

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 24 May 2010 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) 24 May 2010 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-201005024.mp3>

On page:
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

ALAC
Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large

GNSO
Avri Doria - NCSG
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison
Alex Gakuru - NCSG

Andrew Mack - CBUC?

Tony Harris – ISP

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachines
Richard Tindal – Individual

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

Apologies:
Carlos Aguirre - At Large
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Michele Neylon – RrSG

Coordinator: Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Gisella, can you do a roll call for us.

Gisella Gruber-White: With pleasure. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's JAS call on Monday the 24th of May. We have Evan Leibovitch, Avri Doria, Rafik Dammak, Elaine Pruis, Tony Harris, Richard Tindal, Alex Gakuru, Tijani Ben-Jemaa, Sébastien Bachollet.

For staff we have Olof Nordling, Glen de Saint Géry, Karla Valente, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies today from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Carlos Aguirre, and Michele Neylon.

And, if I can also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you, Evan and Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. This is Avri. I'll take the first bit of the Chair, and then I will pass it off to Evan during the meeting. But of course, he can jump in at any time when...

Man: Hello?

Avri Doria: ...the need to. Hello? Am I being hard to hear?

Man: Yes. I'm having a little difficulty hearing Avri.

Avri Doria: Is this better now?

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Let me repeat myself. I'll speak more loudly. Basically, I want to thank everyone for coming, especially those for whom this is a holiday. I'll Chair the first half of the meeting, and then Evan will take over half

way through. Of course, jumping in any time he feels that I am you know, not going in the right direction or whatever.

We have on the agenda for today, we have first a backgrounder on support aspects, and of what the (IGF) - I mean what the ICANN is -- (spoke at) too many meetings -- what ICANN is already planning to do in terms of supporting new applicants so that we understand into what framework we're sort of trying to make suggestions. Karla Valente will be giving that.

Then, there'll be an update in relation to the charter. Then, we'll talk about -- we've switched the order since -- Work Team 2 coming second, perhaps had less time for a full discussion, so we're putting that first. Then, we'll go into Work Team 1 discussions. And then hopefully we'll have time, scheduling, preparation of Brussels meeting, and any other business. Does anyone have any items of any other business at this point?

Okay. Hearing none.

Okay, any objections to the Charter as it's set? Okay. Hearing none, we'll proceed.

Before we start, I just want to remind everyone that - you know, I guess everyone now has their SOI in, but I want to remind everyone that they do need to update it if conditions change, and let us know - does anyone at this time want to indicate any changes in their published SOI?

Okay. Moving on.

Karla, I'd like to turn the floor over to you to sort of talk about - you know, give us sort of an overview of what is being planned for support of new gTLD applicants. And I guess you know after you talk, I'd like to open the floor for some questions, if that's okay with you.

Karla Valente: Thank you, Avri. Can you hear me well?

Avri Doria: I can.

Karla Valente: Okay. Thank you. So, I have one comment. When Olof asked me to join, he asked me because I - well first of all, we have been working together since 2007 and he knows that I looked into this back then when I was first hired to be Director of the program. And - so, that was the reason why you know, he asked me to join the call is to talk a little bit about back when in 2007, early 2008, what kind of things did I look into when facing that issue.

Because, this was one of the guidelines of one of the policies (unintelligible), that is actually to look at whether or not to support applicants. And, I believe it was related to Level 4 of the United Nations list of countries. And at that time, we also thought that maybe Level 3 would be a level that we should look into, just because the infrastructure of Level 3 counties was greater. So, that was one of the reasons why I joined the call today.

So going back to 2008, started doing some research and looking into support for applicants, Level 3, Level 4 of the United Nations, or maybe even expanding that to a not-for-profit organization, depending on how the scope of something like that would be defined, you know. So, the reason really had the base on the policy now. You know, that I understand (unintelligible) is meeting because of the Board resolution in Nairobi.

In looking at the scope and the structure of how something like that would work, that was you know, quite a journey. Because one of the things that I quickly looked around is are there any grants that already exist into the marketplace that would support technology development, or support some kind of local infrastructural development that could be tied to TLD, because obviously there was no specific grants to TLD that at least I could find.

And at that time, I did look into some technology grants that were defined broadly enough that I thought that maybe if we approached the organization we could see if there's broadly enough (good and contrast). For example, management of a top level domain or establishing a register and so forth.

And then the second aspect that I looked at is what would be really the scope of something like that? Because just offering grant for somebody to apply, and some of those programs really have several phases or one phase only. So, one phase only is you know, offering an initial start up money for companies to - or entrepreneurs to start up something. But, there all the programs that you know had to do with sustainability. How throughout time those companies are able to sustain themselves and really you know, bring back to the local communities what they needed to do.

And, one of the considerations at this time was that having something that is not - is beyond a grant but also sustainable would be important for this kind of program, because when we talk about TLD, we talk about registrants, we talk about registrars, we talk about you know, third parties that are direct and very heavily impacted by the success or failure of this organization.

Then, we looked also at information. You know, what kind of information is important? It's also not only about the grant, is about information. If somebody decides to be a registry, there's a huge learning curve, and there is a lot of commitment from this organization from a technical standpoint, operational standpoint, and so forth, to understand this industry and its structure itself, and maybe partner with someone to be able to provide a full blown service. And, this is a very important aspect.

