

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 01 June 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) 01 June 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-20100601.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

ALAC

Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large
Carlos Aguirre - At Large
Alan Greenberg - ALAC

GNSO

Avri Doria - NCSG
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison
Alex Gakuru - NCSG

Andrew Mack - CBUC?
Tony Harris – ISP
Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachines
Fabien Betremieux - Individual - AFNIC
Baudouin Schombe – NCSG (part of the call)

ICANN staff

Olof Nordling
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery
Karla Valente

Apologies:

Richard Tindal – Individual
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Michele Neylon – RrSG

Coordinator: The recordings have now started, please go ahead.

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

On today's JAS call on Tuesday the 1st of June we have Avri Doria, Evan Leibovitch, Alex Gakuru, Tijani Ben-Jemaa, Rafik Dammak, Sébastien Bachollet, Andrew Mack, Elaine Prius, Baudoin Schombe, Carlos Aguirre, Alan Greenberg.

From staff we have Olof Nordling, Glen de Saint Géry and myself Gisella Gruber-White and Olga Cavalli will be joining us later. I hope I haven't forgotten anyone, we're still trying to dial out to Richard Tindal and Tony Harris is on the call as well, sorry about that.

If I could also please remind everyone to press star 6 and star 6 to unmute if your line is noisy and please state your name when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right first thing on the agenda is an update from ALAC regarding the charter. So, and in the last little while we've now had two votes, one from GNSO, one from ALAC regarding the charter. Carlos, do you have anything to mention regarding the ALAC vote on the charter? Carlos are you there?

Okay. Alan, Sébastien, would somebody who was at the ALAC meeting care to report on the activity regarding the JAS group at the ALAC meeting?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah Evan it's Alan. I didn't, to be honest I'm having a blank out here, but I'm pretty sure we did approve it, but I need to go back and check the records. I don't think we did not approve it so I think we did but...

Sébastien Bachollet: It's Sébastien we approved it and the discussion was about which version we make (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Oh right.

Sébastien Bachollet: But it was very difficult to (unintelligible) on the GNSO what it was sent to us was with four items and in fact it seems, I hope that we finally have a good version with five items.

Do you - Olof did you give this information to (Ivy) that it's the one with five items we are to be taken? But anyway it was approved by ALAC but we need to be sure which one version is the right one.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Now that's coming back, thank you Sébastien. Yes. The one posted on the GNSO Web site and the one posted under the GNSO motions said they approved the one with four. Several people said they approved the one with five and the one posted was wrong, so we have approved the one with four, we need to go back and fix that if indeed the one approved by the GNSO was the one with five sections.

But in concept we've approved it.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof here. And...

Carlos Aquirre: And Olof, Carlos is here.

Olof Nordling: Yes.

Carlos Aquirre: Sorry. I have been in a silence with my phone. I want to give the inform about ALAC but I show that Sébastien and Alan said about that, but the update from ALAC is that the in the last teleconference last week, Thursday we approved unanimously the (shutter) of the past working group us, GNSO

council approved before. So it's a great notice, I think for the working group just is what I want to say about ALAC updates. You understand?

Alan Greenberg: Yes but Olof can you confirm which version the GNSO did approve?

Olof Nordling: Oh they did approve the five objectives version indeed and I also got a confirmation we had an exchange with (unintelligible) so she has confirmed to me that it was approved, so I think we're home free and we do have a charter (unintelligible).

Man: So the one that's on the Adobe Connect screen right now is the current one that has been passed by both GNSO and ALAC now?

Man: Olof has that been changed on the GNSO motions page?

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible).

Man: As of the meeting last week it was still showing the one with four sections.

Olof Nordling: Oh. Well all right, that has to be then rectified. I'll talk to Glen about that and we'll see that, resolve that. But it was indeed the case that, and I did specifically read out the objective to verbatim at the GNSO council meeting to make it perfectly clear. So they have, it's on record. So we should, if that's the case we'll sort that out.

Man: Okay.

Olof Nordling: I'll take that as an action point.

Man: So if necessary the ALAC will go back and amend but I think we need to presume that it was approved at this point if we need, have some housekeeping to do we will do that.

Olof Nordling: Right. And I also take that an action point on the wiki to change the draft chapter to chapter. That's an easy change.

