

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 17 August 2010 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) 17 August 2010 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-20100817.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:**

**ALAC**

Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair  
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC  
Alan Greenberg – ALAC  
Baudoin Schombe – At Large  
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large  
Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachines  
Carlos Aguirre - At Large  
Alex Gakuru – NCSG

**GNSO**

Avri Doria - NCSG  
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison  
Andrew Mack – CBUC

Michele Neylon - RrSG

**ICANN staff**

Karla Valente  
Glen de Saint Gery  
Gisella Gruber-White

**Apologies:**

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair  
Olof Nordling – ICANN Staff

Coordinator:       The recording has started.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you so much. And a good day to you all whether it's morning, afternoon or evening or even the middle of the night. It's (still day).

As I said in the note that I sent out, I'm going to start doing this - do we have Evan by the way?

Evan Leibovitch: You sure do.

Avri Doria: Yes, we do okay.

Evan Leibovitch: But you're doing quite fine.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I just all of a sudden I didn't see your name and I wanted to make sure you were here, basically going to start following the new procedures that were voted in by the GNSO.

And so I know this is both a GNSO and ALAC joint group. We're operating under the charter that specified that as these rules became available they would be part of our charter.

So and I'm going to try and do it as quickly and painlessly as possible. So as opposed to asking Gisella to read out who's in attendance, I'll read out the names.

Basically I'm asking all of you upfront as I read your name, please just, you know, say whether your SOI or DOI is up to date.

If you feel it isn't and you've either just updated it or will be updating it in the future, please just give a brief words as to what the update will be.

Now one question has been left pending in my reading of the ruling that came out and the words that were put out. It says all participants will be asked it.

Now when I got to all participants and I started to think of staff as participants I got a very curious question as to whether such statements applied to them.

At the moment they've never an SOI, have never been asked to. So I'm deferring that to the policy groups that I asked the question of. And I won't be asking staff at this point. I'll just read their names as has been normally done. But that is a pending question.

But certainly for the volunteer participants, this is the procedure that I want to try and follow. And hopefully we can do it every meeting and hopefully it can go quicker because it won't need this initial spiel.

So as I say, as I read your name, please confirm whether your SOI is up to date. And if you feel it isn't, please give us a brief update. And I'm going to read through the names as I have them on the meeting view I've been given of who's on the call.

So Rafik Dammak? Are you here? Are you mute and is your SOI on...

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Yes, the update in the SOI but I don't have the DOI.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you very much. I see that Baudoin is on at the moment, Baudoin Schombe

Baudoin SchombeHere. I'm online, yes. Yes.

Avri Doria: And is your SOI up to date?

Baudoin SchombeYes, yes I'm up to date. I feel (unintelligible). Thank you...

Avri Doria: Okay thank you very much. Carlos Aguirre?

Carlos Aguirre: Yes. (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yes means you are up to date correct? Okay. Alex Gakuru?

Avri Doria: Is your SOI up to date?

Alex Gakuru: My SOI's up to date...

Alex Gakuru: No (unintelligible) of interest and no reason for changes in the foreseeable future (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you very much. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Up to date.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. I'm next, Avri Doria. Mine is up to date and it's posted. Michele Neylon?

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Sebastian Bacholett. Oh I see he was disconnected for some reason. Alan Greenberg?

Sebastian Bacholett: I am back. I am back. I am back.

Avri Doria: Oh you are back? Is your SOI DOI up to date?

Sebastian Bacholett: Yes it's up to date. Yes just want to say you have long (requisition) on the mail that - it's something strange for me that the working group set up as a GNSO. The GNSO by themselves decide the rules for everybody.

And I would like very much that this rule was agreed upon by all the SO and AC before to be implemented to any (Docs) event. Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Okay. I'll comment on that after I get to the end of the list. Thank you. Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenberg: Current.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Elaine Pruis?

Elaine Pruis: Yes, my SOI is up to date.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Evan Leibovitch?

Evan Leibovitch: No changes.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. And Andrew Mack?

Andrew Mack: Yes, up to date.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And Sebastian just to indicate, there were participants of ALAC and the GNSO in the groups that did determine these rules.

And as I say, in the charter that was approved by both the GNSO and the ALAC, they do call out these rules.

So yes, it would be really good to have that final step where the ALAC also endorses the specific rules. But I feel that it certainly is not the case that the GNSO has single-handedly hoisted something upon the whole group that everyone A, wasn't involved in and B which the mutually agreed charter did not call out.

But as I say, you know, in any of these cases that's part of the reason we have liaisons. And if you do feel that this is inappropriate, then perhaps that's an issue that needs to be discussed with the liaison and with the ALAC to make any redress that would be necessary.

So, you know, definitely do that if in any way this feels inappropriate.

