SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Friday 27 May 2011 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Friday 27 May 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-20110527-en.mp3

On page :
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call: GNSO
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair
Andrew Mack – CBUC

ALAC
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large
Alan Greenberg – GNSO Liaison – NARALO
Cintra Sooknanan – At-Large
Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) – At Large
Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO
Carlton Samuels – LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair
Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Eric Brunner-Williams – Individual

Elaine Pruis – MindandMachines

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

Apologies:
Alex Gakuru – NCSG
Alain Berranger - Individual
Dev Anand Teelucksingh – At Large
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Baudoin Schombe - At–Large
Tony Harris –ISPCP
Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

John Rahman Kahn - Individual

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's JAS call on Friday, the 22nd of May we have Rafik Dammak, Carlton Samuels, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Carlos Aguirre, Elaine Pruis, Olivia Crepin-LeBlond.

From staff we have Karla Valente, Glenn de Saint Gery and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies today from (unintelligible), Alex Gakuru, John Raman Khan and Baudouin Schombe as well as Tony Harris. Cheryl Langdon-Orr will be joining shortly. And if I can just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Rafik and counsel.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella. Okay, thank you for everybody for joining today's call. So as a (joint) I think it will be like the last one but not with discussion about with, we think, with board and GAAC members.

But if you see the last email sent by Cintra and Evan, we have now a new space, the Version 3 of our report. It's the second (minus) on the report. We (line) it with the missing (part) according to our charter so we are going to continue working on them.

(Unintelligible) I don't think we have Evan and Cintra on the call but we will try to work on it.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm here.

Rafik Dammak: Oh Evan. Yes, okay, so just before moving to that I would like to ask Olivia if there is any update about - at that meeting. Just an update. We are not going really to discuss about that but if there is any update about the meeting between the JAS working group board and GAAC members.

Olivia Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you very much Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Olivia Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you very much Rafik. Olivia Crepin-LeBlond for the record. We had - well both (Stephan) and I received an email from (Katim) who, on the board, who asked us whether he could have a meeting and in, fact, several board members could have a conference call with not only the JAS but also with the GAAC, common conference call with all of us basically.

So this, of course, is something which might be tricky because in terms of the charter which we're saying that any communication with the board would have to be through the chartering organizations.

We had a vote on Tuesday during the ALAC monthly call to allow for this meeting to take place and the vote was unanimous to say yes. The email (toka team) is going out today and what we will propose in the email is for this common meeting of any interested participants - sorry, common call of interested participants to take place during one of the regularly scheduled calls - call times which is either on Tuesdays or on Fridays.

And I believe there are three left - three or four left until the Singapore meeting, so the earlier the better. But we will give him a choice. I think that's the current status. More soon I guess. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, that's - I think that's positive but I guess we will need for the - real (light) from the GNSO site but we count on you to manage that with (Stephan) and Cheryl with the GNSO council.

Olivia Crepin-LeBlond: Well if I may add to this then, with regards to the GNSO - and it's Olivia again for the record - with regards to the GNSO - the response from (Stephan) was that was doubt that this could take place because the report has not even been considered yet or not been ratified by the GNSO.

That is expected to happen not before - is it the 6th of June? You might know better then I do - the dates.

Rafik Dammak: Ninth.

Olivia Crepin-LeBlond Ninth - ninth. So that leaves it very late and, well, there has been no response beyond that on the GNSO site. It is the view in ALAC that we should proceed any way. The JAS is such an important subject and it is an integral part of ICANN's policy and what we're dealing with here is not the policy at all in fact.

Sorry, it's implementation. So it's not - it doesn't need to go through a PDP process. Others might want to chime in on this. I don't know the exact details. Yes, I see Alan's hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: No, my hand was up for another item. I'll just - I'll make one comment on this one though. Although it may make no sense to say the ALAC will allow the JAS group to talk to the board but the GNSO cannot. It is under the terms of our agreement and I don't see how, you know, they can be (unhappy) about it and they will be, but I think that's the limit of it right now.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry. I'm not on Adobe Connect. Could you put...

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Evan. Please go ahead. Sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I would simply note that based on previous activity that we - that we really don't have much of a choice. Arguably we are still waiting for the GNSO to approve the first (milestone) report. So it's - this kind of thing is - I - if we want to have something done before Singapore, we really had no choice but to have ALAC move like this.

