

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Tuesday 05 July 2011 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Tuesday 05 July 2011 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

<http://audio.icann.org/gnsso/gnsso-jas-20110705-en.mp3>

On page :

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

Participants on the Call:

GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison - WG chair

Avri Doria - NCSG

John Rahman Kahn - Individual

Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

At-Large:

Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

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

Dave Kissoondoyal - (AFRALO) - At large

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison – NARALO

Dev Anand Teelucksingh - LACRALO

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Sebastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Alex Gakuru - NCSG

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

Andrew Mack - CBUC

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large

Michele Neylon - RrSG

Tony Harris -ISPCP

Elaine Pruis - Mindandmachines

Coordinator: Please go ahead; the recordings have started.

Gisella Gruber-White: Lovely, thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's JAS call on Tuesday the 5th of July we have Rafik Dammak, Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, (John Ramen Kahn), Baudouin Schombe, Alan Greenberg, Avri Doria, Eric Brunner-Williams. From staff we have Karla Valente and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologies from Tijani Ben Jemaa, Evan Leibovitch, Michele Neylon, Andrew Mack, Elaine Pruis, Tony Harris, Carlos Aguirre, Alex Gakuru. If I can please remind everyone to state their name when speaking for transcript purposes and Olivier Crépin-LeBlond will be joining us a little later. Thank you, over to you Rafik and Carlton.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella. Thank you for everybody for joining today call. So our agenda for today is in the Adobe Connect. Our first item it will be about the letter that we want to send to Kurt about - to confirm about staff support.

The second item is about the funding model (unintelligible) and process aspect. It will be lead by Avri which will give us an update, explanation, etcetera.

The third one it was about to be lead by Glen maybe I think Carlton has some update, I don't know, but we'll see then. And for the fourth item is about the registry service provider of in kind service. And we have I guess some - I think some questions - an update from Eric and Avri.

So if - is there any objection to the agenda? Okay hearing none. First I want to ask - I would like to ask everybody if you have any update in your SOI or DOI please send your update or speak now. Okay.

Starting with the first item Carlton sent I think yesterday the letter that asked co-chairs of the working group want to send on behalf of the working group about asking - and to confirm - asking about - talks about and confirm about

that so (unintelligible) just to confirm and have some consensus from the working group members and then we can proceed after that.

Okay, Eric, please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Rafik. Eric Brunner-Williams for the transcript.

((Crosstalk))

Eric Brunner-Williams: There was exchange via email between Carlton, Olivier and a few others but not the entire group concerning the choice of language in the text of the letter. As Olivier is not on the call perhaps you could read his - or summarize his response to Carlton. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Eric, this is Carlton. There was a sense that Olivier believed that we should send more specific language. For example say we need one staff for this, one staff for that. We need staff with this kind of knowledge or staff with this kind of experience and expertise.

I personally thought that since I didn't know what expertise was required I simply link it to what my outputs would be and that is to say I thought it would be useful tell him that what I want; I want - we want to have a situation where we produce outputs that is of quality and kind like the DAG or the applicant guidebook, for one.

Two, we want to have a framework for applicant processing that is - that will meet the needs of the applicants. So I didn't think I needed to numerate how much staff I needed or the kinds of - specific kinds of expertise they should have.

I thought it would be reasonable to just tell him what my objective is and given his expertise and his time and place he would be able to apply his

knowledge to the outputs. So I don't think we need to say anything more about that.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well...

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Carlton. Eric, do you want to comment because also we have Alan in the queue.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Oh go ahead with Alan.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I think given that we're on such a tight time constraint I think the reasonable path is essentially a mixture of the two. To the extent that we know any skills we should enumerate them. To the extent that we don't I think Carlton's way forward is reasonable.

They may come back with iterations on it and that's fine. But I don't think we can afford the time to agonize over it so much so that we're losing the time from actually doing the work. That may not be perfect but I think that's a reasonable way forward if we can do it quickly. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Is it okay for you Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you for asking, Rafik. I think the issue is has the discussion been presented to the persons who were not parties to the exchange that was off-list in a way that is neutral and summarizes the issues? And then is the proposed outcome adopted after - consideration of the - whatever the issue of discussion may be by the group rather than being sort of a, you know, a one-sided presentation.