Man: Yes. Sorry the version sent by me for Rafik was the version with four objectives. And in the wiki the version is with five objectives. ALAC approved the version sent by me by Rafik.

Man: That's right. And therefore we may need to go back and fix that. But that, I don't think this work group should worry about that at this point.

Man: Oh okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I, have we beaten that to death yet.

Man: I hope so.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So I think we can move on to the next one and so with that, so like I say what that means is that the one that is currently on display in the Adobe Connect room is the one that has appeared to have been passed by all sides.

Okay. Next on the agenda moving into work team one, update on developments. There have been some lively e-mail discussions over the last little while on some of the issues regarding the cost recovery and it seems like it is a good opportunity here to try and continue these because, I mean if we can get some general agreement we may actually have some, we may have some consensus here.

On the issue of cost recovery -- this is something that Richard started and that Tony and others have been discussing -- there is the issue of whether or not we would recommend that the "sunk costs" perhaps be waived for needy applicants.

And while on one hand it is, I think the term that was used in the e-mail is that it's a nuanced approach to cost recovery, and the idea being that the sunk cost perhaps, you know, some of the new applicants, especially the needier ones shouldn't have to pay financially for it every time ICANN decides it wants to do a new study or create another IRT group that has to be knocked out and built up again.

Anyway, Richard do you want to start the ball rolling with it? Richard?

Man: Is Richard on the call? He's not on Adobe Connect and last I heard they were still calling out to him.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tony would you like to start the ball rolling with that?

Tony Harris: Well actually I'm catching up on these e-mails. I only just got into the office, I had no access since yesterday evening so I'm rapidly trying to read the different comments. Is anybody else on the call who submitted a comment who'd like to say something meanwhile?

Man: Elaine you've been involved with it.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: And to Tijani.

Tony Harris: Yes. And perhaps I'd like to say something while I am trying to read quickly through what they said.

Man: Well Tijani's got his hand up so while you're reading, Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes. Okay. Thank you. So I commented on the Tony input saying that the Resolution 20 talked about the application cost and the ongoing costs. So we have, we are not obliged to consider the whole program cost so I think that the risk cost and the development cost wouldn't be considered for us.

Man: So you're suggesting to Tijani that this be something that is waived for needy applicants or for all applicants?

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: At least for our applicants.

Man: Okay.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Since the Resolution 20 is for those applicants.

Man: Okay.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Understand?

Man: Yes.

Man: So basically, I'm sorry to...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: ...jump in.

Man: (Unintelligible) by what you just said.

Evan Leibovitch: Hold on. I hear Olof and Alan's got his hand up and I heard one other voice.

Tony Harris: This is Tony. Could I just respond to what Tijani said?

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Tony Harris: It's very short. I agree with what he said and just to make it very brief, in the comment I sent up that would be the first option.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Tony Harris: The development costs and the risk cost.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Tony Harris: Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Alan you've got your hand up, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah I would not agree with the wording that Tijani used on two counts. Number one, the way that the application costs and recovery of costs has been described in the various documents the recovery of the fund cost is part of the application overall cost of the application processing.

So I would not say it doesn't apply because the board resolution omitted it. I believe the board resolution, the implication was, and we can certainly check on whether that was the meaning, but the implication was that the 185,000 stays. I think we have a strong case for why ICANN should waive the sum costs in this case, just like you know, I have a copy of some software on my desk from a private company that gives, has an educational and non-profit price, which is very much below the regular commercial price.

So I think we have a good argument for that but saying it doesn't count, it didn't count in the board resolution I believe, and we can perhaps check that with staff interpretation, that was not meant to it. In terms of the risk costs despite the name risk it is not a description of risks associated with particular applications but trying to put a measure on the costs which could not be determined through traditional cost analysis methodology.

And calling it the risk cost I think gives us a false sense of security. It is part of the cost that they are expecting to pay averaged over all of the applications and if we were asking that to be reduced I think we need a good argument not just saying it's risk that doesn't apply because that isn't how they did the calculation.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So Alan, just to follow this up a little more, so this is the, so you're agreeing that we should ask to waive it but that we shouldn't ask for it simply on the grounds that there is less risk, there might be other rationale behind asking to waive it. But simply asking, saying okay, it's a risk fund and there's less risk probably won't fly.

Alan Greenberg: No. Because even if that was 100% true they still averaged all of the, all of them and therefore lowering one group's cost increases the other based on the cost recovery model. Whereas the sum cost comes out of a different part of the pot, which is why I suggested it in the first place.

