## SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
## TRANSCRIPTION
## Tuesday 31 August 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) 31 August 2010 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20100831.mp3

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

**Participants on the Call:**

ALAC
Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Tijani Ben Jemaa -  AFRALO - At large
Baudoin Schombe – At Large

GNSO
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison
Andrew Mack – CBUC
Alex Gakuru – NCSG
Avri Doria - NCSG
Eric Brunner-Williams
Elaine Pruis -  Mindsandmachines
Fabien Betremieux - Individual - AFNIC

ICANN staff
Karla Valente
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:
Carlos Aguirre - At Large
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Tony Harris - ISCPC

Coordinator:      Recording has now started.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you. Shall I do roll call for you Avri?

Evan Leibovitch: Absolutely, yes.

Avri Doria:       Please. Evan's the chair on this.

Glen de Saint Gery: Oh Evan -yeah okay. Okay Evan. I'll do the roll call for you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Jas call on the 31st of August. And we have on the call Alex Gakuru, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Avri Doria, Eric Brunner-Williams, Fabien Betremieux, Alan Greenberg, Elaine Pruis, Evan Leibovitch and Andrew Mack.

And for staff we have Karla Valente and myself, Glen de Saint Gery. We have apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr. We have tried to call out to her but she is in Beijing. And probably that's why she can't be with us.

And we have also is anybody else that sent their apologies? I think those are the only ones. Thank you. Thank you. Evan, over to you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, first things before we go any further, could I please hear from anybody who's statement of interest or whose affiliation has changed since the last call?

So I'll give a few seconds to anybody who wishes to state a change in their status since the last call, please speak up now.

I will take silence to mean that nobody's changed. So please speak up now if you have a change.

Okay we receive silence. That indicates that nobody's status has changed since the last call and we will move on from there.

We have two ways to proceed. Okay, Tijani, go ahead. You've got your hand up.

Tijani Ben Jemaa     Yes. Yes please. Can I ask Karla to make the text justified all the large, larger of the space so that I can read it because it's too small, it's scatters and give us the possibility to scroll it?

Avri Doria:        Glenn can you make me - can you promote me?

Evan Leibovitch: Oh you are Avri.

Glen de Saint Gery: You are Avri.

Avri Doria:        Oh I don't see it. Okay, thanks.

Glen de Saint Gery: You are - you are hosting. Do you need to be anything else?

Evan Leibovitch: I need.

Karla Valente:     Tijani, I just augmented the font. Is that okay?

Tijani Ben Jemaa     Okay it's better.

Evan Leibovitch: I think I need to be more awake. After meetings yesterday on MAPO and the Accountability and Transparency Review Team does anyone else here - I mean I know Cheryl was on it. Avri you've got to be pretty wasted. It's been pretty intense.

Man: No rest for the weary.

Evan Leibovitch: Alan, you were on that too if I recall. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. I was on mute. I wasn't on much of the ATRT.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Okay so there's two ways to go. Avri is talking about that we need to do a second pass and we indeed need to. What I'd like to do though is see if perhaps we can get next steps out of the way.

I don't recall any of the public comments to do on next steps. So if we can perhaps come to some agreement on this part of it and then give us some time before the next meeting where we can sort of make sure we've got everything arranged in terms of taking a second pass given some of the new comments that have been put forward.

Is everybody okay with that?

Avri Doria: Just...

Evan Leibovitch: Avri, are you okay with that?

Avri Doria: Yes I am okay with that. Two suggestions though. One is I was hoping that the second pass was not of this document yet but of the

comments and responses documents which a draft of still needs to come out.

And as we had our first walk-through of the comments where we discuss them Karla's been gathering those into a coherent thingy and then I was hoping we could make a pass through that next.

And then we also might as well - I don't know if next steps will take up the whole meeting, it might be worth going through the two sections of text that people worked on in the intervening days just so those can be incorporated in.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so if we can get through next steps then we'll start getting to that document that was a couple of days that was done very recently.

Okay, Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa    Yes a little (G) issue. I propose that all the text that have been already drafted now and we go through them to be sent on the mailing list so that people who didn't attend our calls or didn't attend some of our calls can react if he or she is not okay with what has been written so that we can gain time. Because we need to go perhaps first for faster since the deadline is approaching.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. If that's the case then perhaps what we ought to do is get through this and then maybe at the end of the day if everybody's okay with this Karla, if we could send something out, call it a second draft and sort of make another sort of line in the sand of where we are before we go forward. Is that sort of what you're talking about Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa    Yes. I would like to let Karla or any - or one of the chairs send an e-mail saying please go through this text that we drafted during the call and tell us if you are okay with them - if you are not okay. Tell us if you are not okay with them so that after that nobody can come and say no, I'm not okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria:    This is Avri. I think once we incorporate the two pieces of text from today I think Karla has been sending out in updated argument - I mean an updated document. I think asking the question as you pose is a very good idea.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Karla Valente:    So Avri, this is Karla.

Avri Doria:    Yes.

Karla Valente:    I send last Friday - was it Friday?

Avri Doria:    Yes.

Karla Valente:    Yes I sent last Friday the most of today's version which is Version 2.8 August 27 of the final report. Do you want me to resend that to the team?

