SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Friday 28 January 2010 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Friday 28 January 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. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20110128-en.mp3

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
ALAC
Carlton Samuels – ALAC - Co–Chair
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison, Co-Chair
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Cintra Sooknanan - At–Large
Olivier Crepin-Leblond – ALAC Chair
Tijani Ben Jemaa – ALAC
Sebastien Bachollet – ALAC
Dave Kissoondoyal - ALAC
Alex Gakuru – NCSG
Carlos Aguirre - At Large

GNSO
Avri Doria – NCSG
Tony Harris – ISPCP

ICANN staff
Gisella Gruber-White
Karla Valente

Apologies:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Baudoin Schombe - At–Large
Eric Brunner-Williams - At–Large
Michele Neylon - RrSG

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to

everyone and today is JAS call on Friday the 28th of January. We have Rafik

Dammak, Carlton Samuels, Dave Kissoondoyal, Oliver Crepin-LeBlond, Alex

Gakuru, Sebastien Bachollet, Cintra Sooknanan, Avri Doria, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Carlos Aguirre, Alan Greenberg. From staff, we have Karla Valente and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologizes today noted from Michele Neylon and Cheryl Langdon Orr, and we're just trying to get a hold of Baudouin Schombe.

Could I please remind everyone please to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Rafik and Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Gisella.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella.

Carlton Samuels: Rafik, go ahead, you can lead.

Rafik Dammak: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. I'm sorry that last time I couldn't - I wasn't able to join the call.

So my understanding is that last time the main discussion about charter and so - but before that I would like to ask everybody if they have any update in their SOI or DOI.

Okay, hearing none. So as I said, my understanding is that last - in the last call the main discussion was about the charter and just I'm not sure if it's - we should continue on that or we should move more to discussion about (unintelligible) points, because we have real tight timeline.

But if we want to continue about the charter, I would like to suggest that Carlton can share about all this, that part and I can take the lead after about the (unintelligible) status point. So Carlton, what do you think? Everybody what do you think about?

Carlton Samuels: I'm not at all unhappy with - on too many question that might come up about the charter. I - if you look at what we were doing, it is merely to take the two charters as proposed and begin to work on the issues together.

If you look at the original in the new GNSO charter and you try to bring them together, you see where in the first instance they might have something that says proposed and the original charter says established. I don't see a great big deal of saying proposed and established because you have to propose before you can establish.

I think the problem that they might have had is that you should have definitive outcomes. I don't know why they would be against definitive outcome that the word establish suggests. So I think we're pretty much done with that if we are going to get anywhere. My...

Rafik Dammak: Sorry Carlton, I think Alan is (unintelligible) but please continue on that...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, I thought you were - Carlton was going to continue. At this point, my understanding, and maybe I'm wrong because I left the meeting early, is that the ALAC is going to be considering but has not yet formally decided whether it's going to modify its charter or not. Is that correct?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, we have - I have drafted a unit - what I term unionized charter, which simply looks at the two competing charters...

Alan Greenberg: Is that for our purposes for the ALAC to consider.

Carlton Samuels: That is for the ALAC to consider. What I'm suggesting here now is that if you look at the items where one says established, the other one proposed, I'm not

sure that process wise it matters much because you have to discuss and propose before you can actually put down anything.

Alan Greenberg: I would suggest that since the GNSO accepted one charter and rejected another they, or at least some members within the GNSO, do believe there is a substantive difference between them.

I would suggest that we not agonize over the wording of a charter right now, that unless we find something blatantly bad about what, you know, you have proposed that we wait for ALAC to take action and that we start using our time productively on the issues that we believe are common or on the ones that are unique to ALAC that's the call of this group. I think there are some priorities that are clear.

And not worry about the wording of a formal unionized charter, unless the GNSO takes extraordinary action, which I wouldn't expect them to, they are not going to accept this unionized charter. So they're still working on their own charter.