Evan Leibovitch: So Alan are you suggesting that we not ask for a reduction of the quote, I'll call it "risk costs?"

Alan Greenberg: Well I can't come up with a good rationale why we're in a strong position to do that, at least not until we have the definitive list of the, you know the qualifications of the groups we're looking at where maybe we can craft some sort of wording. I'm not saying we don't ask for it, I just don't know what the right words are and I don't think the ones that have been used just presuming it is a, the costs associated with high risk applications is going to sway a lot of people.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so...

Alan Greenberg: Since we're only likely to, we're only likely to have one kick at this can we need to have the argument strong.

Evan Leibovitch: So is it mainly an issue of (unintelligible).

Man: Can I get in queue (unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. I've got Andrew in the queue and Alan you want...

Alan Greenberg: No my hand, that's it. Sorry I'll put my hand down.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Tijani are you in with something new or can...?

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes. Yes Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Can I let Andrew speak first since he hasn't gone yet?

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: So Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Sure. Thank you. Can you guys hear me?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Yep.

Andrew Mack: Okay. So the last speaker was Alan right?

Alan Greenberg: Correct.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Okay Alan, so what I'm hearing you say is that the risk cost is effectively insurance, right?

Alan Greenberg: No.

Andrew Mack: And, because that's the way it sounded when you were describing it.

Alan Greenberg: No it is not. It is the result of a rather complex mathematical calculation including probability studies and to try to put a price on the things that they do not have a good handle on. One of the largest aspects for instance, was the total number of applications. The calculations were all based on a calculation of 500.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: But they might get 200, in which case some of the fixed costs have to be split over fewer users, over fewer applications. And there are other things where they simply did not have enough information in the cost of outside consulting in some of the cases that they had to use probability to try to determine what it might be based on the distributions that they could, that they could estimate.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: It's not pure risk it's risk, it's a risk in doing the calculation properly.

Andrew Mack: Well that's a fascinating, fascinatingly gymnastic answer. I'm impressed with what they've done but it still sounds like insurance to me, it's insurance, basically it's a downside risk insurance that says if there are fewer applications we're going to have a reserve that will allow us to make sure that this process pays for itself, right?

Alan Greenberg: Well but as I read the document, and it's there for anyone to read, it includes components of that, but it also for instance, they could have said that X part of the process is going to cost us \$1 million and then we have a risk on top of

that of an extra half million. I believe what they did is put the one and a half million in there.

Andrew Mack: But if lumped together...

Alan Greenberg: So it's the whole things that included risk.

Andrew Mack: Okay. So I guess (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: That's how I understand it, that's just my reading.

Andrew Mack: No. I'm asking to try, you clearly have spent some time wrestling with it. What I'm trying to do is to figure out I agree with what you're saying in that it's going to be difficult to just wipe that risk calculation away, the way that we might be able to address it is to go and say well this risk pool was actually based around two or three different calculations, which have all been bunched together.

And perhaps it's possible for needy applicants to get, to waive out of or to step up into a, some part of that without necessarily needing to go from the entire thing, that's all I was trying to get at.

Alan Greenberg: That might be a stronger argument than the original one.

Andrew Mack: I think just as much as I would like to say that we would, as much as I would like to say that we should find a way for needy applicants to just walk away from this, I think that will be a hard sell within the community. And so maybe if we can thin slice it a little bit that would be one suggestion.

As far as the development costs, the sunk costs, I think that, I think that that's an easier argument to make, in part because the sunk costs are I think you can make the argument that some of the sunk costs are related to things that would not be touching the communities that we're trying to support. So I don't

know if people agree with that, but it strikes me that that is a much easier argument to make, a much more coherent one.

Alan Greenberg: Well it's an argument, and just one more thing, it's an argument which ICANN is making on a regular basis this year the financial situation is not as good as we'd hoped, how we're covering at least part of it is, we're not going to put as much in the reserve as we planned. I mean it's a regular event to cover financial issues.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay is this an issue, from what I'm gathering from the discussion between the two of you this is an issue that might be one of wordsmithing or is it deeper than that?

Alan Greenberg: At, well at the very least it is.

