

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Tuesday 26 April 2011 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Tuesday 26 April 2011 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20110426-en.mp3>

On page :

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

GNSO

Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Andrew Mack – CBUC

ALAC

Carlton Samuels – LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

Alan Greenberg – GNSO Liaison – NARALO

Dev Anand Teelucksingh – At Large

Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair

Dave Kissoondoyal - (AFRALO) – At large

Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

Alain Berranger - Individual

Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

Edmon Chung

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Glen de Saint Géry

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Elaine Pruis – MindandMachines

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) – At Large

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair

Andrew Mack – CBUC

Alex Gakuru – NCSG
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Baudoin Schombe - At-Large
John Rahman Kahn - Individual
Cintra Sooknanan – At-Large

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

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Tuesday, the 26th of April. We have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Carlton Samuels, (unintelligible), Carlos Aguirre, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Sebastien Bachollet, Eric Brunner-Williams, Alain Berranger, Alan Greenberg, Andrew Mack, Edmon Chung. From staff, we have Karla Valente and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologies today from Alex Gakuru, Evan Leibovitch, Cintra Sooknanan, Rafik Dammak, and Elaine Pruis. I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call.

If I could also please remind you to state your names when speaking, this is important for the - for transcript purposes.

Thank you. Over to you, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Gisella. Good morning, colleagues. Thanks for coming here.

I have pasted - put up an agenda that we think we could all rally around. It's on the Adobe Connect room. It was also sent to the e-mail list. Is there any objections for us to focus on part three and five of the issues report?

When I say part three and five, I mean we need to settle the qualifications who qualifies for support and we need to settle on how we evaluate against the criteria we set up above. Are there any objections? Okay. There being no

objection, I would like to spend the next 35 minutes talking about part three and part five.

Alain Berranger: Who is speaking, please? This is Alain Berranger.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, go ahead, Alain.

Alain Berranger: No, I just want to - I was - I didn't know who was speaking. I'm new to the group and I don't recognize the voices, so I was - I guess you're the chair and I didn't know your name, my apologies.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. My name is Carlton Samuels. I'm co-chair of this group.

Alain Berranger: Okay. Good to meet you, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alain Berranger: All right. Thanks a lot. Sorry for the interruption.

Carlton Samuels: Not a problem at all.

Alain Berranger: Well, I would like to a point -- this is Alain Berranger -- about the...

Man: Thank you, (unintelligible).

Alain Berranger: ...about the application in scripts.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alain Berranger: There is a criteria with a question mark of underrepresentation would be defined as having less than 20 million users.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alain Berranger: If I look at the scripts around the world, there's - this criteria is very discriminatory because many, many scripts don't even have total numbers well under sometimes 10,000 or 15,000. And if - I wouldn't go as far as saying that, you know, if a community has got only 15,000 speakers that it's irrelevant. I guess it's - you know, we would have to be totally inclusive.

So I have experience with two communities. The Ashinka community in the northern part of Latin America and the numbers are in the thousand and they run across four or five countries. So I don't know how the country criteria selection is going to off in that case. And then take another case of - in North America, the (Itecamec) Tribe or (Ite) in Canada has only got 5,000 speakers.

So I don't know how inclusive - I just wanted to - these pop up to my mind because I've been there and worked with them on connectivity. So that was why it's stuck in my mind. I don't have a solution necessarily to propose at this time.

Carlton Samuels: But the - can I just paraphrase it so I understand you? There's two issues. One that there - the number of - that we're using as a benchmark, which is the 20 million, you think is too high...

Alain Berranger: Way too high.

Carlton Samuels: ...a threshold. That's the first one.

Alain Berranger: Yes, that's (unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: And secondly, I am interpreting this now that in areas where a language community -- a (unintelligible) language community -- transcends or go across borders, then the argument that the ccTLD might in fact support they - the local language is also weak. Is that what you're saying?

Alain Berranger: I'm not sure. All I know is that when we - in a previous life, when we installed some (unintelligible) points in the Andes and in the - on both sides of the Andes on - in four or five countries for the Ashinka community, this was the first time in decades that these communities could actually connect to each other.