Rafik Dammak: Alan, you want to comment or just...

Alan Greenberg: No, as I said, I have a related about a different subject. So I'll wait for this discussion to finish first.

Rafik Dammak: Okay I think that we don't have so much to do to (unintelligible) I think organization and I guess we need to move to the next item if there is no objection.

Alan Greenberg: No, okay. As I said, this one is related however. There is a motion that has been put on the agenda for the next meeting to accept the JAS report - in the next GNSO meeting to accept the JAS report.

That motion is almost surely going to fail because it requires a majority of both houses and it's not likely to get a majority of the contracted parties' house. That will leave the paper in the same state as the previous one, that is, not acted on.

Evan Leibovitch: Alan, sorry this is Evan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: I just have one question for you. This isn't even a motion to approve or endorse anything. They can't even pass a motion to acknowledge receipt?

Alan Greenberg: They can if that's what the motion says. But I believe the current motion - it says more then that. Rafik is the one who made it. He can confirm.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, as far as the motion...

Man: I've seen the motion. The motion has more than accepted. The motion says that they must endorse.

Man: Yes okay.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, and opening for public comment if (it's right) or - yes. And also asking if this (task) is set (on this date). It's really long. I'm not sure if you want...

Alan Greenberg: No, no. I wasn't trying to - I'm not wanting to discuss that motion. The motion is what it is. It was already made. I'll - I'm simply pointing out it will likely be rejected. I can't see it being accepted at this point.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: It is now - it's really hard to be accepted.

Alan Greenberg: But the point I - may I get to the end? I would suggest...

Rafik Dammak: Yes Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, please go ahead. Sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I would suggest that we - that a motion be put - I can't make motions in the GNSO. Rafik is the only one on this call who can - that a motion be put to reject the JAS report. I believe that one will fail also because it will not receive a majority of both houses.

                   What I'm saying is the GNSO, I want the GNSO to be forced to get off the wall and either accept it, reject it or acknowledge that there's no way it can act. And I believe that would be useful to demonstrate that the current way things are working is not acceptable within the GNSO.

There's too much opportunity for stonewalling and for no action at all on things which everyone doesn't agree on. And so I ask Rafik or anyone else to either comment on this or consider it because otherwise we're back in the form that the GNSO doesn't accept something but they don't reject it either. And we're in a Nevernever Land forever. Okay, that's it.

Rafik Dammak: Just to - I think that my - I can predict. I think that (motion we be an event) from the contacted parties. I'm not sure what they are discussing now but I'm sure they will ask for an (inference) but it's still not sure they will vote - they will approve that motion.

But if we ask, I think GNSO council and the vote either for to reject or approve clearly the report, and I think there will be good clarification because many times I heard especially from the contracted party saying that they are supporting our work but maybe (just motion) we have - they have really to prove if they are really supporting or not the JAS (work).

And I'm not sure that is politically correct. We can try to pursue that. Alan, maybe we can continue the discussion.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I mean, it's going to be deferred - that would be deferred to the next meeting which is the Singapore meeting which is not bad to have it done in public at that point perhaps.

Man: But it will be interesting if they would try to defer again because it's not really - usually it...

Alan Greenberg: No, it would - on the - if we make a new motion, that one will be deferred. This one cannot be deferred.

Evan Leibovitch: I'd like to make a point of order in saying that, you know, it's kind of pointless to discuss GNSO politics in this meeting. We have a job to do about applicant support and the GNSO will do what the GNSO will do and ALAC will do what

ALAC will do and let's do what we're supposed to do which is work on applicant support.

Alan Greenberg: Evan, I raised it in this meeting because I was interested if anyone on this group had any pro or con comments. It is a strategy issues and I'm normally the one who says let's get back to substance but this one I felt it was important to raise but not to talk further about it unless people have very strong feelings one way or another.

Evan Leibovitch: Got it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Okay, I think that we can move to the next item. And maybe Evan, do you want just to be - to give some clarification in there so we can maybe really to plan what we can do if we will proceed like we did before for the (unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: (Forgive me) because I'm not on Adobe Connect so essentially I'll just give you an update of what Cintra and I have been doing. Essentially based on the results of the last call, we took away from that that the intent was to use the second milestone report that has already been approved, set in stone with all its rough edges and sent to the sponsoring organizations who had then made their various choices what to do with it.