That's my real concern is that the subject of discussion is presented neutrally and then if approval of the group is sought that the approval is given from the basis of a neutral presentation. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. I just - I want to understand - I want to clarify and understand. So you are - you agree that - we need some support staff - staff support for our work but I don't really understand what your disagreement so can you just summarize...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sure, Rafik. Yes, I'd be happy to Rafik. I don't think there's anyone involved in this who disagrees that increased staff assistance is required to produce the text that is about the qualified applicants separate text from the draft applicant guidebook. So I don't believe there's any disagreement on the necessity for staff to produce a quality document.

The disagreement that - or the discussion that took place off-list in which is being brought to the list is about the text of the letter to Kurt; whether the text is really just an editorial difference over approaches.

So as the group is being asked to approve a version of a text the summary of the discussion of difference I'd like to be presented in a neutral manner rather than by one of the protagonists to a disagreement or to a discussion over the nuance of text.

And I wish Olivier was here to share his view or his concerns. That's really all that the issue is. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Can I just say - we can put the discussion in the frame. I mean, I don't have a problem with that. I just think it would be slightly inflammatory and that's my judgment. That's why I was careful about what I said because I shared the discussion with - no more than three persons. And I believe the response from - the response might be construed as inflammatory on the other side and I didn't think it was necessary to do that.

But if this group - well no I wouldn't even put it in. Olivier is not on and I would not put it in. I would respectfully suggest that we not bring it into the...

Gisella Gruber-White: Olivier is now on the call.

Carlton Samuels: I'm sorry?

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry, Olivier, has joined the call.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: I've just arrived.

Carlton Samuels: Oh thank you, Olivier, you are here. The concern is that I summarized what you were intending to say and it may not have fully represented your views on the letter - on the content. I've told why I thought it was not necessary. You did say plus one in the current letter in the chat. But Eric has raised the issue again. I would not wish to put the discussion that we had offline into the chat.

Eric Brunner-Williams: That was never proposed by anyone but yourself, Carlton. Really the issue is whether or not we have two people presenting a topic for discussion or one person presenting a topic for discussion. It's fortunate that Olivier has joined. If the issue still persists; that is if there still were (bands) of disagreement and points of view between the two of you now is the appropriate time to state what your - why there is a discussion, what the actual issue is. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Eric. Olivier - oh Olivier in the queue, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks very much, Rafik. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond for the record. What I had written to Carlton was just to make the letter simply softer than how it originally looked. And I think that the amendments which Carlton has

put there are fine; that's why I put plus one for this, you know, ultimately I think is what it needs to say.

There is a requirement for more staff support on several points and they're clearly listed here. And I hope that Kurt will be quite positive in receiving this letter and being able to extend the support now that much or many of the ICANN staff are freed from all of the work going into the new gTLD process.

I think that - does that clear the question?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I think it addresses the issue of whether or not we have an issue and apparently we don't and that's a good thing so we can move on.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Eric. Okay I think we need to move forward but just if - some people have some disagreement or I think it's possible always to propose or suggest some rewording. And maybe let's give like one or two days for that for comment and rewording and then we can proceed and send as soon as possible this letter. Any objection to that?

Okay so please forward this - please send them to the list; it will be more easy I think for people to comment and discuss. So for the second item which is about the funding model (funds) and process aspect which I - which will be - this discussion will be lead by Avri.

I think that a few days ago she put some text on the wiki. I'm not sure if there was any comment there. But, Avri, I think Avri is going to expand better than me and to - and to maybe also to ask us some questions, etcetera. Avri. Are you here?

Avri Doria: Yes, I'm here.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: And I'm even unmuted. Okay great. Okay, yes, what I've been doing is - and I've been using the subgroup section of the wiki which, you know, was relatively unused and have started sticking comments in the various subgroups a little paragraph meant to be sort of initial writings so that we would have something that we could start beating up on and editing and talking about and hopefully coming to...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...excuse me. Am I still in the right space?

Rafik Dammak: I think we have problem with some lines I think...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Keep going, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Let's just go ahead.

Avri Doria: So anyhow - and I think I've put stuff in Subgroup 1, Subgroup 2 and Subgroup 3 as the old ones. So in this one - in the financial donors - let me see which documents actually have content. Yes I put one in on fee reduction and program self-funding requirement, I think on funding models and on funds and foundations I believe.

So should I just talk through those quickly? And as far as I can tell no one has commented on them though I think I had most of them in place before the Singapore week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that's because if I may, Avri, Cheryl here. Those of us who have more wiki pages than we can poke a stick at need to actually go in and add them to our email updates so we don't know anyone's done anything to them. So I'm doing it now.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Okay. I had sent out messages but, yes, that probably makes sense.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Yes.