And so - and I - actually I'm sorry. I don't know how many people are Ashinka speakers, but it can't be a - you know, it's probably under 100,000, but it is very relevant for the survival. In other words, should there be - should the survival of the language be an issue here?

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Well, the language is always an issue for us in this context. But I'm going to ask. I see two hands up. I see Eric who has had similar concerns, I believe if I can remember. And I'm going to ask, Eric, can you join here?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Carlton. Eric Brunner-Williams. First, I'd like to suggest that comments of this nature be raised first on the mailing list as e-mail for the purpose of saving time on the voice call. That's really the only point I wanted to make at this juncture as we jump from the criteria to the IDN specifically. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Olivier, you're up, sir.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you very much, Carlton. I was just going to mention one thing. I'm a bit concerned that we are trying to look again into very small cases of - you know, going into the micro rather than the macro view of the whole - of the work. And one thing which I think we should try and steer clear of is to try and define criteria for every Tom, Dick, and Harry around the world.

I think there is a requirement of our group perhaps to not try and reinvent the wheel because I think this is a danger that we're going into -- a dangerous path we might be taking -- and look more towards establishing guidelines

bearing in mind that at the end of the day that there are so many different parameters that could be taken into account it's going to be impossible to come up with a mathematical solution to this.

I expect that, ultimately, the selection is going to be made by some kind of panel. And perhaps we should look at describing what kind of panel could be put together. I also expect that this kind of panel would also exercise a whole lot of knowledge and understanding of the issues and not just look at criteria as such, but perhaps look at various parameters that are at hand during the application process.

But going into definition of exact criteria and putting a number next to these criteria, saying, "Well, it needs to be more than 20,000 users or needs to be less than 50,000 people or needs to be from a country that is on such and such a list," I think is getting a little bit dangerous because we will never be able to find every single solution in the next two weeks. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Let me just make a quick response to that. I quite agree that we shouldn't go into details, but what I disagree about is we should provide some kind of guidance. For us to leave the guidance to the committee to make all the details I think is dangerous. We have other interests and I believe that it is reasonable to have a reasonable set of guidelines provided. And I don't think saying that you should have underserved scripts and even giving an example is far off base for me.

My interest in this case is that we'll look at the five criteria -- five macro criteria -- and when I read and I follow the conversations the ones pertaining to part three and part five are still in play. Now what I want to do this morning is to get closer to settlement on these. So that's my reason for doing this.

Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Okay. Just two quick things. The first is, is that the 20 million number is just an attempt to have some sort of a marker out there. As you had mentioned, Carlton, it is not firm and fixed though people a feeling that that is - that that should be revised.

The second point was about the ccTLDs. I agree with what I think I understood from Eric's posting on the Web - I mean on the listserv which was that given the state of a number of the governments that take - that run are responsible for the ccTLDs. I'm not sure that they necessarily represent the language communities in the way that we might hope. And as a result, I don't think that that's a solution and think we should continue with our focus in part because of that. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Can we go back to Eric? You have your hand up.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Carlton. Eric Brunner-Williams. Again I'd like to encourage everyone to be as terse as possible and to use the mailing list as much as possible and also to avoid, possibly involuntarily, but language which deprecates the position of other. The Tom, Dick, and Harry reference in Olivier's comment comes across unfortunately, and I hope it was - I'm sure it was unintended. Thank you very much.

Carlton Samuels: I'm not sure I follow you, Eric. But I will - it will (unintelligible) to me (unintelligible).

Okay. So there are no - I guess Eric put his hand down. I am still at the point where I want to see a settle the issues surrounding the three, part three, which is to say who - what are - what communities who qualifies? So let me go back to it and ask specific questions.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Alan has his hand up. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Are we satisfied?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Yes? Sorry. Tijani, that you?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Alan - yes. Alan has his hand up.

Carlton Samuels: Alan just had his hand up. Yes, I see now. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I - I'll raise an issue that's come up before. This section is only dealing with what applicants -- what are the criteria for applicants to be eligible -- not the application -- not the intention of the use of the domain. And I don't see how we can put - qualify only the applicants and ignore what is it they're actually trying to do. So I'm not criticizing what is there, but I think there is a section that is omitted that must be there.

