SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Friday 18 February 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 18 February 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-20110218-en.mp3
On page ;
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb
 (transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
ALAC
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Baudoin Schombe - At–Large
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large
Cintra Sookanan – At-Large
Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council
GNSO
Tony Harris – ISCPC
Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachine

ICANN staff
Karla Valente
Glen de Saint Gery
Olof Nordling
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:
Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair
Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board
Baudoin Schombe - At–Large
Carlton Samuels – At Large co-chair
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Alex Gakuru – NCSG
Avri Doria – NCSG

Coordinator: Please go ahead the call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's JAS call on Friday the 18th of February we have Rafik Dammak, Carlos Aguirre, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Elaine Pruis, Tinjani Ben Jemaa. And from staff we have Karla Valente, Olof Nordling, Glen de Saint Géry and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

Apologies noted today from Alex Gakuru, Carlton Samuels, Baudouin Schombe. And if I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella. Hello everybody, thanks for joining the Friday call. Okay today we have a different agenda than last times so we are not going to start with updates but more so that we will follow the agenda sent by Karla today.

The first item is about (unintelligible) the summary and analyzes to the public comment. Okay Karla is here or no Gisella...

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes she is.

Karla Valente: Hi Rafik I am here. I am having wireless connection issues but I am at the call. I sent the document yesterday with really a short sentence in response to the public comments because there was not - really one was in support and the other one was unrelated to the (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay so Karla just to present what was the draft just - I'm not sure that everybody reads the document so.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Can you - is that - maybe the response of the Adobe Connect can be helpful.

Karla Valente: Gisella, do you have the document?

Gisella Gruber-White: Are you able to send it through? Is Rafik able to send it through? I'd have to check.

Karla Valente: I sent it yesterday.

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: ...to the mailing list.

Gisella Gruber-White: Give me a second.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: The document is on its way; just bear with me for a second.

Rafik Dammak: By the way what is the date line for the response?

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Monday 21 February.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so we have I think to decide today and just to check after the mailing list.

Gisella Gruber-White: It's just uploading. Hello? Can everyone see the document?

Rafik Dammak: Karla? Yes, yes. Karla please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Just made it bigger, sorry I've taken over on the chat.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi everybody, I'm in now. This is Cintra.

Gisella Gruber-White: Hi Cintra. Welcome to the call. Rafik, Karla?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, where is Karla?

Karla Valente: I am here, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay that's why I asked. Please go ahead just to introduce quickly and then we can have comments from people in the call.

Karla Valente: Oh sure. Okay so the document which I can't see what you have in front of you but the first part of the document really is just the summary of what people posted in the public comments.

There were only two comments. One of them is really unrelated to the report itself and the other one is very much in support of us continuing the work. It talks a little bit about the applicant cost reduction for developing countries so there's nothing really for us to do under the section that says General Comments because that's the summary of what was said by the respondents.

Then there is a section that is called Summary Analysis. And under Summary Analysis it ideally what we as a team respond to the respondents or basically we say to the respondents.

What I did is I just started with a short sentence that says the Joint Applicant Support Working Group responsible for the milestone report thanks the respondents for taking the time to comment. The JAS Working Group has had its chartered renewed and continues to refine the recommendations that will be presented and considered by ICANN support in the new future.

So the question that I have, Rafik, is whether or not this working group wants to expand on that or change that what I just wrote under Summary Analysis and that's the only part that we have to discuss.

Rafik Dammak: So I think it's up to the working group members who are here in the call. So any comments? Please, Tinjani, go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: You hear me now?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay. So the comments was in fact - the comment were in fact only the applicant community statement. And I don't see the second one because I see only this on your document, Karla.

And the - in fact the statement of the applicant community wasn't, if you want, wasn't to pose problems it was to express opinion regarding especially the fee reduction, regarding also the continuation of the group, regarding the milestone report.

So it's true that the statement supports the milestone report and supports the ongoing work. But that's all. So your summary analysis is well; there's nothing to add I think.

But the second comment I don't see it here.

Karla Valente: Yes it is there; it is the last paragraph of the first page and the beginning of the next page. It comes from the .connectafrica.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: I see, yes, I understand. Okay so I understand. Thank you.

Karla Valente: And as you can see it's not really related to the milestone report directly.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: That's right.