And, how this could be accomplished maybe through partnering with local already established registries or local communities that are part already of the ICANN organization. And, how to do that in a way that there is not conflict of interest, or there is no kind of special treatment of any party that applies into the new gTLD process from an ICANN standpoint.

So, this selection process also is something that you know, we discussed early on and looked into - so who will do such selection? And, it became clear that you know, it would probably be better if we had a third party or an international organization that already handles this kind of (branch) or handles this kind of program that understand how a selection process would work. How to establish a criteria for a selection process.

So for example, there is a company that wants to apply to be a registry. So, what would be a reason criteria? For instance, does this company have to be established in a country that is considered Level 3 and 4? And, does this company have to be structured in a way that for example X% of its operations or X% of its revenue actually stays in the country; therefore, there is a compliance program?

Moving forward, that look into this and make sure that this kind of criteria is met over time. And, it could imagine you know once look into some of those programs, then and seeing how they have the sustainability of this long-term compliance. We also look - okay, can ICANN be part of that? We have a very limited scope of what our compliance can or cannot do within ICANN.

So again, you know even in a long-term, maybe it could be something or should be something that the third party would do. And if a third party does it, does it have - does ICANN have to have anything in its contract or its relationship with that third party organization?

And, the organization that actually becomes a register; do we need to have anything from a contractual standpoint that gives legitimacy to an ongoing compliance program? And then, for how long would that be running? And, who would be involved? Obviously, this would be like a full blown program.

At that time - so, this was some of the initial considerations and initial research that I did at that time, and we didn't go any further because there

were other priorities in the program at that time. You know, starting a (unintelligible) was the just the beginning. We didn't even have an applicant guide book when I started. So, this is where we were and this is the kind of things that we looked into.

So that's what I had, Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Good (unintelligible). I'd like to see if anyone would like to ask any questions? I see no hands at the moment.

(Andrew): Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Andrew): Avri, this is (Andrew). I was just able to get on the line.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you.

(Andrew): Who was just speaking?

Avri Doria: That was Karla Valente from ICANN staff.

(Andrew): Say it again. I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: Karla Valente from ICANN staff.

(Andrew): Thank you very much.

Tony Harris: Hello? Can I get in queue for questions? Tony Harris.

Avri Doria: Certainly. You're first. You got your hand up first, and then Evan. Go ahead, Tony.

Tony Harris: Okay. Fine. Hi, Karla.

Karla Valente: Hello.

Tony Harris: Nice talking to you again. I just have a question actually on what you were just saying. I was - well as you were talking, I was looking in Google trying to find Level 3 and Level 4 countries. All I came up with was a list in Wiki on the International Monetary Fund list of emerging and developing economies.

Could you possibly send to our list a link where we can find a list of these Level 3 and Level 4 countries, so we understand a little more what you're pointing at.

Karla Valente: Yes. Yes. I can. I can take a look. And correct me if I'm wrong, Avri. The policy had - that's what the policy has, right? Something to do with the Level 4 of the United Nations countries. And, I was not part of the discussions when this part of the policy was developed. Do you have any background on this - about the selection?

Avri Doria: Actually I don't. This is Avri. I actually don't remember us getting into details on that. I think we just sort of listed it as an example. But, I did ask Olof, and I'll help Olof in my other job as someone that consults the UN in terms of finding the proper definition of these. But, I don't off of the top of my head remember where they are defined.

Karla Valente: Okay. I'll take a look, Tony.

Tony Harris: Okay. Thanks a lot.

Avri Doria: All right. I'll look up the references to those, because also I do think that that would probably be useful to the people working on defining criteria to have one international set of criteria to look at, possibly build on, or use as it were.

Okay.

Karla Valente: And, just aware Tony - and, I remember looking carefully at this list, and Level 4 were countries -- at least what it looked like at the time to me -- were countries that really needed a lot of infrastructure development. You know, in terms of Internet. So, it's almost - it was almost like putting the horses you know behind the carriage, as in terms of (unintelligible). In terms of making them jump start into a program like that, because there were quite you know considerable infrastructural issues that had -- in my view at least -- had priority.

So that's why at this time, we thought that maybe adding also Level 3 would be probably a wise thing to do, because at least a Level 3 would have the infrastructure and probably be able to participate in a TLD program in a more effective way.

That said, we also discussed whether or not this kind of program or this kind of grant should be limited to the country Level 3 and 4, or should be limited to maybe not-for-profit organizations. Or, do we really care if it's for example an applicant from a Level 3 or Level 4 country - do we really care if it's not-for-profit organization?

So you know, this is yet another criteria you know, that (somebody who deals with manage approval no doubt) could help to define.

Tony Harris: Thanks, Karla. That's very useful.

Avri Doria: Olof, were you clarifying or did you just want to get in the queue.

Olof Nordling: I just wanted to clarify on this. You should know that on the Wiki there are links to the relevant UN pages where the listings are and such. So, you can easily find more information on the Wiki. I put it under the Working Team 2

heading, so that's where you will find the (relevant) UN links for this particular matter.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Olof. That's why in the chat room, I at first asked you if you could put them there, and then put the note, or were they there already, because the back of my mind, I was almost sure that they would probably be there already.

Okay. I have Evan and then (Andrew).

Evan Leibovitch: Hey, Karla.