We will like to have to report to them separately.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: To make it very clear to them what it is we're proposing that they can accept. But let's get to the point where we have a report to agonize over. I don't think we're at that stage today.

Carlton Samuels: I am fine with that, Alan. My own feeling is that look at the charter, the charter is very clear. The first one says - we're concerned about is the criteria of the financial need. When we're going to propose and establish one, we have to figure what the hell it is.

So if - I'm using this as an example. There is clearly a need to determine how are we going to decide what are the inputs to the decision about which applicant is eligible for financial need. I think we can begin to start getting information on that now. Same with the other one.

There has to be some kind of mechanism having determined the criteria is. What are we going to do to actually bring in applicants so that at the end of process say this one is eligible and that one isn't? That's a mechanism. We've got to set up a committee or something.

That requires attention. To me, whether the GNSO believes it or not, you're going to have that requirement. So as I go down the list of things that are required to act, my suggestion is that we divide up the work and then ask people to focus on specific issues and come back to the group with their recommendations for adoption or for the advice and consent of the entire group. That's my suggest.

Back to you.

Rafik Dammak: So tell how you propose that we divide the work if we are going to follow that unionized charter. So do you have some idea how we should divide the work or we can talk about it now?

Carlton Samuels: I would ask for members who would wish to work on the very first piece, the criteria (unintelligible) and let us begin to develop the criteria. I would ask for members who would be willing to look at the method mechanism by wish we will work through applicants against this criteria to show up for work and begin the work.

I would ask for volunteers who would be willing to work on a review mechanism to do that. I would ask for volunteers who will cut the funding and the funding model for making the applicant support a reality to begin to work on that.

Rafik Dammak: Okay I think Avri's in the cue. Avri?

Avri Doria: I was going to say what Carlton just said so I removed myself from the cue.

Rafik Dammak: So (unintelligible) - you want to hold onto your (unintelligible) working.

Avri Doria: I wasn't actually doing that at the moment, although, I've said several times, I'm interested in working in raising and funding models. But, no, I was basically going to suggest something similar to what Carlton suggested, not dividing ourselves along the lines of every item, but basically coming up - I think he came up with four groups and, you know, I think those are good because it covers most of the things that look like it needs to be done and others.

                  Yes, I'm certainly - I've committed myself, whatever this group does. I've been working on trying to get people to think about funding and I'm certainly willing to work with others on working on a funding model. That's - I think it's critical that people do the first one, you know. What are - how do we, you know, determine who gets paid and who doesn't during the processing?

                  But that's not something that I consider myself all that qualified for and (unintelligible). So that one has to get done. I'm not volunteering for that one. But I am volunteering to come up with some program to find different people to contribute money and to figure out the right way to basically manage those funds and etc.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, just see if maybe - Karla can you - I think that - can you (unintelligible) suggest a (unintelligible) by Carlton for the writings, the tasks to the working groups...

Woman: I just did it and it vanished so I'm trying to redo it again.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so then if we have those working and then maybe you ask people who are present now to choose which working that they want to volunteer. They can volunteer in many working so it's not.

Woman: Yes it is uploaded. I don't know if you are able to see.

Rafik Dammak: What I am seeing is the united working group charter.

Woman: (Unintelligible) I think this is what I received.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, but we had moved ahead a little bit in terms of starting some sub-working groups. I suggested that we have a set of people working on the criteria for eligibility. That we have a set of people working on mechanism for working applicants through a process to make them (unintelligible). I suggest that we have...

Rafik Dammak: The letter, it's related to which point, A, B or C?

Carlton Samuels: The mechanism.

Rafik Dammak: Point, I think, Point B.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: So (unintelligible) working group for Point A and B.

Carlton Samuels: Right.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: I wasn't even going by that. I'm just looking at some very hard, high level hard that we know needs to be in place. The eligibility criteria is something that we have to do so we need a group to work on that.

The issue of how we bring people through the process to declare the acceptable for receiving support, there is going to be one of that. Then the funding and how we get funding and what we do to sustain it, there's another one for that.