Carlton Samuels: Alan, I totally agree with you. That has always been my bugbear with this and I've said on the list and I've said it (unintelligible) many times. It's the application that is issue. I will tell you what my position is. It's always the application. I am not even sure that financial need is a major requirement, because if you don't meet the criteria for the objection of the application itself, then you don't qualify regardless.

Alan Greenberg: I think it's both. You can - you're - clearly the track record of the applicant, the financial situation and things like that are relevant. But what it is they're trying to do. Just because they've done good things before doesn't mean this one is worthy of support. And it's easy to leave out, because it's going to be a very difficult one to implement. But I don't see how we're going to justify anyone giving money, whether it's, you know, a government, an international agency, or ICANN, without one of the criteria being, "What is it you're trying to do?"

Carlton Samuels: I absolutely agree. I sent a note through the process through Cintra and (Dev) and to the list -- this closed list -- and my bugbear with that as that I didn't see

that starting the funnel. And that's what should start the funnel for me. Quite frankly, after that, and other people disagree, but once you say the application meets a certain (unintelligible) the policy interest, then you start looking at other things. And you look at the kind of support they need.

I believe, for example, if they want support of a certain way, there might be financial support required or there's financial plus other technical support, and those are two different buckets that you go into. And to me that makes sense, but it's still in process. I hope to see that adopted.

Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. Thank you. I apologize. I was off Internet for the last two weeks and I just come back yesterday. And I don't (unintelligible) all you do during these two weeks.

About just this last point, my problem or questions are how we will keep secret expansion (unintelligible) the list of all the application, because if it's not done that way, we have already people or project where we have difficulty to add them to the process. And in addition, we will expose the extension of the letters they want to use to everybody. And with the risk that somebody else took it or do something or - and that's the reason why I am concerned how we will honor the - this process.

We need to know what they are - what they want to achieve. But in the same time, we don't want to expose them to more than the others in this process. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. If I may paraphrase, Sebastien is cautioning. He says we need to know what the applications intended to achieve. I agree with that. But he say that we must recognize it in such a way that it does - it does not discriminate with them against any other group.

I'm not sure that I understand what he means, but my own interpretation of it is that it is because of the first part that I'm going to be discriminatory. So I have to be discriminatory if you make the first cut. So at some point I have to be discriminant. And...

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. But Carlton, just to take one - if you have one extension you want to work on, you have no finance opportunity to do that, then you are come to this program to have (unintelligible). And that's a good idea. If it's exposed to everybody, then somebody else could take this idea with somebody else with money and could bring that other project without involvement of the trust fund (unintelligible) thought about that. And then it's a real unbalanced situation.

Carlton Samuels: Oh, I see what you mean, Sebastien. You're saying that the concept might be stolen by somebody with money?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: And implemented for other purposes? That's what you're saying.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. And I didn't want to say it with that way, but it's exactly my meaning. Yes. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. You know, that's a problem, but we have to juxtapose that problem against the transparency that this kind of process is bound to embrace. So I'd like to hear what others are saying. I think Cheryl up after you. Cheryl, please?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Carlton. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Just to react to Sebastien's concerns and I'm going to say two things. First one may sound as if it's tongue-in-cheek or having a dig. It is not. Of course, a needy applicant could find someone with money and not come into this process at all.

We are tasked as an applicant support workgroup to come up with mechanisms and methodologies and even options and possibilities of the nature of resources and assistance that applicants for new gTLDs who are unable to rally those resources or have access to those resources be they monetary or otherwise and allow a pathway for such applicants to enter what we hope will be a level playing field.

Now as far as that goes, I wouldn't have thought that the information in a JAS application pathway would have been any more or less publicized at any given time in the process than any other. And in fact, it may be of concern to such a needy applicant to have their neediness exposed too early on the system or in the process. So I would assume a sustained degree of confidence and confidentiality would be applied at whatever stage in the new gTLD applications process we are looking at as to our JAS applicants as much as it would be to any other.