Karla Valente: Hi, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: I wanted to ask you what you had envisioned regarding compliance. Did you first see the idea of creating a new infrastructure? Or, is this the kind of thing that if there were new requirements that (unintelligible) applications that came in this way would simply for instance have new clauses put into their RAA that ICANN's own compliance department would be monitoring? How - could you give me a little bit...

Karla Valente: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: ...more detail on the how you envisioned the compliance side of things.

Karla Valente: Absolutely. So Evan when I said compliance, I said compliance in a very broad way. Because in looking into some of these programs that exist into the marketplace - so for example, grant to help women entrepreneurs in - you know, within such and such criteria. Help to - grants to help this specific country that has to do with specific industry.

Depending on the kind of grants available, they have a specific criteria.

And, one of the - the criteria is not only about the selection process, whether or not the applicants meet a certain selection process criteria, but also if this applicant or this company that is granted some kind of financial support over time meets the criteria - so for example, if the criteria was that the specific applicant in an industry - and again, not TLD related. Just looking at how international organizations that provide grants structure itself - themselves.

Over time, if the criteria was that this company would be granted money to establish itself, but it needed to have X% of revenue, or employees, or operations in a given country, or had to you know, to fulfill some criteria, do they do that over time? You know, so many of those programs also had some kind of a compliance element to it to see if over time the companies that were granted money really met the criteria.

That said, you know one of the discussions internally was whether or not this was something that we would look into, and how important would it be to have something in a program like that that had to do with compliance and had to do with long-term meeting the goals. First and for mostly because once a register is established, registrants, registrars, and others are impacted by the business or by the success or failure of this business.

So, it's a must to make sure that this - there is a sustainable program. Because it's not only about giving money to someone to establish a resister; it's to making sure that you know we have something that is stable you know, going back to ICANN. ICANN's always concerned and you know, to make sure that we have in the future registries that they're stable - that the Internet is stable.

So, that was the scope of the compliance. It was not really particularly to do with the compliance of our Compliance Department, and you know increasing the scope of the Compliance Department itself.

Evan Leibovitch: So, you did not see maintaining the criteria -- the ongoing criteria for instance -- as another schedule added to the RAA kind of thing? You didn't foresee it - you didn't envision it that way?

Karla Valente: Let me put it this way. We didn't go that far. We didn't go that far on actually looking at the specifics. You know, because a lot of that would depend on who manages a program like that? Is it the first party that manages a program like that, that would have a contract with whoever is granted the money? What is the role of ICANN? What is the scope of the role of ICANN? Does this party have to have any contract with ICANN?

And, does the ICANN contract with the registry need to have any special provision that allows the third party organization to actually fulfill some of the compliance requirements? And you know, so there's all kind of layers that go into that from a legal standpoint that we really didn't look into because it depends on how we define the scope of a program like that.

Evan Leibovitch: Hmm.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. I've got (Andrew) and then we probably should move on to other items on the list. (Andrew).

(Andrew): Okay. Great. Avri thank you very much, and thank you Karla. In terms of a couple things that you've mentioned, just to give a little bit of - kind of my sense of things. The focus on Level 3 and 4 I think makes very good sense. I can at the same time see an argument being made that says that if we're trying to reach an underserved population in a Level 2 country for example, that maybe our guidelines should be flexible enough to handle that.

In terms of the focus on the recipient being an NGO, my sense looking around the world, and then some of the other work that we do (de-lines) between what it is an NGO and what is a for-profit or a slightly-for-profit, or a not-just-for-profit. These are changing as time goes on and becoming less

and less clear, less and less of a bright line. I know that there's still a juridical line.

I would also suggest that there may be some value in having something that might start off as an NGO, but that might over the course of time effectively transform itself into a profit making enterprise, if only just for sustainability purposes, such that we could - as there are many of these kind of development oriented projects. A revolving fund. You get in. You get some seed money. If you make it successfully, you pay back your seed money and that goes to other people who need the seed money.

I like your idea about compliance. My recommendation, having been at the World Bank for a few years in a past life, is that compliance can get very, very sticky. And so, the best compliance regimes are the ones that are the simplest, which is to say the smallest amount of reporting and the clearest criteria for entry. I wouldn't think it would be appropriate -- if I had to just guess off the top of my head -- for ICANN to bring that in-house, but I think it would be relatively easy to find someone who could help to both design and implement a relatively low friction compliance regime. And, I think that that makes good sense.

The last thing - you know, I kind of eluded to it a little bit earlier is this idea of grandfathering and graduating. You know, there should be -- as there are in a lot of places now -- the way that we look at these kinds of subsidies in other parts of the development world. They talk about idea that as time goes on, subsidies go down on some sort of a sliding scale, and then people move from being subsidized to being subsidizers. You know, in the way that say South Korea has moved out of the World Bank and is now a contributor to it as a funder.

And, I see no real difficulty with trying to - I think it would - in a best case scenario, we would assume that. We wouldn't assume that a particular

applicant that needed application support on the very front end would necessarily need it forever.

So I guess the question is, given some of those as a backdrop, are there any pieces of this based on your experience working with ICANN that they are you know, particular strong on that they say, "If it's going - if we're going to offer support, these are the things that we have so deeply buried in our head that we're not - we really don't want to change." Make sense? Any questions?

Karla Valente: That's for me?

(Andrew): Yes. Yes.

Karla Valente: Yes. You mean in terms of the criteria? I'm not sure if I'm following the question (unintelligible)?