And I'm suggesting that those are the three main ones as far as I'm concerned right now.

Alan Greenberg: Yes...

Carlton Samuels: Avri has indicated an interesting in the issues surrounding funding and where we get them and so on and the sustainability. I would suggest to this group that we ask Avri to lead that effort.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, so maybe if Karla can you like post the working groups, how we structured them and then maybe people can volunteer now who are present? Now they can volunteer and then to - at least to start working on those points.

Carlton Samuels: Do you want to take Avri's suggestion there just to get back to your question Rafik? In the chat Avri has made some - a suggestion that probably we should put down on the record for the record she is proposing - you see the proposal from Avri?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, that's the idea (unintelligible) because also I'm seeing that Avri's - she's proposing some merger items so that - just to help everybody to see how we are dividing the work now.

Carlton Samuels: And you see Alex has volunteered to be in the fundraising subgroup with Avri. You also see another subgroup being proposed and that is the one that will be the assistants, what I would call assistants in kind.

Rafik Dammak: Okay we have Avri in the cue. Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, I was typing as opposed to thinking, but I was looking and trying to figure in terms of trying to match, I think what Carlton was saying it looks like, you know, A and B, as I said, go together basically -- establishing the criteria and establishing a mechanism or proposing a mechanism.

(Unintelligible) word from the GSNO (unintelligible) term of establishing...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: Doing work. We don't want to actually do that.

Then basically it was looking to me like C and F, whether it was, you know...

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Avri Doria: I think it was C and F, whatever I wrote down.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I think E and F, yes.

Avri Doria: Right.

Rafik Dammak: But yes.

Avri Doria: It was C and G. And then the two of them, the H, you know, that one looks to me kind of standalone. Oh, by the way, we can't scroll - oh yes, I can scroll, sorry. I was thinking I couldn't scroll...

Rafik Dammak: Yes, actually I think, it's (unintelligible) towards (unintelligible) work with ICANN staff about that no?

Avri Doria: Right. So that I think is a separate effort and then the - for those that want to proposed mechanisms on the idea and build out, that seems to be a separate sort of work item.

Carlton Samuels: I agree.

Avri Doria: So we end up with five...

Carlton Samuels: Five work teams.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: I agree. Thanks Avri. I agree.

Rafik Dammak: Okay we have (unintelligible) go ahead. It's okay?

Carlton Samuels: He might be on mute. He might be on mute. Give him a few seconds.

Man: I'm sorry. I was mute. Okay I'm sorry Avri, but I cannot see the relationship between A and D. It is an added work, but the main...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible). If I wrote D, I was wrong.

Man: Pardon?

Avri Doria: I meant A and B.

Man: A and B.

Rafik Dammak: A and B, I am sorry.

Man: B as in boy.

Avri Doria: I may have written D...

Rafik Dammak: So okay, okay. No problem, no problem. Criteria and mechanisms going together, that's the point she's making.

Man: Okay, okay, okay, it's okay. I think maybe it's better to put those points in the (unintelligible) not easy to follow.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible) probably put it in the notes.

Man: Yes, how to create notes. Okay, your notes. We said A and B. Okay, thank you Avri.

Rafik Dammak: A, B, E, Z, D, E...

Avri Doria: Again, I make a mistake. It's D, G.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Avri Doria: I'm so sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, yes.

Man: D and G.

Rafik Dammak: D and G right. H, okay, so everybody see the notes or not?

Avri Doria: I left out...

Man: F is about the...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: That (unintelligible) thousand, proposing (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: No that's H.

Carlton Samuels: That goes H.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Avri Doria: I think F is also with C and G or with...

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I think E and F is about, you know, D, E...

Rafik Dammak: E, F and G that's about coordinating...

Avri Doria: Right okay so.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: C, E, F should probably...

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Man: E and F yes.

Carlton Samuels: It's all about how to provide assistance to the applicant...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Coordination, all of that work, how you get people together and what we do, what kinds of roles will be required for assistance.