Evan Leibovitch: And by the way Avri - and this is Evan - Sebastian just so you know, I was also consulted before this was brought in. Avri had spoken to me as co-chair and made sure that I was okay with this.

We certainly have a situation different in GNSO than we have in at large. In GNSO you have people that by definition have financial interests in some of the things going on. ALAC does not by and large have that situation.

And so the ideas of statements of interest of people making sure that their interests are declared and known in advance seem to me a good idea at the time.

So I will also take some of the responsibility for having brought this or at least going along with the original proposal.

Avri Doria: Thank you Evan. One thing I'd like to add that yes it's always the case in the GNSO that for the most part there's financial interest. Of course there's the non-commercial where if you read the rules there can be other interests other than just financial.

And in an issue like new GTLDs and support for new GTLD applicants, of course we can have applicants, members of applicant groups and consultant to applicants in ALAC as well as GNSO.

So especially in a group like this we could have interest from other than just the normal financial players that we have in GNSO.

Is there any other comments?

Sebastian Bacholett I have a lot of interest with (new) GTLD but not for money purposes.

Thank you very much. It's Sebastian.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Right. I wasn't making a specific pointed comment, just trying to sort of open up the issue.

For example, it would be possible that someone working in this group would be planning to apply for those funds.

If someone were working in a group and planning to apply for their funds there's nothing wrong with that but they should have announced that fact in their SOI so that their comments in relation to their future intentions would already be known when we were speaking.

And that's sort of a - that. And I see (Michele) is strongly disagreeing with my interpretation. I apologize.

As I say, please feel free to, you know, discuss this with the liaison and the chartering organizations. If I've got it wrong, then certainly we should fix it.

Okay, yes (Michele)?

Michele Neylon: The thing is Avri, I raised this with you on the mailing list. And instead of even suggesting for an instant that you might possibly have got it wrong, you basically mandated that your interpretation was the only possible interpretation.

Now I will raise this with our liaison. But I mean I think that you're now - what you're saying now is the exact opposite of what you said in the discussion we had on the mailing list.

Now I have absolutely zero issue with making sure the people declare what their interests are. I will always declare my interest and always will keep mine up to date.

However I think that making us jump through hoops at the beginning of each and every meeting is a massive waste of my time and other participant's time. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And I apologize if my note read as if that was the only interpretation. I was giving my interpretation.

As long as we don't have this encapsulating conversation I do believe still - and I may be wrong - there may be other interpretation - that it won't take this much time. It'll take as long as it takes to read the names.

But thank you. Please do carry forward the conversation. Anyone else before we leave this topic?

Okay, thank you. So now to review the agenda. What I had on the agenda is I wanted to have a brief discussion on some of the thoughts and discussion that are going on on the document structure for delivery.

And then I wanted to begin a walk-through on recommending but getting a walk-through of the recommendation to see where changes need to be made based on the comments reviewed.

So part of the goal is to identify those issues where we may be approaching a consensus and those where we still need to find a resolution path.

Now I don't expect us to get all the way through that, but where we to get all the way through that then the next thing would be a second reading of the comments.



Now one of the reasons why we probably shouldn't get there is Karla Valente has been working on taking the comment analysis and basically then producing a summary of our conversation and then taking a estimated view of what, you know, resolution was being approached which then once she's got that we need to do a walk-through as a group to make sure that A, the discussion is as the members of this group think it should be and complete and then be - look at the option for resolution.

If there is one, determine to what degree there's consensus on that. If there are several possibilities then to discuss further and see where we get to.

So she's still working on that. So it's very, very close. But we have the - yes. Okay, I'm sorry. Okay so, okay so if that agenda's okay with people I'll move to discussing the document structure.

Okay seeing no objections. On the document structure what - and this has largely been going back and forth between Karla Valente and I.

Evan was part of the discussion at the beginning. But as we started editing the document over the last two, three days I noticed that Evan had dropped off the discussion. I apologize Evan. So of course if we got it wrong please shout.

Evan Leibovitch: I didn't drop off consciously. It's just some real life got in the way.

Avri Doria: No, no. And then when you weren't responding at one point I noticed just this morning that the mail started to be Karla Valente and I.

And so I just wanted to make sure that you necessarily see the last steps.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: What we discussed doing was dividing our output documents into two. One is fairly brief, easy to read, easy to handle, 20, 25 pages -- what have you -- which is basically the - it's the final report. It's the one that's on your screen now.

It's table of contents. It'll include an executive summary. And okay, we'll walk through of this (unintelligible).

It includes the executive summary, the objectives and background on the group that you see in all of these reports. It has our working group recommendations at the moment that had titles or (RFC) considerations, who should get support, what types of support should be available.

Maybe we break that up into two sections. I don't know. It's something we can discuss as we go forward. Other recommendations. And at the moment we have additional questions and possible responses. We should probably resolve those into something concrete.