(Andrew): No, that's okay. Okay. There are - where there are two types - there are two types of things that we've been talking about, right? One is criteria and the other one is -- I guess for a lack of a better word -- the operational or administrative parts of it, right?

Karla Valente: Right.

(Andrew): Like for example, the compliance mechanisms and things like that. And so, you've give us an overview - based on your reading, if we were to go back to the Board and say, "Hey. We've got some good ideas," what are the one or two things that they feel very, very strongly that must be contained within so that we make sure that we - you know, that we use those - we plant those flags in our documents or in our recommendations and work with what they're looking at? Assuming that they're not - you know, that we don't completely disagree.

Karla Valente: Yes. So, I don't know. From a Board perspective, I really don't know specifically what they are looking to, because I know as much about the resolution as you do by reading it.

(Andrew): Okay.

Karla Valente: I just figured that as an insider, you might have some insights, you know.

Karla Valente: Oh, sorry. Sorry.

(Andrew): It's all right. Worth a try.

Karla Valente: No. But, I suspect - and I'm talking really as a staff, I'm talking also you know, as a Program Manager in the past, is that probably you know, we need to go back to this community I think with something that is thought through you know. Because we are moving forward with the new gTLD program, and - you know, in terms of development as much as we can and looking at all kinds of (unintelligible) trying to resolve that. We're going to be publishing the Applicant Guide Book, Version 4, by the end of the month. You know, that's what we have been you know, spending our nights and days working on.

So, it's important to see - okay, what kind of things this program is going to have. What kind of things we manage to accomplish and in what time frame? You know, depending on the complexity of how we want to structure something like that, we need to make some kind of advice whether or not this is first round or this is upcoming round, you know, and how this is going to work.

So, this is one of the concerns - from a staff standpoint, this is one of the concerns that I have in my mind, is - okay, in order to create something that is well structured and has the sustainability element you know, and how important is this for - for this group to actually look into having a sustainability element for a program like that? Which will require compliance, which will

imply you know, all kinds of other things, not only just giving somebody money to do something.

(Andrew): Right.

Karla Valente: So, how complex is this going to be? And then, what does it take? And obviously if we work with a third party that already has lots of experience, and already some kind of infrastructure to do grants and to do compliances would be probably more efficient way to go about it. But, I personally haven't found anything that has to do with TLDs. So, I feel on that - still, even if we had all of this program developed by a third party, there's still a lot of the development elements that this third party would need to get into this industry, or to you know, have a program that is comprehensive enough.

(Andrew): I think that would make sense. I would just strongly suggest that we can - that some of the non-technical elements of the sustainability pieces and the structuring pieces of it are really fundamentally not - they're not that technical. That they're just basic program management in this space. And, my guess is that we could find someone who could come to us with a very simple management structure that would not be onerous.

My biggest concern is the more complex we make it; the harder it will be to get approved. And in the end, the longer it will be before people get any kind of support. And since - I think that a lot of how well we are viewed in terms of our success will be can we get something simple out there that makes sense relatively soon.

Karla Valente: Yes.

(Andrew): You know, so we're not miss - so that it's not so far down the line that people have forgotten about it.

Anyway, thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Karla Valente: Right. Yes. And one of the things that I would like to add is if I were a Board Member, I would probably want to see something that clearly defines what is going to be ICANN's role in all of this in the initial stage and moving forward. And, that's because our scope or mandates are you know, quite limited when it comes to compliance, when it comes to some of the things that we need to do.

So as a Board Member, I probably would like to see how the group envisions you know, ICANN's role...

Avri Doria: Okay, let's...

Karla Valente: ...and make sure that we cross all the dots in terms of conflict of interest and all of the kind of things that you know, needs to come with a program like that.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Karla.

Karla Valente: Okay. Thank you.

Avri Doria: One thing I wanted to check on - last thing. Did I understand you correctly, or just make a projection that there would be something on this in the upcoming Version 4 of the (draft) Applicant Guide?

Karla Valente: Something about providing what?

Avri Doria: Right. This whole issue. When you were talking, I thought - perhaps something you said made me think that there would be something on this issue in the (draft) Applicant Guide, or was that my imagination when you (unintelligible)?

Karla Valente: No. That's one - and, I apologize if I...

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: No. We're working on some budget information and use of funds information, but we don't have a lot, and I have not seen anything that is actually related to the Resolution 20 you're talking about.

Avri Doria: Okay. Are there any - my last question. Are there any written reports or documents like there have been on other issues on this particular issue that we haven't - that we've missed?

Karla Valente: I don't think so.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Karla Valente: I think that staff is just waiting to see what...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Karla Valente: ...you know, what becomes of the resolution.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Karla. Thank you very much for your time this morning.

Karla Valente: Oh, thank you for having me.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay, we'll probably come back with other questions over time, and I guess I can communicate directly or through Olof. But, thanks you so much.

Man: Thank you. (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay. Moving on to the next item. And, I think that was a good use of half of our time this morning, but moving on.

Updates from the GNSO Council regarding the Charter. I don't know if Rafik or someone who was actually at the meeting would like to speak for it? It's my understanding that the Charter has been accepted by the GNSO Council with one change, which was where we had said the Working Group will operate according to the Work Group Guidelines set out in -- and then a draft mentioned -- to insert the word interim, which is of course correct.