But we now have a second milestone report that is there. It is in stone and it has now become the frame of reference for a third report. Whether this is a milestone report or a final report, is up to the (doctrine) of this working group and not to the people that are doing the wordsmithing.

But the goal is to start with the final version of the second milestone report. We put as an addendum to it the - immediately following comments that have been received and so the first intention is to specifically identify those sections of the milestone report as it exists, that need clarification, that need extra detail, that need flushing out.

And once we have then figured - once we've done all that, then there is a second task to then assign to this working group either in whole or in sub teams to attack those particular red lined areas with the intention of finding it, detailing it and generally getting rid of the rough edges and making it a more complete recommendation of what we want to see happen.

That's all I have to say about it right now unless anybody has questions or comments.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Just to say that it's maybe just a (third edition) of the milestone report. I think we need to (figure out) it should be a final report because we are working to finish the task and how it's chartered. If there is other extension, it will be something else. But that is just a comment.

Alan Greenberg: I don't say I would disagree with you but I - whether - as we found out the last time around, we didn't - the original idea was not that the second milestone report at one point was also intended to be a final one. So because the or- because the bodies that are interested in this, because we've heard specifically from board people, from GAAC people, that there is an interest in this that goes well beyond the chartering organizations, there may be factors that we are not even - we can't even consider right now that may have an effect on the direction that this group takes.

So that's only what - that's the only reason why I didn't say final. We know that it's the third one because we're already at the second. So that's one thing that we know by fact, that this would be the third version of this report.

Whether or not it is a final or another interim is a decision we don't have to make yet.

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

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. Very good. I appreciate what Evan and Cintra did. We have to bear in mind that we are waiting for feedback from the board after the receipt of our second (master) report and that we have to finish addressing all the items of our charter - existing charter.

If the board asks us other missions, other work, we have to include them in the new charter and we have to address all the items of the charter. We have also, as Evan said, to see what is - what has to be done for some parts of the second (master) report and I think - I want to - Evan to tell me how I can, for example, tell him this part has to be addressed because now we have a text - we have Wiki text and we have comments. Shall I put comments or send email or how do to?

Evan Leibovitch: Rafik, am I okay to talk? Like I said, I don't have Adobe Connect so I don't know if anyone else is in the queue.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, we have Alan also who wants to comment.

Evan Leibovitch: Alan, did you want to go first?

Alan Greenberg: No, go - let's continue this discussion.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tijani, this is exactly what we'd like to have happen. This is not a Cintra and Evan project. This has to be something that the whole working group takes ownership of. And to that end, like I say, the first part of it is not to make the fixes but to identify those parts that need fixing.

So what I'm hoping is, is that people within the working group will have editing privileges within the Wiki, that will look at the document and literally highlight in red those parts of the document that are either unclear or insufficiently detailed, the parts that need work.

I'm hoping that there will be chunks of the milestone report that will not require a whole lot of work because so much - because I'm so much aware of those parts that do.

So I'm trying to get - trying to find out from the working group what parts need clarification, detail and extrapolation and which ones - which do not. So it's my hope, Tijani, that you and other members of the working group will go in to the Wiki, highlight parts of (MR2) that are in the document right now, highlight them in red and at the bottom, make notes of the p- of what's wrong.

And then the intention is once we had - everyone had a look and indicating what needs to be fixed, then we go in and divvy up the work of how to fix it. That's the intent. If the working group doesn't want to proceed that way, that's okay too. But this is the initial plan that Cintra and I set up.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, Evan pointed out that we didn't plan to have a second milestone. We planned to have a final report. Clearly that didn't work. I think the main reason it didn't work is we didn't have a good time schedule and timeline that we followed as we went along the way.

You know, Tijani is right. We're hoping for comments from the board. We may not get them. As I've said before, I don't think we're going to get any formal comments. We may get some informal ones in Singapore.

I think we should be prepared in Singapore to flush out some of the more controversial issues that we've been talking about and I'm not talking about in the report but we're going to be having some meetings and opportunities. I think we need to be able to do that by Singapore which gives us another two weeks maybe.

And then we need to lay out a lo- timeline assuming in Singapore the new gTLD process is either not launched or is launched with some reference to this, that we will have a timeline at that point of when we have to give a final report out and then we work to it.

