this in sync with the guidebook especially given some of the timing considerations now that are starting to happen.

Especially if you believe - if you agree with the rationale that's expressed in Part 2 about why this is part of this round and not later the concept of integrating this with the applicant guidebook in fact might make this simpler for applicants. So there are actually some - there are some advantages perhaps to having them in sync.

And as I was going through the consensus document for the milestone I certainly didn't see anything that precluded some reference to the applicant guidebook in our work. So we can certainly bring this to the floor in future discussions but, Elaine, I didn't see anything in the - I didn't see anything in the milestone document that insisted that this had to be a separate process from the applicant guidebook.

Anyway so what I'd like to do is just - like I say go through the document and highlight the areas in red. These are areas that this group either needs to provide some consensus on - some clarification or at very least some areas where the authors could use some help. So it's a very...

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Evan, could I ask a quick question just to throw out - to complete this last bit?

Alan Greenberg: Yes and I had my hand up also so could we go back to...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...at some point?

Andrew Mack: Go, go, go, sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, no, no, Andrew, I'm not disagreeing with you. I'd like to go back to the speaking list instead of just having this a debate between two people.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes, I think we have three people in the queue and me too; I want to ask a question. So let's just start with Alan and then we go to Andrew and we end with Elaine. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Okay I think this is a good example in my mind of something that we don't need to be talking about at all. If the Board and staff can find an equitable way of implementing our recommendations without putting it in the guidebook but having some sort of parallel process I don't really care.

I care that they're going to follow our recommendations and I care that the information is made available in an equitable way so people understand what is available to them and can take advantage of it. I don't much care if that's done in parallel or in the guidebook.

You know, I know there's all sorts of...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...restrictions - of conditions associated with that but I don't think it's our problem. And I think we really need to focus on the substance of what we're recommending and not the - necessarily the implementation of it as long as what is done is equitable and does make the recommendations available. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: I was going to say something similar but I was just going to add that I'm comfortable either way - whatever way is best - I just don't have a clear sense of what it would look like if it were not integrated more closely with the DAG. So perhaps if that's a preference, Elaine, it would be helpful just to explain how that would actually work because I just don't have a sense of it. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay I think now Elaine can reply to you but we have some noise on the call. Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks. Yes, I'll go back and look at the documentation of that. And so the reason why we wouldn't want to include that line if no one cares that much about it or has that strong a position is that it's - if we say that whatever we're doing has to be built into the applicant guidebook in the community category section, you know, the staff did have a publication deadline for what the board is going to consider in a couple weeks.

And so if we put this in here then what we're asking for is that that process be delayed, I think and if that's not our intention then that needs to be made clear too.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Elaine. Okay just a half question, maybe, to Karla about when the applicant guidebook will be finalized?

Karla Valente: Our internal deadline for the applicant guidebook, Rafik, has passed. Let me just retrieve here.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry? Okay.

Karla Valente: I'm back, sorry.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Can (Adigo) mute this source of noise?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So now we have Olivier, please, Olivier, go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: I think we missed what Karla said. Could you repeat please?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I don't know if - okay.

Karla Valente: Yes, so if you want to have anything included in the applicant guidebook my advise is that we talk to Kurt about the deadlines and the timelines because internally the timeline for us to submit any kind of changes to the guidebook has passed.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Karla Valente:    (Unintelligible) has been working an update for the applicant guidebook all time along and it's up, you know, until today; today is our last...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak:  Sorry I think we are not hearing well what...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak:  We have some noise and have someone is talking on the call but to someone else. Okay please mute your phone when you are not speaking to - for the call please. Okay so if I understand correctly what Karla said that the deadline passed and we need to talk and (unintelligible) Kurt about that. Alan, do you have any comment?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Yes that question was asked at the last GNSO Council meeting and Kurt said there are two versions that are planned at this point; one that is already frozen at this point because he said it was going to be frozen something like the end of last week - I don't remember it exactly.