Carlton Samuels: So (unintelligible) maybe we can start to ask who wants to volunteer for working A and B.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Me, Tijani.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Who else? Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Alex and Avri's already declared for funding.

Rafik Dammak: Yes for that it's the point - it's C. So I was talking about A and B so now we can move to C. It's Alex and Avri. Point E and F, about assistance to the applicant and coordination. Who wants to volunteer? Okay.

                 Carlos, please go ahead.

Carlos Aguirre: (Unintelligible) can you hear me? Can you hear me?

Carlton Samuels: Yes Carlos, I can hear you.

Carlos Aguirre: Thank you sorry. I need to know what's in the matter that Avri volunteered please. I want to be a volunteer but...

Rafik Dammak: Carlos for which one?

Carlos Aguirre: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Sorry?

Carlos Aguirre: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: I didn't hear you well. For which point do you want to volunteer?

Carlos Aguirre: Sorry Rafik. I want to know what (unintelligible) or what is about each work team.

Rafik Dammak: Oh okay.

Carlos Aguirre: I want to be a volunteer, but need to know what is the issue of work teams.

Rafik Dammak: Okay yes. So the first work teams is about the Point A and B. It is about how to prioritize the criteria for financial need, but also to define the mechanisms. So we have Tijani who volunteered for that and maybe he can lead that (unintelligible). And maybe (unintelligible) can also join.

The next work team is G and C, which is about I think the funding, the foundations and funding. So it's - we have Avri and Alex. Okay, that's clear?

Carlos Aguirre: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: And we have for team D, E, F, which are mostly about how to provide assistance for applicants and coordinating the assistance for the applicants. So we merged all those points in one team.

Then we have, okay, we have Item H, which is about how to phase - about phases of fee and how we can waive that, but I think we need to work with ICANN staff of that point.

And the last one, the last work team, it's about how to grid out the idea.

Carlos Aguirre: Okay thank you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, just for the foundation, it's I think Point C and J. I think Avri's there, no?

Avri Doria: Yes. I think G is the one that, as I said, I've already started working on and hope to continue.

Rafik Dammak: And just (unintelligible) Avri comment about the work team, so it's really important that we have many volunteers in each work group and they try to work on a weekly basis so - because it will make more easy for the working group members to review and then we can share the workload between all our working group members.

I think (unintelligible) try to join as much as work in we can, but (unintelligible).

Carlos Aguirre: I am quite (unintelligible) with the opportunity to look at criteria and the mechanisms as well as the funding model, so I will be kind of float between those two work teams, if Avri will have me.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Yes, go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Of course, in fact what I suggested when I was writing is that, you know, the people that want to focus on it, you know, volunteer to be part of this group, that it continues to be open, that it's groups going off. Kind of like when you have a big meeting and then you say okay so for the next hour, you know, we're going off into our separate corners here and then we'll come back and talk.

And that it remain open, that these groups do not become closed. Obviously, they may decide to have, you know, some other telephone calls and, you

know, ask for the good graces of Gisella to help set them up to have (unintelligible) persons talking on things.

But those still, I would hope would be open and anybody could jump in to anything at anytime and just keep everybody up to speed. And then as I said in my suggestion, that each of the groups would be scheduled as part of the agenda, you know, on a weekly.

If we're having two meetings, then that means we can cover two or three of them in one meeting and two or three of them of them in the other, while still covering all the other stuff that we may or may not need to cover.

And to just start getting it done and chipping away at it progressively, but we can't all (unintelligible) everything all the time and that's why I think (unintelligible) suggestion.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Avri, I agree with you. So things that - or a team member saying we need to coordinate (unintelligible) have. It's better to use like, how do you say, the facilities from ICANN so if just for recall, and I think we - as far as people to communicate so the mail increase that - I think that people can be in the loop of the discussion and that Work Team leaders try to report for each - for the - in the calls about the work done.