You know, and I think that's going to require some diligent leadership and control to do that but I think that's what we're going to have to do. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: I have a response for Alan.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Evan. Please go.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Two things, one of which, Alan, you're right. There may not be any official comment by the board but obviously we have already received formal interest from one board member, that is (Katim).

So obviously there are issues that at least some board members want to express to us. And there is also reason to believe that there will be explicit reference to the JAS in statements by the government advisory committee, both in public comments and in its private deliberations with the board.

So this is also the kind of input that we need to find out. I would also make a request to the chairs of this working group that given the fact that we have - we know that we are being discussed at the board level and at the GAAC level, and there're a lot of expectations that are going to be made in this working group.

I'm going to request of the chairs that you try and get us some more extra staff support for issues such as doing some of the detailed writing and helping us to expedite this.

I think we're at the point where we have - we - we're going to need some extra resources to do some of the investigation that we need to do, to be able

to do some of the detail more legalish components of this that don't exist in the report right now but will be required in the final one. We're going to need some extra help that goes beyond the volunteers that are here.

We saw the pace that we'd been working at between the San Francisco meeting and now. That pace may or may not be sufficient for what's going to be required going forward and it's just my personal suggestion that I would like the - I'd personally like the chairs of this working group to make a request for additional staff support.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so Evan, I understand the request...

Karla Valente   Rafik, this is Karla.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes, okay you can (go). I will (unintelligible). Yes, please go ahead.

Karla Valente: Yes, I just wanted to know that they want additional to me.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, (I think so).

Karla Valente: Is that what Evan is asking?

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, either an additional to you or more of your time allocated to this. One or the other.

Rafik Dammak: I was going to ask if - my understanding here, Evan, that you want some other expertise so that we can really expedite our work. So maybe if there is that request, we need to - I...

Alan Greenberg: Well we do - for instance, there's people like (Ara) that have joined this group that have specific expertise in this area and also in terms of the kind of

mechanics, the kind of metrics that we're going to be talking about, the difficult decisions of how are the mechanics done to determine who has need - how to put in the mechanics in place to prevent gaming.

Some of these, I dare say, may go behind the skills of the people on this call. And having some expertise that is made available to us is going to help us and it's going to help ICANN get the kind of report that they expect out of us.

Rafik Dammak: Karla, do you have any further comment or?

Karla Valente: No I don't. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Rafik, so I have Carlton and then - Carlton, please go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Rafik. Carlton Samuels here. Two small things - first with respect to endorsement by board or GAAC, I take the tack of Alan and suggest we would not have an official one. We would, however, be with the pick up sense of what some board members and they might give us a sense of what others are saying in those organizations.

I suggest that we endorse the call inviting (Katim) and other interested board members to join us either next week on one call or the following week and we might put those questions to those that show up at that call.

That will give us some indication - indicators - for our work that might have to happen in Singapore. There is a methodology to that which we can glean some additional information and thereby get some guidance about what's happening in Singapore.

You will notice that we have a - we have proposed a set of things for the Singapore meeting and a format. Those of you who've seen it might wish to make some comments on it to see whether or not it's appropriate in terms of what we're (asking), what we are suggesting for Singapore and whether the

topics that would become a (poor) scrutiny at Singapore would be relevant after the meeting with the board people.

We don't know but that is subject to change. So that's about the meeting. The other thing about staff support, one of the (concerns) that I have is that - as volunteers we take on this very heavy task.

And to me, it requires even getting information about, you know, some of the processes that an organization such as ICANN would have in place and information about the fee structure and all that has been difficult. And (unintelligible) any real move to provide those kinds of support.

Yes, I am for asking for additional support. I'm not thinking additional in terms of Karla, but what I'm thinking about is additional in terms of providing information when it is requested.

It seems to me that this is where staff support is required more then anything else. Just responding to requests for information or requests for data would go a long way to helping us (model) what we need. I am not so sure that we are going to get further in this because it seems to be that some of these things are held as guarded secrets.

I mean, the breakdown of the fee structure, for example, that has been (an X) for as long as I've been on this working group and it has not surfaced. So I think - I endorse asking but I'm suggesting that we ask very specifically. And I'm willing to put my time on the line by saying these are the specific areas where we need staff support and information from staff. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Carlton. Eric, please go ahead. Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. This is Eric Brunner-Williams. Rafik, I entered my current in the chat with Evan's point that I concur that we have additional staffing needs for identified tasks. He mentioned legal and I'm thinking that's

(unintelligible) formation. That's certainly a specific legal task that needs to be undertaken, refer to the (desk) from text shepherding activities to implementation steps.