So whilst I was certainly not making a joke when I was saying, "Well, perhaps they could go and find people with money," that is very true. It's an incredibly worthy cause which individuals are being altruistic about they may indeed go down that pathway instead of into a JAS pathway.

Now that said, I'm a little concerned that again we are getting - how to say this lightly - away from what our task is. Just remember again that we are to build into both criteria and processes some listings and specifications. I think if we start doing that at this meeting, we will get well under way, but I wouldn't suggest that we cannot add or build based on our public comments on our milestone report.

And I think along with the issues that the GAC has raised in terms of municipalities, level governments, etc., and these, Carlton put it, public-private partnership issues can get too added on. The IDN is by definition something that we usually would need a lot of extra work on. And the

contributions we've had in this meeting certainly headed in some of the right directions for the discussion there.

But I don't think we need to shy away from adding them on if they had come out of the public commentary. So to date, the ones that have come to the table having (unintelligible). But I would still prefer us to keep it to generalities.

So with some of the language that we're about to look at, for example, the definition of what percentage of perhaps municipal governments may be involved in a public-private partnership, you may want to keep very generic terminologies there. Majorities and minorities rather than start getting (unintelligible) and 30% and 25%. And the same I would suggest should go for the numbers of users or predicted users in a business plan/

Coming to application as opposed to the purpose of the extension, I think it's fairly important that we recognize the discussion of our previous call or two where the issue of what contribution will a new proposed gTLD in terms particularly of community gTLDs and community-supported gTLDs? What will they make? What numerous different variety or choice or public purpose or public interest will they bring as something that we would be using to establish a preference or priority if not a baseline criteria from?

So I think we have already agreed that we need to delve a little further than we had in our simple JAS recommendations listing which was all about the applicant and look a little bit more at the purpose of the application. In other words, what (unintelligible) insert numbers and letters there and close the bracket meant to do. So from my perspective, we've already gone down that pathway and I think it's a pathway that's reasonable to go down.

Thank you, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you very much, Cheryl. You said a lot there just like me because I'd like to just focus (unintelligible) a couple of things that you said there in that list. I vote to the concern she said that we must - we can actually add stuff to this - the writing that we gleaned from the discussions on the list without going too far.

One of them, of course, is the issue of the confidentiality in the process. (Dev) has raised the issue that if we integrate this JAS application as a subset in the generic application, then that takes care of it. I could emote to that too.

The other issue that I think we need to get moving is the issue of the government GAC's concern about government entities not being discriminated against. I - my answer to that is the public-private partnership and Cheryl's sensible suggestion that we leave it as wide as possible without actually subscribing to a percentage of partnership for any group is a good one. I support it.

The other one, of course, is the prioritizing of applications. Again, my interest is that we must begin with the objective of the applications. And here again Cheryl has suggested that maybe what we should do is to say, of all the types of applications that could be embraced in this issue -- in this process -- we should attempt to give priorities to certain applications. And she says the ones that are community-supported gTLDs that have specific new interests -- that is interests that are not now embraced elsewhere -- might be given the highest priority.

I agree with all of those and I think we could at least embrace those and move on.

Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Carlton. I apologize in advance for being - taking the conversation or attempting to take it back to the issue of the text before. I'm

personally confused by the difference between the text version I see in links from - sent by (unintelligible) and the text that we have before us. For instance, there's no 20% line in the text that's in front of my on the Adobe Connect. The IDN portion of it starts with, "Applications and scripts whose presence on the Web is limited," and continues on for another paragraph and a half.

So a meta question is, what text are we attempting to edit? I hope it - well, in any event, I have a proposal to change the text that's common to both what I see from Cintra and I presume the closed writing team and the text that's in front of us now, and that is to substitute the word "language" for the word "script." And I've attempted to discuss this in e-mail to the list. But I'd be happy to take questions from anyone who's unsure on what the difference is.

But that's my proposal, is that we actually change the text in this call and then confirm that change of text on the mailing list. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: So Eric has a direct proposal on - for the group. Is there any objection to this?

Andrew Mack: Carlton, can I ask a clarifying question a little bit?