So it will be - make it more easy for people to comment and that we can progress. We can make progress I hope.

Carlton Samuels: Can I make a suggestion that when we are using the email group for the Work Teams, we use it and label that identifies what subgroup issue it is, so that it's easy for anybody else to identify.

But I want to emphasize the principle that was so succinctly outlined by Avri. These are open Work Teams. Anyone can join them. We can make them as open as possible.

They will set up their own work schedules but every week we will have some time on the calendar, time on the agenda for them to come back and report.

Man: Yes, Avri, I can quote him but it's not just to report but we are going to discuss about also the Work Team work, and for sure that it will be in the agenda, so don't worry about that please.

Okay, so I think I will - I think on 20 we sent letter to the mail increase but that - at least the four teams and the people who already volunteer and then we will ask the rest of members to join. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, quickly and thank you because that was one of the things I was going to suggest. I was also thinking that we have 20 minutes left here. We may want to and I have to say this because this gives me something I have to do.

But we may want to actually ask those people who are already volunteering for things like the AB Group or the CG Group or the DEF Group to just talk a little bit about what they see, whey they're volunteer - not why...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I'm on the phone because I'm on the teleconference.

Avri Doria: ...just to start off the discussions with like maybe five minutes each, you know, where we think we're going with this so we can actually start the - a little bit of the Blue Sky stuff while we're still here. And then maybe that will inspire other people to join up.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I think so.

Man: Yes, so it's actually that people who want to lead at the start to talk like maybe Tijani now and you after, because for the other Work Teams we don't have already volunteers or leaders, so we can maybe that we can talk about from the Item A and C and C and G, okay. Tijani, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you. First of all Avri, please when you speak, speak in the microphone because you are very far and I understand you hardly. The main point I wanted to make now is that Karla sent an email with the composition - or not the composition, with the Working Teams, the Working Teams that we head up now, and with the persons who now volunteers for each one.

And ask the members of the list to volunteer and to express themselves in which Working Team they want to be. We need to be effective and working very hard starting this week. That's all.

Man: Okay, I think that we agreed about that anyway. Okay, so as we said maybe the - for the two Work Teams that we have leaders and already members that maybe they can start to talk and discuss. So please maybe we can start with the Work Team A and B.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You want me to speak about it? Okay...

Man: Yes, please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So it will be - as you know it's one of the main requirements of the Board to define the criteria for the need or for the eligibility if you want for the spot. And right now we have (Sandra) who sent the document about UK eligibility criteria for other thing but it is a good starting point.

We have to find other experience of our if you want other kind of eligibility criteria in other situations, so that we will try to compile all this and try to adapt it, or not adapt it but try to see how we can find criteria for our case.

I tell you it's not easy. We need a lot of people and I think that we'll manage to have some of the Working Group members volunteering for this Working Group - Work Team.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, we can - that's a good - this is Carlton. It's a good start to look at eligibility rules from around the world, people who get legal advice or legal support or assistance is probably one good category to look at.

It's - it will provide us with a lot of - for us to go on. I would also suggest that there are eligibility rules that are made special in the metropolitan countries for state assistance of one kind or other.

Those might also offer some substrates from which we can extract things. So there is something we can work on. It will require some - probably some searching and that's what I intend to do.

I'm specifically going to look at the rules in various metropolitan countries for state assistance, whether it is for economic assistance or social assistance.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Especially from the World Bank Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, to see what it is that they do. So that's a good - Tijani, thank you. That's the point or that's a good way to acquire. And yes, we will need a lot of hands but we will just continue to work all we have, and then we can get together and consolidate and extract the ones that we think - the points we think would maybe useful in this context and put them to the other members of the group for advice and consent.

Tony Harris:: Hello, can I comment?

Man: Oh, Tony Harris:, please go ahead.

Tony Harris:: Yes, I just - adding to what Tijani just said and Avri and Carlton, there is another source of information which might be useful, which is the guidelines for donations.

