Transcript
Joint SO/AC WG on New gTLD Applicant Support (JAS)
20 April 2012 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Joint SO/AC WG on New gTLD Applicant Support (JAS) teleconference on 20 April 2012 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.

Nathalie Peregrine: Of course. The recordings have already started so welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the JAS teleconference on the 20th of April, 2012. On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, Rafik Dammak, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Baudouin Schombe, Sebastian Bachollet, Cintra Sooknanan, Andrew Mack and (Azim Peak).

From staff we have Karla Valente, Glen de Saint Géry, Dennis Chang, Kurt Pritz and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

I would also like to remind you that as all lines are open to please mute yourselves when not speaking. Thank you very much and over to you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Nathalie. Thank you for everybody for joining today call. It was long time - it was long time that (unintelligible) didn't convene but now we are trying to continue the work for the implementation.

So just before starting to the agenda items I will really want to emphasize that for people to stay - statement of interest or any kind of conflict of interest especially now because we are going to review about the third selection and also that people want to (unintelligible) us the community member representative.

So it's really important if someone applied already for the SARP to state that or - I'm not sure but just to avoid any kind of conflict of interest. Thank you.

Sebastian Bachollet: Rafik, it's Sebastian.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Sebastian.

Sebastian Bachollet: As you may know the Board decide that I am conflicting then I will not explain in length here. But my purpose here is to - is to help and I have no conflict with the purpose of this call. It's really outside it's not for helping with the applicant I am conflicting. But if that create any trouble just let me know and I will drop off the call.

Rafik Dammak: No, but it's more really related to the issue of today; it's not about - it's more if some people apply it for the SARP - to be on the SARP so just to avoid any kind of conflict of interest that's all but not really. Understood we - about your statement. I think it's okay. I don't see any problem so you are welcome to continue working with us. So personally I don't see any problem.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rafik, Cheryl.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Cheryl, yeah, please go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I have absolutely no conflict. And have absolutely no linkage to any of the things that you're discussing. But I do have a concern about what you're asking for being declared.

If I read Section 1 of what the CMR is all about in terms of SARP member selection one of the things it says in the draft document is that CMR, in other words, the people that we may very well be talking to in some way shape or form in this call will not be privy to the candidate identity of SARP candidates.

And at this call, if you ask people to self-select and say oh I've put my name in for SARP doesn't that somewhat compromise that? Now if it gets removed from the draft then there's no compromise. But if you have someone or some half a dozen people identifying now saying yes I've put my hand up for SARP then that becomes a farce.

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, I thought about that the problem if - because we should not - to know about the identity but it's still I think - kind of problem. So - but I am open to listen to the feedback of people just have that concern I wanted to emphasize that. Okay I see Alan in the queue. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I would think if people have applied for the SARP they shouldn't be participating in this call. And why they drop off is none of our business. But...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Since it's conceivable out of this call we will say that there will be a relationship between CMR and knowing who the SARP candidates are or selecting who they are. I think it's completely inappropriate for someone who will ultimately be known as potential SARP candidate for some people be part of this discussion.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may? That's something - Cheryl here for the record. Alan, that's something that they would be compromising themselves about if such a SARP candidate stayed on this call. And the members and attendees of this

call are in the public record that would be a huge oops. But I'm not sure how we can...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Well it's - Cheryl, it would also be an oops in that conceivably they could be participating in setting up the rules that would enable them...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...preferentially to be picked.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: So I think anyone who knows that they...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: ...have applied should disappear quickly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I agree, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: We should have said that to begin with. We didn't.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. But self identifying themselves to the rest of the group but stay is not the way forward.

Alan Greenberg: No, no, no, no.

Rafik Dammak: So (importance) to avoid any - any conflict of interest so people should like - it's more to be - how say - more self (unintelligible) and to act. I see Avri in the queue. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thank you. I got here a couple minutes late, sorry. I had trouble spelling my name to the operator and it took several minutes to do it. So anyway I don't quite understand this - I don't expect this meeting is picking SARP members. I don't expect this meeting is even setting qualifications for SARP members.

So while I have absolutely no intention of applying for SARP because I think no one from JAS should - but that's just a normative statement I make personally - I really don't understand why they'd have a conflict of interest by being in this meeting.

