SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 19 August 2010 at 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) 19 August 2010 at 12:00 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-20100819.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
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large
Carlos Aguirre - At Large (beginning of the call)

GNSO
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison
Andrew Mack – CBUC
Alex Gakuru – NCSG

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachines

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

Apologies:
Avri Doria - NCSG
Baudoin Schombe – At Large
Olof Nordling – ICANN Staff
Tony Harris

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you Tim. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Thursday the 19 of August.

We have Evan Leibovitch, Alex Gakuru, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Rafik Danmak, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Carlos Aguirre, Alan Greenberg, Andrew Mack, Sebastian Bacholett.

From staff we have Karla Valente and myself Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Avri Doria, Baudoin Schombe, Tony Harris, and Olaf Nordling.

And if I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking. This is for transcript purposes. Thank you over to Evan and Karla.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay in keeping with what I had mentioned at the last meeting I would like to ask at this point if anyone on this call has registered or has indicated a change or an update in their statement of interest?

If no one says anything I will assume that everybody's statement is current and has not changed since the last call. Does anyone have an update?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...continue with disclosure. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So hopefully that was an easier way to do it then way it was done last time and I hope the way we'll go forward with it.

What I'd like to do is to try and pick up on the document where we left it off last time. The only problem is I am at a slight loss right now while I'm waiting for my machine to chug along and bring up Adobe Connect.

Gisella could you possibly - do you have the document right now up on Adobe?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Yes it is. If someone can just remind the group where we were up to we can all scroll to that page.

Evan Leibovitch: I seem to recall us being on Page 8 when we left last time...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...we stopped last time.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because I've gone through to Page 11 sorry. Okay Page 8 it is.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry Evan I was trying to get off mute.

Karla Valente: Yes Gisella the document was uploaded last time. It should be there in the list.

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay we'll go through it I've got the document on the screen.

Evan Leibovitch: Was it Page 11 or Page 8 where we left last time? I'm at the disadvantage of not seeing it in front of me.

Andrew Mack: It appears that Page 8 is correct just looking at it unless I'm mistaken.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Could I ask somebody else at least to read off again what's in the document and start any discussion? I should be up and going with my stuff within five.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Evan I have my hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He can't see you. Go ahead Tijani.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks Tijani. I wouldn't know otherwise.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Okay I have a preliminary comment before we start please. Two calls one day apart is too tight.

I couldn't read and work and prepare something for the call of today. So can we please modify the second call and put it at least two days after the first one?

Evan Leibovitch: Look, I'll be the first to agree with you that twice a week right now is - to me is extremely high pressure on this, especially along with other things that are going on.

Without Avri here and with a fairly light attendance on this call I'm hesitant to make a judgment on this right now.

Tijani could we please take this to email and get a broader consensus. And I agree with you that we need to space this a bit better but...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...I don't think we're in a position to do that on this call.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Andrew Mack: Evan so what - this is Andrew. For what it's worth for those of us who have who are trying to put together some deliverables I couldn't agree more with Tijani. I think it's just not enough time to digest what we've got and also to come forward with something.

Evan Leibovitch: Could we be better to - could we do this with one call a week? I'm just personally finding twice a week to be...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, no. I don't agree. And perhaps we have to get the inputs from the ICANN staff to know on which day there is not a call or is not a conflict for the calls.

Evan Leibovitch: I'll tell you what. Gisella could you possibly arrange a Doodle based on the times giving another day of breathing room?

So you - so Tijani you're suggesting perhaps Tuesday morning if Tuesday morning - well for me Tuesday right now like this time of day on the Tuesday and the Friday?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: For example yes.

Andrew Mack: Yes. Second it. Good suggestion Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Gisella could you just could possibly confirm that there are no conflicts and perhaps send out a Doodle?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely I'll send out a Doodle for this time on Friday then.

Evan Leibovitch: Twenty four hours from now.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes. And with regards to the Tuesday call are you keeping it once every couple of weeks? We've got Rafik who would have a conflict if we changed the time of our Tuesday call.

Evan Leibovitch: I think...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Remembering if you've got a 90 minute call. Cheryl here. If you've got a 90 minute call once a month you have a problem with the ALAC meeting starting just an hour after your traditional Tuesday start.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes I think the Tuesday meeting is worth keeping because we have had even before we went to twice a week.

Gisella Gruber-White: I strongly suggest we keep the Tuesday at 1300 UTC and we can try for the Friday at this time running for an hour and a half.

There's one other group but I don't think that there are any conflicts. So I'll send a Doodle out for 1200 UTC on Friday for Jazz for 90 minutes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Good.

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Gisella?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: For Friday please don't forget that you have the GHE...

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: ...meeting at that. So maybe one hour (entires) and then it would overlap this GHE work team.

Gisella Gruber-White: I know you're on the 1300 on the Friday call as well. It's just if we start this call it's 1100 - 1130 UTC that's 4:30 in the morning in Los Angeles. I'll send out a Doodle.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay very good.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so well thanks for - well in small part the discussion of the meetings taken enough time...

Andrew Mack: Evan you're fading away.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry?

Andrew Mack: You're fading away, your voice.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes because my Adobe Connect computer's on the other side of the room from my...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So we need make give him a headset or a better computer that he can move to his phone.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: No the good news...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: They have these portable computers.

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: You sound like you're calling from the space shuttle chief.

Karla Valente: Another alternative is a smaller room.

Evan Leibovitch: I think the (story has) had better computers than I do right now. Okay...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...I've said that. I've joined the land of the...

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, keep close to the microphone Keep close to the microphone. We don't hardly hear you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so I - so either I can read the documents or I can talk to you but not both at the same time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Will someone send this man a headset by Fed Express.

Andrew Mack: Or a longer Ethernet or telephone cable.

Alan Greenberg: They have these portable computers nowadays, you know?

Karla Valente: Evan I can help reading the document. What part are you on?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I am on - can you hear me okay?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just keep yelling at us. We'll be fine.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay I have moved - I am actually now onto Page 8. And so under the section Proposals the following suggestions have been formulated in regard to fee consideration.

Do I need to read that paragraph out or is everybody okay with it being able to read it for themselves? And opening discussion on this now?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: We have - Evan we have worked on this paragraph yesterday on Tuesday.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It's already done.

Evan Leibovitch: All right, how far did we get? I thought this was where we left off, sorry.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No we did Paragraph 1 till Paragraph 4, number 1 through number 4.