Avri Doria:    No, not at the moment. What I would do is after today with any updates that come in today it gets sent out. And at that point then either Evan and I can follow it up with a hey folks, you know, this is where it's at,

anybody that's either been attending the meeting and especially if you haven't, read through it carefully, bring up any issues, et cetera.

Is that okay? Tijani, does that meet what you're looking for?

Tijani Ben Jemaa     Pardon?

Avri Doria:     So what I just discussed with Karla, will that meet what you were asking?

Tijani Ben Jemaa     Yes. Okay, thank you.

Avri Doria:     Okay, thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right, without further ado I'd like to go to where we left off last time which was next steps. That is Line Number 255 in the document on Adobe Connect Page 11 I believe it is.

And so if everyone's there hopefully we can move on and maybe we get this out of the way fairly quickly.

Now Karla, you've highlighted these in blue. Does - is - have - is there any significant change to this since it was last in the document?

Karla Valente:     No. It's highlighted in blue because this is where we stopped.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Karla Valente:     We have to start here at next steps.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Karla Valente:     So in addition to this blue highlight Evan previously there are two paragraphs that were identified as something that still needs to be worked on.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Okay, Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa     Yes, line 257. Due to the constraint of time and the need to get the board feedback, to get board feedback on the approach, et cetera, GNSO is before board. Our mission is to give the board resource.

GNSO created this group. And ALAC and GNSO are the two parts and other perhaps constituencies are part of this working group.

So we need to give the board that output of our work and we need the feedback of the board to our work.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, you raised a very interesting question Tijani if we need to bring out to the rest of the group. I mean this is not just the GNSO group. This is a GNSO and ALAC group meaning that if this has to get sent back to the various groups for approval then it needs to get GNSO counsel and ALAC and then go to the board.

Do we need to include all that into next steps or is everybody okay with what Tijani is saying that we don't really even need to mention GNSO counsel because we have the constituent parts of this group? Our main concern is board feedback? Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Based on experience on the VI work, it's not clear we're going to get GNSO feedback on this certainly not in the very quick manner although we can certainly ask for it.

And I would say based on experience we're not going to get board feedback either. Typically the board does not issue a statement on how they like a work.

They may eventually act on it, not act on it, ignore it. But so we may get individual feedback. I think it's unreasonable to expect that we're going to get board feedback no matter how much we may want it.

Evan Leibovitch: So...

Alan Greenberg: So I think number one we have to take in the fact that we're not likely to get a lot of feedback from most - from either GNSO, maybe ALAC and probably the board. But regardless whatever the - whatever position the GNSO has in this we should have a comparable one for ALAC.

Evan Leibovitch: Well...

Alan Greenberg: Shouldn't be singled out.

Evan Leibovitch: How do you - what do you suggest about the wording of this in - I mean, what you're saying makes an awful lot of sense. We're not going to get board feedback. We're going to get board decision based on what we come up with, not...

Alan Greenberg: Oh ultimately.

Evan Leibovitch: Right.

Alan Greenberg: But by then that's not feedback that we could use for going ahead with the work.

Evan Leibovitch: Exactly. So...

Alan Greenberg: Maybe because our - this work may have a life past the announcement of the application.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, do you have a specific wording in mind to replace this or are you just pointing this out and see if we can just hammer it together?

Alan Greenberg: I need to think about it for a moment but go on to other people and we'll see.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, first of all it is a horrible oversight that I just said GNSO council. And that obviously needs to be corrected.

I think that first of all we're trying to get this into the board board's hands by the retreat. I think there is some hope that there will be feedback from the retreat. But you're right, there may not be.

I think going on, I think if you look at some of these bullets, these bullets are things that may or not may not be in our charter yet. So we may need to go to both of our chartering organizations and update where we're going on from here.

We will have made the initial recommendations. And what this is trying to capture is that we have other work to do but that work may need a chartering organization. Yes, go ahead an updating of milestones or what have you. And so that was the thought behind this.

If there is no feedback there is no feedback. But, you know, but in any case we would still need a chartering update to continue on to some of the things that are listed here I think.

Perhaps others will say no, no, no that's included already and then that's great. But I think we - for some of the things that we may want to do we do need further consultation with our chartering organization. And again, I apologize for the sloppy writing.

Alan Greenberg: Then my recommendation will be to take the phrase and the need to get GNSO and board feedback on the rules before proceeding on these work items, change that and the desire to get feedback, GNSO, ALAC and board feedback comma, they are proposed. I would not put the feedback as a condition of doing any further work.

Evan Leibovitch: Are there precedents of how to be able to go to the board for feedback? I mean I know we're really stressed for time. But either working with the retreat or working with any board subcommittees is there any kind of a precedence of how we go to the board for feedback of how to best do something in advance of going to them for a final decision?

Alan Greenberg: Regardless, typically the board does not give informal feedback. It may make them pass a motion which there may or may not be an opportunity to do during the retreat.

Last time I saw that it was not listed as a formal board meeting. You may get feedback from individual board members.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I can't remember a case where the board gives formal feedback other than through formal action.

Evan Leibovitch: The informal...

Alan Greenberg: I may be wrong though.