But, as I say, sure, you want to be, you know, a thousand and one, you know, covered; drop out. But I really don't see why there would be a conflict of interest because I expect that all we're talking about here is the CMR, you know, and such.

And obviously if the CMR is somebody coming out of JAS or appointed by JAS then that person hopefully is not applying for SARP because they were on JAS. But I really don't see it seems to still all be meta level and not actually getting into details that have to do with choosing SARP members or certainly choosing applicants. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Avri. Alan, I think you want to comment - to make comment?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I do. I'm not - I don't disagree at all with what Avri is saying although I'm not sure we ever set a rule other than a self-imposed one about a JAS person not applying for a SARP. As long as this document still says draft it could be changed because of whatever happens in this discussion. And I think to be squeaky clean we need some level of separation. But thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So can someone please mute because the noise? Okay so maybe now we should go to the - still review the proposal which is the first item in

our agenda. So to review the proposal to implement the SARP selection design and evaluation process.

Maybe Karla can introduce quickly. I hope that everybody reads the document but just to introduce quickly to highlight the most important parts. Karla.

Karla Valente: Thank you, Rafik. Hello everyone. And we have in Adobe the draft community member representatives document. This same document was sent to everyone on the distribution list. So if you are not necessarily looking at Adobe that's the document we are going to be looking at.

In this document you will find a description of what we envision the community member representative's role would be. And basically the role is in three areas; the SARP member selection and in this process is the CRM to provide the input on the - basically criterion process for the selection in the SARP training materials.

So we are going to have an intensive training with the SARP members probably done via Internet remotely really explaining to them how we are composing this SARP, what they are going to be doing, what is expected from them, etcetera.

And then once the SARP is in operation the CRM - the CMR role is to observe the process as a nonvoting member and attend the meetings as observers. So this is - we are proposing for the role of (unintelligible) to be.

At this point we envision - we don't know the number of applicants for financial assistance. And not knowing the exact number of applicants doesn't leave us the final guidance of how many SARP member - SARP teams we need and how many community members we really need.

At the minimum what we would like is to have three groups of SARP so three teams of SARP that would be reviewing the applications. And in each of these three groups there should be one, maybe two, CMR members. It was suggested that it's two per team so we always have a backup in case the person cannot do it.

One of the important things for the CMR is that in order to observe as a nonvoting member the CMR can really make sure that, you know, the process is followed and everything is going smoothly. So this is the main idea of the process as it is not.

Again more the (tales) about how the SARP will function we are going to be developing in the upcoming weeks. And we will be asking the CMR input on this process and criteria too.

It is important that the members chosen to be CMRs can commit with the time that we are proposing. We originally set three to five hours a week. Then we have the evaluation phase probably more as we do the criteria process design and review of training materials.

We also ask that the CMR members do not have a conflict of interest and follow the code of conduct that we have in the Applicant Guidebook.

In terms of the timeline - and this is why it's important that in this call we are able to actually appoint individuals - and that's my wish list of course - that we appoint those individuals to be CMR members.

And the sense of urgency for that is that we need to have those members selected this month so we can ask them to sign all of the confidentiality forms that need to be signed and we need to get them on board with, you know, and start really doing actively the work of - or progressing with the work of the process and criteria for the SARP.

I hope I covered everything. Maybe we have something that Avri or Tijani would like to add - Rafik is also part of the sub group that works with the Board. So there's a sub group that works with the Board that is composed of Avri, Tijani, Rafik and Cintra.

And they have been talking to the Board about this concept and some of the other things that happened in the past month too. Maybe they have something to add.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Karla. We have already two people in the queue so we start with Tijani and then Avri. Tijani, please go ahead. I think he has a mute problem. Tijani?

Man: Probably muted.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so maybe we go to Avri and then we go back. Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay yes thank you. Yeah, I guess I just want to give a little bit of background on that SARP group. As most of the JAS group probably remembers one of the strong recommendations that we made in the final report was the ongoing participation of the JAS working group and its members in the process of developing what we called then the JAS program and what's now become the ASP, the Applicant Support Program.

                   The Board in its response to the JAS working group responded very favorably to that and actually set up this sort of three-party sub team that's been talking and working together which as - as was mentioned had the, you know, had four people in it - actually has I think five people in it.