Andrew Mack: I guess Evan I think there's a substantive piece which is that you can make an argument for, that you can make an argument that needy applicants wouldn't need to, shouldn't be responsible for some costs. But because of the nature of those applications there is some risk associated with them and as a result I think it would be harder to pass through, I'm just trying to think about what's practical.

It would be harder to make the argument that they shouldn't have some, that some sort of risk calculation shouldn't be included in their applications, make sense? So I would be dividing up those two and then even within the risk calculations maybe since they were all from what I understand, placed in one basket, maybe there's a way to subdivide that basket to get us away from risks that wouldn't necessarily hit our communities.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So maybe perhaps an answer is to go offline after this call and have you know, people on the (WT1) group sort of but heads and try and figure out some wording and some ways to slice and dice this that might make it more acceptable.

Tijani you've been extremely patient. Go ahead.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes. Thank you Evan. I, it was possible for me to reply to the disagreement of Alan when he was talking, but the rule for me is to raise hand first and the chair give the floor. Thank you Alan. Thank you Evan.

So I wanted to say that we have a text that is the revision 20 and I don't think that it is normal to say perhaps they don't mean that, perhaps they mean that. If the whole group here think that the meaning of this resolution is not only the application fees and only the ongoing fees, the ongoing costs, we have to ask the board itself, it's possible.

But I think that we need to interpret the text not without a lot of suspicion if you want. We have to interpret it normally and it's written clearly, I think. So - but once more if the whole group here think that it is not clear and we need more clarification we need to write to the board itself. I don't think that we have to be afraid to do proposition, we are asked from the board to propose how we can make support.

So if we are really afraid, and perhaps it is not (to this), no - we read what is written, we try to understand and we try to work according to this text.

Evan Leibovitch: Do we have, Tijani do we have the luxury of time of being able to go back to the board and ask for clarification? I mean we're under a bit of a time crunch and I can imagine that the back and forth of going back for clarification through the board may be a significant delay here. Do we have that luxury of time?

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Evan I will answer this question. I have written what I said now I think one week ago or perhaps more. If people who think that it is not, it is not the meaning of the resolution I think they had to tell it in this time so that we have time to consult with the board.

Now at the last time if we, if we come back and say no, it's not the meaning, perhaps it's not the meaning, I don't know we will be blocked.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. We've got a queue forming. Elaine and then I've got Alan but Alan are you addressing this issue?

Tony Harris: I was in the queue, Tony Harris.

Man: Tony.

Tony Harris: Hello?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah I'm still here. Evan I was going to address what Tijani was saying but Tony should go first I would guess.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay (unintelligible).

Woman: Yeah, somebody should cut that line out.

Man: There's a busy tone on, oh okay.

Man: Okay good.

Tony Harris: Should I go? This is Tony.

Evan Leibovitch: So going back to the queue okay. Elaine were, you're first in the queue, do you, are you addressing this issue?

Elaine Prius: Yes. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Elaine Prius: Well, I was reviewing the new (unintelligible) by ICANN yesterday starting with draft applicant guide book and the cost. So what I'm hearing in this discussion is that we're looking at two different sort of (unintelligible) that we might be able to request be waived for our applicant's which are resulting in some costs at 25k and then risk agencies which are about 60,000 per applicant.

And so what I see in this document that (unintelligible) budget 28th of May '10 PDF it says that they're expecting Round 1 will take 18 months to complete and then Round 2 expected to open 12 months after.

So I'm wondering if anybody has an idea if these development and sunk costs will only apply to Round 1 applicants and if we need to consider that our applicants might be benefiting from the Round 2 applications (unintelligible) minus 25k?

Evan Leibovitch: So you're saying as a consequence of coming in at the lower price that perhaps some of the needy applicants should wait for the next round?

Elaine Prius: Well I think that's sort of, yeah the obvious logic in what's being published here, but I don't know if these development costs are going to be spread over Round 1, Round 2, Round 3. Does anybody have an indication of that or all of these development costs being recovered in the first round?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah I can answer that when I get, when I get up Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Well you're next Alan, so Elaine do you have anything more? Is there...?

Elaine Prius: No. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Alan you're next queue (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: The intent was that the known cost at the time the fee was developed were totally to be, were to be totally absorbed by the first round therefore if, and there's a risk, what we're calling the risk which I like to call just the fuzzy part of the calculation would cover, would to some extent cover that if it was an incorrect estimate.