And I think we do need to (proceed) the implementation steps in addition the (mysteries) that remain a (unintelligible). Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Eric. (Unintelligible).

Man: No, I'm - sorry about that Rafik. I'm (leaning) my hand.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, just something. You ask if you - we can't invite some board members to join our (conference call). I think that we have some observers. I think it make sense that they can join one of our (conference calls). I'm not talking about that meeting between board and GAAC and JAS working group but it - those observers in our (mailing) list joined the call anyway. But we can invite them if we think that we need it. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I agree with the intent of Eric's message on the chat and what he just said. I disagree strongly with the example he gave because I think that's a good example of what we shouldn't be doing. This group does not need to tell ICANN how to form a foundation.

There are plenty of people around and lawyers probably already on their staff who can give them the details of that. That's not our job. Our job is to specify things at a much higher level, I believe, as to what we would want from ICANN related foundation to do, not how to form it or exactly how to fund it. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Alan. Karla.

Karla Valente: Yes, I just want to clarify one thing. Requests are made to staff by me. And the reason why they are being delayed is because staff is extremely busy

with publications that happened this week, hopefully this week, with the next (iteration) of the applicant guidebook.

I believe that next week it will be easier for people just to get to what's (needed to the) GAAC. I did - need to be provided. I requested a (deterred) breakdown of the call associated with the new gTLD program in addition of what was published, there was a budget paper published some time ago for something in addition to that which needs to be prepared.

So I think that - I just want to clarify that it's not an issue of non-action or not an issue of unwillingness but it is an issue of, you know, having the availability of people to do that. Because of the short term and board meetings and GAC's ordinary meetings.

I'm not making excuses for staff, I'm just saying that even if you had on my side or you replace me if you want, you know, you still have on the other side of ICANN a lot of scheduling issues, a lot of, you know, time issues for these things. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Sounds like, just - I want to clarify. Don't think that people ask to replace you or blaming you but I change my understanding that maybe for some tasks - specific tasks maybe it's possible that we may need some additional staff. But I do think that you participated, you are a team player here, in this working group from the staff side and I don't think that anybody here in the working group is undermining that. So...

Evan Leibovitch: Rafik this is Evan I want to agree with that. Karla this is in absolutely - I want to make this clear - this is in absolutely no way a personal comment on your role here, or the quality of the time you've given.

What I'm saying is that the allocation of staff time to us is going to need to ramp up substantially and is going to have - is going to require some certain

kinds of expertise for us to be able to produce the kind of output that I believe the community is going to expect of us.

Did not for a moment take this as any kind of a comment - of a negative comment on the nature or the quality of the work you've put in; at least from my point of view.

Rafik Dammak: Karla, you want to comment?

Karla Valente: No, thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Thanks Rafik, this is Andrew, the three points that are out there, first of all, I'd like to agree with everybody else. Karla we're very appreciative of the time that you've given and of your steadfastness throughout this. This has been quite a long process and we know you've put a lot of work in. So, please, no matter what don't take that as anything other than our appreciation.

That said I do agree with Evan, if we're going to do the additional things that we are being called upon to do to create additional precision I think we need more hands on. Some of that may be specialist help in areas - if, for example, to Alan's point if we - if ICANN has somebody on staff that knows enough to help set up a 501P3 and whatever that, you know, whatever form we end up recommending, that's great, we still need that person's time.

If not, we need somebody else's time because I think that the point that Evan was making was that we just are kind of out of bend with, and partly to the edge of our expertise. So I don't think the two are in any way mutually exclusive. But Karla you mentioned that there was - that ICANN staff is fairly stretched. We get that we just need to try to find a way to either augment that staff or to get more of your time or something like that.

The last point is about the data, the one that Carlton mentioned. I do think that regardless of how stretched staff is, there do seem to be a couple of, kind of, underlying data points that we have been struggling without and I'm not sure what it is that we need to do to get those and maybe Carlton could speak more specifically to what - you know, to some of the things that are on his mind.

But whatever that is, I think we're at the point where we need to get some of those data points and if that's a staff issue or if that's an issue around our ability to get access to them or if the, you know, something more about the assumptions we need to know. I think that would be very, very helpful. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Andrew. Karla, you're hand is raised, do you want to comment?