Then there's the section that I started to flush out but we haven't gotten very far with in terms of next steps.

Then basically it has annexes in this document. There's our charter. There's the board and - I guess it's the board resolution that created this group.

And then there's a list of the addenda to be found in a companion documents.

Now if we can quickly go to the back of that addenda, that addenda, so this was basically the first document is I say fairly this is what the recommendations are and here's the background of the group.

The other document, the companion document would be a much longer document. It would have the - you know, the general - the list and affiliation or

all the working group members as these documents generally do. It'll have a discussion of the participation levels.

There'll be a common summary including the working group discussion and resolution. That's the document that I mentioned that Karla Valente is currently not - okay I guess I misspelled members. I'll fix that, thank you.

Karla Valente is - it's how I worked on it. If it's full of misspellings you know it was me. If the grammar's bad it was probably me.

Anyway, so it'll include the comments, summary including working group discussion and resolution document that I mentioned that Karla Valente's working on that I hope we walk - do a walk-through of at the next meeting and the meeting after.

A compendium then of all comments received including - and this is including interalia. If I forgot something, please make sure that we remember it. I'm sure Karla Valente will remember things.

But the Brussels face to face session transcript, the full comment list, the African (Afriello) statement, I left this out there to indicate that I'm sure I forgot something, you know. And those belong in there.

Man: Avri, Tijani's got his hand up.

Avri Doria: Oh okay sorry, Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, thank you. I propose to split and (next lead) into for annexes. I think that it's better to put each document in a single - in a separate annex so that it should be very clear.

So I propose a next C will be working group members (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay sorry I...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes?

Avri Doria: ...interrupt you a second. I think I didn't make myself clear. Annex C here is just this list of documents which is the list of documents that are found in a companion document.

In that companion document there will be Addendum 1, list and affiliation of working group members.

Addendum 2, participation of working group members. Addendum 3, comment summary.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I understand.

Avri Doria: See it'll be a separate section of another document.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I do understand. But an annex is a separate document annexed to the report.

Avri Doria: Yes, but that's just a list.

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Pardon?

Avri Doria: This is just a list.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, no. No, I don't want it to be list. I want it to be annexed with the documents.

Avri Doria: I don't understand.

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Because an annex is a document which is annexed to the report. And that is annex.

Avri Doria: So you want...

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes?

Avri Doria: You want there to be 12 different documents?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Pardon?

Avri Doria: You want there to be 12 different documents?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I want them to be annexed to the document.

Avri Doria: I don't...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I want the public comments to be a document, annexed to the document, Annex B.

Avri Doria: You mean you want it to be physically attached?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: As such, yes.

Avri Doria: You want it to be in the same file?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. And it is part of the report. The report is - the core - is the core report plus the annexes.

Avri Doria: Right. But we're dividing this - what I'm suggesting dividing this into two documents, one of which is the essential core recommendations and one of which is all of the addenda, all of the annexes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: That's...

Avri Doria: And an annexed document is a separate document.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: That's what I agree. I want to...

Avri Doria: Okay so you want it all to be one big document?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: A (100) different pages?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes please. Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Can I - it's Alan. Can I ask a question? Are we talking about the physical form with...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...two different file names or...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: But if you ever distributed them on paper you'd always print both?

Avri Doria: Not necessarily.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Avri Doria: Everybody wouldn't necessarily need to print those.

Alan Greenberg: I'm trying to understand. Okay you're saying the first one could stand alone?

Avri Doria: Right. And it would include...

Alan Greenberg: And Tijani's saying he does not agree to this?

Avri Doria: Exactly.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Avri Doria: Right.

Alan Greenberg: We're not arguing over the term annex versus attachment or something like that?

Avri Doria: Right. No we're arguing over whether we have one 25 page document and one 200 page document or whether we have one 225 page document. And we're not really arguing. I've just made a proposal and we've had one person agree with it.

So as we move forward, you know, we can continue to discuss it.

We'll certainly work on building them in two pieces. If we get to the end and Tijani's opinion is the prevalent opinion of the group, then we can make it just one document, you know.

Evan Leibovitch: Tijani, this is Evan. Would you be okay with the idea of the first document providing a Web link and making the second document available on that Web link?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You can do it like this, but in the - in all the reports I have seen in my life you have the report and all the annexes in the same document. It's a whole document.

Avri Doria: Right. I guess I have a different experience. In fact I know the new GLTD recommendations that we're responding to were indeed done this way where there was the first document that had the recommendation and then the second document, the Part D that had all the rest of the commentary and reports and everything else in it.

So it's two different experiences. As I say, I'm just making this recommendation. But if the group feels that it needs to be, you know, one big document, then certainly we can make it one big document.

Yes (Elaine)?

Elaine Pruis: Yes. So I understand the idea of keeping the document short so you're not overwhelmed with all sorts of information that if you really wanted you could go somewhere else.