For example here in Argentina we have - the government has a program which allows nonprofit organizations to receive donated equipment or things, you know, that are donated in the wealthy countries.

And there are a series of requisitions which qualify you to be eligible to receive donations. That may be the same in other countries.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, because I'm not sure Tony Harris: when you joined the call, but do you want to volunteer for this Work Team?

Tony Harris:: To be a member, yes, but not to lead it.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Oh yes, okay. Thank you Tony Harris:. Thank you. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, I think what Tony Harris: just brought up actually would contribute to two different teams. One was in terms of the criteria for what people are, you know, criteria that people have in Argentina feeds into this AB Group.

I think the notion of donated equipment and that and how that works might also feed into the DEF Group of the how, you know, assistance-in-kind let's call it, you know, whether it's services or equipment or whatever can.

So I think that actually that bit of knowledge would probably contribute to two different, you know, to two different Work Teams' efforts. That's what I wanted to say. Thanks. Could I go on and start talking about the CG Group?

Man: If there is no more comments about the Work Team A and B, we can go to the CG Group, yes. Any comments?

Avri Doria: Yes, just quickly. So - oh okay, I'll wait.

Man: I don't think - no, there is no comments so you can go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes, and especially since we were just doing quick intros to the topics here. On the contributions and the mechanisms for distributing those, basically there's been a couple different parts of it.

I mean, there's a part of it that is sort of one - to one side and it's the GNSO problematical one of what happens with auction funds. And I'm sort of not thinking of jumping into that one as a first mechanism.

What I've started doing and started doing on my own, which is trying to sort of motivate the notion that there are lots of rich Registrars. There are, I mean, you know, we look at the parties they give.

We look at the money they spend to bring in cuisine. They've got money. There are rich domainers. There's basically a lot of wealth in the ICANN community, so the idea is to start appealing to that wealth, at first just to make pledges that sort of says, "If there is a way for - mechanism for, you know, maintaining and distributing these funds, yes, we will donate."

Now I haven't gotten anybody to shout out that yet, but I'm working on it. And then there's obviously the notion of, you know, you have to build some mechanism for managing it.

The other side of it is, is some of those may sort of say, "That's a really good idea and we're willing to put together a fund, but we're only willing to put together a fund for people that are community applicants.

Or we're only willing to do a fund that we manage ourselves and it's for people in our country." And I think that that's great too, and so the other half of it is working with those folks to sort of get them to agree for example to use the criteria that the AB Group is working with plus their own, you know, and it has to me in my country or it has to be community or it has to be IDN, and basically getting them involved in it.

I think next steps other than the bits I've done either to annoy people on the phone or to, you know, write a couple blog pieces trying to generate interest in this, and by the way I have gotten interest in some of the blog pieces I've written on this, though it's mostly been, "Yes, good idea. You know, we're thinking about it.

We'll get back to you in about a month after our Board has talked about it, so that's great, but no public - yes, we contribute $100,000. You know, we pledge."

So I think one thing we have to do is come up with a more organized approach to these rich potential donors sort of as an appeal letter, as - and, you know, phone calls that we talk to them and also we have to start thinking about what is the shape of a fund that manages it?

One of the comments I've already gotten from people, "Great idea on the fund but I don't think it should be based in, you know, North America or Europe. It should be based somewhere in, you know, a developing economy."

Or, "Good idea but," and so start collecting those notions of what is the right way? Where is the right place? Is this indeed the right thing to do? And come up with a proposal for how to establish, you know, some fund mechanism that handles it.

So that's what I've sort of been thinking in terms of the CG and as I say some of the stuff that I've just, you know, while waiting for the group to either decide it was doing it or not doing it, or to decide, you know, coordinate, I just started doing it because if we could get donors to say, "Yes, we'll do it," we're already ahead of the game.

I think DEF, and I'm not volunteering to lead DEF, but certainly to be on it is a very similar type of operation, but it has to do with the in-kind. It has to do with services and help and translation.