Evan Leibovitch: So we...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So you were actually on Page 9 not 8.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so we are on Item 5 on Page 9, is that correct Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Four is not finished.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: A point of order. For the future doc version of documents can we have numbers on the sections so those with different pagination can have a chance of finding something?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Good.

Evan Leibovitch: This is - well Alan you're right. This is Item 4 but it's Item 4 under some sections. So we should have the sections Numbered too. Is that what you're...

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I'm looking at Tijani's document which has a lot of changes in it and I haven't yet found where proposals is. But I'll keep working on it while you're talking.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Good.

Evan Leibovitch: All right so can we reopen discussions then on point Number 4 on the top of Page 9 about lowering registry (unintelligible) due to ICANN? Does anyone have any comments on this?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes my comment Tijani.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: My comment was that we have to remove the 25 cents and we increase it by at each minimum value used so far.

Because I gave the example of .org and .name that didn't pay - that don't pay the fixed fees and pay only 20 cents for the transactions. So why we use 25?

Evan Leibovitch: So instead of changing - all right, so takeout registry level transaction fee is $25 per initial (unintelligible) domain registration and just change that to the minimum existing...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: ...fee?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: My proposal is the following Evan. Instead only charge registry level transaction fee per initial and/or renewal domain name registration at its minimum value is used so far?

Alan Greenberg: I would say comparable to instead of at.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes comparable to works, yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes my English is very poor. I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh...

Alan Greenberg: Tijani your English is very excellent.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Tijani's English is better than my Australian is so that's good.

Alan Greenberg: And perhaps better than your English is Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh I don't even try about my English I can tell you that. That's - that's just bad.

Evan Leibovitch: And at this time of day Tijani's English is better than me in any language.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Evan, but we still can't quite hear you. You're still breaking up a little bit.

Evan Leibovitch: That doesn't...

Karla Valente: This is Karla. Could you please repeat the change that you want reflected on the document?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You want me to repeat?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Karla Valente: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Okay instead only charge the registry level transaction fee per initial or renewal domain name registration at each minimal or the...

Alan Greenberg: Comparable to.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: ...comparable to the minimum value used so far.

Alan Greenberg: Used for other GTLDs?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes used for the other GTLDs, good.

Andrew Mack: Can someone read that...

Evan Leibovitch: I was just going to ask once - Karla, once you have that down can you read it back as you last believe us to have said?

Karla Valente: So what I have is lower registrant fees due to ICANN in the lieu of the registry level fixed fee of other than 500 per calendar year that we charge the registry level transaction fee for initial or renewal domain registration as it's comparable and then I lost it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay the minimum - to the minimum comparable fee elsewhere?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Andrew Mack: To...

Karla Valente: You'll be...

Andrew Mack: To a fee comparable with the minimum...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Charge...

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: such fee charged for other GTLDs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: At that point can I ask is there any real value in leaving the sentence in many TLDs pay much less to ICANN if anything?

I would propose we delete that sentence and then move on only to as a minimum is absolutely required than consider lowering this fee by 50% to qualified applicants?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I'm quite happy with that.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Can you repeat Cheryl please?

Andrew Mack: Yes can you say it again? I'm sorry I'm not quite sure I follow it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: To delete the sentence many TLDs pay much less to ICANN if anything in brackets.

Andrew Mack: Right okay.

Evan Leibovitch: That's it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's it. And then it's the rest...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Oh no but Tijani added the next sentence. If a minimum is absolutely required then...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: ...consider lowering this fee to 50% for qualified applicants.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I proposed that we delete that.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That is the cost that I'm looking at and I'm assuming that was being left?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Right if I'm...

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Andrew Mack: ...reading - if I'm understanding it correctly the sentence that we disagreed on or we just discussed should replace those two, right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. The sentence we just agreed on is a new variation on the sentence prior to an annual fee of 25,000 to ICANN is a barrier to sustainability for an applicant representing small community.

Andrew Mack: Yes okay so that's - but doesn't it obviate the need for those last two sentences?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think it obviates the need for the sentence many TLDs pay much less.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But I'm...

Andrew Mack: I guess...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...not satisfied to remove the option of a 50% for qualified applicants reduction.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes, absolutely yes. Yes (unintelligible). Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Andrew the issue is not just the fee for domain but the minimum they have also set of 25,000.

Andrew Mack: Okay got it. I'm sorry I understand you know. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Cool. So Karla just to be on the safe side could you read back the entire point 4 as we now have it (unintelligible).

Karla Valente: Okay. Lower the (registry) fixed fees due to ICANN in lieu of the register level fixed fees of 25,000 per calendar year instead only charge the registry level transaction fee per initial or renewal domain name registration to a free comparable to a minimum used in for other GTLDs.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Karla Valente: And a fee of 25,000 to ICANN is a barrier to sustainability for an applicant representing a small community. If a minimum is absolutely required then consider lowering this fee by 50% for qualified applicants.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I thought we deleted that, no?

Alan Greenberg: That last sentence, if a minimum is absolutely required, is that staying in or going out?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I thought we deleted this sentence.

Karla Valente: I wasn't clear about that. I thought we deleted the many TLDs and then the sentence before that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No I'm Karla I suggested deleting the many TLDs sentence but leaving in the 50% reduction one.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. Tijani had suggested however that that sentence be modified to say instead of consider lowering that lower.

Alan Greenberg: So change that last sentence. If a minimum is absolutely required lower this fee by 50% for qualified applicants. I believe that was what Tijani's suggestion was.

                  Is everyone okay with it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm comfortable with it. I prefer it in than out.

Alan Greenberg: No, no but the stronger wording that says lower the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...fee rather than consider lowering the fee?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. but I'm always happy to stronger wording. Less words then stronger words are always good from my point of view.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: My point of view...

Karla Valente: The change was made o show...

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Can I speak please?

Karla Valente: ...then lower by 50% for qualified applicants.

Alan Greenberg: Okay Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you. My point of view is to - we have to give recommendations. And if the recommendations are not possible they will not be accepted.

So we don't have to give them half of the solution. We don't have to get - to tell them if a minimum is absolutely required.

We said that it is a barrier so that's all. We stop here. We don't have to give them the half of the solution if you want.

Alan Greenberg: Tijani there is no expectation that they will think of that themselves. They may say all that we're not going to lower it to zero therefore let's go on to the next recommendation.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: But in this case we are not - we consider it as a barrier and yet we say okay we will make them pay a 50% amount.

Alan Greenberg: Presumably 12,500 is not as large a barrier as 25,000. It's not the best. It's not what we want but it's better than keeping it at 25.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: But Alan I have to notice that .org the name and others don't pay the fixed fee. Why the needy applicant that have to pay? That's my question.