However, since the costs have increased radically since there, since that calculation was done we spent another year and a half that we weren't forecasting would be spent. I suspect at Round 2 they will add yet another part of sunk costs in which they haven't forecast at the first go around, so waiting for the second round may not be the guaranty because of that, even though the intent was to sink the costs they may not all have been covered and there may be more added.

In terms of consulting the board on the vertical integration thing the motion of the board was even fuzzier. And the vertical integration group did ask the board after the board finally met and the board only meets once a month the next time they meet is in Brussels at the end of the meeting, they came back and said we're not telling you anymore.

And finally yesterday the staff interpretation of it came out in (DAG-4) and for instance it interpreted zero ownership across ownership to be 2% or less than 2%. So I think it is fair to ask staff what the interpretation is, we may get a quicker answer than that asking the board will take at least to the end of Brussels.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: And probably we'll get back an answer saying we said what we said.

Evan Leibovitch: But Alan it's not, I mean obviously staff has been interpreting things but I mean will it have a much harder time challenging something that the board made explicit than something that the staff guessed at.

Alan Greenberg: I think in the terms of the sunk costs we just assume that this is something we can argue for and not ask for an interpretation ahead of asking. And the same for the fuzzy costs, for the you know the risk or the fuzzy costs but I just want to make sure that our argument is strong so it doesn't get rejected out of hand.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I've got Avri next even though her hand's been lowered in the Adobe Connect. We're getting onto more than half way into the call.

Avri Doria: Did you have Tony?

Man: Wasn't Tony on the call?

Avri Doria: Did you have Tony Harris before me?

Evan Leibovitch: I only, well he's not in the Adobe Connect. Tony are you on the call?

Tony Harris: Well yes actually but I'm quite happy to wait until Avri's finished.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tony Harris: Thank you Avri.

Evan Leibovitch: Avri you go, then Tony then hand things off over to (WT2).

Avri Doria: Okay. First off I'm not sure that we need to rush to (WT2) on this. We need to sort of get some resolution here. I think Alan's right in terms of going to the board for the confirmation. I think at this point that doesn't make sense.

So but, sorry a machine went on beside me so I moved. I think what we really need to think about is putting together a proposal to the best of our

understanding of what we want to propose to them. I think that this can be a sketchy one.

I think part of this comes back in the ending talk of what we're you know, we have on this is you know, what we're going to talk about in Brussels because if we have sketchy idea of a proposal it can be discussed there. We can then get board feedback as one often does in the sort of informal board sense, and so you know, that can happen.

I think we do need to make a decision here is we often have notions coming up of well, you know, they can wait until the second round and in terms of many of the things that we might propose I think yeah, waiting until the second round will be it certainly, you know, any sort of fund raising and helping those things. So there'll be two things, some of those may be second round, but I don't think that we want to necessarily jump at the notion of (W2), I mean of Round 2.

And then the other thing I wanted to ask is has anyone explored the notion of whether it's appropriate when speaking about aiding people in development areas to have them paying sort of the sunken costs of a process that A, they haven't necessarily been totally part of and don't have major inclusion and just beginning to have inclusion in.

And B, those sunk costs are sort of an, a notion of an incumbent cost of this massive organization that we're talking about a development need to get them into, is it appropriate, and it's just a question I'm asking. Is that something that, you know, somehow seems wrong to ask people in development regions to pay for the expenses of an ICANN sunken cost, so that was all I wanted to ask, thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: So just to follow-up from that Avri, I'd like to try and explore what Elaine was saying and what you followed up on and saying well, if the ICANN assumption is that the sunken costs are going to be recovered by this round

then can we perhaps work under the assumption that if we ask for some of these to go under a subsequent round providing ICANN doesn't take forever to get to that subsequent round, that those sunken costs will be covered off and no longer an issue in the fees for a subsequent round. I mean what does everyone think about that?

Yeah. Alan made the point that something in Adobe Connect, that something caused as we knew them when the fee was determined.

Alan Greenberg: As they knew them.

Evan Leibovitch: It could even go higher if we're, if we continue to drag this out. Oh sorry, Tony go ahead.

Tony Harris: That's okay. I think you were trying to sum this up very well. Just a couple of things though that I heard on previous comments. I'm not uncomfortable with using the term risk cost because actually they, ICANN uses it in the document, they define it as risk cost.