Carlton Samuels: Sure, Andrew. Go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Thank you very much. Andrew Mack. Eric, can you explain - I mean, I understand why there has been some push to use "text" - to use "script." Can you explain to us why you prefer to replace "language"? I'm not, on the face of it, objecting. I'm just trying to understand how you see the difference and why that makes sense. Thank you.

Eric Brunner-Williams: All right Andrew. I'll ask a question back. But the purpose of the question is not to determine the answer. It's simply to determine whether or not a communication mechanism is effective.

Have you read the note that I sent to the list on the IDN issue yesterday?

Andrew Mack: I did. I just - I'm just trying to understand it a little bit better and but I did read it. Yes sir.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay good.

Andrew Mack: I read all your notes Eric. Don't worry.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well that's flattering.

Andrew Mack: Well take it how you like.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I tried to answer that question in that note which is that there are languages that use a single script, multiple languages using a single script as well as languages which use multiple scripts, typically a Latin script where there's Latin orthography has been proposed by Conquest or Colonialism and a non-script.

So the focus on scripts alone would actually mean that we would not be recognizing a language diversity interest or a linguistic diversity interest from any applicant in the new world except possibly two edge cases.

And for most applicants in Africa as both Arabic and Latin are not likely to be offered as justifications for applicant support those being major scripts with more than 20 million users or whatever the number might be set to, and it also eliminates Hmong scripts in all of its forms again because the number of users.

And so it really creates a possible beneficiary class to the JAS having an IDN or a linguistic component to a very small area of the human population which uses scripts which are primarily located in Southeast Asia.

So basically the script focus eliminates the entire Cyrillic, Latin, Hmong and Arabic language communities that use those scripts independent of what language they use from the possible beneficiaries of applicant's support.

And I would offer that language preservation, language recovery, language diversity, is not a goal which we are intentionally limiting to populations that inhabit Southeast Asia.

I hope that helps answer the question.

Andrew Mack: Can I ask a follow-on just to understand then? So for example because we've talked about the example of multi-script communities, the communities that have - that exist in two or more scripts and you mentioned a number of them in North America and some in North Africa and places like that.

I'm just trying to understand they - in some instances you have communities that have one language that is expressed in two different ways. In other instances there are communities which are effectively bilingual in their true existence, right?

I think that the attempt to try and get at scripts was an attempt to try to capture the examples of communities that have two languages that they use - two scripts that they use.

Does that make sense? Is there a way - I'm wondering whether the one - we don't wish to - I understand your point about not wishing to push out people that use other languages. I'm trying - I guess what I'm trying to do is to square the circle on these two. See - to - and I'm sorry. I'm not explaining myself very well.

Do you get the general idea though that the - and for example...?

Carlton Samuels: Can I just jump in here? Can I just jump in here?

Andrew Mack: Please, thank you; my apologies.

Carlton Samuels: The question is how do you embrace the issue of language diversity in the attempt to make the technical transformation from language to script as we have in this writing? That's the question.

Alan Greenberg: Can we get back to the speaker list?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'll be happy to take questions.

Carlton Samuels: We can get back to speaker list. Eric, can you wait for questions? I'll just get to (Elaine) and then go to Alan afterwards. Thanks.

(Elaine Pruis) Thank you very much Carlton. This is (Elaine). A simple suggestion that may offer some Part III, the - when we list the five criteria, you know, Part III, will qualify as the support. I noticed that we used both applicant and application.

But my suggestion is noting that the financial need of the applicant is seen as primary and mandatory. I think the discussion today has indicated that criteria three, the need of the community to be served by the proposed (GLD) should actually be the primary and mandatory criteria and not the neediness.

So I simply recommend we switch one to three and three to one or something like. Certainly bring three to the need of the community as the overriding primary and mandatory criteria.

Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm speaking with relation to Eric's comment which I strongly support.

IDN is very in vogue in ICANN. But the real issue is IDN is just a tool to support language. It's a tool to allow communication with people who either don't use the same script and/or don't speak the same language.

And yes, there are some - a small number of cases relative to the other one where there are multiple scripts that are used for a single language.