And so it needs to get some people on it that really know what a Registry does and a Registry service provider, and knows what kind of help people will need.

So it could do something similar to what I'm proposing for CG money raising but for, you know, the in-kind help and take a similar route but it's a different route.

And so as I say I volunteer to be on DEF and that but, you know, certainly I'm not putting myself up as someone that would drive that one, because I don't have the knowledge of how a Registry works to be able to drive that kind of group. Thanks.

Man: Yes, and Avri - yes, I agree. I think like your Work Team, it's more for - the target is more foundation and do this organizational pool which are willing to give some funds, when for DEF it's more for the technical - mostly for technical assistance and maybe that we need -the targets must be a Registrys or Registrars which are willing to help new applicants.

So - but maybe any coordination between the Work Team is - I think it will be helpful. Maybe they can share some ideas so it's not to reinvent the wheel again. Okay...

Avri Doria: That's one reason for always coming back to the full group, is the full group is really our sharing and coordination point. And when we say, "Well CG has been working on blah, blah, blah," DEF says, "Oh, yes, yes, yes, et cetera."

Man: And yes, and for that yes, we need to ask that - to encourage people to work in the wiki so to share the - their work in the wiki so it will be more easy for people to see that and to try to navigate in the emails.

So okay, Avri you want to - any more comment about C and G? No? You can hear me, no?

Avri Doria: I could hear you, yes, but barely.

Man: Oh, okay. Just I was asking you if you want to - you have any other comment or...?

Avri Doria: Oh, for CG, no. And I already contributed to DEF and since I suggested that the H and I, I could comment on what I think is needed there if there are no volunteers to comment yet, but no.

Man: Okay, maybe I will volunteer for DEF but not necessarily to - okay, I can volunteer for DEF, okay. Let's go forward.

Avri Doria: Yes, for example I think Elaine is someone that we would want to try and bring back and get her into DEF since she's a - very much a lead on those kinds of ideas in the first chapter of this group.

Man: Yes, I think maybe also (Kelly) is from which - to our side, yes. Yes, definitely. I'm just concerned about the two points for the G about - not G, the H, about the fee and for the IDN Work Team.

Maybe for the IDN Work Team Andrew will - may volunteer for that. He was really - yes, maybe he will - he can volunteer for this Work Team. So okay, we have just five minutes so if there is any comments - yes Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, if I could speak on H a little. I - again I'm not volunteering for this one because I'm not - but, you know, certainly and I don't want to put, you know, Tony Harris: on the hook.

Obviously I can't, but on the slot but, you know, for example he was very much a very forceful person and there have been other people in the group. And so I think a group with them that would, you know, find the right person in ICANN and open it up and actually, you know, jump into that issue with ICANN, you know, the people that have really been paying attention to the fee and the fee structure and all of that.

Now we know that we're - or rather it doesn't look like we're going to get fee reductions, though I think we should continue to attempt to get fee reductions.

You know, one of the proposals that I heard from a Board member at one point in terms of fee reductions is, "Well, you know, you haven't proposed a mechanism for doing them.

You know, you haven't said how do we remain self-funding," because we never really said point blank, "Can you raise somebody else's fee if you have to?"

And I don't know if we want to say that but we never have said that. In terms of that, there also may be a notion that if certain monies are raised, those monies can perhaps be allocated to, you know, assisting with those fee reductions and that.

I don't know but somebody, you know, needs to take this one and really needs to - if we're going to do it. I mean, we've got it on the list. It's on the ALAC Charter.

It's not certainly on the - I don't think it's on the GNSO Charter. And, you know, we need to have people and that's going to be sort of a lot of work of

working with ICANN to try and ferret out the information we need on it. Thanks. Like I say, I'm not volunteering. I guess that's the way it looks to me.

Man: Thanks Avri. You should just - suggest a volunteer maybe if Tony Harris: is willing to join this Work Team.