But Tijani could you please explain why you would like it all in one document? Could I hear the positives and negatives of each concept?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: For me the report will be the court report plus the annexes. And in any case you would have perhaps a huge document but it would not be a huge book. It will be a huge document and you can select the report only or you can select only Annex D or Annex F.

It's not if you want - you will not handle a book of 300 pages.

Avri Doria: Okay. So Tijani, if I understand, so you're suggesting perhaps it'd be structured in the same way that the draft applicant guidebook be structured although that may be overkill for just one working group in that you can print



out the whole thing or you have the option of printing out the separate pieces?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, exactly. It's exactly that. But I want to say that it is not a very important point. And I don't want to spend a lot of time on it. If the majority wanted to be two documents it's not a problem.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Alan your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I was going to make a quick comment and then suggest what - how do we proceed.

My preference is in fact to go with what Avri's suggesting. Because faced with a 250 page document, most people will choose to ignore it rather than to try to figure out which part to print or look at which is a subset. So I favor the short one.

But I just continue this on the mailing list...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...no using meeting time on it.

Avri Doria: Okay. And I have - I see agreement from Andrew. I don't know whether he's agreeing with what Alan said in substance or continuing another time.

I just wanted to go through this. We can certainly come back to this later and discuss it on the list.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Avri?

Avri Doria: Tijani, yes?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Avri yes, it's only to say that this report is not for the public to visit it. It is for the board to consider its recommendation from this group to the board.

So the board will know very well how to get only the report or how to get the annexes -- only your comment. But I am well with any solution no?

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, yes.

Avri Doria: And, you know, yes, okay great. Thanks. So anyhow that's where we're at at the moment. And we'll revisit this structure stuff once we finish putting on all the words.

Yes Alan has got a new hand up.

Alan Greenberg: I was just going to comment on Tijani's comment because I think it's important that one hears it all - similar things all the time.

The board is facing so many documents and large documents that one cannot assume the board is going to try to take extra pains to figure out which parts to read.

They'll either read the summary that that provides. Or if they're eager they'll read - they'll go farther. We - I think we need to make it as easy as possible. That's it.

Avri Doria: Thank you Alan for your comment. You put something I was thinking of saying far more diplomatically than what was about to come out of my mouth. So...

Alan Greenberg: That's a rare turn.

Avri Doria: I appreciate that very much. Okay, so now yes Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Last question. Yes, I agree, I think if they're going to get it a lot and especially since this is new, brevity may get us a better hearing.

So we have in our minds the idea of putting together like a two-page executive summary?

Avri Doria: Okay that comes to the next part of the discussion which is the walk-through of the document. Okay.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Yes, I see that we have something that's mentioned as an executive summary. Is - because that's what they're likely to read first.

Avri Doria: Right. So yes, okay. In terms of in that, we do have an executive summary. It hasn't really been touched much since the snapshot.

I tend to think that executive summaries are things we come back to once we have written the rest of the document.

I think it's very good to have an executive summary. I think we should have a very careful executive summary.

The one thing I changed from the snapshot on this one was, you know, basically starting to move away from the work team one, work team two motif that we had in the snapshot more to this is the working group output because now we're discussing the issues and coming to resolution on our recommendations as a working group on the whole as opposed to the working teams just going off and working alone.

Though of course there may still be some, you know, smaller collaborations to get bits of wording done.

By the way I've got a new microphone today. People are hearing me okay?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes, Avri...

Avri Doria: Okay yes. It just came in the mail yesterday. I'm trying it out for the first time today, wanted to make sure I was being heard.

Alex Gakuru: Incredible. And basically - excuse me (unintelligible). I'm not online. I've had Internet outage. This is Alex of course. So excuse me, but I'm following from the conversation.

Avri Doria: Okay, I did send - but of course, if you don't have Internet, I did send out the document last night or if you had pulled it down. But if you don't have Internet I don't think have any way to get it to you but okay thanks.

Alex Gakuru: Don't worry. Don't worry about it. I'll get it. Just carry on. I just wanted to (unintelligible) so that you don't think I participated. But just know I'm listening.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Okay so I don't think there's much to discuss about the executive summary at the moment. I think we should come back to the executive summary once, you know, we have finished the recommendations.

But basically it'll include a background section, recommended that it include then a brief, you know, one liners or what have you, of our recommendations.

Those will be challenging to word in such a way that we have consensus on the expression of our executive summary, you know, and taking into account the balance between the recommendations and their level of consensus.

But there certainly should be consensus on the way we state them even if we didn't have full consensus on the way - on the decisions we made and then the conclusions and next steps recommendations that we make. And so that's been left empty.

I've gotten into putting watermarks on draft that way they are drafts so no one gets confused and thinks it's a final product. Because we've had certain issues in other groups with is this the final product? Is it a draft? Is it a whatever?