Avri Doria: So I think that that's part of the - so in one on the fee reduction from basically MR1 which was stronger, MR2 seemed to weaken a little bit I'm making the presumption at this point in what I've written - and as I say this is just starter stuff so I'm sure the group will have, you know, changes made to it so please understand that as I decided that I would just put stuff down and then see what happened to it.

So on fee reductions the basic assumption there is all JAS-qualified applicants should get the fee reduction that we recommended in MR2 of the - of the - I'm trying to talk and look at what I...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...at the same time - of basically the risk and the reserve fund that those should be given to anyone who - whatever criteria, whatever group decides these are JAS-qualified too.

And what this one does is it includes a discussion of the issue with using that money about how many applications could be considered for JAS support

and what I've been recommending there both in the list and in the writing is not to try and estimate how many people are knocking at the door but rather estimate from a percentage basis what would be a reasonable target or reasonable goal for the outreach to JAS-qualified applicants.

And I basically worked with formulas of 10% and 20% outreach so assuming either 10% of the applicants were JAS or 20%. So basically this one piece, fee reduction and program self funding requirement, goes through a slightly better than back of the envelope accounting analysis to basically show what money this would take, where it would come from and how that would be dealt with and what the results of that would be, i.e. at the time of applications certainly the risk and - the risk and reserve fund would get less than was in the budget.

And that's the consequence and, you know, etcetera. So that one I don't know if anybody wants to talk about it, ask me questions on it. But that's basically that one. So that's the first one because one of the things we get from the Board constantly is well to do the fee reduction where does the money come from? And the argument I've put in here is the money comes from the other applicants. So that's the first one. I figure I'll stop and let people ask questions or, you know, we can go onto it later.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Avri. Eric Brunner-Williams. Avri, there's only one link that I see in the sidebar and I've looked at it and it doesn't seem to be - well I want to ask is this the only wiki page that contains the text that you're...

Avri Doria: I believe so. So it's under - if you open Subgroups and then you open Subgroup 2 you see case for donors is empty; conversation notes is relatively nothing. And then there's...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Ah.

Avri Doria: ...fee reduction and program self funding, funding models, funds and foundations.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay thank you very much.

Avri Doria: You're welcome. Okay I can go onto funding model. I think I have something in there or is that one of my old ones that I never filled in? No that's not one that I - that's an old one that I haven't added to; that's just the list of different funding models and it still needs more work.

Funds and foundations: okay in this one basically I take as background what's in our charter and as background, you know, and then basically - and then quote from the final applicant guidebook as part of the background. And so then the two elements in these quotes are obtaining funds that can be used to offset the costs for JAS-qualified applicants and establish a framework for managing and distributing these funds.

So basically here so then I give a first (unintelligible) a framework that has to do with basically us recommending to the Board set up a planning committee for funds and foundations; not wait until long from now, you know, as soon as we can come to consensus on such a thing that they set it up.

Then there's a set of things that this group would be responsible for, investigating legal structures, investigating requirements, draft the document defining core responsibilities and activities, define methods of work for the funds and foundations, accept membership for the first board of the foundation, start obtaining pledges of funding with which to seed the resulting fund or foundation and of course the \$2 million is possibly in that.

It recommends using a method like was used for establishing the ACRT and all the other review teams that it draws from all the organizations within ICANN to ensure that the whole community is met and also that there - as we suggested in MR1 that a professional fundraiser familiar with this sort of

international effort to support the qualified be hired to work with this foundation working group to get things set so that there would also be an expert.

So then it talks about what funds could possibly go into something like this, funds for the foundation to manage, distribute can come from a variety of sources, you know, as there's budget allocation, there's auction proceeds beyond the cost of running the auction, there's allocation of funds from ccTLDs, various people have talked to them, and you know, there's a possibility that they would make allocations.

Allocations of funds from incumbent gTLDs, registries and registrars, you know, external funding sources. I kind of think there should be a tax for JAS applicants on anybody that wants to spend \$100,000, you know, supporting the ICANN meeting but of course I don't think I put that in there.

Then there's basically, you know, looking at the various categories, looking at the use of funds, funds collected can be used for various purposes, application assistance beyond the JAS-recommended reduction of fees, assistance in deferring the cost of the required continuity instruments, overcoming technical requirement gaps such as, etcetera. So that's within that.