Tony Harris:: Yes. I'm quite happy to do that. I think it's an important subject. I think we've been brushed off very lightly with this, and I still think the application fee is completely overblown.

Man: Do you want to take the lead for this Work Team?

Tony Harris:: I don't know if that's such a good idea time wise. I'm really, really stretched. I'm happy to be a co-leader. Would anybody else sort of be a partner on this?

Man: Okay. Yes I understand. Anyway you will be really helpful for this Work Team with your experience.

Tony Harris:: Well if I can I'd be very happy to do it. Sure, no problem.

Man: Yes, thank you. Tijani, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you. Avri, the question you have been asked about how the fee reduction will be done is a tricky question. It - that means that ICANN will not accept to reduct - to reduce the fees unless someone pays to compensate it and it's very sad. That means that there will not be a solution. I am really concerned.

Avri Doria: If I can answer. Yes, I think it is problematic. What they've asked is within the constraint of the program remaining self-funding, if we accept that the fee is what it is because that's necessary, which the Board is sort of accepting that, you know, Staff has said, "We need this fee in order to do this program."

And if they accept that and, you know, it's not for the Board or perhaps it is for the Board to say, "Well prove that you need this," I don't know that they've done that.

But if you accept that they need that amount of money, then if you're lessening the fees for someone you've got to find some compensation for it elsewhere, either because, I mean, because the program being self-funding is one of those requirements that the Board is sticking to and I don't think they're going to go back on.

So either somebody's got to pay more or there has to be some other compensatory model. So what model are we proposing is what people ask. We can't just reduce some fees. Well who covers it is what they're saying. So yes, it's sad.

Tony Harris::   Can I comment?

Avri Doria: Yes, please.

Tony Harris::   When you're finished Avri.

Avri Doria: No, I'm done. You know me. I'll keep talking until someone stops me.

Tony Harris::   Yes, I just wanted to say that I entirely agree with you and I would also point out that I think part of the problem in asking for a fee reduction is that thanks to the efforts of this impressive intellectual property lobby which has pushed this thing about 2-1/2 years back on schedule, I mean, that's adding expense every month to the process because, I mean, how much is this Brussels meeting going to cost ICANN at the end of February for example?

And it's all related to the new gTLD program, so that may be something which really weighs in the balance unfortunately. If we'd been on track with schedules and all these extra expenses and not being heaped upon ICANN,

we might have been received with let's say a better disposition when we approach them on something like this. Hello?

Man: Yes, sorry. It's okay. You want to...?

Tony Harris::   Yes, I finished. I didn't know if - I wasn't sure if I was disconnected because of silence. I hope I didn't shock anybody with what I just said.

Man: Okay, I see Alan. Please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I've refrained from commenting on this for a while now. I made the case earlier that I think this is a futile effort and not worth our effort. Tony Harris:'s - the issue Tony Harris: has raised is part of it.

Even if $100,000 was wrongly calculated originally and I don't think we're going to have the basis for making that decision, there have been huge costs that have been incurred since that $100,000 was established.

ICANN's methodology for paying that back has, you know, it has not been to raise the $25,000 or $26,000 that was allocated to some costs, but to say Round 2, 3, 4, 5, 106 will have to pay part of that cost also instead of being paid off in Round 1.

I just think that this is not a good use of our time because I think the chances of success are so small that I think it's a red herring. I've said that before but I will say it again now, but I really think it's not a good use of our time. Thank you.

Man: Thanks Alan. I think now we are run out of time for this conf call. Can you see if there is any further comments? No, no, no comments, no feedback so okay, I think we can adjourn the conf call for today.

Thank you everybody for your participation and I think that now we can start the - oh, Avri. You have something to say?

Avri Doria: Oh, no. Sorry. I didn't - that was an accident. Sorry, but while I've got the floor, great meeting. I'm glad we started. Thank you.

Tony Harris::   Thank you all. Thank you Avri.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you everybody.

Tony Harris::   Thank you Tijani, (Dave). Bye.

Man: Bye.

END