But the vast majority of languages we're looking at that are not supported or unsupported right now are ones that use scripts similar to others.

So it's not the script we're looking at. It's the language. Language is what we use to communicate with. Script is a tool for it.

Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: That's exactly what I want so - to hear. So I'm asking now. Do we have specific language that we can agree - that can be proposed now that we can all agree on?

Woman: Can we hear from Edmon?

Alan Greenberg: Eric suggested changing the word script to language or IDN script to language.

Carlton Samuels: IDN language.

Woman: Can we hear from Edmon?

Carlton Samuels: Just the word, script to language.

Woman: Can we hear from Edmon because he is our IDN liaison?

Carlton Samuels: Oh Edmon is there. Yes. Edmon I'm going between windows here. Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. This is Edmon. And I think in general I support the idea. There's only, you know, there's one thing that we might want to just be careful or note is that I guess bringing in some thinking of the GNSO side as well.

When we talk about that we need to make sure that it doesn't create a situation where the script or the language produces a word that means something in one script and then means something, you know, different in another. I mean means something in one language and means something different in another language and sharing the same scripts and therefore creating conflict - you know, a contention situation whereas one gets the support and one doesn't.

And, you know, I'm not saying that this is necessarily an issue. But just need to flag it and make sure that we cover this as one possible scenario and why we think it's justifiable even at that pace.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Edmon. I don't - I actually never thought of it but I see that as a major issue you just brought up.

How might this be accommodated?

Edmon Chung: Eric is next. Perhaps he has thought through this as well. Perhaps we can listen to him (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: All right Eric, Edmon has deferred to you.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Carlton. When multiple languages share a single script there is of course significant overlap in the appearance and the assembly of characters so a word in Persian and a word in Arabic both using Arabic script

may appear to be the same word but they are different words in different languages.

And the same situation arises in Yiddish and Hebrew which both use the Hebrew script that is for the Hebrews - I mean for Yiddish which is expressed in Hebrew script as Yiddish is also expressed in Latin script.

Within the Latin script community alone which everyone on this call is somewhat familiar with there are multiple languages which use the same word with the same meaning or in similar words with different meanings. Because we're talking about streams for entries into the root it's - and we're also talking about streams for - well communities or governmental organizations so on and so forth, because we have eliminated the broad class of speculative or generic name or other kinds of applicants which are the prevailing form in the GNSO from consideration and are dealing principally with NGOs, communities, governments, the likelihood of name clash which gives rise to user confusion I believe has already been dealt with by the mere presence of that restriction on the applicant that the policy of non-confusability or excuse me, of real meaning to the end users is just already present.

That was - that's a response to Edmon's point about the similarity of sequences of characters forming labels.

But actually I raised my hand to ask the question how do we actually get a proposed edit accomplished in terms of process because we're interleaving issues, (Elaine)'s issue and the issue I brought up rather than dealing with one to complete closure and then going onto the next.

Well I have a question to the Chair which is a process question of how do we get things done?

Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Eric I'm suggesting direct. You know we had appointed scribes and the scribes are not here on this call.

So I would actually suggest that you make the change directly on the wiki which is editable to you. That's what my suggestion is.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Or as a comment.

Carlton Samuels: Specific language.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Or as a comment on the side.

Carlton Samuels: Or a comment on the page, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That was Cheryl (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. As a comment on the page but I want - I'm encouraging specific language meaning change this spot, this word or these words in this spot, replace it with this. That's what I mean.

Edmon you're up.

Edmon Chung: Yes, thank you. Yeah, I think Eric mentioned just now the - he also reiterated the issue. I don't hear a reason or a suggestion on verbiage on how to mitigate against it yet.

But I guess it's probably easiest to see it from the wiki and work from there.
But I guess I just want to reiterate this is definitely something we need to

bring up, you know, and have some way to address it because in the case of, you know let's take a - well imaginary example and one, you know, sharing the alpha numeric - the English alpha numeric script and something in a particular language, the word S-H-O-P means some community. And in the case of the English alpha numeric it becomes - you know, it means shop.