And just I'll make the quick reference here to the work that Eric is going to talk about later I put a note in Subgroup 3 on capacity building, registry service providers which is one more way in which these funds could be allocated but first there really needs to be someone that sits and makes these decisions.

So that's my contribution so far. As I say I put them on the table as a place start. I think that they're consistent with MR1 and MR2 that they don't go beyond the limits of our charters but of course I could be wrong.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Avri.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Avri. Cheryl, do you want to comment?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, I'm just busy catching up a little and it's very impressive, thank you, a lot of things to digest and react and think over though, yes.

Avri Doria: I see Alan has his hand.

Alan Greenberg: Yes just a...

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...a procedural question. I'm trying to find where the links are to the various subgroup working pages.

Avri Doria: Okay...

Alan Greenberg: And I can't - I see mention of them but they're not links.

Avri Doria: You go to the (up) group - the way I did it they're just - each page is opened under another one so you open up Subgroups and you hit plus...

Alan Greenberg: Where do I find Subgroups?

Avri Doria: On the sidebar - on the sidebar you'll see a...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...left hand side.

Alan Greenberg: Okay I - all right I don't have a sidebar. Maybe I need to figure out how to turn it on.

Avri Doria: Okay and then you open up Subgroups and under Subgroups...

Alan Greenberg: Oh okay, sorry, my sidebar was - my sidebar was turned off and...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...there was no way to get to them. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay so you just expand those and you'll find them in line...

Alan Greenberg: Once I turned on the sidebar I'm okay. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes. As I say, you know, please read them, please comment. As I say I'm definitely not religious I just decided that I would do my best to write something down so that - and try to be consistent so that we have a place to start so we can hopefully finish.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that's great.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, we have Dev and Eric in the queue. Dev, please go ahead.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Chair. Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Just a question on the funds and foundations documents. Under the donors there's a statement here, "Various registrars and registries from both the GNSO and the ccNSO have made statements that if there were a way to donate that could be gamed they will be interested in helping." I guess I don't understand what that statement...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right, no...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...it might be one of my standard I forgot a not. Let me, I mean, you know, it might just be - there's a certain kind of typo that comes from...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't know, Avri, I think it could be a fair statement for some.

Alan Greenberg: I tend to agree.

Avri Doria: Sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Let me just check for games so I can tell you...

((Crosstalk))

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I think you meant could not be gamed but, hey.

Avri Doria: Yes that could not be gamed they would be...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan and I have lost it.

Crosstalk

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: It was a bit of a - but it actually raises a whole new issue. Good one spotted, Cheryl.

Avri Doria: You will often find that with my writing.

Rafik Dammak: Oh dear, dear, dear.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Good one, good one, good one, Cheryl.

Avri Doria: I have it fixed.

Rafik Dammak: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: I think it's technically not perfectly correct but anyway so we have Eric in the queue. Please, Eric, go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you very much Co-Chair. The - I also have a process or I suppose a procedural question similar to Alan's who couldn't find the link. My question is are - is the venue for the discussion the wiki page or the mailing list? Within the wiki I find links that don't lead to very much and of course they're old links that you pointed out in your summary discussion, your opening comments.

But I actually can't know all the live links in the tree unless I visit every leaf node in the tree, exhaustive search. So my procedural question is how can we ensure that everyone who's interested in contributing on this issue actually is well informed as to the actual location of text?

In the past the mailing list has been the text of record with the exception of documents which are not very structured in terms of link depth such as the MR2, the MR1 and final reports. So really it's just a question about how we deal with the complete knowledge to the contributors for a wiki with many links. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Well...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I've made - Cheryl here. Do you want me to respond to that or?

Rafik Dammak: Okay Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. I've found that there is a strong case for edit and (deliberative) processes going on in the wiki pages as opposed to just in mailing links particularly when the mailing lists get very, very long and they're not threaded in a way that makes it easy for search and return.

The way I've approached that - and I hope it's one that is relatively efficient - is that as soon as I know about a node in the tree in a wiki I then mark it for - to watch. And so any changes including the addition of a link from that page then gets emailed to me.