The second thing is if you look at the definition risk costs means uncertain costs and costs that are harder to predict or risks including an anticipated cost such as variations between estimates and actual costs incurred.

Well that's a very elegant waffle but I mean the development costs are not so much them but the evaluation component of the fee, which is close to \$100,000 in my opinion is generously padded to address any, you know any shortcoming which the risk cost is supposed to be doing.

And secondly, if I recall correctly the consulting entity that recommended this \$60,000 fee worked out in the average was, unless I missed the call, an insurance specialist. So it does seem to have been devised by, with the concept of an insurance environment, okay.

I would also like to congratulate Alex Gakuru on his submission where he says I believe we should make all the recommendations that the working group feels would be beneficial for the target applicants and then leave the board to adopt or reject as per their best judgment.

I do feel, with all due respect, that we are exhibiting an awful lot of concern of what ICANN may think about what we will say and we're also worried about will they have enough money. And I mean that baffles me, the, what the application fee costs, I mean that should set anybody's mind at ease about ICANN being short of money, but well that's just my opinion on this.

And I do think that Tijani's point should be included, there's no time to go to the board obviously, and if this interpretation is not what the board intended, well what will happen, they'll tell us we didn't mean that. It's as easy as that really. Well that's what I have so far.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. That probably will need some expansion into e-mail, I mean considering we have less than 20 minutes left in this call, no sorry, this is a 90-minute call. Oh sorry. So we've got more time to expand on this. Is this something that perhaps we can get a little bit more specific on? I mean I think I agree with you that trying to read the board's mind is probably problematic and that we should try and not assume what the board was thinking and that we got a mandate.

I have Andrew's hand up first and then Tijani and then Alan. Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Yes. I wanted to go back to what Avri said, I think that the point that she brings up is a very good one, which is to say that an awful lot of the, that were I an applicant from an underserved part of the world I frankly wouldn't feel that it was appropriate for me to be paying for the costs that really had very little if anything to do with me.

And I think that that's an argument that we're going to hear and I think it's an argument that will reflect what is basic fairness in my mind.

One of the questions that I had was about this sense of timing. Are we assuming that everything that we do will affect only the second round or some sort of a second round? If that's the case that gives us a slightly larger amount of room to work, but we've got to be careful because I can see it just as easily happening where they go after the first round and for whatever reason it doesn't go as they expect.

And then they come back and say oh no our sum costs are bigger or oh no I've got more, you know, we've got more risk expenses than we had expected and the applicants in the second part of it may actually have a harder time. So I think it's very, very important that we put down some sort of rule that says regardless of what happens in the first round here's what we're expecting in the second round. Does that make sense everyone?

Evan Leibovitch: My only concern with that, and Andrew what is your consideration about the time it's going to take to get to a second round?

Andrew Mack: You know I don't have a clear sense of that. I'd love to get other people's thoughts. And whether a second round will be clearly demarcated from the first round or whether this will become more of a kind of an ongoing process I don't know that either.

What I am concerned about is that we don't want to kick the can too far down the road. Because, you know I mean for example the related to this idea of trying to find funding I can see it very easily being a situation where we say yes, we've come up with a good solution and now great, we'll form a committee and go off and try and find funding, which might or might not ever happen.

And I think that would kind of march away from what we're trying to do. I think we want to keep it as simple as possible and keep this process integrated into the broader process.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tijani and then Alan. Tijani go.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Yes thank you Evan. I support 100% what Tony said and I think that we have to make recommendations regardless what will be accepted and what will be rejected.

Second point, we don't have to think about the second round because the second round has other circumstances and we don't know what will happen till there. So what we are doing now is for this round not for the second round.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right so everything we're talking about is immediate and then what happens in the second round gets discussed in the second round. Okay. All right Alan I have you next.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Evan Leibovitch: And since I don't have the ability could anyone who's raised their hand in Adobe Connect please lower it when they're done because I don't have the ability to do that right now. Alan you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Okay several things. In terms of the timing we just heard that they're expecting the first round to take a year and a half to process and then a delay of about a year before the second round. Therefore we will have lots of time to have this discussion regarding the second round based on real facts that we understand from the first round, so I would not worry about the second round at this point.

It's going to be a different game, there may well be some landfall profits or windfall profits because of auctions that we'll know about by then, it's a very

different world we're looking at so I wouldn't agonize at this point about the details.