And it means a generic word in one particular language but it means a very specific community word in another. Those situations when they arise that creates a situation whereby, you know, obviously one applicant gets additional support and one doesn't and I think that would definitely raise issues from an implementation standpoint and, you know, how people might gain the system.

So I think that's probably something we just need to address. I'm not saying that it's impossible to address. I certainly haven't thought through it how to address it yet. But I think that's something that we need to bring up.

Carlton Samuels: Can...?

Edmon Chung: And resolve.

Carlton Samuels: Can I just interject here Edmon? I will respect your expertise on this IDN issue.

Might I suggest therefore that again you go to the wiki and you raise the issue as a comment (or aside) and if you have some specific language that you would wish to see in the document that address these needs that you would address them.

\

And surely for Eric who has - had the interest in this area and has some kind of expertise on it, it would be good for all of us to see that in writing so that we can incorporate in the document as agreed. And I mean specific language

because it's at a point now where we need to have specific language identified.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, agreed.

Carlton Samuels: All right. There are some - I'd like to just summarize and then move onto the Part V which I think is going to be short.

The criteria situation we think needs to be reorganized. We think there are some - should be some specific language that talks about the priorities giving to applications.

We also think that we could address the government GAC's concern about not excluding governmental entities by pointing to public/private partnerships which we propose as a vehicle for the governments to participate.

We believe that we should have some kind of criteria that sets out very succinctly the issue with the IDNs and for that we need to change. Eric is proposing a change to the language and there's going to be specific change to the language.

That pretty much rounds up what I think is - oh, there's an issue about the - a benchmark for the size of the underserved community. Some folks raised the issue that benchmark we have here for 20 million was too high. The response for that is that it could be a lower number but the idea is that it should be some number. We are just giving guidance that says that we don't want to reduce it to a catchall. But certainly some number was important to have as a way to recognize an underserved community.

I'm quite open. It would be interesting to see that. I see Cheryl has asked for AOB to raise up; I'll do that Cheryl.

With regard to Part V, I would like to ask members to look specifically about the criteria, the evaluation, evaluation.

Do we have a sense that members are agreed here that the financial criteria, we are making a concerted effort to reduce the impact of the financial need as the main and critical criteria to be evaluated?

Do I have a sense that members here now agree to that proposition?

Woman: Did Tijani wish to speak to that before we move on?

Carlton Samuels: I seek Tijani's hand, yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Carlton. I wan to remind you that this working group is created due to a (reservation) of the Board, (reservation 20). And the (reservation 20) is to - is for support to needy applicants, needy applicants; applicants that need the support for applying for and operating the (unintelligible).

So the need is the - if there is not need, there is not working group, there is not support.

Carlton Samuels: I am suggesting Tijani that we embrace the concept that need might be more widely defined. That's what I'm suggesting. I am suggesting that there's also social need that could be defined. I am suggesting that there is also a political need that could be defined. I am suggesting that we embrace the criteria that need not be just money.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Carlton I am sorry. But if you have money, even if you have a social need, if you have anything, you can apply. If you don't have money you cannot apply.

And this working group is to allow people to apply. So the need of money is the financial part for everything here.

And then for the other criteria's that are there, we tried to give more importance to the public interest for sure. We will not help someone who's (stream) for commission (unintelligible), okay.

But if he's not needy he will not need support.

Carlton Samuels: I hear you Tijani. Alan, but with great deal of respect, if you don't meet the policy objective that I would consider while we are sitting here I would not consider it. And that's where I stand. And it makes sense to me.

Boards can be wrong (unintelligible). And to me if the criteria for the public interest policy perspective, that is what drives this. And if you don't accept that as the first instance than the rest of it to me don't make sense. But I am subject to, you know...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Do we mean - let me ask you a question. Do we mean that someone who's not needy can be helped, can be supported?

Carlton Samuels: No. I mean that we would consider first what the project is and then we consider the need.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You can consider them and any other you won't. But the need is a criteria that you cannot omit. You cannot override. It gives the branch (public) criteria for giving any support. You can't (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: I understand. I understand your perspective in truth. I understand your perspective. I'm just saying that I would look at it the other way.

Alan you have a comment?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I do. I think that the various criteria we're going to have to establish have different characteristics.