Karla Valente: I'm sorry for that, I just forgot to lower it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Cintra please go ahead.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hey Rafik an apology for the late join to this meeting. I, you know, I can attest that Karla's really done her best in terms of trying to get input from staff on certain points. I raised several queries on the whole cost issue as well as the risk cost with regards to the process.

But there seems to be a bit of confusion with staff, you know, I mean, instead of getting a response, I got more queries from staff on what was my purpose and what I was really trying to achieve.

So I don't know if staff perceives our group as not being parallel to the (unintelligible) or just trying to basically push back that process that. I don't know if there's a bit of confusion there that we can help clarify; in order so that we can really work together and be on the same page. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, well Karla, please go ahead.

Karla Valente: Hi Rafik, Cintra did give some questions that I passed on to our implementation operation - specifically the operation scheme. And there was some qualification questions that they wanted to pass on, and I passed that to Cintra.

But I think that the implication that anything is done by staff to either minimize the importance of the work that is being done here is completely untrue. It's just a matter of people understanding about the process and understanding about the criteria and I think that the document that was presented was not, you know, quite clear to people.

You have to understand that when you talk to operations people they're so in-grained into the details of operation and that sometimes when you throw something that, you know, seem to them to not match what the process is that they are doing, they will come up with questions to have a better understanding of what it is. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Karla.

Carlton Samuels: You know, quite frankly I am not at all bothered by asking clarification questions. But with, you know, I spend a lot of time to do this, and when offline - and I'm going to make a frank disclosure here - when offline people say we're not working because we are not addressing the issues. But when you ask questions to address some of the issues especially some of the ones that they are as why constituencies ask. And there's no timely response. Then it tends to leave the impression that there is a push-back, and that is what it is and let's just be frank.

The questions that were asked about cost are central to answering some of the niggling questions raised by the registry, registrar constituency. The response has not been timely. And the questions therefore, have not been

answered with the clarity that some of us believe it could've been answered had we got more detailed information about the costs for this new detail process.

And that's what the issue is really. It's about timeliness of response. Especially when you have people beating down your door on the other side; saying that we are delayed, we're delayed, we're delayed.

I - those things are connected and it doesn't take more than two brain cells to see that they're connected. And it irritates me when the same persons who are saying privately that this working group has not produced, are now saying - and spoken about it within those same issues of costs or having details about costs. And we are not making the connection between getting answers in a timely manner to questions that are asked.

If clarifications are needed, yes, that's okay, but it would be useful to have the clarification requests sent in a timely manner. That's the issue here, and it's nothing to do with Karla or it has to do with the timeliness of the response.

And yes, we understand that staff is swamped as are volunteers. I have to work for a living for full days. But we cannot not understand that staff is swamped with work, and not make that connection to the output of the working group. It seems to me to be counterintuitive. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Carlton. Okay.

I think we need to move forward. I think now we rise at some issues, but we need to move forward and continue working in our requested task. So maybe if we (unintelligible) all the discussion about that third (unintelligible) report and how we will proceed and to avoid discussion about the process.

If even (unintelligible) to make some request - specific request to the working group about if they think that there are some parts that (unintelligible) or how they think that we can proceed in the way that we make progress.

Especially if we compare what happened to the second minus (unintelligible) report how we can - how we should really to avoid the issues that happened there.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi Rafik. Okay I sent a link to the working group yesterday with regard to our third version of the document. All the comments are pasted below including mine pasted as an actual comment on my email.

So it's just a matter of everybody in the working group taking a look at it and seeing if there are areas that they find vague or require further clarification or have not really captured what has been said in both charters.

I'm hoping that maybe you can all take a look at it by Tuesday, our next call and we can probably just finalize shortly thereafter. This is just a red line version so it is not - it's a work in progress. If there are areas that we find vary with each other and we do decide that we want to change that, that will be raised as well. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cintra.

Just wondering if all comments we can, how do you say, if people are going to comment on the document but if it's for to make Alco more productive, if we are going to discuss the document, either the people say start sequentially to comment on the document so and then we can move - we can really make progress and not need to go backward. So it may work or not, but just trying to work in a way that - to do enough progress in the Singapore meeting.

I'm not saying that we are going to finish work at the Singapore meeting, but trying to make as much progress as we can.