If there's a smarter way of doing it perhaps Dev or one of the more technologically sound people in the group might want to share that with us but at this stage, Eric, that's the way I do it. And that is what I've just done quite literally when I discovered that Avri had been putting content into those previously unused setup pages I - I've just gone in and marked those for watching and so I'll get a heads up if someone changes anything on them, probably something I should have done earlier but I haven't done it until now.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...smarter way of doing it. Thank you.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm sorry, Cheryl. If a list of the nodes were posted to the mailing list then everyone who receives it could mark up nodes accordingly as watch items.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure.

Alan Greenberg: That would be a useful, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...that needs to be, you know, dealt with in terms of an agreed process then.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I was going to say a reasonable level set to get us all there.

Avri Doria: I'd like to say that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...I did with every new one that I put out I did send a note to the list saying I have put out such and such. So I did that. It might be nice to have something - also for any of you that have used this if you go in just when you go into cross community and click on the top you see recently updated.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: So that's another clue. I think we should use both the wiki and the mailing list. I certainly will continue and if somebody's got a, you know, because there's any number of ways we could organize the wiki site if somebody's got another way to organize it I'm more than willing to help re - move things around, put lists in, you know, as we start, yes, certainly willing to help make it easier for people to find stuff but I have made it a point every time I created a new one of these documents to send the list a URL. It's just a mail from me you all ignored.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I think that's - Cheryl here for the record - that's part of the problem at least a great for those who are on a few of them and are passionately devoted to them and read every word that everyone sends to each of them.

And they often end up in two or three (by) dialogues rather than wider group discussions.

Those of us like me who are on far, far, far too many lists often have a problem with the delving into. And, you know, you put it on the to-do list and then it doesn't get done. So perhaps a digested form - we meet regularly enough perhaps, you know, something that just is a - is one of the little squares in our Adobe Connect room; these pages have been updated, you know, so far or these are new pages you might want to watch them.

And just have them as a little node in the Adobe Connect room so those of us who want to utilize the wiki, you know, don't let it fall through the cracks.

Avri Doria: Another thing that I can add - and then I'll put my hand down - is that, you know, try to remember and suggest it to other people that if you're putting in a new document that's never been there before put something in caps in the subject line that says new document.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes, just...

Avri Doria: Just so people know to pay attention to that one as opposed to...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly.

Avri Doria: ...that it's just my normal blather and they can ignore it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We don't ignore you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Yes, I do agree. So we need to as both the wiki and the email, email more maybe for notification and also have some interaction. But for better tracking I think the wiki is most appropriate space for that. And also we

have now subgroups so they can work in there part of the document. And then after the script team will try to compile all this and also the comments.

I think we do have quite - three people in the queue so we have Alan then Carlton and then Dev. Alan please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, yes I was just going to follow onto what Cheryl was saying. You know, unfortunately the alerts from confluence that a page has been changed can also get to the point of - I'll look at them later in the to-do list and you don't get to them.

If anyone has any influence over the IT people or confluence it would be really nice if there was a watch this page and all children function.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: That would make life a lot easier. You still get the emails but at least you don't - you're not in a position where you forgot to say watch a page. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I wonder if - Cheryl for the record - I wonder if we could ask someone to talk to IT about that because it would not only be useful for - so this work group but for many others.

Alan Greenberg: Well, you know, we could put it for the whole GNSO or ALAC page and then you know you're not missing something. But I've mentioned it at least once and maybe it's worthy of mentioning again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

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

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Rafik. I just want to add something here. From the start we made the request that if you have anything substantive to say about a post put it on the wiki. Although it's good to have it in the list because the lists can get long and the conversations can get convoluted and the threading might be missing if you put it on the wiki it's a much more permanent spot.

And, yes, there is not everything that we need on it, the suggestion from Alan is appropriate at this stage to mention. But I think - and we've said from Day 1 let us use the wiki to make any substantive comments because that's a much more permanent spot where others can go and see it.

Yes it's not the best wiki in the world to navigate but I think if we start there we will get somewhere. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Carlton. I think we have Dev and I think about 20 minutes on this call and still two other items so...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: ...no, Dev, it's okay, please go ahead.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, okay Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Just to echo what Alan says I think maybe there is a setting for watching all the child pages if so I'll gladly share that information. I'll also see whether maybe a (assess) feed can be created and make it a easy sharable link so that everybody could then read it and I'll see what I can do in that regard. That's it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Dev.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Dev. Carlton do you want to comment or...

Carlton Samuels: No I'm done, thanks - thank you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So Eric please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Rafik. In responding to the co-chair - Carlton's statement that we've said from the beginning if you want something put it on the wiki. This deprecates the use of the mailing list as a communications of record for this working group. I don't think that's the appropriate choice to make.