                   And what we - the JAS group was consulted about the creation of that group in the beginning so the first notion was that we would put the two chairs of JAS - the Chair of the At Large New gTLD working group, the ALAC liaison to

that At Large working group and that we then made some substitutions with Cintra and Alan taking the spots of Carlton and Evan.

And then we later added Tijani to the group because of his - we wanted this basic help on the financial issues - the financial concerns and the specificity of those criteria because that had been one of the banners that he had carried quite strongly in the JAS working group.

So this group has been working with the staff and the Board. And as an aside I mention it's probably an exemplary bit of how, you know, as an implementation is going forward the staff and the Board participate and include those that have a - participated in creating the policies and really working hand in hand to create something and the extent to which the staff and the Board have gone to include all of us in this process has been great.

You know, not that we always got what we wanted. And if I wanted to complain I'm sure I could find a way. But the level of participation and give and take has been one of the best I've experienced in my time at ICANN.

So this group (unintelligible) have been periodic reports both the JAS and to this group about what's happening as the discussion started on okay now the SARP and what do we do, you know, the whole notion was discussed. The JAS group had recommended quite strongly that there be experts and advisors to some of these groups.

And one kind of expert that was really conceived of is members of the JAS group - those people who were actively involved in creating this - while they shouldn't be the ones making decisions because there may be a conflict between policy maker and implementer but that certainly they'd be able to sort of give advice on well what was - what was the discussion behind this particular requirement? How did this develop? What do you think people were looking for?

And that kind of advice - consultation, you know, that they could give being a valuable asset to the SARP team in doing their evaluation. So that's the essence where I think this developed out of from those conversations of this group.

You know, so - and in terms of JAS group specifically and both JAS and the At Large New gTLD working group has sort been participating in this effort but still restricting it to JAS working group members that actually participate in the conversation we feel has sort of fallen also under the GNSO Council's motion that the JAS participate in the ongoing review of the implementation.

So, you know, that's sort of the light in which this has been seen by those of us in that sub team and sort of the way I believe it has been reported to the JAS group. And I also believe, you know, sort of approved by the JAS group as we've gone along.

So I guess - I don't know if there's anything else I can add. But that's what I thought to say. Thanks.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Hello (unintelligible) hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Yes, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Okay thank you. So I will comment on the (unintelligible) that Karla presented. First of all Karla said that the minimum number of the teams would be three according to the number of the support applicants.

I would say that the minimum would be one. If the number is not so huge we can - we use only - we can make the SARP working as a single group. And the advantage of this single group will be that all the members of the SARP will evaluate all the applications which is better because they had - we will have more eyes on each application. That's the first remark.

The second remark is about the role of the CMR. I think that the CMR doesn't have - shouldn't have only a role of let's say observer really a passive observer. For example for the selection of the SARP members I do think that the CMR has to - has to give input about the candidates; not only about the process but also about the candidates without name - without names - without identity only application.

Only defined for each candidate for the SARP should be given to the CMR to give their input about - or more or less their opinion about those candidates. So that - it will not be only the coordinator and ICANN who decides on the list of the SARP members.

Because the coordinator will have the full information about the candidates including their identity and they will make their proposal - their recommendation and then ICANN will agree or not agree on it. So I think that - the opinion of the CMR and the selection will be important in my point of view. This is the first point.

The second point as it is presented now only the coordinator will select the teams and will select the team leaders and the SARP chair which is, in my point of view, not too fair. I think that a way to select or to form the teams will be during the training ICANN and the CMR members will - will try to find the most people who are participating in the training people who may be leaders and they will identify them together.

And also to form teams who have to get - how to say balance of teams so also during the training we can find - we can see how we can form balance of teams together with ICANN and the coordinator. So I think that the role of the CMR must be more active; not so passive as it is defined here. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Karla, do you want to say to answer then we go - okay with the queue, which is quite long.

Karla Valente: So I'm not sure if this is for me to answer. Really this is a proposal of what the role of the members would be. There are some reasoning behind that. The selection of the - so a few things. First is that we envision one to two CMRs for each SARP team. The number of CMRs is determined by the SARP teams and not by the financial applicant.

But that said if we have a higher number of financial applicants and we need to increase the number of SARP teams that automatically increases the number of the CMR.