Alan Greenberg: Because it's too late to change them. For a .org it's not an issue of minimums so that's...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: The prevailing wisdom may be that those were mistakes that they are not going to repeat.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Alan - Evan I don't understand what you say.

Alan Greenberg: I - what I said is for .org it's not relevant because their volume is high enough that minimums are not the issue. And for the other ones I believe those are as Evan said to be blunt, mistakes that ICANN is not going to repeat.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: But we have to make use of these mistakes.

Alan Greenberg: Ah.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You don't believe so? We are trying to help needy applicants. So we - it's a good - the point for us to show them that we are not asking for something which is not used. It's used already.

Evan Leibovitch: Well you're right in saying that the precedent exists. But we may be walking in and I think we probably are walking into a situation where they may believe that precedent to have been something they don't want to repeat.

And so Tijani, the question is, if we ignore it totally we give them the excuse just to gloss over the entire issue and keep the status quo or do we say then if you really must do something, then meet us halfway literally?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: The status quo that we're looking at is not what they charge other GTLDs but what's in the DAG. So I think we have to be a little bit pragmatic about that.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: In this case I prefer to put 30%, not 50%. Yes, I try to be really the more helpful for those applicants.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually I don't have a problem with changing the percentage to 30% and then they can play with the percentages if need be, you know, say 25% or 30%.

Alan Greenberg: Make it 40% which is around 10,000.

Evan Leibovitch: All right, okay. We're making some headway here. So...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: ...a ballpark percentage for us to say?

Alan Greenberg: Don't use a percentage. If a minimum's absolutely required, then lower the fee to 10,000 - the minimum fee to $10,000 for qualified applicants. It's a round number.

Evan Leibovitch: Tijani?

Alan Greenberg: Easier for budgeting too.

Evan Leibovitch: Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes?

Evan Leibovitch: You okay with that?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And see what - at least then there's a - something for them to react to.

Alan Greenberg: No I understand your point totally Tijani. If they're doing it elsewhere why can't they repeat it here?

But the fact that the DAG exists in its current form clearly indicates that they don't want to do things the way they were done before.

This is the - I mean this is the reality that we're dealing with. The rules are changing for the creations of new TLDs compared to what they used to be.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Right. I understand.

Alan Greenberg: So we have to confront them based on those terms rather than historical ones.

Andrew Mack: I think we either need to accept something or take a poll on - or go to the mailing list. Otherwise we're going to spend the whole hour on this or hour and a half on this section.

Evan Leibovitch: I mean personally I would have said 25 and use it as a starting point and let them come back with something, you know, bigger.

But 10,000 is a flat number or a lower percent. What's the preference around the call?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I will agree with the minimum that it's possible to put.

Evan Leibovitch: Six dollars.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: I feel like we're on the Price is Right. I - we need to put something to Tijani. Assuming we need to put something what are you comfortable with?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Can you put 30%?

Evan Leibovitch: Thirty's fine.

Andrew Mack: Fine.

Evan Leibovitch: Alan, Cheryl?

Alan Greenberg: Fine, fine.

Evan Leibovitch: Every...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was happy with 30, yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Andrew, Carlos, Alex?

Alex Gakuru: Time to move on.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it's okay with me.

Alex Gakuru: It's Alex. Or we can take time.

Andrew Mack: No one's saying no. Let's go on.

Evan Leibovitch: All right, okay Karla could...

Karla Valente: Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes?

Karla Valente: This is how the sentence reads now.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Karla Valente: If a minimum (unintelligible) required, then lower this by 30% for qualified...

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, to 30%.

Karla Valente: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not by 30%, to 30%.

Karla Valente: To 30%.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, could you do me a favor? Read back Number 4 exactly as you have it and then we'll move on.

Karla Valente: Okay, lower the registry fixed fee due to ICANN. In lieu of the registry level fixed fee of 25,000 per calendar year, instead only charge the register level transaction fee of the transaction fee for annual or renewal domain and registration, so a fee comparable to a minimum use to - for all the GTLDs.

An annual fee of 25,000 to ICANN is a barrier to sustainability for an applicant representing a small community.

If a minimum is absolutely required, then lower this fee to 30% for qualified applicants.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: All right?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Number 5.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, reconsider the risk contingency cost per applicant, $60,000.

The work team questions if ICANN really expects a total of $30 million, 60 times 50, 500 applications and unknown cost of service.

This fee could be reduced, excused to the applicants that meet the criteria established by the working group.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I propose to remove reduce and to put only excused. And we said could, could...

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, right now we have - right now they say this fee could be reduced/excused to Tijani's proposing eliminating the word reduced and just have the fee could be excused for applicants that meet the criteria.

Comments?

Alan Greenberg: I make the same - it's Alan. I make the same comment I made before. I think if you simply ask for that it will be outright rejected.

Andrew Mack: I think if you say reduced you leave open -- this is Andrew. You leave open the possibility that it could be excused. But if you ask for it to be excused directly you may be getting - you may get pushback. I think I agree with Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I'm...

Evan Leibovitch: So in other words, as a matter of philosophy here, just going for all or nothing gives us a chance of getting nothing. If we say all, some or nothing we're more likely to get some.

Andrew Mack: That's my reading of it. I think I'm hearing the same from everyone. It's not a question of whether or not we think it should be reduced but what's the best way to get the maximum reduction?

Alan Greenberg: Or we could use the same tactic as the previous one and say it should be eliminated. And then and if...

Evan Leibovitch: Do we have a consensus?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: What Alan said?

Evan Leibovitch: Alan?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: What was your last proposition please?

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, I'm having people cut out. Evan you asked is there a consensus with what I said or with what is there?

Evan Leibovitch: With what you said.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...is the statement saying the fees I would believe should be - should be excused or - I would say okay, "This fee should be eliminated for applicants that meet the criteria established by the Working Group." So...

Evan Leibovitch: That change is changing could to should but otherwise leaving it intact?

Alan Greenberg: No.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No.

Alan Greenberg: I eliminated the word reduced from that side - from that sentence and then I'm adding a new sentence, "If elimination is not possible it should be significantly reduced," or something like that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Drastically reduced.

Alan Greenberg: Drastically reduced.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So we're saying the fee should be excused but if you're not going to excuse it to reduce it significantly.

Alan Greenberg: Drastically.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tijani are you okay with that?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Karla Valente: Can I read back what I have?

Evan Leibovitch: Please.