In terms of when will the rounds be and will they be rounds or a steady state, ICANN has ongoing basis said that they will batch applicants, that the process is too expensive to do one by one as they dribble in. And there's always the potential for competition between them so they will be in batches or rounds presumably on an ongoing steady state basis after that, but there always will be rounds, at least that's what the intent was so far.

In terms of reading the board's mind, I don't want my expressions, my wording to be misunderstood. I'm not saying read their minds and therefore don't ask for what they didn't mean. We want to ask for everything we think is potentially viable but by reading their minds and trying to figure out what they meant we can craft our arguments to try to convince them to do something different than they may have originally meant.

So it's not a matter of whether we ask for something or not but it's how we craft the arguments.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Is that all Alan, any more?

Alan Greenberg: No that's it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I want to go back to Elaine since you mentioned the, you were the first one to mention the idea of punting certain things or considering certain things for a second round. What's your take on the response you've heard?

Elaine Prius: Yeah my concern about asking for the sunk costs to be waived for our applicants in the first round is that if ICANN is planning on not recovering any sunk costs in the second round, it could easily come back with (unintelligible) applicants need to go in this first round. Why don't they wait until second

round when we know that things will be less expensive because we don't have these costs to recover?

So I'm just trying to follow that line of thinking, and actually I think we should answer that question like why are applicants (unintelligible).

Tony Harris: Can I get in queue, I'm not in Adobe, Tony Harris.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead. Actually Elaine more to add or? Elaine do you have more to add or?

Elaine Prius: No that's all.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Go ahead Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes. I just wanted to say if you think about a second round, I mean at the end of the day the distance between the last round of TLDs which was in 2004, and perhaps the new round, I'm saying perhaps because we have no idea if it will be next year or not, is by my count if it's next year will be seven years, I wouldn't be surprised if we have more overarching issues that come out of the process of the initial round which will then, which may well then push a second round into, well who knows how many years up the road.

And that would not necessarily mean that the second round would be cheaper. Anything could happen, I mean you could have 50 applications instead of 500 and then ICANN would really be in financial problems. So I think it's a little risky to make any plans on a second round because we have no idea what might happen.

Evan Leibovitch: That echoes what Alan has said in the Adobe chat area where he said that we can't assume that the (sunken) costs (unintelligible). Okay we've got somebody with a very noisy line. I was just mentioning Alan has said in Adobe connect we can't assume that the sunk costs in Round 2 will be gone

or even less than we have now. So I think we, you're right that we can't make that assumption.

I have Avri in the queue and then Sébastien. Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Yeah. Just two quick points, I think that the board's motion and I know I said things were obvious in the (VI one) and I'm going to say that again here. I think, and I'm sorry I'm the one that's in a noisy place, I think the board's notion talks, the board's motion talks about the current gTLD program and wanting it to be fair. So I think to sort of say well they meant not this round but the future one would be to mangle the notion of the present and what it means.

The other thing that we have to consider is, and actually we don't necessarily have to consider, but one thing that I look at is in terms of looking at these costs, in terms of looking at the notion of basically covering the cost of the whole application process and the notions of fairness, one of the arguments that perhaps this group can make is an across the board argument that sort of says those sunken costs don't belong in the price.

And individuals have made this claim before and yes they've made it unsuccessfully, but perhaps there is an argument that a, you know, a ACSO working group on this issue can review it and can if it wishes make that argument now. And you know, I'm not suggesting we go as far as the ccTLDs and make it all voluntary whether you pay those sunken costs or not.

However, I think one could make an argument, and then it's not a preferential treatment it's just that by helping the development players and the development applicants one helps everyone, thank you, and we probably should move on after the people that have had their hands up, then we should move on to the (VT2). Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have Sébastien in the queue. Is there anybody else that wants to get into the queue right now speak now or Sébastien has the last word before we go (WT2)? I mean what I like to do is I'd like to see a couple of people at very least Alan and Alex since you guys started things at the beginning about let's go off line and see if we can wordcraft, if we can craft some working about what we want.

So it deals with some of the issues and concerns that you guys had at the very top of this call regarding, you know, the nuances of things and how we can word things in such a way that we're dealing with the board's own rationale. So I would like to take some of that into the mailing list.

Sébastien you have the last word.