Rafik Dammak: Okay any further comments? You know, as I think Tinjani explained well that it's African (unintelligible) statement so it's - and which is supporting our work and the ongoing work and then the - I think the response is enough to respond to that.

So if I don't hear any comments now I think that there is some agreement from people on the call. And then just we need to send - just to ask people on the mailing list if they agree if it's possible today and then we can send the summary. So what do you think?

Karla Valente: I think it's a great idea.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So okay if I don't see any objections so we can move...

Karla Valente: That was easy.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Okay so the next item it's more about San Francisco, to prepare for San Francisco meeting and the working group meeting. So Karla can you please just introduce quickly what are the items related to this point?

Karla Valente: Yes. Thank you, Rafik. So for the Silicon Valley ICANN meeting that is happening now beginning of March the JAS Working Group expressed the wish to have a face to face meeting. This is not a public session, is just a face to face meeting for this group to do some work.

And what I would like to know to be able to book a room for us is what day you want to meet, for how long and what time. And a confirmation of course that this is only one meeting and that subgroups are not meeting separately.

And last time during our call my recollection is that several people from the subgroups said that they don't think that they need actually a meeting room, that they can meet ad hoc, you know, about their own issues but we needed the one face to face meeting for the whole group. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Karla. Just first because the time I see it's first the date it's either Wednesday or Thursday and it will start quite early. So first we may check if it's okay for people to start at 7:30 in the morning.

Karla Valente: Yes that is - it's just a suggestion because last time, Rafik, when we were in Cartagena it was - a lot of the members of this working group had a very early start in their respective constituencies organizations and that's why I really put the 7:30 is a very unkind time. Of course we can meet at any time and we can meet later it's just, you know, a suggestion take into consideration how the schedule starts early for most of us.

Rafik Dammak: Yes we can start to check it. (Unintelligible) in the queue Tinjani and then Elaine. Please, Tinjani, go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay. So first of all Wednesday is a crowded day for At Large. I didn't want to respond to your email, Karla, because I was waiting for the finalization of the schedule. I didn't want to propose another time and then it will appear that there is something in. So perhaps from my side perhaps that Wednesday is not the right day for At Large even though 7:30 is free for us on Wednesday.

But I still think that we have to avoid 7:30 is too early for people and the risk to have very few people coming.

Karla Valente: Okay. Thank you Tinjani. And - this is Karla. Thank you Tinjani and the meetings team should be publishing the schedule next week.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. You're going to have a difficulty slotting it in anywhere else but there you go.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks Cheryl. Elaine please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. I would like to also say 7:30 is going to be a very tough time to make. If we do end up doing that Wednesday would be better for me than Thursday. But could we just do it - maybe have a...

((Crosstalk))

Elaine Pruis: ...which day and which time would be best for people? Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: So just I think to add I think GNSO - for GNSO I think maybe Thursday is not so crowded (unintelligible) so maybe Thursday it's - it should be appropriate and then it - if also suitable for ALAC so it - that can be good day.

About the time so it will be no easy for everybody but maybe we can find a compromise to start at 8:00 or not at least 7:30 but at least at 8:00 we can leave some room for people to come.

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: I'm sorry, Karla speaking. Maybe it would be also easier for people to voice a preference after the meeting team publishes the schedule next week - so by next Friday probably people will have a better feeling of what would be the best time and date.

Rafik Dammak: So - but there is a (design) to ask for slot - time slot or not? So maybe just...

Karla Valente: We don't need to ask for a time slot. I need to reserve a room and the earlier I book a room for us the better it is. But it - if we do that next week is not a problem at all we can still do that.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: So I think that we should we wait for - to have the - (unintelligible) to be published and then - or to be online then we can have better idea so how we can select the day and the time.

Karla Valente: We'll see, yes.

Rafik Dammak: So if people agree we - so we can work on that next week it's better than we have better idea about the time and how is the schedule for San Francisco meeting. Okay. If I hear no objection so we can move. And then to rework on that ICANN list.

((Crosstalk))

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: No, no, no, it was...

Rafik Dammak: Oh okay.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay no problem. So we can - so Karla we can add this item for the next call. Okay? So what else about the San Francisco meeting? I see that about (the system) if - to define what is the overall (messaging) that needs to be (unintelligible) by this working group during the ICANN meeting.

So Karla can you explain little bit what you mean by this?