Okay, any issues on the executive summary part at this point? Any extra sections that it would need that weren't included at this point?

Okay, and while I put together the first version of this I believe that after this assuming she's willing to take it, Karla Valente will, you know, hold the pen and do the updating between meetings. Is that a correct assumption Karla Valente?

Karla Valente: That's correct.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Just in trying to get everything done in the two, three days I sort of fell into a staff-type position that I occupy in other organizations.

Objectives - and so then we get the objectives and background. So at the moment this is still very similar to what it was in the snapshot and talking about the Board's resolution, then describing our process.

I started fluffing that out a bit to talk about -- added a second paragraph about after receiving comments from the community comment period, you know, the working group resumed its work. While separate teams would occasionally work on a specific text recommendation, the working group works as a whole in discussion of resolving the comments and then making any changes to the recommendation.

You know, and then I'm speaking for the future but also work was done to expand explanation on some of the recommendations that had not been sufficiently explained. And that's something that we've already discussed the need of in a couple places.

That will probably need to be expanded a little bit more in terms of the process that we go through over the next couple weeks to finish the document.

Then there's the discussion of the issue background which we have not written yet and need to be written. And I re-titled these -- these had been Work Team 1c considerations and Work Team 2 -- who should get support and what types of support.

Now this is one place where I have a question that I sort of quickly glanced over when I was going through the document structure is as I read them, while working to - Team 2 did both who should get support and what types of support should be available seems to me structurally two different questions.

And perhaps sectionally in the document they need to be divided. But, you know, I wanted to basically throw that question to the group and see where we are on it.

And I see Andrew's hand up.

Andrew Mack: Sure. Avri I think we handle them in different - in our initial documentation and stuff that we did in Brussels we handled them in different bullet points or in different paragraphs. I don't see any problem with breaking that out into smaller bits.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Yes I had seen that and that's where I started to get the notion that they should be divided out.

Okay. So that's one change. And anyone object to separating those two in the next view of the document?

I see (Elaine) has her hand up.

Elaine Pruis: Yes I'm just - maybe it's my unfamiliarity with documents like this but what does issues background mean? How is that different than a summary of our work?

Avri Doria: In one case as I understand it -- and this was the original outline created by (Olaf) -- one is basically stating what the problem is. So in other words there is a problem in terms of the fee, it is too high, it is difficult for people who are operating at a different currency at different per capita income levels -- some statement of what the problem is.

You know, some statement of in deciding who should get support, there's a big wide world but, you know, there's only limited support. It therefore needs to be, you know, there need to be criteria.

So a lot of the background discussion we've had in terms of what the problem is and differentiating that slightly from what the solutions are is my view of how these sections differ.

Elaine Pruis: Okay thanks.

Avri Doria: The problem phase. Okay? Any other issues on this section.

Okay. And obviously, you know, we'll need to discuss and come to consensus on those expressions of what the problem is because, you know, that's material to the solution.

Andrew Mack: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes?

Andrew Mack: This is Andrew. Quick question. We really haven't discussed that issue very much at all. We just kind of launched into it.

Is that something that we will want to discuss at any point in time? And is this an appropriate time for us to do that?

Avri Doria: Well I have two answers to that. I think in one sense we have discussed it constantly in terms of people saying, "Well the reason we're doing this is, the reason we're doing that is."

And so you're right, we didn't do it as a specific let's set down our problem statement. What we did do is we talked about the problem constantly and what problem we were trying to solve.

Andrew Mack: I understand. I guess what I'm wondering is is that since this is all stuff we need to get banged out anyway and we've only got 25 minutes left, is this a time when we should, you know, we're going to have to put it down at some point.

Avri Doria: Right...

Andrew Mack: Does it make sense for us to just say do it and we'll run - see if we can run through it quickly now?

Avri Doria: We could. Although what I would recommend and I was about to say is it might be good if we could find volunteers to put a quick draft together of what we have said and understood over the last period and actually have some words that people could start with - from.

Blue sky, empty page, drafting in a group can be challenging. (Elaine)?



Andrew Mack: I know.

Elaine Pruis: Yes I was just going to volunteer to write the problem for fee considerations and put it on the mailing list for comments.

Avri Doria: Fantastic. Thanks.

Can I get a volunteer for who should get support problem statement?

Andrew Mack: I guess I'll do it.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you Andrew.

And the what types of support should be available statement? Is there a volunteer to take a first crack at that on the mailing list?

Andrew Mack: Sure I - let me try - I actually, I can try that one - we've been handling both of those together. I'm happy to try and do a little bit of each.

Avri Doria: Okay great. And then - and I think that whether it's at the Thursday meeting which by the way I will probably miss because I'm traveling and taking four days vacation. But whether we do it at that one or at the next meeting, you know, then we could start to talk about how to change it.

And hopefully people can discuss what's on the list.