And there would be an other one which would be published in time for the publication deadline for the June meeting which essentially is the end of May. So there are two revisions; one that presumably the Board will be working on and there has been - will have been other comments by the end of May and then a version a week or so after that.

So we're looking at two revisions in the timeframe we're talking about. Obviously it's too late to get it into the first one; the second one is still

possible. At least that's the way I remember what Kurt said. Karla can correct that if I'm wrong or someone else who was on that meeting.

Rafik Dammak: Okay we lost someone on the call. Karla, do you want to answer or then we can go to Evan.

Karla Valente: No that's fine, Rafik. There is a second version. We don't have internal deadline for the second version yet but you are right we publish usually before - two, three weeks before the beginning of the ICANN meeting. I think it still would be...

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: ...information from Kurt.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, the deadline is for the publication for this meeting is I believe the - very close to the end of May. And clearly we cannot have a substantive discussion at the Singapore meeting if it is not published in that deadline so I think that's...

Karla Valente: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...what we can expect.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Karla Valente: Yes so we might want to check also - we might want to check how this goes with the board retreat whether or not some of those changes that are going to be done for the next applicant guidebook have to be on the agenda before the end of May.

Rafik Dammak:   Thank you very much Karla for this insight. It's really helpful. Evan, please go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: All we can speak to is what we've been asked to do. We've been asked to come up with a report for May. In fact the beginning of this call Olivier was quite correct in saying we need to have a timeline nailed down for this.

We've been asked to give a report in May. It's up to the powers that be to choose to heed what we asked or not to heed what we ask. But we are getting so caught up in what could happen, what might happen, what others are doing that - to the point where it's distracting us from what we're supposed to be doing.

This has been a problem with this working group now for months. And I really would appreciate if we got back on substance and stop worrying about what is going on around us. We've been given a task; we've been given a time to report on it. Let's just do that. And if they want to heed what we say they'll heed what we say. And if it means a delay in the process while they integrate it, that's not our problem. We've been asked to give our advice let's give it.

Alan Greenberg: Recognizing we have a parent committee to go through before it can get there.

Evan Leibovitch: Understood but that's the process under which the joint working group has been formed and the parameters under which the board...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...waiting patiently for our input understands already.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...I know you know.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thank you, Evan, thank you Alan for your comment. It's clear that we need to do work and we don't have so much time so maybe if we can set up our own deadline for each task and to try to reach consensus as soon as possible it will be really helpful. Andrew, you have any comment?

Andrew Mack: Yes, just quickly. I agree with Evan. I'm actually now a little bit confused myself about what our deadlines are. And one thing to abide by the, you know, the legitimate desires of GNSO and ALAC do we have a clear sense of when we would need to get this to people to have its maximum impact because that will help us to build our timeline. If that's the thing that we get out of this call that will be useful in my mind.

Rafik Dammak: Okay if the deadline for (unintelligible) they should - how to say - depends about when ALAC and - actually cannot speak for ALAC but at least for GNSO when GNSO Council will have meeting and then we need to submit the motion one week before the meeting.

But anyway it may take more time for them because they can ask for consideration to discuss the report and to comment it. So if we are going to set up deadlines according to like GNSO Council meetings we

need to be a long time to submit the report before a GNSO Council meeting.

We discussed about deadline for this working group and we thought - I think we reached consensus to have the final report for this event in May. So if we are really try to stick with GNSO Council meeting's times I think maybe we need to do - finalize our report more earlier. And now we are in I think in the 15th April so we don't really have like less I think (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: So, Rafik, the question - I guess the question is simply this, if we wish to be available for the board retreat and if we would like to make sure that both ALAC and GNSO have what they consider to be adequate time what is our cutoff? Is our cutoff the last day of April? If it is we can work on that. If it's the, you know, if it's the third day of May we can work on that. I just - it will help us greatly I think as a group to have a clear sense of when we need this ready to go to pass onto our constituents or sponsors and that way we'll just - we'll adjust accordingly.