Karla Valente: So the working group is now working on the continuation of the milestone report so there's going to be a final recommendation. If people or the GAC or the board or general, you know, public asks okay so when do we have the next work? What we should be expecting? What is it that we're supposed to be saying? What are the next steps for this working group? What kind of expectations can we set for, you know, about this work that we are doing?

Rafik Dammak: I'm just - as we are not going to have - we are not going to participate in public session so it is - the (unintelligible) will be how we can - maybe we need to make some presentation to different constituency and stakeholder groups if it's possible.

At least I think that I will have to present an update to the GNSO Council in the Saturday but not sure about that (unintelligible) and how we can - let's say how we can do that with other constituency and stakeholder groups. Any comments? Cintra, please go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Cintra, if you are muted star 6 - star 6 to unmute also.

Cintra Sooknanan: ...using star 7...

((Crosstalk))

Cintra Sooknanan: I just wanted to mention that I have been speaking to (Tracy Hackshal) who is (unintelligible) the GAC representative and he's on a working group which is led by Alice who is the Kenyan (doc) representative. And they are preparing for the Brussels meeting a mechanism whereby developing countries can seek aid in order to apply for gTLDs along those lines.

So I had invited him to join our working group just to ensure we are not duplicating effort and he has agreed. And he said he will also request the same on the other members of his working group.

I don't know if it's appropriate for us to request from Alice or through staff their documentation and their work up to this point so that maybe we can dovetail or see where they are at in terms of our work.

Tony Harris: Can I get in queue? This is Tony Harris.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, please go ahead.

Tony Harris: No I think this is an interesting comment. My only question is is this initiative for the developing countries is it going to be presented by governments or would it be something which would involve developing countries as a whole? In other words the public and sector, the NGOs, everybody?

Cintra Sooknanan: I don't know the full details of it but I know it was a presentation that was to be made at the Brussels meeting one of those subcommittees to deal with that aspect. So I don't think NGOs were specifically invited but certainly I think we should take on board or at least consider what they are presenting to the board.

Tony Harris: Okay thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Just to clarify...

Cintra Sooknanan: I don't know if - Karla is not on the call but perhaps she could have given us some more information or staff, I don't know. (Tracy) has told me that the would be available for the Tuesday calls. Certainly if the attends key will be able to let us know more.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof - Olof Nordling here. Hello, the last son, I'm back again.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You're never lost.

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Well just to clarify a few things, there is a GAC Board consultation that's taking place in a little over a week's time in Brussels for two days. And the purpose of that exercise is to identify the differences between the current stance of the guidebook and the GAC advice in a number of areas.

     And one of those is providing opportunities for all stakeholders including those from developing countries. Where the GAC advice while it certainly differs from what's in the guidebook right now but it also differs - slightly then from the approach followed by the JAS working group.

Notably that they focus on, for example, categorization as a way of applying different conditions for different applications and thereby also the different costs and different application fees. So the purpose of that exercise is really to identify where the differences are just as a little background.

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Is Karla on this call? She was on the call but has she dropped off?

Gisella Gruber-White: Karla is on the call.

Karla Valente: Still here.

Olof Nordling: Yes, yes, right, okay. Well for you to take over the explanation to all that.

Karla Valente: No I think the explanation was accurate. There is really this categorization approach but in addition to that they also stress communication and they stress the timing of when something would be implemented for applicants from developing countries. By they I mean the GAC, sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Okay we have Tinjani and Alan in the queue. Please, Tinjani, go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay thank you. I thought this point was the Item C of the agenda that's why I didn't participate in the discussion but now since it is now discussed I do think that we - that the categorization of the GAC is not much far from our approach too because they wanted to make - if you want some categories being less and we put criteria to pay less also so it's - we are not too far.

I propose that we invite Alice from Kenya and to invite the GAC member from Sri Lanka to attend our next meeting so that they will be - we can discuss with them and we can find with them what is common and what is the message we do want to pass if they agree to do so - to pass it for us.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Alan please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I wanted to clarify but I think I disagree on what Tinjani just said on the first part that is how close together we are. There are a number of people on this call, perhaps most of them, who strongly support categorization.

And categorization is very different from what we're doing because it explicitly says ICANN sets the price differently which we have been essentially forbidden from talking about because of our charter and how we were mandated.

So we're not looking for - they're not looking for interesting ways that we can finesses a lower price but simply it's a lower price, you know, for a whole bunch of different reasons. So conceptually I think it's very close to where we are. Because of the rules that were imposed on us I think their position is a much stronger one.