Andrew Mack: Two quick questions if I can Avri to give us -- (Elaine) and myself...

Avri Doria: Sure.

Andrew Mack: Some guidance. Number one is how long do the problem statements need to be?

And the second question is I want to make sure that we distinguish this from our recommendation. Can you give us your best exact explanation of what that needs to cover?

Avri Doria: Okay I see (Tajani's) hand up so I'll let Tijani go before I try to give my answers. But yes, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you. I wanted to say that I really want that any substantive production be sent on the list.

Not put on the wiki page because you put it with a name that I would perhaps not recognize and I will not know that it is the document that I want. But if you sent an e-mail I will read it for sure.

Avri Doria: Okay certainly. I think people sending these fragments of text in e-mail is good.

And then either Karla Valente or I or someone can cut them into documents, can move them to the wiki, whatever.

By the way I want to check something. I dislike sending documents through the e-mail just simply because it makes bandwidth bigger and people lose them anyway.

So I tend to just put documents up on the wiki and send people the URLs for them.

Andrew Mack: (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Is that an objectionable procedure to you?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No.

Andrew Mack: One alternate is doing something like a Google document that allows for easy collaboration.

Avri Doria: Right. And I think that's great except I think at this point getting this group trained to doing that may be challenging. I think early in the process it might have worked.

But certainly people are willing to do that. You have to send out invitations to everybody which means you have to have everybody's e-mail addresses.

You can't -- if I understand Google Docs correctly -- send it to a group.

Right and I just - (Elaine) just said please don't change the working methods at this point.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes okay.

Avri Doria: So yes, so please send these paragraphs on the list. Okay did you answer my question how long do they need to be?

I would say as long as they need to be to express the problem. I can see them being multiple paragraphs.

I can't see them being longer than multiple pages. You know, so I don't know that the group should put a paragraph or page limit on them at this point.

In terms of the division between what is a problem statement and what is a solution, that's always a tricky, fuzzy, gray area for people. And I think it's one of the things that'll come out in the discussion.

Where being very careful in stating the problem in sort of a neutral - well, neutral way. There is a problem with payment. There is a problem with

finance. There is an issue of scoping the list of people accurately because there's only so much, you know, ability to give assistance.

And I'm just throwing out examples not saying these should be there. But staying away from the "and therefore" and "and so" and such.

And just basically stating what the problem is that people were trying to solve in this solution and what are some of the aspects of the sub-problem. And as the problem is we want to give support to the right people.

A subtext problem was and we want to make sure it's not gamed, you know, or whatever words we want to use instead of games since that's a very disturbing word for some people. But, you know, that sort of thing.

I don't know if that gives enough. Did I answer the question Andrew?

Andrew Mack: I'm not sure - I'll be honest, I'm very, very wary of any assignment that says take as long as you need or as much space as you need. I like to try and give it some bounds especially since we've got a limited amount of attention from our audience.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Andrew Mack: But also I'm wondering -- I mean all of these are going to bleed together a little bit. Do we want one statement of problem for the entire working group?

Do we need - I'm just - I'm thinking out loud here but I'm - I don't want to repeat.

Avri Doria: Okay. I think the fee consideration and the who should get support and the what types of support, they did end up having separate problem statements.

When the work teams went away they went away with what we thought were two problem statements, at least implicitly. And what turned out to be really three implicit problem statements.

It's not for me to set bounds on pages here. But I would say if it was longer than two pages we're probably in the solution space.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Okay. We'll make an effort.

Avri Doria: Okay. And as I say, and - yes. Right.

Basically yes, we do want people to pay attention to the solutions. So we should be careful.

But we need to frame it somehow. And we should come back and discuss what people contribute on the list.

Okay. The next part is the working group recommendations.

Let's start walking through the document. What I did here was I basically just changed the wording a little to say originally Working Team 1 was passbook meeting, the working group's charter objective, 2.

And of course that goes into I guess part of the problem statement is going back to the charter. I should have thought of that earlier -- to identify how the application fee could be reduced and/or (unintelligible).

And then a brief discussion of the process that went on. And then the proposals.

So I've been talking this whole meeting. I see Tijani has his hand up.

Evan can I ask you to start doing this part of the walk through? Are you - do you have -- I'm putting you on the spot, I'm sorry but I feel like I've been talking the whole time.

Do you have Adobe support today?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes but badly. Okay yeah I do have it on my screen and I do have it available.

Avri Doria: Okay. And I have Tijani with his hand up and then I'll pass the talking over to Evan.

And I want to say that because I have to catch a plane I will be leaving right at 10. But, you know, thanks.

So Tijani and then Evan it's yours.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Thank you. It's only a text problem. It's not a substantive problem.