Karla Valente: Okay. "This fee should be eliminated for applicant that meet criteria established by the Working Group. If elimination is not possible then it should be drastically reduced."

Alan Greenberg: Yep.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Very good.

Evan Leibovitch: All righty. So we're okay to move on to Number 6.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: All right. So...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I don't think...

Evan Leibovitch: ..."The fixed variable cost of $100,000 is based on the total costs through the previous round of applications which the cost considerations document quantifies as $1.8 million for all ten applications. The fee most probably include the costs associated with the conflict that arose from rejection Triple-X which remains unresolved." Do we need to get into that wording in this part?

"Fee of $180,000 may be significantly skewed by the long-term work required for XXX. Actual evolution and administrative costs for the other nine applications may have been considerably less than $180,000 per piece. If this is the case the $100,000 fee could be reduced just for the applicants that

meet the criteria." My first reaction to that is I don't think we need to go into the history of .XXX quite as much as we do here. I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think if you change the language to say, "These cost considerations of the ten applicants undoubtedly include some exceptional circumstances. Based on this we believe the fee should - cost fee should be reduced for the applicants that meet the criteria established by the Working Group," and cut out most of the middle bit.

Alan Greenberg: My position on - I agree with what Cheryl said if that whole thing is there. My original position stands that I believe - if you remember the $180,000 for past applications was simply used as a sanity check to say that the calculation done through other means was not totally unreasonable and it's a completely different process than the previous ones.

And I think the old history is not relevant. Plus we're not really even sure whether the implication is correct. So my personal feeling is to remove this whole section. I didn't win that battle but I would definitely remove the .XXX references.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Evan Leibovitch: Can we say just more vaguely that the cost recovery is believed to be based on previous exceptional circumstances that need not be repeated?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, well you can't say the last part because it very well could be repeated.

Evan Leibovitch: Well...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The fee undoubtedly includes exceptional costs.

Alan Greenberg: We don't know that and it's not relevant. That was only used as the sanity check, not as the way to calculate the fee.

Evan Leibovitch: So - well I mean we can't exactly state in here we believe they just pulled $180,000 out of thin air.

Alan Greenberg: No. No. The $185,000 was done through laborious calculation.

Evan Leibovitch: Right. The...

Alan Greenberg: It was then compared to the $180,000 as the sanity check. We don't know exactly what that $180,000 included, whether it included legal fees for .XXX or it included, you know, coloring their toenails.

Evan Leibovitch: Well depending on who I talked to it seemed like the number was essentially, was made deliberately high to keep out players that couldn't afford it which is exactly what we're trying to address here.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I haven't heard that statement so I can't speak to it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In which case could we cut it to a very short sentence that says, "The fixed variable cost of $100,000 should be reduced for applicants that meet the criteria established by the work group." End of sentence.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. You don't give a rational for that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep. And don't put three X's in a row if you want the board to see straight.

Evan Leibovitch: I would go as far as to change should to must but otherwise I'm fine with it. Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Andrew Mack: I don't know if we need must but I think that that makes sense the reference to Triple-X seems to be...

Evan Leibovitch: It's a distraction here.

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: It's a distraction here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a distraction, yep.

Andrew Mack: And it might cause people to focus on that and, yeah, I guess it's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yeah. Oh yeah.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So Karla do you have Cheryl's wording?

Karla Valente: I have. I have one sentence only which is, "The fixed variable cost of $100,000 should be reduced to meet the criteria established by the Working Group." Is that correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Be reduced for applicants that meet the criteria established by the Working Group.

Karla Valente: So I have, "The fixed variable cost of $100,000 should be reduced for applicants that meet the criteria established by the Working Group."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep and then the next paragraph reads fine to me following on from that.

Andrew Mack: The next paragraph being WT 1?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Evan Leibovitch: We'll move on. Let's tackle them one at a time. So we have totally reworded six and significantly simplified it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Evan Leibovitch: Everyone okay with that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep. But the next paragraph I thought was still under Section 6.

Evan Leibovitch: Yep, "WT 1 is working with WT 2 on identifying sources of funding." Okay. Oh, (Elaine), hi there. Welcome and you've got your hand up.

(Elaine):   Hi. Thanks. Sorry I'm late. I'm on Central time and yesterday I was on Eastern. So I do have a question about number six and I wrote a majority of this part of the paper.

And the idea was that we would in keeping with the principles of cost recovery explain how or why our applicants could be excused from contributing towards cost recovery or why the funds might not - that number might not be relevant for their application.

So I'm totally happy with getting rid of the .XXX references and this came from a comment somebody else submitted. But I am a little not okay with just saying we should just lower the fee for our applicants without any sort of reason or justification or how is this money going to be made up somewhere else.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Where did that second proposal come from? Because nobody I thought I heard tonight at least, today, has suggested changing anything in the following script after what was edited out of the Triple-X explanation. The work following in from what WT 1 and WT 2 have done seemed fine to me.

Alan Greenberg: No. I think the point (Elaine) is making is the original rational for lowing this fee is a significant part of the $100,000 was a 60,000 - I think 60,000 item called risk.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: And that was interpreted by some as being these are costs of risky applications. That is those who will have legal fees and those who will do other things and therefore since we deem our cultural - our community applications not to have that kind of risk that it would not apply. My argument...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you...

Alan Greenberg: ...my argument originally was that the term risk was inappropriately used and that isn't how it was derived. But that nevertheless was - the argument was some of the costs or all of the costs in the risk and part of the equation would not apply and therefore they - our identified applicants should not be charged it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you're talking about the need to add a sentence that says, "For community supported and community based applications any risk is minimal," then absolutely agree it should be added. But I don't see that removing what we have done from the first paragraph in Section 6 has done anything to take away. I mean I don't see that that was explaining that there was a risk assessment error.

Alan Greenberg: Well no but it - if I remember correctly that risk issue morphed into the .XXX one. (Elaine) you might have better memory than I do on it. Is (Elaine) still with us?

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Am I still here?

Man: Crazy call today.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She dropped off but she's coming back in.

Man: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: All right. Do we need to be clear here in just saying that, you know, do we need to be clear here in using the word risk? If we're not going to mention XXX and insert some rational why we think that this can be reduced.

Alan Greenberg: Well - but (Elaine) is the one who did the writing so we need to wait for her to come back to answer that question.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Can we not address any of that in the meantime?

Andrew Mack: Can I pose a question real quickly? This is Andrew. I was under the impression that there were two kinds of risk that we're evaluating. One was if you will the historical risk and that's where this Triple-X thing came in. The idea that the abnormally complicated and risky applications.