Those Working Group Guidelines are still in discussion, and there in comment review at the moment. And so, we're working on a particular version of it. I don't believe there were any other changes to the Charter at this point.

I think I had agreed to send out emails to the group saying that the Charter had been approved, and I then didn't do it. I got totally bogged down with other stuff, so I apologize. But, I am both saying that it was and admitting my failure at the same time. The news has been very full of things telling me we have to admit our failures immediately.

So, I don't know Rafik or Olof, is there anything to add from the GNSO meeting on this Charter?

Rafik Dammak: This is Rafik.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: There is nothing. You were just - you summarized it - what's happened, and that's (unintelligible). And (therefore), that I also contact (Carlos). He will be informed - (I like) about what's happened (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. One thing that hasn't happened yet, and I guess it doesn't actually happen until the Charter has been approved by both, although we certainly should do it, is we need to have the Co-Chairs sort of - I don't know if the word is specifically approve, but they need to be reviewed by the two. So, there'll need to be a - though it was contained in the report that was sent to the GNSO last time, I don't know if the GNSO considers itself as having reviewed and accepted the Chairs. But, we probably should do that in some definitive point at some point.

Olof, I see your hand up.

Olof Nordling: Yes. Well, this is Olof. You perfect summary. But, I did actually send out together with the agenda a little note in the agenda mail that said so much, that it had been accepted.

Avri Doria: Oh, thank you so much for making up for my failure.

Olof Nordling: Okay. Thanks.

Avri Doria: I appreciate it.

Okay. So anything else on the Charter at this point?

Okay. In which case, we move on to - oh, one question. I don't know if anyone knows from ALAC, do we have an idea of when ALAC will take up this issue? Or, do we need to consult with Karla?

Sébastien Bachollet: It's Sébastien.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Sébastien Bachollet: It will be pick up at the ALAC meeting tomorrow afternoon.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much.

Sébastien Bachollet: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you.

Okay, WT2. Work Team 2. Who from that group would like to give us an update on where they've gotten since last week?

Man: Which group is Work Group 2?

Avri Doria: This is the...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, (Boswan) would like to? This is the one that - WT1 is the one about looking for fee reduction, and WT2 is the one that's looking about all means of assistance. I was...

(Andrew): Okay. Well, I'm happy to do the assistance one, but if someone would like to jump in and put in some points (upside), too.

Avri Doria: Okay. Great. Please go ahead. This is (Andrew)?

(Andrew): Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Remember, give your name before you speak. I have (unintelligible), and I apologize, but say your name before you speak.

(Andrew): Okay. This is (Andrew), and we've had some very, very good back and forth on the email list so far this last week. A lot of it is actually fairly closely tied to - or related to some of the pricing issues.

But, a couple of the key points that have been mentioned recently. Elaine made a series of good points to which Richard made some excellent responses, and so - and I had some thoughts to add in, so I'll just give you what I consider to be the - kind of the state of play right now.

One question was what size is meaningful? And, Elaine asked the question, "What if this only serves a very small part of the public?" And, I think that there were two ways to read that. One way to read that is a small part of the public, meaning that there is a relatively limited demand. And, my guess is as a community, we don't care that this necessarily has a demand for the ages.

But, that there must be some sort of very -- how would you say -- that there needs to be some sort of critical mass in order to make it work viably and to make the sense - make sense for us to spend the time on it.

I mentioned the fact that there are small countries with big footprints and very large communities with no footprint at all. I threw out a number, and it was really literally just a guess. A community of the size of about half a million people. And, I was thinking in terms of some of the other numbers that had been bending around in terms of the numbers of registrations that would be necessary for financial viability, assuming that we're not just subsidizing the entire thing.

And, that's based on cost recovery. That number is by no means firm and fixed. It was just a guess, thinking that if there is a community much smaller than that, then we're talking about multiple registrations per person, which we think - which I was guessing is unlikely. But, I'm not sure that there is a right number for that.

There was a question about would an applicant need to demonstrate demand for the new TLD? What's the threshold? For example, the 10K registration is to be considered viable. I asked about the pricing issue itself, because it depends on how much the pricing issue is. How much price per registration we're looking at and things like that.

We also were talking about the idea of taking an accurate sample of a multi-jurisdictional community. So for example, the Catchewa-speaking community of Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador was one that I used. They are many people in relatively remote areas who might benefit substantially from this, but it might be difficult to survey in an early stage.

And, I will defer to someone who knows more about how survey than I do, but would think that it would be useful - especially since one of our goals is to try and reach people who are heretofore unreached. It might be useful to come up with a flexible way of tapping the initial demand.

And then, does the TLD have to be a worthy cause in order to qualify for support? My first line was that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. I think that there is - it's difficult to say that there's - that there're - that - you know, what's one person's worthy cause is another person's trivia.

But, it does strike us that - it did strike me, and other conversations that I've had offline that certainly the people that we have in our Group A, which is to say ethnic and linguistic communities, that we can take almost as a given that they're - that serving them if they are unserved is probably a positive good. And, it actually gets kind of murky when we go into the NGO space.

One thing that's come up in conversation also is the difference between the NGO or the non-profit as an organizing principle. Better to say the organization that does the applying might be a for-profit, might be a non-profit, and also the -- so, how would you say this -- there are - the NGO is both the structure and it is an entity, if this makes any sense. Greenpeace for example is an

NGO, but it is not a Category A the way we're using Category A Community.
Make sense?