Avri Doria: Oh.

Evan Leibovitch: The informal feedback made that be the best that we can expect or - Avri?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. We might try for more. First of all, since grants that were chartered by ALAC and GNSO but were also chartered at the request of the board, so I think this group could decide that we want to send our report simultaneously with some sort of cover note to all three of them for the 13th target.

And then it is possible because we are responding to a board motion and if we send them the report directly that they can respond with the motion.

It wouldn't be out of the retreat. It would be out of their next voting meeting. But still we very well could get feedback from it and we could especially request that feedback in the cover notes from all three. And the board has often treated a formal request for feedback as something they need to react to.

So there is some precedence for them formally responding to a formal request.

Alan Greenberg: Certainly we can say since we are chartered by - you know, we were requested of this by the board we would like some indication of whether this is in a direction which pleases them and should we continue with this work.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Well what about changing for instance the word need to the word desire at least or something like that to make it something a nice to have as opposed to a must have?

Man: Tijani's been trying to speak for a while.

Evan Leibovitch: Well also Eric you had your hand up and then put it down again. Are you - did you need to talk? You want to get in the queue or...

Eric Brunner-Williams: No.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Tijani, go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa Okay, what is the mission of the liaison of the GNSO and ALAC in this group? Isn't it to inform those twos organization about our work?

So I think that the charter organization are well informed about what we are doing and if there is something which is not well or which is not okay with those organizations their agent will tell us. They are here for that I think.

It's not a problem if you want to keep it like this. But at ALAC I don't mind. But we - it is compulsory for me to expect that feedback from the board because we need to know if we are going in the right direction.

But it's not - it's really - it will be very sad that we work all this time and at the end the board will tell us no it's not what I asked you to do.

Man:            So it is what they asked us to do we may just be doing it wrong.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Karla?

Karla Valente:   Evan, this is Karla. I'm a little bit confused about what changes you want to be made.

Tijani Ben Jemaa   Not yet. Not yet.

Evan Leibovitch: Well first thing is we - if we're going to keep in - a line like this then we need to add ALAC together with GNSO counsel and board.

And I am suggesting at least for the purposes of this wording that we change the word need to something a little softer that indicates that we want it but we can proceed even if we don't get it.

Is anyone...

Tijani Ben Jemaa     I agree. I agree. I agree.

Evan Leibovitch: I mean the word desire instead of need comes to mind. But I mean does anyone have a better word to put...

Man:                The desire to or interest in getting...

Tijani Ben Jemaa     Interest is very good, yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Interest in.

Tijani Ben Jemaa     Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Is everybody okay with the replacement of the word need with in - need to with interest in and adding ALAC to this line?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, the verbs have to change like the get to getting and stuff like that but yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have a checkmark from Alex. We had one from Tijani. If anyone is against this please put an X in otherwise I will assume we have consensus on this?

Okay Tijani thank you for pointing that out. That was significant. Does anyone else have any comments on this paragraph between Lines 256 and 260?

Okay all right moving on first...

Karla Valente:     Evan can I - I'm sorry Evan. This is Karla. Can I read you the text?

Evan Leibovitch: Please do.

Karla Valente:     Yes so due to time constraints and the interest in getting GNSO
                   Council ALAC and board feedback the following work items are
                   proposed for discussion as either extensions to the joint SOAC new
                   gTLD applicant support working group charter work items for another
                   group. The sentence at the end doesn't make much sense.

Evan Leibovitch: That's right. All right take out the word either.

Karla Valente:     Take out the word either?

Evan Leibovitch: The - well the sentence makes sense if you take out that word.

Karla Valente:     Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: And...

((Crosstalk)).

Karla Valente:     So in (unintelligible) GNSO Council ALAC and board feedback the
                   following work items are proposed for discussion as extensions to the
                   joint SOAC new gTLD applicant support working group charter work
                   items for another group.

Evan Leibovitch: No, that still doesn't make sense.

Karla Valente:     No. What do we want to say?

Do we want to say that this is there is more work to be done either by this joint SOAC working group or yet another group?

Evan Leibovitch: What are we trying to say here folks?

Man: I think Karla actually just said it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay how about a superseding on the work items they are proposed for further discussion by the joint SOAC new gTLD working group for another group, something like that.

Okay Karla could you say again what you just said and let's see if or okay with that?

Karla Valente: Okay let me see if I can read that. Hold on just one second.

Due to time constraints and the interest in getting GNSO Council ALAC and board feedback the following items are proposed for further discussion of the current joint SOAC new gTLD applicant support working group or another group.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay I would change of to by and then I think you've nailed it.

Karla Valente: You would change - I'm sorry could you repeat?

Evan Leibovitch: By the groups instead of the groups.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay read them back one last time and then everybody give me a checkmark or an X. Karla read it one more time.

Karla Valente: Okay. Due to the time constraints in the interesting getting GNSO Council ALAC and board feedback the following work items are proposed for further discussion of the current joint SOAC new gTLD applicant support working group or another group.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay change the word of to by and okay Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Oh sorry. I don't mean to have my hand up. I'm having terminal problems.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Karla do you see the word of in the middle there? Just change it to buy and I think we've got consensus.