                And then there's the second question which is that the groups that we're identifying is actually less risky than the average. So that they're - so that we wanted to capture the fact that the risk profile generally was skewed and that specifically our target group is even less risky that that. Does that make sense?

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I'll - I'll...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If it's decided that is the same thing (Alec) - Andrew.

Alan Greenberg: I'll reiterate my original comment that if you read the details of the cost analysis risk included things like we don't know if we're going to get 100 applications, 500 or 6000 and...

Man: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...therefore it's hard to decide what the right number is for allocating the fixed costs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: We - there are some parts of the process which everyone will go through but for various reasons we have not been able to cost them out accurately. We've used our - the insurance type calculation to generate a risk number because that's what we're putting it at even though we don't - even though actual hard facts are absent. That's why I didn't think it was appropriate to use the risk. But saying these applications are less risky, it was a calculation that looked at the average cost not of a particular application. That was the issue.

Evan Leibovitch: But basically Alan you're saying then is that they've pulled the number out of thin air based on their calculation.

Alan Greenberg: No. It wasn't out of thin air it was actuarial calculations and pumping in statistics and Monte Carlo simulations and a lot of things. It was scientifically done which is equivalent to pulling it out of thin air perhaps only history will tell us which it is.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But that's not the point I would have thought. The point is we are saying that for a criteria driven and acceptable criteria set if applicants who meet that criteria do qualify for the additional support, the type of support that can be

made available in the rest of the document until we get to Section 4, if that is the case they are not only likely to be less risky but should be given a lower fee. (Elaine's) got her hand back up.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead (Elaine).

(Elaine): Okay. So they are not more likely to be less risky because they are probably going to be more financially vulnerable and we're not sure about their actual commercial viability. So I absolutely am not okay with saying they're more likely to be less risky.

If you want to say that they should not have to pay the entire application fee that's fine. But my point is we need to explain where that money is going to come from or why we have an issue with that part of the fee.

I don't think we need to say anything about dot Triple-X, that came from Tony Harris initially when we started the Working Group and he put forth several ideas.

If we can just say, "The fixed variable cost of 100K is based on the total cost of previous round of applications and those fees might include costs that won't be relevant to this round. So if the board would consider lowering that part of the fee structure for our qualified applicants." That would be good language to me.

Evan Leibovitch: Everybody?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm happy with that.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Me too.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Karla could you read back what you have?

Karla Valente: In Number 6?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Karla Valente: Okay. Number 6 I have the first paragraph is simply reduced to, "The fixed variable cost of $100,000 should be reduced for applicants that meet the criteria established by the Working Group." And it goes to the second paragraph, "Working Team 1 is working with Working Team 2." And there is no change to that last paragraph.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No. You got the language of (Elaine)?

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah. Karla do you have what (Elaine) just said?

Karla Valente: No I don't.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. (Elaine) could you read back what...

(Elaine):   Sure. So I just said, "The fixed variable cost of $100,000 is based on the total cost of the previous round of applications. Those costs might not be relevant to the new GTLD program applicants and the Board could consider lowering those costs to applicants that meet the qualifications for support." Or something like that.

Karla Valente: Okay. So I'll read to you what I have, see if it's close to what you said. "The fixed variable cost of $100,000 is based on the total cost of a previous round of applications." Is that correct?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Exact.

Karla Valente: "And might not be relevant to the new GTLD applicants and this cost should be reduced for applicants that meet the criteria established by the Working Group."

(Elaine): That sounds close enough.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: That's good.

Karla Valente: Okay. And then the second paragraph I have the same as it is written now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Is everybody okay with that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Tijani you're sounding really fed up.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I said yes.

Evan Leibovitch: All right. So, okay and we're not changing that last paragraph, "WT 1 is working with WT 2."

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No.

Evan Leibovitch: Does anyone have any comments on that paragraph? Going one, going twice. Okay moving on. Bottom of Page 9, who should receive support? "Key to making a support program work is choice of initial support recipients. With this in mind WT 2 considered a number of possible applicants but agreed the initial focus should be on finding a relatively limited and easily identified sets of potential applicants which would be non-controversial to support. Based on these criteria and the review of the comments the Working Team recommends the following.," Blah blah.

What is the word supposed to be after, "and something the review of the comments?" And "per" the review of the comments, does that sound right?

Andrew Mack: That looks just like a typo.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah. So I think the word is per - per the review?

Andrew Mack: That should be fine.

Karla Valente: Further review?

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah. The word instead of "aer" is "per."

Andrew Mack: Or we could even say. "As in - based on these criteria and a review - and a review of the comments." Is that clearer?

Evan Leibovitch: Just say, "And per review of the comments." Is that okay?

Andrew Mack: Sure.

Evan Leibovitch: Let's move on we've still got a lot of ground to cover.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No. No.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Go ahead Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Evan - Evan yes I propose to remove, "Relatively admitted and easily identifiable sets of." I propose to remove this phrase and I explain why.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So I said that our mission, the mission of this Working Group is not to find relatively admitted and easily identifiable set of applicants. Will it make a new GTLD program inclusive if we say that?

Evan Leibovitch: I - okay. I thought that - I thought basically that the intention was that we were going to put forward that could apply to half the applicants so they'd be rejected out of hand.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No. When the (decision) 20 asked us to propose the foundations they didn't spell out that it will be for reduced number or for a limited number or for something like this. So we don't have to put it ourselves. It is - I don't think it is good.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Andrew and (Elaine). Andrew you go first.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Tijani I think we've had this conversation before. I think everyone agrees with you that the desire is not to - is to create a system that is open. Our intent from the very beginning was to come up with some sort of small test group that we could use to get this process going.

That is a partly political decision because we want to get some support from the group because this is a new initiative. And it's partly just a simple logistical thing. If as Evan says the criteria make it possible for half of the applicants to make it and to submit an application for support then that won't help the process.

Is it a little bit imperfect to choose some group over, you know, to favor some group to some extent? Probably you're correct but I think this is a practical - the idea behind it is a practical consideration.

You'll note that in part because of what you have said in the past we've made it very, very clear in following language that it's not only limited to these groups but just that this is the group that we are focusing on. If other groups wish to apply they still can. Is that - does that make sense?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I find the language as it is now, as it was wrote I find it absolutely exclusive of any other groups because you said, "At this initial phase," that means this round, "We will give support to these groups or these kind of applicants."

The other kinds will be looked at at another point, at later date. That means at later rounds. And as you know from the beginning there was a long discussion about this (feasibility) of rounds and it was suggested that for example rounds would be opened at fixed periods - at fixed frequency with limited number of applicant.