We did not have the intention to review the actual identity of the SARP candidates. One of the reasons is because in the EOI that we released we did not provide notice to those SARP candidates that their identities will be revealed.

And we did not really - we don't have any consent to distribute anything. So we need to be cognitive of that and respect that process too. And if we choose do something else then we need to make sure that SARP members are okay with it in advance.

The idea for the coordinator is not to select a SARP member but to do a pre-selection which means looking at some criteria and looking at the SARP members across the board and make a recommendation to ICANN.

And we could remove the names of the SARP candidates at this point and just give some of the background - and not background, sorry, some of the key qualities that the candidates have. And in a few weeks we are going to know the financial applicant candidates as well where they come geographically, etcetera.

So based on those statistics, not necessarily on the specific names we could draw some conclusions or we could come up with a process. And also I hear Tijani talking about the operations of the actual (unintelligible). And the

discussion that we had before - and Avri and others, correct me if I'm wrong - was that the CMRs would attend as observers; there would be no voting members. They would look at the process itself but not actually evaluate anything.

We also need to be aware that we didn't tell anything to the financial applicants or candidates that they would be revealed before - beyond, you know, actual evaluators. So we need to just acknowledge that.

I think that is as much as I can say, Rafik. I don't know - there are several hands up and I know Kurt is also on the meeting. I don't know if there's anything else that he can or wants to add.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Karla. Okay we have Avri, Andrew and then Carlton in the queue so Avri. Avri - maybe still muted?

Avri Doria: Yes, no, sorry, I forgot to take my hand down. But since my hand is up I guess the - I very much support the point of minimizing the role of the CMR process and not to evaluation largely for reasons that Karla just gave.

Also just because I believe the more walls we build in this to make sure that certain people are the ones that are seeing the financial data and not many is important. Though I very much understand Tijani's perspective I prefer to err on the side of making sure that the information - the very, very private information about financial wherewithal does not go any further than those mostly and outsiders but not necessarily who are actually the evaluators.

If we start making comments remembering that the CMRs are supposed to be JAS working group and one of the - and this is a personal belief, as Alan

said, there was never a decision on this - if we start to make comments and participate fully except for voting then in a sense we are being policymakers doing implementation.

Whereas I see the role of the CMR as the policymakers being sort of coaches and advisors on consistency of the implementation to the policy but not actual part of the deployment. Thank you. And this time I will remember to take my hand down.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Thank you Rafik. Andrew for the record. Avri said a couple things that I was going to say. I think we need to have a fairly bright line between what the CMR does on what the SARP does and avoid a situation of which we affectively grandfather ourselves in as kind of influencers in the actual process of the SARP.

That said, I think that there is a good role that the CMR can play in kind of keeping the process on track and doing a little bit of on-the-fly evaluation of it so that we might make some suggestions as it goes forward.

My - to the point about how many people are in both CMR and SARP based on what we've seen it's - it is likely going to be a lot of work.

My inclination is to say let's build a bigger pool because life gets in the way and people have things that they have to do. And it's better to have a few more people that are trained up and are at the ready than to have a few less. So that's my suggestion. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Andrew. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Rafik. Are you hearing me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Please go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. This is Carlton Samuels for the record. I want to - a couple of three things.

First of all I truly believe that the CMR's role should be restricted to process. As Andrew says you need a bright line.

It seems to me that we've been involved in setting a policy perspective and to have a (unintelligible) evaluator that it will be a bit overboard. That's my feeling.

Now that is not to say that we cannot do some evaluation. But it's evaluation of process. I would want an early warning. I think the CMR's role with respect to the JAS work group is to serve as an early warning like a canary and the mine kind of thing for the overall JAS workgroup.

Having said that the other thing is the number of CMR's that you might wish to start with.

Andrew gave a good reason why you should start with a big pool but understanding that you may not need everybody from the pool to be involved in the process.

I think in terms of the team you want a balanced team. And you want some folks who are on line. As I say they are supposed to be canaries for the process back to the JAS working group.

In terms of the leadership for the - and the role of the coordinator, I'm not so sure that you - the coordinator's role is as Karla said to evaluate the staff members capability or their fitness or purpose, however you might look at that.

I am not - there's a discomfort for me with the coordinator being the one responsible for the pre-selection evaluation of SARP.