And so, if the Zulu community decided that they were going to form an NGO
and to make an application as an NGO, they would be different in my mind
than say the Red Cross, which is definitely an NGO, but not necessarily a
community. Does that make sense to everyone?

Avri Doria: Any questions?

Okay, thank you for that. If there are not any questions or discussion now, I'll
sort of recommend moving it to the - continuing the discussion on the list. It
does seem to be moving along. But, are there any questions that anyone
wants to ask, or additions from others on the group before I move on to - or
we move on to Work Team 1?

(Andrew): Avri, I had one more point -- I'm sorry -- that was down at the very end...

Avri Doria: Oh, I'm sorry. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): No. No. Not at all. I'm trying to keep it brief.

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Andrew): There was some question - some - let's see. There was some discussion of
the idea of anonymously identifying a need and putting things up using the
APTLTLD, (unintelligible) TLD, et cetera, and the cc operators as a good
channel for distribution. I think that that's right. I am - just wondered out loud
in my own mind whether there was a bit of a conflict. Whether they might see
this as a threat to them that we might be taking - that a new gTLD in this

space might be taking registrants that they might like. And, I don't know whether we could factor that in.

The other thought was about a point that Richard made. We were relating -- I think it was Richard -- relating to discounted services or free services offered by registries, or even pooled registry services at one point in time. And, those were all very interesting ideas.

I shot back something where I think that if we could bundle them together we might make it worth people's while to build out in some of these secondary scripts as an example, and to go into some of the smaller communities, again trying to basically offer a package deal. So, that was one thing that came up in conversation that I thought I would add.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. I have Tijani with a hand up.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: And, I'd like to take maybe one or two questions, but then move on. Thank you. Tijani.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes, Avri. Thank you. I think that at this stage, if we want to have a preliminary draft for (unintelligible), we need to start having something to work on. Because now, we are discussing and everyone is giving thoughts, but we - I think that we should start by drafting something to work on, to be - if you want the (dust) off all the group.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I think that's a really good suggestion, and (could've been) one of the things that might not have gotten at the end about how close our schedule is.

Avri Doria: Elaine, the floor is yours.

Elaine Pruis: Good morning. It's Elaine speaking. I just had two points - one question and one point about (Andrew)'s summary. First of all, I'm wondering if anybody knows how many people are in the Catalonian community. If they surpass the 500,000 threshold that he suggested. Anyone have any ideas how many people are in the Catalonian community.

(Andrew): I know that - I am (unintelligible) positive that just the city of Barcelona would be larger - the city of Barcelona and maybe its environments should put them over that limit. But two things from my mind Elaine. One, is that that was just a really a guess on my part. I'm not a demographer, you know or anything like that.

The other thing is is that in the case of the Catalonian community, they wouldn't necessarily - they wouldn't need this kind of support, right, because they have other sources.

Elaine Pruis: (Unintelligible) so putting that forward, that would be a good test of the threshold question, because they actually do have a very viable TLD, although it's not hundreds of thousands of registrations. I think there are 40,000 registrations, though.

(Andrew): Yes.

Elaine Pruis: (I'll correct the numbers from that.)

Avri Doria: A quick point on Catalonia. It's listed as having a 7,475,420 population.

(Andrew): Down to the 20, Avri. Okay.

Elaine Pruis: Okay. And then the next thing. We kicked around the idea of not limiting our discussions based on whether or not you know, what level country has the infrastructure to actually operate a registry? But looking outside maybe a first tier country could provide registration - or registry support an infrastructure.

And, I just wanted to point out there's already a viable model of this. There is the Council of Country Code Administrators which has the 20 ccTLDs that all use sort of the same registry software, and sometimes host outside of their country based on whether or not they have a T1 line or if they have to use satellite uplinks. So, there's already a good model of this in place, and I think that's a worthy path to pursue for our issues. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. At this point, since we only have ten minutes left on this meeting, I'll - just a couple hands went up. Richard, did you want to say something on this before I moved off to Work Team 1?

Richard Tindal: Yes. A quick question for Elaine. This is Richard. Do you have to be a country both to be a member of COCA, or could one of our cultural linguistic groups also join?

Elaine Pruis: Well, the current model for COCA is the IONA designated administrator of the ccTLD can apply to be a member of COCA. An application is basically saying, "Yes, I'm at the IONA appointed number, and here's my \$10.00." But, that's - I'm not saying that you know, COCA itself could do this.

Although, I'm sure that the Charter could be adjusted to supply services to ethnic and linguistic communities, which I think is sort of along that same line. Where, the objective of COCA is to make sure that (unintelligible) which in this case are ccs get an opportunity to run at a first class system.

So, we - you know, if that's one they want to look at, I can talk to the Directors and see if they're willing to adjust their Charter for that. But, it's a viable model that's worked really well for several (unintelligible) countries.

Richard Tindal: You know, I think personally it would be a good idea just to make an informal inquiry to COCA to see if we did come up with some guidelines for applicants

that we think would be eligible to support, if COCA would - just informally, if they would be interested in broadening their Charter.

Because I agree with you. I think that's a great infrastructure model for the sort of applicants that we're talking about.