Okay. So I don't think that she has for the comment about the report issues you make, maybe we can have like five or ten minutes about the planning for the Singapore meeting. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Can you please take the lead on that about (unintelligible) to explain about what...

Carlton Samuels: Yes, okay. The proposal was that we would have a Singapore meeting. The proposal is that it will be on a Thursday after - Thursday morning before the noon hour. We are proposing that we will have it set up as we have been at large meetings where we have a round table with people around the table from the different country (unintelligible).

We are proposing that we will tailor the agenda to focus specifically on the gritty areas that have come out in the report. Hopefully by the time we get to Singapore we will have greater clarity on some of those areas.

But the idea is that we would tailor an agenda to get further and better particulars from some of the groups the constituencies on areas in which they find some knotty problems. And I won't really need them, you see them on the week you see from the questions the areas that are of major concern.

The idea again is that we will try to get some leaders - discussion leaders in these areas and hopefully before Singapore and based on what we see coming out of the conversations with the GAC and the board in these remaining teleconferences will help us to zero in more - focus in these areas.

We had - I will just cut and paste and send it to Karla the proposal; and she - so that she can have a look at. Thank you Rafik, I'll send to Karla in a minute.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. We have Eric in the queue.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Eric Brunner-Williams, what is the date for this proposed meeting?

Rafik Dammak: Eric is okay?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Rafik I asked what is the GMT for these proposed meetings?

Woman: The time.

Carlton Samuels: Thursday, 11 to 12:30.

Man: Wonder if they have free lunch?

Rafik Dammak: Is that the public meeting.

Woman: It is 2300 UTC Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you very much the purpose for asking was to determine the effect on remote participation.

Carlton Samuels: You definitely create something there, Eric. That I don't think we had kind of looked at in a deep way - remote participation.

Karla? Can I ask, Eric just raised the issue of remote participation would the time slot that we are now looking at tentatively. Would that be a depressant to remote participation?

Karla Valente: No, I have a request of remote participation I have also requested to have French and Spanish.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry it's Alan I'm not on my computer what was the time in local time that we were talking about?

Karla Valente: Eleven to 12:30.

Carlton Samuels: Eleven to 12:30.

Man: That doesn't sound like 2300 UTC. It is 8 hours difference between Singapore and UTC.

Man: No that would be the difference to Eastern time. So there's exactly 12 hours of difference.

Alan Greenberg: I know but Eric asked UTC time.

Man: Okay. So it'd be 11 o'clock Utica time.

Woman: Eleven o'clock Singapore time is 0300 UTC.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay we're not sure how we can fix that conference with the (unintelligible) time for people for participating by remote participation, but...

Woman: It's 11:00 pm Eastern time.

Carlton Samuels: I just put the proposal in the note page.

Rafik Dammak: So I think on the (unintelligible) he made to the remaining is so if people want to comment on the description (unintelligible) remaining list but if we have also comment now it would be really helpful. Especially to work what kind of message we want to carry. And for that ICANN credibility, and I think it's one hour and a half.

Okay, so any further comment about the public meeting in Singapore?

Are you going to leave shortly now, or are you meaning it for the Singapore meeting?

Man: No I'm going to have to leave this meeting in a few minutes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, I think we have just four minutes left; if we have any further comment about the public session in Singapore. Also we have a working group meeting. Sorry?

Cintra Sooknanan: Rafik? I'm having some trouble raising my hand. I just want to know is it at that meeting, not a public meeting but the meeting with the board GAC that will decide our next action items or next milestones. Or is that something that we should actively discuss into (unintelligible) call now? Well, at the next call?

Rafik Dammak: You mean the board GAC (unintelligible) working group meeting?

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes, because we...

Rafik Dammak: Yes, it's...

Cintra Sooknanan: ...on our own page we really don't have milestones as to what dates we're really working toward.

Rafik Dammak: To decide (unintelligible) we don't have so much to do in (unintelligible) our level. So, when we have update we will proceed.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Andrew please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes, I just had a quick question which is have we got a tentative agenda? Am I - are we in the process of developing that?

Carlton Samuels: No we have no agenda, it's just a framework for the agenda. We thought that when we discussed it the idea is that the agenda items for this meeting will look at the zero in on the knotty issues that we still have outstanding queries about. And the hope is within the next couple of weeks when we have some conversations, teleconferences, some of that will become much clearer.