Yes you might reduce the risk of (unintelligible) by having an itemized list given to the coordinator so he doesn't see names. What he sees are descriptors. That'll be - they would be detailed descriptors of the personalities.

But it seems to me that we need to be very careful about jobbing out this role to the coordinator as one.

If anything, if anything, I would want a much bigger group to be looking at the SARP especially if you can do them itemized. It seems to me that it might be a useful thing to do. Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Carlton. Okay so I'm not sure is Tijani...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: ...still - okay you want to comment okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay and we have Alan. Okay please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay thank you. First of all I have never said that the CMR had to be involved in the evaluation of the applications -- never.

But contrary when I commented on the documents about the SARP, not this one, another one the SARP I said that because I saw a certain role of the coordinator in the evaluation of the application because they said the evaluator of the SARP will be I should say reviewed by the coordinator.

And I uphold to that because I think that only the SARP members have to do the evaluation. And they have to appoint people who will get the support, only the SARP members only.

I number said that the CMR members have to have any say about the evaluation. But I don't think that the selection of the SARP members to be recommended by the coordinator who knows the name.

Because in that document they didn't say the names would be removed. They said that ICANN would give the coordinator all the (EOIs). So in this case I don't think that it's fair that the coordinator will make their recommendations to the ICANN, the final recommendations to ICANN.

I see that if the coordinator will make the final recommendation at least he doesn't have to get the identity of the candidates.

And I don't see any harm in making the CMR members also giving their point of view about the candidates without names, without identity. It is not evaluating anything. It is only giving their point of view about the SARP members. Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Alan please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm getting a little confused here because we're talking about applications both for the SARP and the actual applications for the - for support. So I - sometimes people are saying things I'm not quite sure which applications they're talking about.

I have no real problem if assuming it is not forbidden for reasons that Karla mentioned with the CMR people suggesting to the coordinator which people would be good SARP members.

I would definitely not want to see the CMR people having a real say on it or having a decision process.

The CMRs are I - we seem to be saying came from the - come from the JAS group. And the JAS group was self-selected, the people with very specific positions.

And I think we have to be very careful that we're not hurting the impartiality of the SARP by doing that.

If the CMR are going to participate in the SARP then they will be privy to the applications, the applications for support. So it's not going to be kept secret from them. They may not have a vote on the outcome but they will be participants.

So, you know, I think what is being proposed is reasonable if the CMR's can be chosen before the SARP people or at least a core number of CMR's are chosen. I have no problem with them being involved in the evaluation. But that's a - but I would not gone any farther than that. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. So I think we can say that with consensus that the CMR should most only really to do to evaluate the process to be - (unintelligible) evaluate the process but do not be involved at all in the selection of the SARP members.

I think okay we have Alan and (unintelligible). Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Hi everyone. I was wondering if it shouldn't be a major role and maybe it's - I have the document but I'm not sure it's clear there that the CMR has an important role in making sure that all the selection criteria in the SARP are respected.

So in other words the CMR would also act as part of the process that everybody I think as a consensus wants to limit the role to should include quality assurance on the selection of SARP.

The other point I wanted to make is that in the business of grantmaking evaluation because in fact that's what ICANN is doing, it's making a grant, it's a highly specialized area.

And I think the - we have not talked a lot that I know of -- maybe I'm wrong -- about the terms of reference and the profile of the coordinator.

So I think the other role that CMR could have is in being an advisor to ICANN on the selection of the coordinator, making sure the coordinator is a top-notch professional evaluator.

And besides all the other qualities he will - he or she will acquire require. That's the extent of my comments Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. About the coordinator maybe Karla can clarify how it will be selected and so on, what are the criteria for the (selection) for the coordinator. Myself I cannot answer that but maybe Karla can provide more clarification. Karla?

Karla Valente: Yes, thank you Rafik. In fact we already have a party that can act as coordinator. This is a company that has been helping us with the designing of the EOI and some of the other things that you saw in the past month.

The idea of the coordinator is to have this independent party between ICANN and the individuals, you know, and help with the process.

It's not only a resource issue but is also because if you look at other evaluate, the new GTLD program all of them have a company, you know, basically (shouldn't that), you know, they have the company.