But it was rejected and adopted method is one single round for a limited number of applicants. That means that there is not a foreseen round other than this one. So we don't have to speak about the other rounds because perhaps they will not happen or they will happen in ten years. I don't know.

Andrew Mack: I...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So that's why I say - that's why is say - that's why is say if we make restrictions now we will make the majority if you want, a lot of groups, a lot of possible beneficiary of this action we will reject them from the beginning.

Andrew Mack: The question Tijani in my mind is only is the - we don't - we have a saying don't make the perfect the enemy of the good. And if you have another suggestion as to how we can avoid being flooded by applications then I'm certainly open to it.

This was - the only reason we did it this way was to try to give a little bit of shape to this initial effort so that we can get the political support that we think that we will need. And also to make it, you know, because we were expecting that we will have a limited amount of resources including a limited amount of resources to go through the process.

I am concerned that if we receive, you know, if we were to receive 100 applications for support that we wouldn't have the resources even to evaluate

them. But perhaps other people have better ideas and I'm open to changing this I just don't have another proposal on the table to get to where we're trying to go.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You are right Andrew. I...

Alan Greenberg: Can we let other people in and not just have this be a debate between Tijani and Andrew?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes you are right, excuse me excuse me.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Well I've got Alan you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I have a question and a comment. The sentence which currently says, "Work Team 2 considered a number of possible applicants.," Did Work Team 2 actually look at specific applicants? That is The Red Cross, the Nairobi Student's Association and someone else or did they look at a class of applicants or type of application? I didn't think there were any applicants at this point.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You're right.

Andrew Mack: There aren't. No applicants at this point, correct.

Alan Greenberg: So how did they look at a number of possible applicants? What does that mean?

Andrew Mack: You're correct. We were talking in the broad sense about the classes of applicants.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Okay. Fine...

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: If you want feel free.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Given that I - the rest of my comment didn't make sense if I understood that. I think the relatively limited is the absolutely essential statement there.

If we don't say that and go on record as saying we are interested in a moderate number then many of the other arguments that we made of reduce the (front) costs or something like that, that argument falls apart if it ends up being anything other than a small percentage of the total applications. So I think that's essential.

Easily identifiable I'm not sure is the right wording. I think what we're trying to say there is we're not going to end up in lawsuits because of who we pick and who we don't. They have to be reasonably objective criteria and they have to be not (gameable) or moderately not (gameable). I'm not sure easily identifiable captures that.

But I think it's essential that we maintain the reasonable number, limited number and that we capture the readily - the, you know, the objective criteria readily identifiable and not gaming in it's as quick a sentence - as quick a phrase as we can. I just don't think easily identifiable is that phrase.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Alan, what about moderated number or something like this?

Alan Greenberg: I could live with moderate number.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Elaine).

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Yeah. (Elaine) go ahead.

(Elaine):   Thanks. Yeah. I think the part of this sentence that isn't being looked at that's very important is that Working Team 2 agreed that the initial focus should be

on blah, blah, blah. We've already had this conversation. We've already debated it.

I'm - don't want to offend anybody but I'd prefer that we work on substance of what those applicants should be rather than saying if it's a limited number or a moderate number. Tijani if there's an applicant type or sort that we have overlooked, I think we should add that rather than try to change the language so we might include everybody or anything. Maybe you can let us know if there's something that we've overlooked that we need to add rather than changing the language. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tijani, do you have an answer? Do you want to respond or should I go to Cheryl?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: (Elaine), I didn't understand very well what you said. I'm sorry.

(Elaine): Okay. Then I'll try to be concise. So we discussed this already.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

(Elaine): We've - or we've gone through this document several times before we presented it in Brussels. And we agreed - the working team agreed after several discussions that we would only focus on a limited number of applicants.

So if there is a type of applicant that we've overlooked that you want included, I think we should include that type of applicant rather than say we're open to any sort of applicant.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. I propose to add some yes in the next paragraph. I propose to add some kind of applicants, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Can I have a go at changing...

Evan Leibovitch: You've got it, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...some of the language into my minimalist view again? The - I sort of jarred when I read this only because it seemed to be putting a different frame of language that I just wasn't overly comfortable with. We weren't talking - we talked in the paragraph before about Work Team 1 and Work Team 2, you know, identifying sources, et cetera, et cetera.

And I just wanted you to hear how I thought this paragraph under who should receive support might read better. But what I've also done since I've put up my hand listening to what (Elaine) and Alan had said. I've tweaked what I was going to say slightly; so with all due plagiarism copyright to Alan on this.

Key to making a support program work is the choice of initial support recipients. With this in mind, it is agreed that the initial focus should be on finding a relatively limited set of potential applicants which would be non-controversial to support. Full stop.

Then it goes on. Based on these criteria and the review of the comments, the reviewer can recommend the following.

Evan Leibovitch: Poetry. I think it's wonderful.

Alan Greenberg: Sold.

Karla Valente: Wonderful but could you repeat please?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I certainly can. Key to making a support program work is the choice of initial support recipients. With this in mind, it is agreed that the initial focus should be on finding a relatively limited identifiable set of potential applicants which would be non-controversial to support. Full stop.

Then it goes on. Based on these criteria and the review of the comments, the working group recommends -- please make sure you re-spell recommends -- the following.

Evan Leibovitch: Tijani are you okay with this?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, but only to change relatively limited by what we said was rated but it is a number or something like this. Is it possible?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. Relatively limited doesn't exclude moderation but it says there is not an open end or moderation can be middle. And I think if we looked at, you know, a moderate group could be 50% of the applicants. Well that's not going to get anywhere in (blanket) support.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Do you think that 50% of the applicants will be supported?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I have absolutely no idea. What I do know is that terms relatively limited are going to give people a great deal more comfort than moderate.

Evan Leibovitch: I think the point Tijani is that we have to set out in this document that we are not trying to put something together that would apply to half the applicants.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely. And that is why I wouldn't go to...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Let's be honest, if we get one person approved under this we're setting an important precedent.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes we are.

Karla Valente: Evan, do you want me to read back what I've got?

Evan Leibovitch: Oh gladly.

Karla Valente: Okay. Key to making a support program work is the choice of initial support recipients. With this in mind, it is agreed that the initial focus should be on finding a relatively limited identifiable set of potential applicants that would be not controversial to support. Based on these criteria and the review of the comments, the working group recommends the following

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: All right. Are we okay? We've got less than 20 minutes left in a 90-minute call and we still got a lot to do. Okay. So we are now on .A at the top of Page 10 which reads currently at least in the initial pilot phase target support to ethnic and linguistics, communities (easy to house it) community, (unintelligible) speakers, Tamil speakers.