But the idea of the GAC board face-to-face is to deal as quickly as we can with those issues that are still outstanding. So that we can move forward with more assurance, that's what we are doing and where we're going makes sense.

Andrew Mack: So let me see if I can paraphrase what you just said. If I'm understanding it. We have a rough idea of about what we want to do, which is to zero in on the key outstanding issues, fair enough. That we're going to spend the next couple of weeks as part of our time on the phone to try to narrow down what those issues are, right?

Carlton Samuels: Right, correct.

Andrew Mack: And okay, and so to take a - what I think is a line from Alan's playbook, my only thought, suggestion would be that we structure this meeting as to the greatest extent that we can to focus on the big picture blotter issues and not get trapped in some of the smaller or more process-oriented issues because I think that could eat up our time very easily and some of the comments are coming from commenters from whatever space our more detail-oriented and

some of them are much broader and I think that conversation will be much more valuable if we can address the broader issues. All right, thanks.

Carlton Samuels: I agree Andrew that could - that would be my own sense of going in there. That's why you want the board - that's why you're looking at the board GAC you're thinking of the broader, more strategic issues. Not the details.

For example the issue of funding is a broad issue - is a (unintelligible) issue that board and GAC, for example, the issue of eligibility for governmental bodies a broader, wider issue, that bears some interest. Those are the kinds of things that I would be interested in hearing.

Andrew Mack: Agreed.

Evan Leibovitch: This is Evan, is it okay to talk?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: I think we basically have two things that we need to do. As we near the end of the call, I really need to attract everybody in this group to have a look at that WIKI page and just start giving thoughts to doing the red-lining. And helping us figure out what needs to be done going forward based on what we've already done.

We're going to have meetings in Singapore that may change what we're doing, it may add things to the charter, it may remove things from the charter. But we still have work to do between now and then. And that is to take away the rough edges of the milestone report 2 that everybody knows exists.

So while we're planning ahead for Singapore meeting I really would like to ask everybody in this group to go to the WIKI page and start thinking about the changes we need to make to this document to make it more presentable to the community.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Evan.

Eric please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Oh, thank you, Eric Brunner-Williams. Evan, very good call to (unintelligible). Those who are going to (unintelligible) the already critical parties to use the opportunity to take a second bite at the apple as it were. To be obstructive or offer comments which are actually advocacy points.

For those going to Singapore I suggest you anticipate meeting with opponents, actually not just meeting with supporters. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Eric. If there is no other comment. Any other business?

Oh, Karla?

Karla Valente: Yes, so just to make sure, one of the things that I'm pursuing is to ask (Jeff) again for the detailed cost breakdown so I'm following up on that. Regarding the 401K that is being discussed in the chat room, based on what has been discussed; my assumption is that what you're asking for is actually somebody from legal to talk about that. Because it's not only on how to establish a 501C, you know, that's in online information, but it is the implication of establishing an entity like that parallel to ICANN. How much we can or cannot do and why. So, I think...

Carlton Samuels: That's exactly what it would be Karla.

Karla Valente: I'm sorry?

Carlton Samuels: That is exactly - the latter part is exactly what is the interest. What are the implications?

Evan Leibovitch: We don't need staff support just to tell us about the mechanics, that's not the intent. And by the way I have one response to what Eric had said.

And that is essentially to make a note that to Jenny, myself, Carlton, Olivier, and Cheryl all of the members of the ALAC executive committee are on this call. So regardless of where the opposition comes from please be aware that there are also some very fervent supporters of it who will not back down.

Man: Here here.

Carlton Samuels: Thanks for speaking for me on my behalf, Evan. No, I seriously mean it.

Evan Leibovitch: So we have Susan in the queue.

Carlton Samuels: (Unintelligible) go ahead.

Cintra Sooknanan: It's not in queue Rafik, I'm not sure if Carlo is finished but I just want to mention that the cost is the 185K cost as well as the risk-contingency cost as well as the ongoing operations cost. Is those three types of costs that we need clarification on. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Karla do you want to comment on that?

Karla? You there? No?

Karla Valente: Hi, did I just hear my name? Karla.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I ask you if you want to comment on what Cintra said.

Karla Valente: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Oh, too much noise. Okay. So, I think that there is no any further comments. Maybe yes, maybe no, but...?

So, thank you (unintelligible) joining today's call. And (unintelligible). Thank you.

Woman: Thank you everyone, thank you.

END