In this one we really have individuals. So it would be - it was important to have someone in this case the company, that could coordinate, help train, help to draft these training materials and everything with the different SARP individuals and also with the CMR.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Karla. Alan, does it answer your question or...

Alan Greenberg: Yes no, absolutely. This is a - I do not question at all the role or the sourcing of the coordinator. I just feel that the - in a way the CMR should be a resource to ICANN also in regards to the coordinator. And the CMR should be a resource to the coordinator.

But yes...

Rafik Dammak: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: ...I'm quite comfortable with Karla's explanation. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. So I guess as maybe said before that we have concerns like the CMR will act as advisor and just to evaluate the process but to not be involved within the selection of SARP evaluator (in a sense).

So I guess we have - we had some comments. Maybe if there is any change Karla will update the document and then send it (again) just to (unintelligible) that review.

And maybe we can then move to the next item which is to appoint the CMR member, the committee member representative from JAS working group.

And so I guess that it will be good to have volunteers. I'm not sure, Alan you want to comment or is that your hand is (up) - still up.

Alan Greenberg: No, no, sorry Rafik. I should've taken it out. It's from the previous.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: You're welcome.

Rafik Dammak: Does - thank you. Carlton I guess you want to intervene. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Yes thank you chair. This is Carlton Samuels for the record. I am speaking to the appointment of additional CMR members.

If most of you would've seen on the list that (Alain) volunteered for one of these slots. And I just want to bring it to the members that, you know, if there's no objection to that (Alain) be added to the pool.

I as I said is you know that we expect that the existing group from the JAS working group that's been involved in the conversation will continue. And because Cintra was (unintelligible) meeting I would expect Cintra to continue in that role.

And so I think it the minute what we might wish to do is have another two, three persons that could stand up. Maybe somebody (unintelligible) might be useful here too. Thank you.

Andrew Mack, would Andrew be interested?

Andrew Mack: I would do it yes. I think so.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so it as to - (unintelligible) - Carlton wants to suggest - Alan has volunteered. Also Carlton suggested Cintra and Andrew.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: And so I also want to if - I know maybe it's a little bit too much but I want to ask Avri is she wants to volunteer to be CMR. She was involved with - in the process. And I really, I am confident that she will make good job there. Avri, you agree or...

Avri Doria: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes I put the agree check. Yes I agree, thank you.

Carlton Samuels: And I was saying that those persons who are already on the team are Rafik. That includes you would be volunteered for it.

Avri Doria: Yes if we can - yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So that's five persons. So we think it's - we go to six person?

Man: (Unintelligible) I have my hand up.

Rafik Dammak: Okay (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) Cintra, Avri, Rafik and Tijani.

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

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It's okay. I wanted to volunteer for this group. And it's okay, it's done.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you. So we have six people. Please if there is any comment any - or any objection please speak.

                  Yes Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, you have enough for the initial group. I'm willing to participate should additional ones be necessary afterwards though.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So that makes...

Avri Doria: Actually Alan weren't you in the sub team?

Rafik Dammak: I was but no one's mentioned my name so I'm just...

Avri Doria: I think that was.

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: No, no, no Alan. Everybody in the sub team plus the two others that we agree to...

Alan Greenberg: Then we have more than the six we need initially.

Man: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: That's fine. Not to worry.

Sebastian Bachollet: I have (unintelligible) Sebastian, if I can say one word?

Rafik Dammak: Yes Sebastian. Go ahead.

Sebastian Bachollet: Okay I am in a little bit a strong position here being participating (unintelligible) and the member of the board.

I think you - it will be better as it was said to have a bigger pool then the six. But you need - I guess you need to start with this I will say six preferences or to anchor the people.

And it - as it will depend on the number of applications who will ask for support as a member of people will be needed to be adjusted.

One part of the discussion could be also to know how one - how many one group will take care and how it's organized to have the smooth process to be sure that each team take care of the application with the same type of behavior, not to have a more relaxed and a more severe one.

And in that sense I was thinking of the following. And sorry to not have put that before in front of you but the idea could be to have let's say three pools or three SARP team for the moment and each one get a number of applications, the same number of application.

And I was wondering if we can't give each SARP team one gets some applications, each review by the team too, so one from the team two is reviewed by the team three and team three by the team one and that it's not all but it's to serve of the application who are looked by a team and yes it will decrease the level of differences. That's my thought.