                          These potential applicants have the benefit of being relatively well defined in truth and pass the test of being generally non-controversial since communities already have a history of representing at ICANN and facilitating community on the Web as one of ICANN's (unintelligible).

                          Comments.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tijani, go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Or (Steve).

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Moment. Okay. Rather than or put it like this. (Richard) has drove my attention on the facts that there is a big ambiguity on - because we don't know if those criteria are - on of this criteria is enough to get support or that we have to have a set of criteria to be selected.

And I think rather than say like this that we give priority to this group or the other group, we start by saying that the main criteria for the support is the (meet). This the first criteria. And we say that the other - the two categories that - the following activities may have support - no. The following criteria cannot have support if they are not in need of it. And we put the categories.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Now at this point I have to back to the people on Work Team B and ask. I would tend to agree a little bit with what (Elaine) is saying that we don't - I don't know if we to re-debate the whole issue again in essentially saying is the emphasis here in this particular paragraph on purpose of the group or is the emphasis here on need? Because right now we're - right now this thing is basically trying to limit it by (function of the) group or at least by stated constituency.

Okay. Now does any...

Andrew Mack: Yes. Would you like me to respond?

Evan Leibovitch: Please do.

Andrew Mack: Okay. As I said in my comments that I sent last night, there are a series of different things that we're going to use as filters, right, so that we can get to the smaller groups - manageable group of potential support recipients. There was no intent to start with one as opposed to another.

Everyone agrees that need is an important criteria and there are other important criteria and this targeting was just the first thing that we put down. If

the group feels strongly that we want that to - we want to elevate the need category to the front, you know, I have no objection to it.

I don't think it changes the document particularly and I don't know if it offers us a lot of value to wordsmith it at this level. But if you feel strongly, I have no objection.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Evan, can I make a short comment?

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I think the need what is Point D, it's a page later or part of a page later. I think there is some value in elevating that to the first point. It doesn't change it a lot but it does catch people's attention first and doesn't make it sound like an afterthought. And then we don't have to worry about having said need first. We don't have to worry about implying that all Tamil speakers will be worthy of support for instance.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I don't...

Alan Greenberg: Especially if you live in Canada this month.

Evan Leibovitch: So you basically just...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...rather than rewording them.

Alan Greenberg: I think that addresses the issue of - puts need right up front.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's reordering.

Alan Greenberg: And gets it out of the way.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Alex go ahead.

Alex Gakuru: Right. I think just to support what Andrew was saying, what we have though of when at least that some of these linguistic and ethnic was, we felt that if we brought in people that speak in non-Latin, we probably would have a lot more buy in from the ICANN Board. Otherwise would be -seem to be actually supporting the IDN. So that was probably one or the other reasons why we brought it.

It's not a question of priority or preference. So maybe we move initial phase but the idea of getting an English speaker was try and bring the content online really. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Now if I read Alan's suggestion properly, he's suggesting rearranging things so that D becomes the first point.

Alan Greenberg: That is what I suggested.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Is there a...

Andrew Mack: (Alan), which number, I'm sorry?

Alan Greenberg: D as in dog.

Evan Leibovitch: Right now we have A, B, C and D on there with D meaning - being the last one that is in point form and talks about financial needs.

Alan Greenberg: No. There's also an E.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: I'm looking - the version that I've got has only D - that I'm looking at online and it says it has a series of (concern) not recommended for support. Are we looking at different version of this?

Alan Greenberg: Maybe. I'm looking at Tijani's modification.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Maybe he added that one. Hold on.

Andrew Mack: I'm looking - well I'm working off the one on Adobe Connect.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Okay. I hadn't been.

Andrew Mack: And there is no Point E on that one.

Man: Right.

Alan Greenberg: No. Tijani added the point that I was saying for most of the first.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Is the wording was the main criteria for eligibility should be need. An applicant from one of the categories mentioned wouldn't be selected for support if he/she is not in such a support category. It's the first one that needs to be modified slightly but I'm suggesting that that one be added. I'm sorry. Not moved. I didn't realize there was an addition.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Read that point E again. You're proposing this go front and center and you have a suggested modification. For Karla, could you read it out as you suggested happen?

Alan Greenberg: I hadn't suggested but I can try on the fly. The main criteria for eligibility should be need. Period. An applicant from one of the categories below...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. Exactly.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...would not be selected for support unless the need criteria were present.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: May I give a proposition?

Evan Leibovitch: Well, I just - does any - is everyone okay with that. I don't see any checkmarks or anything. So the idea of this is the point at the very top of this essentially making it clear that, you know, there might be other criteria but need is primary.

Man: Yeah. Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: All right. I agree. I think it's fair.

Andrew Mack: And he's right. Let's move on.

Evan Leibovitch: Tijani, are you okay with this? You have your hand up. You were...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I would like - I would like to tell you want I propose as language. It is not A or B or C. It's as a (unintelligible), if you want. The main criteria for eligibility should be the need. An applicant from one of the following categories wouldn't be selected for support if he or she is not in need of such support.

And then A, the categories are A, B, C, D. I have four categories. I can read it if you want.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, before you go to that, I mean frankly Tijani, I think Alan's very, very concise or opening statement I think actually expresses that particular point you wanted to make but does it in far fewer words. Alan...

Karla Valente: Evan, do you want me to read what I've got?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Here's why - he did use one word better than I did. He said following up below but yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Evan. Okay, that's - okay. Please Karla, read it back.

Karla Valente: Okay. So on this session that says who should receive support, I added the Number 1 and then the first paragraph reads. Key to making a support program work is the choice of initial support recipient. With this in mind, it is agreed that the initial focus should be on finding a relatively limited identifiable set of potential applicants that would not be controversial of support. Based on this criteria and per review of the comments, the working group recommends the following.

And there is no change to A, no change to B, not change C except the type of recommend. And then on D it reads as follows. The main criteria for eligibility should be need. An applicant from one of the categories below would not be selected for support unless the needs criteria is met.

A series of moves are not recommended for support based on working group work specifically. And then we have all of the bullet points without change.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. What you had as D, the main criteria...

Karla Valente: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...there should be one word change. Instead of below is the following. Use the word following in the - I'm not quite sure if it's in the right place. But that's...

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: ...from one of the categories - one of the following categories.