Elaine Pruis: Okay. I'll do that.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I see Evan has his name up. I'm going to turn the Chair over to him. He can do his last comment on this, and then move on into WT1. So Evan, the floor is yours. The Chair is yours.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Elaine, I had a quick question about the - my only concern about the path you're talking about is I don't think the ccTLDs have to deal with the issue of gaming. One of the things that's on our mind is having you know, a developed country registry trying to do something in the name of a Western developed country or an unserved community as a way of gaming the system.

Have you - do you know if they've had to deal with that kind of issue, or how that comes into this equation?

Elaine Pruis: Well, the COCA model is - it started out as three very small ccTLDs working together, sharing resources to create an EPP registry system. And, that's totally based on economies of scale. None of those three countries had the knowledge or the resources to create the system that they thought they needed in order to retain control of their registries against (hostile reach) allocations from parent countries.

And example would be .CX is trying to stay in control of that registry, where the Australia government has sought many times to wrap that under their control. So, that's just an example of the (unintelligible) the issues that they've been working with.

Basically, they're trying to make sure that with the authority of the local government, and the approval of ICANN and IONA, they have a viable registry operation in place so that the community can keep the resources from the registry in their own country.

And the reason why COCA has grown from those three original to more than 20 is that we've seen (Adams needs) had -- I don't know -- probably ten different ccns delegated to them. And, they were running that out of Europe for countries that - you know, small islands in the Pacific Ocean.

And as the governments became more involved in ICANN and (GAC) numbers showing up and IONA re-delegations to the local communities, they needed some sort of software and hosting in order to broaden viable registries.

So, this is a - sort of a home grown solution to a well known need in the second and third world ccTLD space that we could defiantly if not use the COCA if they're willing to change their Charter, then we could at least follow their model.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

All right. Oh, Avri just popped this over to me. Okay, Richard can you take what you've got to email, or does it need to be said right now? We're running late into the hour.

Richard Tindal: I'll send by email.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right, I'm going to make a suggestion. We'll take this offline to see if we can possibly maybe get somebody from the group that Elaine's talking about to come and speak to a future meeting. And, I'll work offline with Avri and staff to see what we can do about that. That seems to be a good idea.

In the meantime, we have a whopping five minutes left in the hour with which to cover Work Group 1 as well as possible updates about Brussels. So, do Tony or anybody else from Working Team 1 have an update of what went on there?

Olof, are you - do you have some on Work Team 1, or something else?

Olof Nordling: Oh, it's actually something else. Just a very brief update. As it is right now, we have a placeholder for a two hours session on Wednesday in Brussels. Between now - let's say 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm local time. So, on Wednesday in Brussels, that's where we - we do have a slot at least.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So, does this mean - is this going to be an open workshop or we're going to be expected to make a presentation about this?

Olof Nordling: The concept is rather that it would be like a workshop or a podium discussion. Potentially -- and I say potentially -- have (unintelligible), who was the promoter of this particular motion in the Board, to have him as the anchor man for it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Well thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes. We should probably talk off line on how to organize such a session.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. We'll take - yes, we'll take the details off line. In the mean...

Avri Doria: And then be back with a report for next week's meeting.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tony, do you or - do you have something to talk about in terms of at least brining the call to speed on what's happening with Work Team 1?

Tony Harris: Well, I tried to - I was away from the office all last week, but trying to follow it. Basically, I think we're at a place where we need to do some - again, some drafting to try and pull the different opinions I've seen into some initial document we can all pick at. Because, there doesn't seem to be general agreement on how to go forward.

And, I've already put my thoughts in writing more than once, and I really liked the posting sent by Tijani the other day, which I'm sure all of you have seen. I think he's absolutely right about not limiting what we want to say, and just you know, take the list that we maybe churn down on some of our proposals. And, if we only have two or three minutes, well it doesn't seem logical that I should attempt to an update on everything that's been going on.

Evan Leibovitch: But, it's safe to say you're - are you looking for people there to help draft the sort of straw man draft that would then be presented here for further comment maybe next week?

Tony Harris: I think yes. My suggestion would be perhaps by email, those who want to contribute rapidly say so, and we can get together and start putting the different ideas into this initial - let's say re-initial approach.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Between you, me, and Tijani, we can start something off at least, and then put a call out on the list to see who else wants to get involved with it.

Man: And Evan, are we talking about doing two separate ones? One for the Working Group 1 and one for Working Group 2? Or, are you talking about trying to put something together for both?

Evan Leibovitch: It's my understanding that what Tony is talking about is to deal with specifically the issue to Working Team 1, to try and bring together a divergence of opinions on this.

Man: Okay.

Tony Harris: That's correct.

Evan Leibovitch: I've got Avri and Tijani. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes. I have several things. One, I think it probably does make sense for each of the Working Teams to start figuring out their own basic draft. I think in terms of delivering something, we would put them together with some sort of you know, umbrella over them indicating how the group is working and you know, this is a section in their (unintelligible).

The other thing that I just want to throw in before time runs out, and I have no problems staying on longer if other don't. We should consider - we have to consider the scheduling of this telephone call, and we should consider whether - because of our schedule and what we're doing we want to extend to a 90 minute. But, I'll take that to the list. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Oh, I had some - okay, I've got a checkmark from Elaine. Somebody else said they wanted to talk, but they've withdrawn their hand.

Man: It wasn't me.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: It was me, but Avri said what I wanted to say.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Tijani.