And I don't know if I am allowed but if you want to put my name at the last name in your list but really the last one and if you need me I will be happy to help. But if it's possible, I am not asking anything here. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Sebastian. We have Avri and Tijani. Avri?

Avri Doria: Oh sorry I should - I had that up earlier and then I decided I didn't have anything to say so I take it down. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Okay Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. So (greetings). First of all don't forget that the members of the CMR doesn't have to get any conflict of interest. So we don't have to nominate anyone who has a conflict of interest.

Second point, as Sebastian said I made the suggestion to the people in charge of the implementation that even if we have a lot of teams in the SARP we need to have the criteria of the financial needs to be very (unintelligible) and to be scored by it all of the SARP members because there is not objective criteria and it is only an evaluation of the evaluators.

So we need at least this criteria to be checked by all the members of the staff.

Third point I also made this remark for the implementation team, I said that as it is now the criteria, we have only three points for the financial need. Why, the financial lead was the origin of all our work of the (Resolution 20) of everything.

So I think that the (scrolling) have to be reviewed so that we give more power or more weight to the financial needs. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Merci, Rafik. Sebastian I want to tell you how smart the proposal is that you made to have the cross evaluation. I think this is a very good evaluation system technique.

On -in terms of you working on the CMR I of course hate to contradict a board member but, you know, this process is going to result in a grant being made to...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Sorry, you don't contract anybody. I am not a board member here but I am board member also. But you - no contradiction and you're free to say what you want. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: No, no. I understand. It was just another. It just out of courtesy.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No worries.

Alan Greenberg: (Unintelligible) Sebastian. I - but I think that you're going to - the board is going to end up directly or indirectly approving those grants.

And I think the aesthetics of, you know, of you being both on the CMR on the board doesn't work very well in my humble opinion, okay? Thank you.

Thank you Alan. Just maybe I think Sebastian can clarify. But I think Sebastian that the board decide to have a program committee for the new GTLD and so for only the members of the board who don't have any conflict of interest. That's my understanding is correct.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes it's totally correct. And I am not a member of this committee.

Rafik Dammak: So I think then you can participate. I don't see any problem in the - that you can participate as CMR because you cannot anyway to participate the decision for the new GTLD (unintelligible).

Sebastian Bachollet: Okay Sebastian, again don't spend too much time on that. Just you can discuss that on the mail later. It's not so important thing. I give you my (unintelligible) but if it's too complicated it's not necessary.

But discuss the other point. It's not the main problem today. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Sebastian. Alan do you want to make another further comment or...

Alan Greenberg: No. Thank you very much. I understand the generosity of the offer and I have no further comments to make. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Just because I was asking because your hand is still up. That's why.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, okay. I've taken it down.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So as we reached the one hour of this call and I think we did the review and also we appointed - no I guess (we still) have to appoint the CMR.

I'm not sure if there is any other comment to make or any other business or any kind of (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Yes Karla?

Karla Valente: Rafik this is Karla. Just to make sure on my list I have, (Alain), Alan, Cintra, Andrew, Avri, Rafik, Tijani, Alan and maybe Sebastian.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please register my no. I put it in the chat. I think it should be thanks but no thanks to Sebastian's offer. We have eight already and I think it would muddy the waters considerably.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'm clearly not getting that through on the chat though. Let's make sure it is on the record. Love you dearly Sebastian but...

Sebastian Bachollet: That's okay Cheryl. No problem. I agree with you and I withdraw my proposal, thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cheryl. I think Alan wants to make a comment. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I think Cheryl has said it clearly enough but I'll add another flavor to it. We're trying really hard to be squeaky clean and not do anything which will attract criticism. That one's over the line so I agree with Cheryl. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cheryl. Okay.

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton. I put it in the chat but I have to agree in this case. I really dearly love this idea Sebastian as be always trying to be more involved and take an operational role. But in this case I think the message might be discombobulating to others. So I really think we should be cautious and not do that.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you. I think it's clear guys. Anyway so I think we can now close this call. And thank you for everybody for joining.

I'm not sure that we will have sent another JAS working group. But it's always a pleasure to discuss with all JAS working group members.

Thank you for today and see you soon.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

END