In the eighth line there is an and that you have to remove. The beginning of the line is the reviewed the document - the comments, not and the comments. This and is not in its place.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes that sounds like one of my blips.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Also in the 11th and the 10th line and non-English language and from comments received, it's a repetition.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: And during the workshop et cetera.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Yes I'm sure...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: There is...

Avri Doria: Those are all mine.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: There is something missing Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You didn't speak about the applicant statement so I added and also according to the (unintelligible) applicant statement on the report - on this report to applicants for (unintelligible) developed (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay. That - Karla Valente do you have - Karla Valente since you're holding the pen on this do you have his comment?

Karla Valente: I have - you want me to put it up the screen?

Avri Doria: No, no, no, no, no. In terms of the comments he just made.

Do you know where they are in the document? Do you - and as - I want to make sure that as people give you these corrections - give these corrections you've located them and can say yes I've got that one.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Avri Doria: So that's why I was just checking with you if you caught the comments.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Do you want me to repeat Karla Valente?

Karla Valente: I would like that please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes okay. The first thing is line 8, the third word and is not in its place. We have to remove it.

And in the 10th line there is repetition -- from comments received. It was said in the line before. So we can remove it.

And at the end I added because there is no motion to the applicant statement, I have added and also according to (unintelligible) applicant statement on this report to applicants for new retail deal developed in Brussels.

Karla Valente: Got it. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: So okay I'm passing this off...

Andrew Mack: Evan there's also an instance of the word form that says from. Or the other way around.

It says form but it's supposed to say from.

Avri Doria: Right. And the comments should probably be pluralized. And from comments received during the workshop held at.

Yes that's me. That's my stumble fingered typing. I apologize.

Evan Leibovitch: Quite forgiven.



Avri Doria: Okay yes. Also I forgot to mention in passing this over that I had sent in the e-mail that Tijani did send a very complete set of requirement - of corrections and comments and such.

So okay. I'm going to stop talking now.

Evan Leibovitch: Avri you're actually doing pretty good. But if you want a breather just - it's up to you.

Avri Doria: Okay well there's only 10 minutes left. So it doesn't really matter.

Okay. So do you want me to continue? Is that it?

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay then we get down to under the background we have basically a comment from Tijani in his -- it says in keeping with the principal of - and where is that?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Of full - you want...

Avri Doria: Of full - right.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes I want to remove full. We decided only to - when we did the snapshot.

You remember Alan. You gave this notion Alan.

Alan Greenberg: It's muted. Yes I remember. I agree.

I don't remember the rationale but I remember having the discussion.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Where are we? I'm sorry it's not clear.

Avri Doria: Right. We're in the back...

Alan Greenberg: Fourth line of background.

Avri Doria: Right fourth line of background. Thank you.

Andrew Mack: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Where it says to accommodate applications and (unintelligible).

Tijani Ben Jemaa: In keeping with the principle of cost recovery, not full cost recovery. That's the change.

And it was discussed at length when we was doing the snapshot.

Avri Doria: Right. So does anyone object at this point to that correction I guess is the question?

Okay hearing no...

Alan Greenberg: Well we could always have the discussion all over again.

Avri Doria: Right. Well we don't need to have the discussion over again if no one's objecting. It's just that what I'm trying to do in my perhaps clumsy way is to make changes carefully.

If there's a consensus, you know, at least a passive consensus that there's no problem with making the change someone recommends, we make it. If there's an active discussion then we set it aside and have more discussion.

So on hearing no objection to this one that one can go through. Karla Valente you've got that?

Karla Valente: Got it.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. And basically okay, then we go into process.

Please, you know, let me know if you've got comments on any of these at the moment. The discussion is semi-driven at the moment by Tijani because he did contribute a concrete set of recommendations that's easy to go to.

Please, you know, let me know if you've got comments on any of these at the moment. The discussion is semi-driven at the moment by Tijani because he did contribute a concrete set of recommendations that's easy to go to.

So basically I don't know if there's comments before this but Tijani I guess wanted to delete the line, under proposals one...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: We have his first major recommendation there. Hopefully I didn't miss one -- delete the line, "We expect very few applicants relative to the number of total applying to meet the criteria for assistance for the financial burden of weighting these fees should be minimal."

And basically I can read your explanation, if we consider the total number of applicants as 500 what is very few? Less than 10?

I don't think it is appropriate to justify our proposal by the few number since we don't know it. And the resolution point expressively - yes, expressively mentioned that ICANN aims to ensure that the new GTLB program is inclusive along the lines of the organization's strategic objectives.

Does a very few number of applications supported make the program inclusive? And I've got Alan and then Andrew. Alan please?

Alan Greenberg: I think the general statement is a very important one because we need to - once people start bristling saying you're telling us to give away money. Where are we going to make up the shortfall?

And so the fact that it's relatively a small number I think is a very important statement. I would suggest changing the word very to relatively.