Karla Valente: I got it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay any X marks? Anyone not happy with that? Okay great, let's move along to the first bullet point which is Lines 261 to 263.

Okay comments, questions rewording anything at this point, definition of mechanisms? No comments? Everyone's okay with that? All right let's move on.

The next bullet point line...

Rafik Dammak: Evan sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay go ahead. Is that Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Just asking what we mean by external review committee? It's for the committee which will make selection or the committee which will review the activity of the selection committee?

Evan Leibovitch: I think - well I mean my own reading of the bullet point is essentially, you know, defining whatever group it is that's going to make the judgments on the worthiness of an application based on these criteria.

Andrew Mack: This is Andrew. I think that calling it an external review committee might be a bit misleading. I understand Rafik's concern.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay can we strike - how about just striking the word external?

Man: I agree with that.

Man: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Anybody object? Okay Rafik are you okay with the - with that bullet point with the word external taken out so it's a little less...

Rafik Dammak: Well that's okay yes. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: All right moving on to the next second bullet point, Lines 264 and 265, clear enough? Any comments, rewording?

Okay next bullet point. Establish...

Rafik Dammak: Oh yes Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: I'm sorry. It's Rafik again. Why here we are just think that we may be able to help in the first round with funding?

My understanding that we are to make sustainable approach, so maybe the establishing relationship with any donor would be will be conferred or second.

I don't know what how much ground we - there will be but we - I don't think that we need to say that it's to help in first round.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so and I've got a check mark from Andrew about just scratching the reference to the first round. Tijani and then Alan.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes okay, it's okay. We have to remove the first round.

Evan Leibovitch: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I'm leery of saying this committee or this working group is going to establish relationships with external agencies.

In the past when similar things have been suggested we've had our hands slapped saying we cannot speak on behalf of ICANN.

And this has to be - this is a staff responsibility, not something that a working group or a committee can do.

Evan Leibovitch: How about rather than establishing the relationship simply identifying the potential donors?

Alan Greenberg: That would be something I think might be more acceptable.

Evan Leibovitch: I mean someone has to establish the relationship and start talking to them. I'm just not sure we're empowered to do that.

Evan Leibovitch: Good point. Andrew?

Andrew Mack: I agree. I would - might say that we would explore the relationships or something like that.

Evan Leibovitch: That's the word.

Andrew Mack: Do we want to - I think that makes the most sense. Do we want to commit ourselves to coming back to the board with something on this or do we just want to leave it blank? That was my question.

Evan Leibovitch: Well I mean we could essentially change that line to say identify donors who may be able to assist with funding and just leave it like that. Eric then Alan. Eric, go ahead

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. Fund raising is a professional activity. It is a real skilled area of work. I don't think that we are that body.

And I don't want ICANN not to realize that if it's going to do fundraising it needs to hire a fundraiser, someone who is experienced in fundraising in doing donor outreach.

So I don't see that - I agree with the comment that we should not be the liaison because there are legal issues and are representing

whoever the heck we are as ICANN which we are not. Some staffer can do that under the guidance of corporate counsel.

So the relationship part I agree with a previous speaker. The outreach part too however I have real concerns because we're not good at this. We're just a bunch of people. None of us I think has a real experience in doing professional fundraising.

So I don't want ICANN to not fund a fundraising job, you know, to not fund the person who would actually do this work competently and assume that we are doing work competently. Thanks very much.

Evan Leibovitch: Eric let me follow-up with you on that. So it's a reasonable point so what is this group's role then in that issue at all?

If we're not doing the relationships, we're not identifying the groups what are we just doing, pointing out that it would be a good idea to do that?

Eric Brunner-Williams:      Well ICANN hasn't taken the step of actually funding a fundraiser, someone to actually find donors, cultivate the donors get the donors to donate.

That's a need that we've identified as part of response to the board's instructions to address need.

Evan Leibovitch: So we're identifying the needs but essentially we're not in any position to execute.

Eric Brunner-Williams:       We don't have the budgetary authority to hire anyone to do it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, no it's a reasonable point okay. Karla and then Alan. Karla go ahead.

Karla Valente:     Yeah, I have a suggestion for wording because I think that this gets into the implementation part. And also I would like to remind the group that Kurt has offered to have some kind of consultants helping.

And maybe one of the things that the consultant or consultants could do is to help pre-identify this potential, you know, party that could help with funding.

So this is the wording that I have here, it's a recommendation. Identify parties who may potentially be able to help with funding and further refining the support process.

Evan Leibovitch: I don't even know if we're qualified to pick the consultant?

Eric Brunner-Williams:       No actually I don't think we are. I mean real donor community is something that you really don't run into unless you do very high level fundraising.

These are people who do, you know, do gifts in the order of millions. And I don't know if any of us who are in that business.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so again I'll come back to Eric in saying okay do we scratch this bullet point entirely? Do we have a role to play in at least saying somebody ought to do this?

How, you know, how would you rephrase this then? I agree what you're saying. This group does not have the competency to either identify who could do the funding or even to identify who's the right consultant to do this. So how would you suggest we change that bullet point or do we just strike it period?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'd be happy to supply text but to do so spontaneously...