And if we are putting in criteria and neediness and I'm talking from a financial point of view because if you have money you can buy technology. You can buy expertise. If you don't you might need contributions of expertise or you may need contributions of raw money because, you know, the fee levels are too high or whatever.

On the other hand if one of the criteria is that you're going to be doing something good and worthy that we feel is important, that's not a financial criteria so to pass, you know, to go through this funnel of do we end up thinking that this is something that falls under the criteria and ICANN wants to support and that's in a lower case S, it's going to have to meet multiple criteria.

If you desperately need money but you want to do something stupid that has no value, you're not likely to meet all the criteria. If you want to do something that is a good worthy cause but you have oodles and oodles of money then you're not going to meet the criteria.

So there's a multipronged set of criteria we need. And the evaluation process is going to be different for each.

So yes, finance is not important in evaluating whether this is good stuff you're doing, but it is crucial and mandatory in evaluating whether you need help.

Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Absolutely. And absolutely, so my suggestion was that you start with that first one you said, that's where...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, but it's multipronged. It's not (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Sure. But the second part is where you get into the financial.

Alan Greenberg: Doesn't matter which one you order, you're going to have to meet all of the criteria as - you know, according to whatever rules you set forward.

Carlton Samuels: Can we ask this question? We are desperate to find a way to get into an evaluation. Some of us believe that a workflow might have been an efficient way to do it. And we're working on that on the sidelines.

But for the workflow to happen we have to have at least a certain way to get into the funnel.

Can we ask for some specific step-by-step process that could arrive at this, help us to get to this place where we can use the workflow? Is it possible?

Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Carlton. I'm sorry to be repetitive.

But do we have consensus on this call...?

Man: Yes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...to propose a change? Taking a comment into the text on the wiki (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah, but we'll use type and I'll send it to you.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I think Eric, as far as I'm concerned Eric we asked the question several times and nobody agreed.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Carlton.

Man: About what?

Carlton Samuels: The change to the language. Edmon says that he would temper it by offering some specific declarative language and that's how it was agreed; came from the words script to language, that specific one.

I didn't hear anybody making an objection to that.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well actually I object to the - adding the declarative language about generic words that Edmon has proposed.

Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Well we at least would allow Edmon to put it in words so that we can look at it.

Edmon Chung: Just to clarify if I may. This is Edmon. I'm not suggesting, you know, an example or specific thing about the generic word. I just brought it up as an issue that that needs to be identified and suggested what we, you know, what we suggest to do about those situations.

So Eric, you know, I...

Carlton Samuels: That was my understanding of it Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Right, okay.

Carlton Samuels: We're at the top of the hour folks. It would be - we have to end the call, others are dropping off.

But I still have not had a question - answer to the question. I still think we need in terms of Part V probably a descriptive of how we go through the process of evaluation. Where we start because that's an issue, the contention is that there's various criteria. Some are more important than others, some start here, some start not.

I still think we need to have some language that we can use to define a workflow.

And I'm going to ask you all to - if you have any language to put up it would be good for you to do it so that people who are defining the workflow can see it and get some value from it.

Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, (even) proposed formula. Why don't ask people if they (agree with it)?

Carlton Samuels: The formula is on there but we've not had any response from it. That's why I'm asking for the - I'm simply paraphrasing that Tijani. We still need to know exactly what it is. And that's what we're trying to get to right now. It was documented. It was up there. There has been no response. But we need to have it so that we can settle this.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I do think that we have to put on the table what is compulsory as criteria.

Carlton Samuels: That is exactly what I'm asking Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. And what is compulsory, is compulsory for all. And what is...

Carlton Samuels: That is...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: ...optional, we can - and that's how - that's what even put in the formula. But if we don't agree with this formula, please give another one.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, that is precisely what I'm asking. We need to have it because (Deb) is working on the workflow for us and that needs to be defined and settled.
Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: (I agree with) the formula (unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: Good. We hear from you on that. Based on the timing here, I have to close the call. Thank you all for attending.

I am out. See you all. Bye-bye.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I am - you closed the call? Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No problem. Okay it does not matter.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

END