And although I think we support - I support it, many of us support it, it's not necessarily a recommendation the group can come out. So I think it's very much a complementary effort and we should work together where appropriate but there is this sticking point that they're actually recommending different policy whereas we're bound by the original policy. Thank you.

Tony Harris: Can I get in queue? Tony Harris.

Rafik Dammak: Okay just Elaine and then Tony, okay? Elaine please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: This is Elaine. Rafik, did you just say go ahead? I can barely hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. I am going to strongly oppose supporting categorization from our working group. I like the idea that disadvantaged applicants would get a reduced price but the actual categorization concept has been debated and kicked around in the community for years and it hasn't gained enough traction to get any consideration beyond (unintelligible) category and generic names org categories within the guidebook. So I would not support that.

Rafik Dammak: You don't support that? Elaine? Can you hear me?

Elaine Pruis: I'm sorry, what did you say?

Rafik Dammak: I just wanted to clarify you don't support that we try - you don't support the idea of categorization or just you don't support that we work with that working group from the GAC?

Elaine Pruis: I don't support categorization or the effort of trying to coerce categorization at this point in the program. I think that our efforts and our energies would be better used then to try to push something through that hasn't been accepted by the community as a whole over several years.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Elaine. Tony please go ahead.

Tony Harris: I have a very brief comment. And I think this is opening up a can of worms. As far as the time schedule is concerned if this becomes a serious issue it will mean policy development, it will comment periods, it will mean - I don't know maybe the GNSO will have to work on policy. This could set the whole application process back 18 months or 24 months easily. So I'm not really very much in favor of that.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Tony. Any further comments? Okay so anyway I think we may try to contact this working group. We try to send email to Alice and to check from her side. I'm not sure that maybe she can - or they can attend the next call in Tuesday but at least maybe the Friday call if it's possible for them.

And then I think - I'm not sure about the topic of categorization so maybe we don't - we don't jump on that topic now. Oh okay, sorry, Alan, okay I will repeat.

What I said that I will try to - I will try to contact Alice and to check from their side if they can attend the next call. Not sure if it can be Tuesday but maybe - probably for Friday call.

So I'm not sure if we have now consensus about the topic of categorization. And so - and maybe we need to discuss that in more details in the mailing list because not all working group members are present on the call.

So please, Tinjani, go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you. This categorization is something that we worked on with (Laton Lachatelle) before the launch of this working group. And we worked with him and I support - I support strongly the categorization because I find it a fair way to make things difference. We cannot put all people together and all people are at - doesn't have the same ability to apply and the same conditions.

So if there is support or not support for categorization it will not help now because there will not be any (unintelligible). So what we need now is to convince the GAC people to look before our aims if you want. And that's why perhaps we need to invite them. That's my comment.

Rafik Dammak: Oh thank you. That's what I was saying that we...

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: ...don't jump quickly on the topic of categorization. We don't have everybody here on the call, it's not - there is some objection; some opposition to that so

we cannot have consensus now. But it's just about to pass the message to the GAC.

So the idea was from Sebastian to prepare a message for the GAC Board meeting. So we will just - for the GAC but it's for the GAC and the Board members. And then we may need to work on that (event) quite tight and we know it's quite tight time to do that but to prepare a short message to express what working group want to advocate for - to the GAC members and to board members.

So maybe we need just a few people that can try to work together in a few days to prepare a message that can after to be reviewed by the working group members and then we can ask kindly Sebastian to pass the message during the GAC and Board meeting. So any comments?

Okay so you agree with that way how we can proceed first to contact the GAC members and to see how we can work with them and to avoid duplication of work and then working on message that we should send for the GAC and Board meeting in Brussels. Okay. So we send all this to the - after to the mailing list to have more deep discussion.

I guess we can move to the next item about subgroup updates. I think we have only Tinjani, Elaine and Tony (update) from the work team. So we will start with Tinjani's work team. Please go ahead and just make just a short update. And I...

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: ...show that you already sent the message. Okay. Please go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes very short, okay. So as we discussed last call I proposed you - I sent you a short email with the ideas we discussed last time. And it is about for example self declaration. And I said applicants who wish to benefit from

the support should provide a declaration of their proprieties, a financial report for the last three years, a bank statement of their last three years.