Evan Leibovitch: Understood.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm just as low on coffee and sleep as the rest of you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Karla do - are you have your hand up for a suggested wording or can I go to a...

Karla Valente: No, no I just forgot to take that down. Sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay I have Alan and then Andrew. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: All right. I think we need to do a level set as to what we're doing and what we envision ICANN doing in this whole thing. We're certainly asking ICANN to put some of its own money or limit the requests for money it's making of these designated applicants.

I don't see ICANN as acting as the intermediary between the applicants and external donors. I don't see it acting as the broker.

Man: Maybe not...

Alan Greenberg: I see it...

Man:　　　　　(Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: I see it...

Man:　　　　　(Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Pardon me. Sorry. I thought I heard someone say something. I see ICANN potentially identifying entities that have expressed interest in supporting such applications and, you know, identifying them and identifying contact points.

Man:　　　　　Yeah, same...

Alan Greenberg: And certainly working with these organizations at the start to try to explain to them what it is that applicants may be looking for. But I don't see ICANN being the intermediary or us for that matter being the intermediary and brokering anything. I think that's a one-on-one responsibility between the donors who may be setting their own set of rules over and above any that we'd - we are setting and the potential applicants.

　　　　　　　And I would say that our responsibility is to work with designated ICANN staff or contractors to put this process in place. Now that's not the fine wordsmithing of the sentence.

Evan Leibovitch: But Alan, what you're suggesting and still has place for a matchmaker role if not one of an agent.

Alan Greenberg: I would not say a matchmaker. I would say, you know, you're identifying the potential donors and what they're interested in doing. But approaching them is up to the applicants, not ICANN making the match.

Evan Leibovitch: So that...

Alan Greenberg: Because...

Evan Leibovitch: So...

Alan Greenberg: The - any donor may have rules which are a subset or a superset of what we're looking at in terms of applicants who need support.

Evan Leibovitch: So this means you're saying ICANN might publish a list saying user groups that have expressed an interest in possibly funding applicants?

Alan Greenberg: And they may have had to do a lot of work beating the bushes with the kind of experienced person that Eric is talking about to approach this. I mean you don't look up The World Bank in the phone book and call the first number you find. You know? That's not...

Andrew Mack: Can I...

Alan Greenberg: Likely to lead...

Andrew Mack: Can I...

Alan Greenberg: Yield something. So yes, go ahead please. I think I've said my piece.

Andrew Mack:     Okay. And - yeah, I actually used to work for The World Bank so I can speak to this with a little bit of clarity.

I think there are two potential ways of doing this. One is to create some sort of a funding mechanism that would be attached to ICANN so if you will a pool of funding. And the way that that would happen would be that on the basis of the work that we've done this basket, this pool of funding, becomes - it becomes effectively an empty bucket and ICANN might put in some of its own resources and other groups like The World Bank or major foundation might be encouraged to do so as well.

There are benefits in doing it that way. There are also - there's also the possibility that we could go to a group like the bank and say okay we need to set up a trust fund to support new applicants from, you know, especially from the emerging markets, what do you think. There - the challenge with doing it that way is that then it's completely offshore from ICANN and you don't necessarily get some of the combined benefits of having a larger pool.

In either case I don't think it's an impossible task to identify some of these groups. The - it's - from my experience it's not like traditional fundraising. There - we could literally be trying to put together what is effectively a project for support that would be funded by one of these donor agencies. It's doable. It just takes time.

And I think - I mean the sense that I have is that we can play a role in at the very minimum suggesting some places to begin the looking but somebody has to have responsibility for that looking. I agree that there needs to be some point person. Whether they're called a fundraiser or not in - I'm indifferent. But that make sense?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. But - Andrew, it also sounds - before Karla comes in it also sounds like you and Alan are sort of not quite on the same page on this. And Alan is suggesting a very minimal role if any whereas it seems like you're suggesting more of an activist's role in ICANN and actually helping to make those pairings happen.

Andrew Mack: Well I'll put it this way. I don't actually - I think that the system should to some extent determine itself.

I understand the concern about being involved as a broker. And that's fine.

What I am suggesting only is that if you're asking individual groups to go to separate funders and things like that it's a very inefficient way of doing it. If we have an opportunity to make a request to one of these larger funding sources it is possible that we could get them to say okay, great, this fits with our development objectives, we will support it. And then where it is housed, whether it's housed in the donor agency or housed in some sort of, you know, some sort of body connected to ICANN, that would be determined by the rules and regs.

Evan Leibovitch: And...

Andrew Mack: But I don't think that's deal making. I just think that that's trying to secure a funding mechanism that doesn't require that the applicant that is already stretched also goes to, you know, try and make their own funding setup from an external source.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Avri, are you speaking directly to this?

Avri Doria:      Yes I am.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Avri Doria:      What I think the role of this group or a follow-on group needs to be is sort of continue midwifing the whole project. In other words I think that there is a gap between having some suggestions that this, this, this should be done and the implementation having gone into place.