Karla Valente: Rafik, this is Karla speaking if I may?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Karla Valente: The board retreat is going to be May 19, 20. Our internal deadline to submit anything for the board agenda for the board consideration is two weeks before and that takes us to May 6. So if I understand this conversation correctly by May 6 we should have a report that has been reviewed by the GNSO and the ALAC chairs. Right?

Evan Leibovitch: Well it's either or; either of the chartering bodies is capable of submitting something to the board. They don't both need to agree.

Karla Valente: And if we don't have something by May 6 we will submit by later day. My advice is that we make the board know that and get a confirmation that they will, you know, be able to review something and input something into their agenda even if submitted after May 6.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay but - okay so we have a hard and fast date that you're giving us which is good and useful right now which is May 6. That is the day that we need to give something that the board is capable of considering for its retreat. Correct?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so as was being said at the beginning of this call we try and work backwards from that and see the extent to which we can produce a useable consensus and to the extent we can approval by GNSO - well I don't know how GNSO Council - how fast it works or whatever. But, you know, if we have a situation we can do, you know, ALAC is capable of doing virtual balloting. So, you know, this is not out of the realm of possibility.

Rafik Dammak: Evan I think I have question for Glen. I'm not sure about when the GNSO Council will have the conf call in May?

Alan Greenberg: I can speak to that if I get up; it's Alan.

Rafik Dammak: Okay please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes the GNSO has a meeting on the 28th of April and another one on the 21st I believe of May. I'm sorry, the 19th of May. So there is essentially no way the GNSO is going to approve this by the 6th - by the...

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...6th of 15th of May. It's not going to happen. So let's not even worry about that; that's pretty much a fact. You know, even if we have it for the meeting of the 28th which means it has to be submitted four days from now or something like that it's not likely to be voted on and will be deferred until the meeting which will be too late for the board deadline.

So that's a reality; the question is can the ALAC meet a schedule which is tighter? And I think it goes back to Olivier's, you know, statement of tell us the definitive last possible date you can accept this and process it and then the ALAC maybe able to, you know, set up some exceptional meeting to discuss or do an electronic vote or whatever.

Whatever it is I think the optics of this are such that if the ALAC approves it it can't be looked as a rubber stamp it actually - the ALAC actually has to have an opportunity to discuss this otherwise it's going to be viewed as a sham by parts of the community so.

Rafik Dammak: Okay - okay we have comment from Evan, Alex and Alan. You still raised your hand or...

Alan Greenberg: No, no, I'm done.

Rafik Dammak:   Okay. Okay Evan please go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh sorry, my hand is down if somebody else has comment go ahead.

Rafik Dammak:   Okay so Alex please go ahead. And let's keep...

Alex Gakuru:   Yes thank you. I think we have - Alex speaking. We have got six minutes left and I'm concerned that we have gone back to discussing other process instead of discussing this wonderful document that Evan was taking us though and we would have raised the issues that need to be to attention we have spent a fairly large chunk of our time just discussing other (unintelligible) and we had agreed we should not tie ourselves and get into this and discuss it and make our recommendation the shortest time possible and give them out.

But I am concerned that we should not over-dwell on other process outside and if we had for example gone through the items in red on this document I would have left this call a far much happier person feeling I've done something. Yes, thank you.

Rafik Dammak:   Okay, thank you Alex. Okay. Yes it's important that we should focus on the work that we have to do. I think we have this proposal and started to discuss about. I think Evan suggested that on the weekend if working members can make some comments on the wiki...

Evan Leibovitch: We have three different channels through which a comment can be done whichever people are more comfortable. As you know there is an open Skype chat that some people have been using that some people are comfortable with in which case they can find other people who are online and talk in real time between now and the next meeting.

There is the email. There is email which is also interactive but doesn't work quite as fast. And then there is the ability to leave comments on the wiki page. And I will commit to looking at every single comment that is there and attempt to integrate it into the document.