The mailing list is archived publicly; the wiki is available publicly but it is also subject to edit whereas the mailing list remains the static record of our activity. So that's my entire point. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Eric, let me respond quickly. No it was not an either/or statement it was both statements. Let me repeat it again: I said both. It is nice to have it on the mailing list but if it's a substantive comment please add it to the wiki. That's what I've said and the record will show many weeks I've always said that. So it's not a one or it's both. Thank you.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I correct one thing? The wiki is also a permanent record because every change is recorded by who made and when. You can go back to all changes so it is as permanent a record as an email archive. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you, Avri. Any other comments about the - okay Eric, you want to reply?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. This addresses the subject of the access of edit - the edit history to the public users. I'm not sure that the edit history is accessible to the public users. So on the narrow question of transparency of process...

((Crosstalk))

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...presents maybe equivalent to what the mailing list presents but it's something I don't know for sure and I'm - I don't know if Avri knows that the public has access to the edit history as well. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: So...

Avri Doria: I believe so but I'd have to confirm it; I'd have to do trial and error to make sure but I believe so.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you. So I guess it's time to move to the next item. I don't think that we have any further comment on that. But just okay I think we have some consensus that we need to use both the wiki and the mailing list. I don't think that the wiki is really appropriate space to track discussion comments and to that to have the useful outcome that can lead us to have the report at the end.

So for the third item - yes, third item. Carlton can you lead this because we - Elaine is not here on the call.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, Rafik. Most of you would have seen the list - what Elaine was looking at; she was looking at in kind contributions. It's Subgroup 3 on the wiki, In kind Services it's called. And if you look at it she had it broken down under two heading: capacity building, services. And she specifically address a few components that she think would be useful for that.

And resources that might be required to help registries set up and these includes things like software, licensing specifically for registry software functions, consultations, enable them to get moving, operational concentration and so on.

And then she also went into the question of the IPv6 issue. She juxtaposed the GAC recommendation that the IPv6 requirement be relaxed or eliminated for needs assessed applicants. And it raises a question as to whether or not

this was something that should not be allowed but they should find a way - we should find a way as part of the support structure to allow these needs assessed applicants to be able to implement IPv6 from the start.

And she made some suggestions there requesting additional work. If you look at the questions she asked - and this again you will have to see from the email list on - if you look at her email she sent out on the 8th of June she wanted to ask the group to make some specific recommendations.

She wanted to ensure that we define all possible types of assistance that might be required. She wanted to ensure whether or not we would look at how we would chart a single coordinator to manage the request for assistance. And she wanted to know what we thought of the skills of this coordinator that would be required.

So as I look at what she has offered the gaps that are left to be filled at least in her - in her estimation is that she wants to be sure that all possible types of assistance that might be requested somehow advocated for or our document ensure that they are covered. She wanted to ask the group to see if we could define the coordination and management framework for these assistance. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Carlton. I think we have Avri in the queue. Avri. Okay I think maybe she's trying to unmute. Avri.

Avri Doria: Sorry I was - yes I started talking but I was mute. Okay on the IPv6 I understand that the GAC has asked for that to be excused. I tend to think that here we're running up against an article of faith in ICANN that would be almost impossible to get waived because the ASO and ICANN Board have decided that it's a policy imperative that IPv6 be included notwithstanding any opinions I may have about the validity of that being the policy I believe it is.

What I tried to suggest - and I wrote a little note in one of the sub trees, you know, the covert and hidden sub trees about v6 suggesting that there might be a two-part solution. One is to get the IS, ASO and various ISPs to basically put together a - I'm not sure what the right word - program is the wrong word - but a guarantee that they will through their efforts provide not only the IPv6 addresses but through the cooperation with the ISPs in the region will guarantee a tunnel to any JAS-qualified applicant.

And that that guarantee would be something that would be - and this the second part - that ICANN would have to accept that that guarantee from this, you know, board, group, committee of ASO and ISPs would be sufficient given that there would be yet another year to work out the details of exactly how. But that that would be a sufficient thing for anybody doing the application.

So it's somewhere between waiving the need to have IPv6 access now to finding a way for an applicant to answer that question in a positive way that ICANN will accept. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Avri. We have Eric and Alan in the queue. Please do go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: No thank you, Rafik. Go to the next person.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, as you like. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I just put it in the chat what Avri just described was already in Milestone 2 so unless someone is objecting to it hopefully it will be in the, you know, flushed out more in our final report.