I think all the discussion that we've started now as to what sort of (unintelligible) and what sort of bucket and how it is done and getting the people, I think taking Kurt up on his suggestion to put us with some people who understand how things are done to get better information so that we can do a better job of helping to get the project kicked off and kicked off in time for the new gTLDs is the kind of thing that I was trying to talk about there, that this group or some other group needs to continue working just to make sure the project happens and doesn't just fall through the cracks with so many other things to do.

So I think - and the last thing is I would suggest that if Karla or somebody has new wording to get that into the notes section so people can actually read the wording. I don't have the ability to type in there because I've had problems this morning so I'm not, you know, an operator on it. But thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I don't think Andrew and I are really that much different. But our perspective is different.

The kind of thing he was suggesting of having ICANN put together a fund or a group of donors and various ways of administering it would be my method of choice if we had sufficient time and if I thought ICANN was interested in being that organization. ICANN does not view itself as the helper of the developing world. It's something that it's being perhaps coerced into. But it's not its main raison d'être.

And I just don't see ICANN doing that in the timeframe we're talking about. And we probably don't have the time to do it anyway.

It's not that I don't like that as an effective way of getting donors involved and making things easier and more effective for the applicants. I just don't see it happening.

Andrew Mack: But Alan, at least...

Alan Greenberg: Now maybe I'm just being cynical. But that's my perspective.

Andrew Mack: But Alan, it's so within our realm as a group to be able to put that forward to the board and let the board decide whether or not it has either the inclination, the resources or the time to do this.

Alan Greenberg: Certainly.

Evan Leibovitch: And I might also add that given that it takes - this is a process and it will take some time -- these donor agencies don't have money just lying around unallocated -- to begin that process now even if it does take time is probably worthwhile.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I - my major point was not the time but my major concern is I don't see ICANN as having an interest in taking on this new persona. And again...

Evan Leibovitch: Understand.

Alan Greenberg: Maybe I'm a bit cynical about it. But I just don't - I have seen so much reluctance at ICANN at - in so many small ways of trying to adapt to addressing the needs of the developing world that I just can't see it taking the lead role in this kind of thing.

But I'd be delighted to see it happen. I just don't think it's going to happen this week.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, maybe next week. And - okay, Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. I wanted to point at an exception - two exceptions to the suggestion that ICANN has no raison d'être to be in this area of the previous speaker.

As early as the green paper where presentation was identified as a fundamental interest of the new entity ICANN retains that interest. In the absence of parties other than the highly capitalized applicants from the first world is certainly a profound representation interest of ICANN.

The second area where ICANN has a obvious interest is in IDNs or that is in scripts other than ASCII. So while the general observation that ICANN has no role in the - in third-world development may be - may feel true or sound true or as one looks at ICANN as a present entity seem at - not even sufficiently cynical.

The actual reasons for having this institution include representation. And it also includes scripts other than ASCII. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right, Eric, I don't think anyone here is saying that it's not within ICANN's purview. I think the issue is probably more a matter that there's concerns about ICANN - the current board's willingness to get into this.

Having said that then it's perfectly within the purview of this group to try and prod the board into having an interest it might not have had. Would you agree?

Eric Brunner-Williams: They asked for someone to prod them in some direction. I suppose that's us.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Well if that's the case then we've got to go back and wordsmith these lines because I mean it sounds like there's still interest in the group in having us put forward to the board some kind of mechanism for helping deserving applicants find organizations willing to fund them.

I don't know if we have total agreement on that. But I certainly don't see a lot of opposition to the concept.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Evan, if I may?

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm not sure that the applicants-to-donor relationship is the only thing that we should be exploring. My point appoint representation

and IDN, these are two different buckets. These are not applicant-specific. They are class or category.

And looking for donors who in - wish to support these as themes, as categories, is not out of - is not a useful thing to do. So I don't want to simply constrain the framework to a donor and an applicant pairing.

Evan Leibovitch: Eric, all I'm trying to do is work on one bullet point here and - I mean we're not necessarily limiting things outside a two-line bullet point that right now talks about establishing relationships. There is a legitimate issue brought up with that. This particular bullet point needs some work.

That doesn't preclude other areas. But we need to refine what it is we're asking the board to do in terms of whatever relationships might be existing, encourage them to (unintelligible) between applicants and those who would fund them. Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes. I'm going to go back to the earlier language that I suggested and use something along the lines of explore, explore the possibilities of co-financing from external sources with an eye towards creating some sort of support fund.

Evan Leibovitch: Does the word facilitate have a use here?

Andrew Mack: Say it again.

Evan Leibovitch: Does the word facilitate have a use here?

Andrew Mack:    Facilitate's a little bit more - facilitate puts you more in a brokering
                space which I personally am comfortable with because it is part of what
                we do, right? But if other people are - don't think - if other people think
                that's too far forward for ICANN I understand.

                The idea is only that we are going to explore this because we've - we
                as a group think that there's value in having some sort of support fund,
                dedicated support fund, because we know this stuff is going to take
                money. And we're agnostic as to the source of that fund, its different
                components or even where it is being housed but we think that that
                process of identifying the support funding needs to begin as soon as
                possible.

                That's my - that's what I'm hearing the group say. Am I correct?

Evan Leibovitch: Well there - it's a slightly different issue. The idea of building up a fund
                as opposed to relationships between individual applicants and
                individual donors, do you see that as different or the same thing?