So there are all those three ways. I will personally be monitoring all three. I know that the other members of the team are also using Skype and email. So I would encourage anybody who is going through the document make notes, send them by email, talk about them in chat or put them in comments on the wiki. And this is going to be the best way for us to do some of the substantive work that has to be done. We can't depend simply on these two calls a week.

Rafik Dammak:  Okay thank you Evan. In addition to that proposal we also have some text and for the different work team and also we need to work on that. Maybe now we are (unintelligible) making some priority to - about criteria but also we need to think about that. Are you - with Cintra and Andrew do you think those other parts of the wiki in regard to the other work teams or not?

Evan Leibovitch: Well the document is not complete. The Section 5, how do we evaluate the applications which includes the entire procedures and process which includes the very elaborate flow chart that (Dev) has been working on and for which I am extremely grateful because I will do - go a long way to try and demonstrate the process of how the evaluation can take place.

But also all the substantial amount of words that have been written so far about how to do the evaluations, all that is yet to go into the

document which I will attempt to coordinate with the team and have in this weekend. So I'm asking everybody at least to look at the first four parts that are there. Part 1-3 I think are fairly complete. Part 4 which includes the description of what a qualified applicant would be eligible to receive that is not complete.

I'm aware of other text that needs to go into that. And like I said the last section that has to do on the processes and procedures and evaluation that is also yet to be done. So the document is going to significantly grow over the weekend.

Having said the I would encourage people to really go and have a look at even what's there because there's an awful lot of red text there, there's an awful lot that needs to be determined, that needs to be agreed to by the working group or at least identify where divergence exists so we can make the readers of this report understand clearly where we're at.

Rafik Dammak:  Okay thank you. Tijani please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:   Thank you. I prepared some remarks on the text proposed by Evan and the team. And I was hoping that to will - I will provide them today and we would discuss them today but unfortunately we spoke about other things. And I hope that it will be this last time we don't speak about substance. Can we commit for the next calls never speak on anything except the text - except the substance?

Last thing the work of the work teams will be compiled by Evan and the editing group. So Evan is the - Evan and his colleagues are the pen

holders so they are compiling all the texts produced by the work teams and they are proposing so a unique text that we will discuss together.

Rafik Dammak: Okay I think that we agreed about that right. But about any discussion in relation to the process or - anything I'm not sure how to prevent people to do that just what I can ask that we focus now on the substantive part of our work. And if there is any problem of process I think as maybe co-chairs we can handle that and to - we will discuss with people where needed but let's focus on the substantive.

Okay so as we are reaching the end of our call let's agree for - okay, Olivier, you will have the last word but just - what I was going to say that we will have this weekend to discuss about the (unintelligible). I think the editing team will try to do the best to compile the comments, etcetera.

And then we will continue discussing about the document in the next call if we have real specific questions. So it will - it more easy to make consensus. So we are not - I don't think that we are going to do that word by word just if we have specific question if there is some part that we need to reach some consensus it will make it more easy.

I'm not sure that how we will highlight those disputed part but it will make it more easy for discussion. Olivier, you will have the last word for this call. Please go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you very much, Rafik. I missed a couple of minutes of the call because my line was cut. But I have not heard anyone mention the fact that Karla has very kindly forwarded the latest comments from

the GAC on the applicant guidebook on the - yes. And there is a section that deals with applicant support.

I think it would be worth everyone reading that section and perhaps integrating some of the proposals that the GAC is now bringing forward into the JAS document or at least finding out if the proposals in the JAS document agree with some of the possible proposals from the GAC. Back to you. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. So if any - no other further comment and I think we - Olivier you want to comment again or is - okay I think you raised your hand. So I think we have a clear action plan for next days until the next call. So I will ask everybody - kindly everybody to try to comment the proposal and then we will - I think we can make real - real progress in these days.

So thank you everybody for joining today call. And we will adjourn this call for today. Thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:   Bye.

Andrew Mack:   Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak:  Okay bye.


END