For the qualification to be declared needy an applicant should have a total need - a total net profit over the three last years less than - and this is the (result), we can discuss it - I put $100,000 US.

Nevertheless the applicant should also demonstrate its sustained capacity or capability to operate the string. And thus should have a total net profit over the three last years more than or equal to $70,000.

Those values are arbitrary and don't have scientific explanation. But if we assume that applicants should provide at least a self funding of 30% of the application cost the amounts can be seen as reasonable.

The last point is the gaming. To verify the self declaration ICANN should make use of professional entities at asserting the truth and checking the exactitude of the declaration. Any misrepresentation will lead to the rejection of the application and will disqualify the applicant for the next five years.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Tinjani. Just I have a few quick comments. First that asking the applicants to declare about financial reports and bank statements we are assuming here that the applicants is already existing organization or maybe company.

But I am expecting that for the new gTLD program it's more that we will have - how to say - new form and structure or organization. I'm not sure how they will handle those requests about three years of financial report and bank statements.

And the second comment about the net profit, we can expect that some of those applicants will be not for profit and they may just have tried to only to -

not to have real revenue just too much between the expenses of running a registry and so not expecting to have so much benefit or profit. Yes, thanks.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes. It is not a problem. If it is an NGO for example that is a not for profit organization they have to get some funding. And we put it in our (unintelligible) report. So the self funding is what I am asking for if you want.

And we said that it must be less than $100,000 to be eligible for the support. And it cannot be less than $70,000 because we need a sustainable operating the - as I say operating manner to mange the string. So I don't - I didn't put all the documents needed I put only examples that I think about. There must be other documents needed to demonstrate their need.

But if an organization doesn't have a financial report I don't think - any organization have financial report. And I put net profit but it can not - it can be not a net profit it can be - I don't know, an amount that they have because they need money to apply.

Tony Harris: Can I get in queue? Tony Harris.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Tony and after Tony Cintra. Please go ahead.

Tony Harris: Yes, getting to this subject of Tinjani's very appropriate comment on having some funds coming into these organizations perhaps $100,000 for a three-year period is quite a low threshold because with $33,000 a year it's - it must be a very, very tiny organization.

And becoming a TLD registry even with outside help is not something for the faint of heart. And as far as profit statements or net profit for example if you want to become a member of a global network such as Global Knowledge Partnership, GKP, as an NGO you have to submit at least a yearly balance - an audited yearly balance which at least in South America registered NGOs have to have this done every year and audit it.

So it's basically really a balance sheet more than - which shows the income and expenses of an organization and demonstrates that there is some - some money coming in. That's just something which might be helpful.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Tony. Cintra, please go ahead.

Cintra Sooknanan: Right. I just wanted to make a comment with regard to the three-year period. I think that is appropriate simply because when an organization in my jurisdiction is applying for charitable status that is a period they look for organizations that are established for a while and stable.

And a three-year period is a sufficient amount of time to really be (turned) in if an organization has been keeping appropriate financial records and that kind of thing and has appropriate structure and things of their management. You know that they follow through. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Tony, please go ahead.

Tony Harris: Yes, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, yes, you can.

Tony Harris: Can I respond to that please? Tony.

Rafik Dammak: Yes you can, yes.

Tony Harris: Yes, I just want to make clear I was not objecting to a three-year period I was just saying that the amount of $100,000 spread over three years, if I understood correctly, is insufficient. But perhaps I misunderstood and Tinjani meant...

Cintra Sooknanan: No, no, no...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: ...$100,000 every year for three years. I could have misunderstood.

Cintra Sooknanan: No I agree with you. This was in response to Rafik's previous comment.

Tony Harris: Oh sorry.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: So it's - just to my first comment about how to say that to show that bank statement it's - oh assuming that an organization, NGO or any kind of structure applying for the new gTLD program to exist at least for - to be exist for at least three years so but we can't expect there will be many new applicants who would just start at the top their organization or company this year or just they started last year so...

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: I agree with you. I agree with you and it's not the three years is for the entities already established for three years at least. But we can - we would not reject an organization that is born one year ago or two years ago. So it is a manner to show that the organization can - first that the organization is needed and the second that the organization can operate the string afterward.

So we can change the three years and - three years for the entities established at least three years ago.