Andrew Mack:    In my mind I see that as detail. If I - if the - what I don't - what I think is
                a bridge too far for ICANN is getting involved in helping individual
                applicants go for - go to individual donors. I think that that's the least
                efficient way that we could go because ICANN won't be very good at
                the matchmaking but the matchmaking itself suggests a level of - it
                suggests endorsements which depending on where we are in the
                process we may not want to offer. And I think it's a lot of touches on
                the ball.

                I'd much, much rather - based on personal experience I'd much, much
                suggest that we create a fund - we try to create a fund and that in the

same way that people would apply for, you know, they're going to be - effectively going to be applying to - think about it like this. We've got a limited scope of money and a limited scope of other technical resources that are at our disposal at any given point in time, right, like in our bank account.

And so people would come to that fund to say hey I'm interested in this. That way they - if they wish to top it up in other ways or if they wish to go for other sorts of funding that's fine. But having some sort of core fund I would think makes the most sense. And ICANN matching up individual donors strikes me as inefficient.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Does anyone else have any - okay, Eric, go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yeah. For the last more than a minute I've just heard a real flood of words, broken sentences, repeated phrasing. Expressing the - whatever the speaker's idea clearly and slowly would be useful.

I appreciate that it's difficult. But if we could just speak slower and more plainly that would be - that would improve the comprehensibility of whatever's being said so...

Evan Leibovitch: I think part of the issue is we're dealing on a phone call and people don't really have the time to sit down and spend a lot of time crafting stuff while we're on this call.

Eric Brunner-Williams: That's correct. Doing wordsmithing on a call is difficult. So I've - I have an editor buffer where I've stuck some words in which I will work on and send to the list. Let's go on.

Evan Leibovitch: Andrew, would you also be interested in helping to try and wordsmith this? I mean it sounds like you've got a pretty clear idea but it needs a little bit of wordsmithing.

I mean the one thing that we do know is that bullet point at Line 264, 265 has to be replaced with something else. So Eric's going to go off and come up with some suggested wording based on what you've heard here.

Andrew Mack: Evan, obviously Eric doesn't believe that the way that I speak is particularly clear. I'm happy to take a look at what he presents.

Evan Leibovitch: I wasn't thinking so much as an insult as the fact that we need to maybe deliberate a little bit more in email than we can do on the call right now so...

Andrew Mack: Sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Can I leave it to one or the two of you to basically go off and come up with some wording we can use to replace this bullet point? Is that okay?

Andrew Mack: Sure.

Evan Leibovitch: Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: All right. All right, so that bullet point is being deferred pending new wording.

Moving on, Bullet Point 266, establishing framework for managing auction proceeds future rounds ongoing assistance. This one seems fairly straightforward.

Anyone - any comments on this one? Going once. Going twice. Okay, next one.

The Bullet Point 268 to Line 270, methods for coordinating assistance and discussion of intent to be given to - by the ISP. Okay. Could whoever wrote the original of this explain what they meant by where is the role of the ISP? Anyone going to take credit for writing this?

Avri Doria:     It's Avri. I think I originally wrote this whole section so I have to take blame or credit as the case may be. So let me try and think if I could recollect.

I think - and perhaps again ISPs was wrong but one of the things we talked about in - and perhaps it was not ISPs but backend providers that I meant to say and just got into one of my cross-letter things. But what we were talking about is various technical assistance relationships and such as that.

So I think that that would have been -- I actually don't remember writing it but I think I must have -- what I'd be alluding to and as a lot of the assistance that we've talked about providing is in the -- not us providing but being provided -- is in the getting help for someone, from others whether it's other backend providers. It may be ISPs at a certain point though I don't think that's the major part of it.

Man:                It should be RSP.

Avri Doria:         RSPs, yes. I think that's my typing badness. So I think that's where it's at, that basically there's that whole conversation about that part of the effort that, you know, also needs further work into how, into bringing people together, into setting up or not setting up but understanding how exchanges of some sort or other could be set up -- that kind of notion -- without having gone very deeply into thinking about it.

                    Thanks. By the way are we at our time or are we a 90-minute meeting?

Evan Leibovitch:  I'm pretty sure this was an hour meeting so we're...

Avri Doria:         Okay.

Evan Leibovitch:  Pretty close to time. I'm going to make a suggestion. Karla, for the next meeting could we spell out RSP because we haven't made earlier reference to it? So can we just say registry service provider?

Karla Valente:     Okay. So this is Karla. I changed ISP by backend registry service providers.

Evan Leibovitch:  Okay. Eric, go ahead. Tijani, you have the last word because we're going to have to close off this call soon.

Eric Brunner-Williams:      Thank you very much, Evan. I'd prefer to see cooperative here rather than a reference to the existing registry service providers. Getting the half of them who are in material need to be self-standing or to be as cooperatives self-standing I think is a better goal than facilitating their business relationship with VeriSign as an RSP or

Afilias or (New Star) or CORE or (Alts Registry) or whomever else is offering themselves as the commercial RSP vendor.