Avri Doria: Yes, I thought I was just flushing it out I didn't think I was...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, no, no, I'm just pointing out to the group it's already something that we had de facto decided on that was brought up originally by Eric I believe.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you.

Carlton Samuels: By the way just for FYI Elaine had put together a spreadsheet in which she has attempted to group possible types of assistance. It might be useful for the group to look at the - this spreadsheet because you could - I believe you could add here very quickly any kind of additional wording or additional (unintelligible) systems that you think might be necessary here. I would suggest to you that this spreadsheet because it's available. It might be useful to just add something to it if you have something to add. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: ...the spreadsheet. I'm going to put it in the chat.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it already is.

Carlton Samuels: Okay great.

Alan Greenberg: About halfway down.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, it's in the agenda not the chat.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, in the agenda. It's in the agenda.

Rafik Dammak: Okay is it present in the wiki? Yes, it's in the wiki but...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: And it's also in the agenda on the - on the Adobe Connect.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so I don't think that we have further comment here. I don't see anybody in the queue. And we have the last five minutes about the fourth item so maybe we can move to the - that item. Okay there is no objection.

So it's about the in kind service for sustaining needs assist in gTLD operation. And I have Eric and Avri so who wants to start? Avri.

((Crosstalk))

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...communicated to us prior to the call so we had no means of knowing that there was - that we were on the agenda.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, Eric, I couldn't hear you, what? Can you please repeat?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, Chair, the notice to the discussion leaders was not communicated prior to the call that this item was on the call so we had no prior means of communication or awareness that this was an agenda item. May I suggest that this not be referred to as an in kind service as that term has been used in the past and I believe it's used correctly for the services that existing providers may offer in lieu of money to applicants or in lieu of money to the - a foundation intending to support applicants.

The suggestion of a RFP is a suggestion of how to allocate some of the foundation money or the seed money plus subsequent monies to some specific form so assistance that's common to two or more applicants. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Eric. We have Carlton and Avri. Carlton, please go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. Just for the record Eric said that the discussions were not aware of it; that is factually incorrect. That actually is not the case. I prepared the agenda myself; it came from my own intuit. I put it on a special mail on Sunday to Eric. Eric responded in saying that he was not ready to discuss it.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Carlton, that was registrars not registries. Get a grip, man.

Carlton Samuels: I made the point that this was a conversation that was happening on the list and Avri and Eric were the main discussants. I thought it was best that for the same reason that Eric just pointed out that it be brought into the main discussion because I think it was - it needed the discrete airing because there might have been instances where it could be confused. That was the reason. And I pointed out to him that was all that was required here for the five minutes to ensure that people understand what it was about. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Carlton. Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi.

Rafik Dammak: Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Can I be heard? Am I mute?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Speak up a little, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay great. I just wanted to make two points: one, again, I have got a, you know, a basic set of paragraphs on some of this for people to read comment on. I think I agree with Eric in part that this isn't just in kind but I disagree in that I believe part of it is in kind.

To a certain extent, yes, this is one of the allocations to which money could be made whether as Eric was suggesting two of the applicants wanted to get together to do something and it was a grant to them or whether deciding to set up the service was done by a funded third party from these monies is an open question for applicants and the funding group.

Some of it, though, and I think Eric even mentioned some of this in his email in response to Carlton such as licensing for software or even, you know, donation of the kit for one of the registry in a box type outfit are indeed possible, you know, contributions in kind. So I think this is really - could well be a hybrid entity that takes from both categories. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Avri. And, anyhow - Carlton, do you want to comment or you're - okay. Eric, please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Rafik. Carlton was confused in responding about a registrar item on the agenda versus a registry function on the agenda. So he was factually incorrect although it doesn't give me any pleasure to say that.

I think we should actually discuss this on the mailing list or the wiki because there are substantive issues that are more important than whether or not there was notice given to the leaders of the call. And that's all I have at the moment. Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: So, Eric, do you want to comment or your hand is still up? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So I don't think that we have any further comments about this. We have three minutes providing that's - for this call. So any other business? Okay so this call for today is adjourned. Thank you, everybody for joining this call. And see you on the next on in Friday. See you, bye-bye.

Avri Doria: Happy days, you all. Bye-bye.

Carlton Samuels: Bye-bye.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Bye all.

END