Alan Greenberg: Following categories. Correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. And that should be - that should be A.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah. Move that to the top.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: And that should not be A. That should leader of the whole paragraph.

Alan Greenberg: Fine. It could be a header.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm overriding...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Excuse me. Excuse me Cheryl. And A, B, C are the categories that we said the following categories A, B, C, D.

Alan Greenberg: Tijani, we're agreeing with you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. We're all agreeing with you. It needs to be an overriding sentence.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So Karla...

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Now Karla, E did not change however. The part that is currently says a series of groups not recommended stays where it is.

Karla Valente: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Andrew Mack: We don't want to lead with that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Karla could you read back what you have for D?

Karla Valente: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: For D?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Not for D.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: It's no long D.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Oh no, not D.

Evan Leibovitch: Is someone proposing to bring (unintelligible) front.

Karla Valente: So my understanding is that you wanted to have as A the main criteria for eligibility should be need. An applicant from one of the following categories would not be selected for support unless the need criteria is met.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Stop there. That is not a bullet point. That's actually part of (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: That's part of D.

Evan Leibovitch: No. No. What Karla just read now comes before the bullet points.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Before the A, B, C.

Evan Leibovitch: Before the list, correct.

Andrew Mack: Evan, what I think I'm hearing for clarity sake would be to leave D - what we have now as D as it is and just take the overriding one sentence about the primary focus should - or the first - the primary determinant should be on need and just elevate that piece. But leave D as it is.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. The new sentence that Karla has read seven times is a new paragraph that precedes A.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Karla Valente: Okay. So the first paragraph now reads as follows. Key to making a support program work is the choice of initial support recipient. With this in mind, it is agreed that the initial focus should be on finding a relatively limited

identifiable set of applicants - of potential applicants that would not be controversial of support. And then there's a new sentence.

Alan Greenberg: Correct.

Karla Valente: The main criteria for eligibility should (unintelligible) an applicant's one of the following categories would not be selected for support unless the needs criteria is met. Based on this criteria and per review of the comments, the working group recommends the following. And then we have A, B, C, D as they were before.

Alan Greenberg: Give that woman a star. You have it perfect.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well done.

Evan Leibovitch: I agree. Does anybody not agree because (unintelligible)?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: I have Tijani and then (Elaine) with their hands up.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. I think that's the place of the main criteria for eligibility is the need is not this one. It's the - it is after build on this criteria and further the review, et cetera, the working group recommends to (unintelligible). The main criteria for eligibility should be the need. An applicant, et cetera, the following criteria are A, B, C, D. You see.

Alan Greenberg: That will work too.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: So you're saying put the new sentence after - just immediately before A but remove the words the following.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No. You put the following is for A, B, C for the categories.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Where - Tijani, where are you putting...

Evan Leibovitch: Hey guys, we have a lot - an awful lot to do. We only even have - we have less than five minutes left in this call.

Alan Greenberg: And I have another call. I have another call at 9:30.

Evan Leibovitch: I know. Tijani, is what you're suggesting - I mean for me it looks like just a refinement of the wording. It doesn't change the meaning of what we are doing.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I think it's not the same. If you put it - because we are talking about the criteria and the criteria must be immediately after this part of...

Evan Leibovitch: And they are.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. No, they weren't. They weren't.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Are you suggesting that the sentence based on these criteria stay where it is in that paragraph - in the first paragraph, remove the words the following but keep the semicolon. Put a sentence on...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...an unnumbered sentence saying the main criteria and then follow the detail of criteria.

Evan Leibovitch: You have that.

Alan Greenberg: I'm happy with that.

Evan Leibovitch: Karla, do you have that?

Karla Valente: Let's see if I have that.

Alan Greenberg: She inverted two sentences from that.

Karla Valente: So the first paragraph would be key to making a support program work is the choice of initial support recipient. With this in mind, it is agreed that the initial focus should be on finding a relatively limited identifiable set of potential applicants that would not meet - that would not controversial - I'm sorry, that would not be controversial of support.

And then I have the main criteria for eligibility should be need. An applicant would not be selected for support unless the need criteria is met. Based on this criteria and then the following is the same.

Andrew Mack: Could I suggest that we could add - we could stop this right after the main criteria for support is need? Period. The rest of it can go. It's just a repeat. It'll have more impact.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think it makes it (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I heard Andrew. I didn't hear Tijani's answer.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. I am so sorry that I cannot display what I want to - what I propose because I think for me it's very clear that it must be in this order after controversial for to support. Based on this criteria the working group recommended the following. The main...

Evan Leibovitch: Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: ...criteria - yes. Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Andrew just suggested very clearly at the outset, okay, that the main criteria is need. I don't...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: ...know how we can express that more clearly.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No. No. It's clear. No. The problem is where to put this sentence. That's all.

Karla Valente: Yeah. So maybe the changes may be based on these criteria T-H-E-S-E is T-H-I-S.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right. We are at the end of 90 minutes and we have not finished this. Do you want to keep going or do we take this to email?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I will send on email what is my point of view.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Does the rest of the group think that we can wrap this up in another five minutes or if not, we should take this to email? What - Alan's got a hard stop. What about everybody else?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, how far through the document are you planning on getting before next meeting? Where were you trying to get to?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm just trying to get to this paragraph before the bullet points.

Andrew Mack: We're done, aren't we?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...we all agree in principle.

Man: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We're saying the same thing with one sentence higher or lower than another sentence. If Tijani puts that to an email...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...then we can all go yes we understand.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And then he knows we understand and it'll be okay. But at the moment it is a piece of minor peasantry.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So if that is the case, then we will take a general acceptance of that particular wording to email. Then when we continue on Tuesday, we will pick up where we left off which is here at the beginning of Point A.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. Didn't - are we still making changes to A to D?

Evan Leibovitch: It's not my intention but we haven't gone through them.

Karla Valente: I thought that.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm okay with them. Hopefully that'll be a very quick thing. But as I found here, I can't count on things being quick.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But Tijani mentioned he was going to add a couple of extra things. If that could be all done - if the email - if the proposal for changes can be done on email through to the beginning of Section 2, what kinds of support might be offered. So we would be looking at email for the positioning of the necessary sentence and the criteria A to D.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right.

Evan Leibovitch: So we are going to deal with this first thing on Tuesday. If you have any comments, not just Tijani, on what we're going to do with that, send those in email preferable before the weekend so people can digest on them. And we will see you all back on Tuesday to pick up from here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: All right. Thanks everybody.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Bye bye.

Evan Leibovitch: Bye.

END