Rafik Dammak: Just maybe that some - some requirement for company may have more than three years and some other more requirements for those new established. So

maybe to ask the document that's more relevant for their case. Any further comments for the Work Team A and B?

Okay we can move to Work Team leaded by Tony. I think you already send the document so maybe short introduction and then we can have a short discussion. Please go ahead.

Tony Harris: Are you asking me to speak because I can barely hear you, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry just, yes, I said that please go ahead just to present the document that you sent today to the working group.

Tony Harris: Okay. I did send a document yesterday and then I sent another message saying please put it on hold because I discovered a document from ICANN I had not read thoroughly issued in October of this year but - of last year, sorry.

But it turned out to be basically a review of the budget allocation for new TLDs. And having read it twice I haven't really come up with any substantial changes to the way they - to the division of things within the application fee in other words, the original concept of - or justification of the application fee.

So basically I will confirm by mail later and repost my brief summary or report. And what I can tell you all is I think it's going to be very, very difficult to obtain a fee reduction because it's not a question of how good an argument you present but really on a matter of will.

Will the ICANN Board be willing to review this when they have already sort of told us, you know, this is not - this is not doable. So I wouldn't place too many expectations of success on anything we do in that respect. But I would - I think we should mention it in presenting new documents to ICANN.

And the only thing I found which might - as a long range shot be justifiable would be to see if the evaluators who are - people who are contracted

externally to ICANN perhaps they would waive or reduce their evaluator fee in the case of justifiable applications that require assistance within whatever parameters that we come up with.

But then again that may be a little difficult to achieve. That's all I have to say right now.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Tony. Any comments?

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Okay I have a very easy group; there's consensus all the way around.

Rafik Dammak: Tinjani please go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you. I understand what Tony said about the...

Tony Harris: Could you speak up please, I can't hear you.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: You don't hear me now?

Tony Harris: Now it's better, yes.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay. So I do understand what Tony said about the willing of ICANN to accept the fee reduction. But I think that we should and we have to keep asking for it. It is - it is the only way for the developing countries and for the poor communities to apply.

We will not find funds to fund all the needy people. As you said, as Avri said, the funds are not - there is not a lot to find elsewhere from other entities. So the only thing that is possible is the fee reduction. And if we - if we manage to achieve this fee reduction we will do a lot for the needy applicants.

So there is - there wasn't a real rejection of the fee reduction but they said - they said they don't see how and - that's right that they see - they say from outside ICANN. But I think that we have to convince - we need to go ahead and to do it again, excuse me.

Tony Harris: Can I respond, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes please go ahead. Yes, yes.

Tony Harris: I just want to say that I agree very much with what Tinjani just said. And I have made - in the document I sent him which I will reconfirm I have sent some suggestions as to what - perhaps what we could tell the ICANN Board if we're going to ask them to reconsider this. So I'm in entire agreement with Tinjani on this.

Rafik Dammak: Okay any further comment? Okay I think we have - we can - we will finish with the last work team leaded by Elaine. Elaine you still here?

Elaine Pruis: Yes thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, please go ahead Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Yes so over the last week for the - finding help as far as technical work goes and coordinating that work last week I was at the .next conference and spoke to several providers there about our program.

And (Kieran McCarthy) who organized that conference has agreed to forward a short blurb on our work and a link for some more information to all of the attendees at that conference. So that's an effort to get the word and also try to get some more providers aware of what we're doing and considering internally if they can support our work by providing pro bono services.

So as far as what I'm going to send to (Kieran) I was just thinking of looking at the (unintelligible) that have been put up and then a link to our summary reports. And let's see next week I'll be attending the GAC ICANN Board consultation so I'm looking forward to (unintelligible) on what our message is going to be in that environment so I can carry that also.

Third thing is I've got a spreadsheet built that takes apart the application questions. And I put it into a matrix and divided it up into what sort of help might be needed, you know, for instance one question you might need technical support, you might need an attorney, you might need a consultant. Some questions you just need one piece of that other questions you need all three.

So I still have to get some information from Karla about how to post that to the wiki. I still haven't figured that out. But that's all I've got going on right now.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Elaine. Any comment? Okay so I think that hearing none I can assume that we can adjourn this - we can adjourn this call for today. Thank you everybody for attending. And I am really sorry about the confusion about the time. Anyway I hope that we can fix this for next calls. Okay, thank you. Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Thank you, bye-bye.

Karla Valente: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: Thanks (Tim).

END