So I'd like to see this not focus so much on our providing a relationship with existing commercial providers but with the applicants becoming either self-standing operations, self-hosting operations or with true cooperation with other applicants arriving at the same or an equivalent status. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Eric, I'm going to come back to you and suggest maybe we can think of some other wording that would refine this. I think you're agreeing with the principle that we should coordinate assistance. But you're saying that we should also assist potential applicants to be self-sufficient as opposed to just running to an RSP.

Eric Brunner-Williams:    Correct. So this is another wordsmithing item I think. I just don't want to see it left as RSP.

Evan Leibovitch: No, you're perfectly - you've got a very good point. I mean if an organization is cash-strapped as it is, if they're able to do some of the RSP functions themselves then more power to them.

Okay. Tijani, you've got the last word. Elaine, is your point a quick one or - okay. Well Tijani, you go first.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:    Okay. Thank you. It is about methodology. Can we please agree on the agenda before the meeting because today I was prepared for the commenter views and we are dealing with the next steps? So my participation was very poor because I am not prepared for it. And I

think that next steps are very important and everyone has to think deeply about to put on - no, or interesting points in this section.

Second point, I like that all the text produced by the members be included in the text with a color to indicate that this text are not yet discussed. I mean the text that (Ellen) sent about the (unintelligible), the text that I sent about the financial instrument and the text that Andrew sent today about the multiple strengths.

So I think that everything produced in this group has to be in the draft with specific color to say that those text are not yet discussed and so that we can discuss them. If we don't put them in the draft you will not discuss them anymore so it is very important.

And last one, I do think that we need to send an email on the list saying that this is the point at which we arrived today, the text which is clear are already discussed and we have consensus on them, the text which are - which has this color are under discussion, the other test have not been discussed at all. And we need the feedback of the whole group so that we can go forward. Otherwise we will always repeat ourselves.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Okay. Elaine, you've got time for a quick comment and Avri gets the last word.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. For 268 to Eric's comment about registry services providers the background discussion there was that rather than having underfunded applicants building out their own systems which would be prohibitively expensive we would try to wrap in registry service providers who would be willing to provide backend services at a

discount. So I will work on some wording there to flesh out that concept because I don't think 268, 269 and 270 really addresses that.

Evan Leibovitch: And can I leave it to you to perhaps go offline with Eric so perhaps you can between the two of you come up with something that addresses both of those issues. We certainly...

Elaine Pruis: Sure.

Evan Leibovitch: ...don't have time to do it on the rest of this call.

Elaine Pruis: Tijani, I'll do that on the mailing list. The second thing is I agree with Tijani, we do need to bring in all of the mailing list thoughts and discussions. A lot of time someone will put out a comment or something that we should discuss and it never is dealt with on our calls.

And I think one of the reasons that we're having some issues, myself at least, is these calls for me are at 6 o'clock in the morning and a lot of the email traffic comes in one or two hours before. So I don't have the wherewithal to get up at 4 o'clock in the morning to read two hours worth of emails before our 6 o'clock call. So it would be helpful for me if people could put in some comments, you know, 12 hours before the call that we could discuss or else consider that during our call we need to address some of the mailing list comments. That's it. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Karla, quick question to you, are you okay with doing some of the suggestions that Tijani made in terms of marking the stuff in one color that we have discussed, marking stuff in another color that we have not yet discussed? Are you okay?

Eric, you've got your hand up. But I've really got to cut this off for now. Anything more you need to take to email.

Karla, do you...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Karla Valente: I can. How about highlighting - continue to highlight in blue things that we have not reviewed and if it's not in blue the rest of it was reviewed?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Good. And the sections that have already - that we have discussion on and we didn't reach consensus can have another color also.

Karla Valente: Yeah. This one...

Woman: I...

Karla Valente: Like need further review?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Let me jump in. I think everything - nothing has consensus yet. I think that most of the document is close to consensus but I don't think that Evan and I -- perhaps, you know, Evan and I need to talk about it -- are ready to declare that stuff has consensus.

There's stuff that has been reviewed once. None of it has been through the list yet. There are issues where some people think there's

consensus but other people feel that they haven't had a chance to comment on it yet.

As I mentioned earlier I definitely will after this next version goes out put out the call saying everybody please read, please comment. I've put out comments before. For example at the last meeting I said I would put out some emails. I put them out way too late. And when I put them out I was told there's already consensus on these issues when during the meeting I had mentioned that, you know, I don't think we have consensus yet so I'll put out emails on them.

I think that we should include the sections of documents that people have contributed that we haven't even discussed yet. And those should go in as bracketed text in some sort of color.

In terms of the agenda we do try to give it out in advance and follow it. In this case we did not have the document to review yet on the comment responses because of a misunderstanding and because of a volume of work so I apologize for that. But we really do try to do what we said we would do.

So - and I thank everybody for staying the extra ten minutes.

Evan Leibovitch: And on that note we will call it a morning, afternoon, evening depending on where you are. This has been pretty intense and I guess we will see you all later in the week.

Please, there's a couple of - those of you that got wordsmithing duties please see if we can do something so there's plenty of notice before the next meeting. And we will see you then.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:   Okay, thank you.

Woman:          Bye-bye.

Man:            Bye-bye.

Man:            Bye.

Man:            Thanks.


                        END