Actually, it becomes more important than that the two Work Teams come up with some kind of statement or documentation, since according to Olof, we do have some time within Brussels where we're going to be expected to present publicly and talk about this in an open forum. So, that makes it all the more important that we have at least something on paper, something that we're able to put up on a screen and talk about.

I mean, you're absolutely right Tony, with time running out on this call, we don't have a lot of time to do this specifically here. Is there anybody that has any questions or comments about any of the things you've been seeing on the list about Work Team 1? Or, are we going to just take this all off line?

We're one minute into the hour, and we have a limited amount of time to deal with this. But if anybody has any real serious questions that can be answered - that should be answered on this phone call, please do now.

Okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: Evan, this is Glen.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, there.

Glen de Saint Géry: Can you hear me? Yes?

Evan Leibovitch: I can. Yes. Go ahead, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: I just wanted to know whether you will need any time to present something to the Council over the weekend - this Saturday or this Sunday. Would you like to do an (essay) to the Council, or do you consider that the two hours that you will be having on Wednesday will be enough?

Evan Leibovitch: I don't know. I think we need to defer - Avri, do we have something full cooked enough to actually present something to Council? I won't be there on the Saturday.

Avri Doria: Okay. I'll certainly be there on the Saturday. I can certainly give an update of where we are if the Council so wishes. I don't know that we'll be in a position of having something that we need them to act on, but it's certainly appropriate for you know, me to give them an update and deal with questions from the

Council members and the rest of the GNSO community and others who happen to be attending that meeting.

So certainly Glen, if it is of interest, do schedule me in for time. But, I don't think we're drive - we need to drive a request. I don't know if anyone agrees, disagrees - agrees with that.

Evan Leibovitch: Well by the same token, it was my expectation that Carlos and myself would also be giving a brief update to ALAC during its meeting on the Sunday. But as you say Avri, I don't expect that it would be any formal request for action so much as an update on where things are going.

Avri Doria: Does that help, Glen?

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay. Thanks. That's lovely. And, the next call is for next week, because Monday is a Holiday in the US.

Avri Doria: And today was a holiday in Europe I understand.

((Crosstalk))

Man: And Canada.

Man: It's a holiday here, too.

Avri Doria: The only thing I have to say is I know that I will be on my way to an airport at this time on Monday, so that leaves most of the call Chairing to Evan. I think the work that the group's doing needs a meeting next week. I don't know if people want to schedule for another day. We also need to look at the fact that we do have the meeting currently scheduled in a timeslot where I don't think the ALAC liaison is able to attend.

And so, a discussion we should take to the list in addition to the - do we expand to 90 minutes, is do we want to change our time.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I'll tell you what. I'll go offline with Carlos and find out if there's a specific problem with this time of the week. If there is, we'll bring it back to the mailing list. If not, we'll try and accommodate Carlos some other way.

Sébastien Bachollet: It's Sébastien. I can't - (the reason I ended there), I had to reschedule my - if you can give me on second.

Avri Doria: Sure. Certainly. You've got it. I'm sorry Evan, it was your Chair, but I talk too quickly.

Evan Leibovitch: I would've said the same. Go ahead.

Sébastien Bachollet: Thank you. I think it's important that we have some kind of the same type of briefing in both group GNSO in Iraq. And, I know that for Iraq people, it's almost impossible to be on Saturday. I am still struggling. But, I guess that I will be on Saturday, and I will be happy to join Avri for the GNSO (unintelligible) meeting. And, I think it could be great if somebody - if Avri or somebody else from the GNSO could be on the Iraq time to discuss this issue.

I think it's important to have this (slight) change.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I'm more than willing to come into that meeting when the report is being given and participate. So you know, let me know what you need, and maybe we'll have to do a little bit of a schedule shuffle if I'm caught in something else I'm committed to. But otherwise, certainly.

Evan Leibovitch: We'll figure something out. I think it's a matter of saying you know, it'd had come at a very specific designated time, and we'll work it out.

(Andrew): And Evan, can I make a suggestion for next week.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

(Andrew): My suggestion is listening to what everybody - what we got on our plate and the amount of time that we're going to need, I would be willing to do a 90 minute if other people could do it. Especially if we could move it later in the week. That'll give both of the working groups that need to be actually putting pen to paper or its equivalent, to come up with a straw man draft.

And if we wanted to actually review those drafts, it'd probably would be useful to have a little bit more time.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, let's ask right now on the call. Either through ticks in the Adobe Chat or speak up here. Is there anybody who does not - cannot do a 90 minute call next week?

Avri Doria: Any big red Xs?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry?

Avri Doria: I'm saying any big red Xs, and I don't see any.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So, we'll put the request out on the email list as well. But tentatively, count on -- until changed otherwise -- it'll be at the same time, but it will go for 90 minutes.

(Andrew): Are we stuck with Monday?

Avri Doria: No, we're not.

Evan Leibovitch: We're not stuck with Monday, and we seem to have a problem with the ALAC liaison. So, there might be - I mean, there's a possibility there might be another going out if we need to consider another time.

(Andrew): Great.

Avri Doria: Okay, then.

Evan Leibovitch: All right. Is there any other business?

Okay. Going once. Going twice. Okay. Well then, seven minutes into the second hour, thank you all for coming. We will see you sometime next week for 90 minutes. And, thank you again for your time, and especially for those that had to take off from their holiday.

Olof Nordling: Thank you, everybody.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much.

((Crosstalk))

END