And (unintelligible) it there. I think for people who are going to viscerally object to anything which implies ICANN reduce its revenue because of this, we need to make the reassurance that we're not expecting half of the applications to fall into this bin.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Andrew?

Andrew Mack: I agree. I think - I was going to suggest that we don't want to - the idea of being inclusive it means that it's open to all but does not necessarily mean that it should be, you know, that the application - that the process should be open to all but it doesn't necessarily mean that everyone is eligible to receive support.

I think that how we state it though is important. I wouldn't want to understate either because then the danger is is that people look at this and say well this isn't that important then.

So I just -- I think the way we state it just shows that it's important but just not a window that's open for - where a lot of different applicants will receive funding.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you.

Tijani can you accept (Alan's) change of very to relatively instead of the dropping of the sentence? Or...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It's better. It's better.

Avri Doria: It's better.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Relatively, it's better.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Andrew Mack: We could also change should be minimal to should be reasonable or something like that.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. Yes, yes.

Avri Doria: So we expect relatively few applications to meet the criteria for assistance so the financial burden of waiving these fees should be -- what was the end?

Andrew Mack: Reasonable.

Avri Doria: Reasonable.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Reasonable, yes.

Avri Doria: Anyone object to making the changes that way? Okay Karla Valente do you have those?

Karla Valente: Yes I have the change. Relatively.

Avri Doria: Okay. Relatively and the end replace minimal with reasonable.

Karla Valente: Got it.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And of course we'll pass through this text again.

People will have a chance to review it again. Those not on the call can obviously review and comment as well.

Okay. Let me see, we've got five more minutes.

Anyone else have comments at this section? Looking at (Tajani's) document the next issue comes up in point four.

So does anybody have anything or do we have anything from our comments that suggest that we need changes to either two or three? Okay.

Then in four Tijani recommends the removal of another sentence.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Can I...

Avri Doria: Correct?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Can I explain?

Avri Doria: Please do. It - when I was reading it I wasn't sure whether it was better...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: For me to read or you to explain.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes I will explain. If you read the budget FY '11 you will see that (org) and the name doesn't - don't they - the fixed fees and they pay only \$0.20 per transaction.

So we don't have to put \$0.25 since it can be \$0.20 only. And any cent is very important for those needy people.

So the change I proposed is to remove \$0.25 and to add at its minimum value used so far.

Avri Doria: Okay. I didn't quite understand because I'm looking at your document here and I'm trying to understand the change you just said.

If minimum - because I saw you deleting if minimum is absolutely required then consider lowering this by 50%. And what you're suggesting changing it to is?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I am suggesting to change the - because we mentioned the \$0.25 per transaction. And it is possible to have less than \$0.25 per transaction since now .org and .name pay \$0.20 only.

And they don't pay the fixed fees. So it's possible to do the same -- at least the same for the needier applicants.

Avri Doria: Okay. (Michele)?

Michele Neylon: I'm going to have to drop off in a second. But just dealing with this here specifically, the - if you look at the budget, the current budget for what the current registries are paying they're not all on a per transaction fee.

For example .museum only pays \$500 a year and that's all they pay, full stop. Whereas say with VeriSign are at the opposite end of the scale.

They pay a much higher amount per annum. But - and then other ones are paying a per transaction fee.

So my understanding of what (Tajani's) talking about is not to take this \$0.25 transaction fee as being a given but to look at either reducing the transaction fee significantly for these identified TLDs or looking at a different way of them funding ICANN.

I mean I've got to go so I've got to get on...

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Bye.

Avri Doria: Okay. This sounds to me like an issue that we probably should have slightly more conversation on, and it being 9:58. So I suggest that we continue this one on the list and that at Thursday's meeting we pick up from this particular topic.

Andrew Mack: At this same spot, yes.

Avri Doria: At this same spot, yes. And as I say it's unlikely that I'll be at that meeting so we'll announce it ahead.

Is that okay with people? So okay I see two hands - no I see (Mikhail's) hand is not still up. I believe he left. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I just wanted to say this seems to be an issue that we're all violently agreeing with each other. So we just need to wordsmith something...

Avri Doria: Right.

Alan Greenberg: That covers everything we've been saying.

Avri Doria: So if somebody's got a good suggesting of wording please put it on the list.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.



Andrew Mack: On Thursday we'll pick up here at Page 8.

Avri Doria: Okay. Anything else at this point?

Evan Leibovitch: Thank you Avri.

Andrew Mack: Thank you Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you all.

Andrew Mack: Safe travels.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: At the end of the paragraph I suggested that we remove the last sentence.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: If a minimum is absolutely required then consider lowering the fees by 50% for qualified applicants.

Evan Leibovitch: I think the point is there are a bunch of options and we may want to capture all of them.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. Thank you all.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Bye-bye and I'll certainly post the call (unintelligible) bye.

Man: Bye.

END