Sébastien Bachollet: Okay it was, I forgot to take mute off, sorry. Yeah I wanted to support what Tony say and with the example of this one of TLD with seven years we never know when the second one of this type if it will come and if any second one of this type could come.

It's one of the reason it's so difficult today to explain to people that, what they can do because it may be that it's the last chance to have new gTLD and it's not just a joke what I am saying here.

My other point is that I still feel I don't understand how you, each year I can have a (unintelligible) check and spend money to develop a program and they want to recover these costs. It's like when the new entrants came for the telephony we will have asked each one of them to pay for the land line either by the each state and the, all the teleco on the country.

And I am sorry to repeat that but it's not, it's not a good deal today for all the gTLD projects and specifically for the one we are discussing here. Thank you very much.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. On that note I'll work with staff and Avri afterwards to try and come out with a sort of action plan on how we take this and try and gel it into some wording. In the meantime we got half an hour left in the call and Avri over to you on (WT2).

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And yeah I think and adding the thing there I think what's important for us is to have on both (WT1) and (WT2) a sense of what we're talking about and what we're thinking of proposing that we can talk on Brussels.

Now in terms of what's remaining of the agenda we've got the (WT2) update on developments, (WT2) discussion and then we have scheduling and preparation of a Brussels meeting. And I want to make sure that we allow that we have any other business and I don't know if anybody has any, but I want to make sure we have time for that if it's there.

On (WT2), in terms of following the discussions that were on the mailing list there seemed to be two things covered. And one I'd like to ask Elaine to talk a little bit more about and that the (CCCA) and especially I think it's important to understand what it means in relations to minds and machines and that and how that might be helpful to people.

And then the other thing that was discussed was sort of the size of an applicant as a criteria and I think that that got a fair amount of exercise and wasn't, you know people I think eventually decided it wasn't the size that counted but I'd like to hear from people in that group.

And then I think there starts to be a little bit more discussion about what other criteria one could have but it hasn't been developed yet and there was also a little bit of discussion about, and this mixed with the (CCCA), and I'm sure I'm pronouncing it correctly, initiative that talked about technical assistance and other things like that.

And the other thing I'd like to add to the discussion is anybody that had time to read (DAG V4) does it change anything that we're talking about here.

So I don't see any hands yet, is there someone who perhaps Elaine you could start sort of , just sort of covering the (CCCA) issues and then find out if there are others that want to add to the (WT2) developments discussion first?

Elaine Prius: Sure. So last week we talked about looking at our applicant sharing infrastructure and different resources as a way of minimizing their costs. And I talked about (CCCA) which is the Counselor's Country Code Administrators as a model. (CCCA) has more than 20 (gTLDs), some larger ones that share registry software.

They share, sometimes we share hosting in a secure NOC, Network Operation Center, if their own country like Haiti for instance they don't have a stable uplink to the Internet or they don't have IPD6 technology or whatever might be required.

So there's already a model in place where registries, registry operators are sharing resources and technology, and so I was asked to check with the director of (CCCA) and see if they would consider adding our applicants into their charter. Currently their charter they only serve ccTLD operators and the response from the director was they are happy to help small, not-for-profit, non-commercial applicants directly and treat them as they do the ccTLDs if they're not commercially of interest to minds and machines.

So there's two things there and we need to figure out what small not-for-profit, non-commercial applicants means and we also need to look at what the, what's commercially of interest. Now minds and machines has an exclusive license to use the registry software for the new gTLDs and so you know, at first look that would eliminate our applicants because supposedly they're looking for a new gTLD.

But I think there's some wiggle room having one foot in both worlds at (CCCA) and minds and machines I think we, we can make a space for our applicants in this model. So right now I've written a proposal and it's being discussed internally at minds and machines that we would consider replicating the (CCCA) model for new gTLD applicants that, you know, have met the criteria that was laid out in this working group.

So that's in the process but the other part of that is not only do we need to look at (CCCA) and minds and machines but this is also something that can be done by any other registry operator. If you look at affiliates for instance they use the same technology and hardware for more than one TLD.

So this is something that any operator can do. And so they've asked in another e-mail that we put out a request for providers to let us know if they're interested in supporting our applicants in this way, not only for applicants (unintelligible) writing the application and translating documents interpreting things, building business plans they also need, probably are going to need the technology that meets the very strict requirements that are laid out in the (DAG).

So that's basically what's happened in my e-mail (unintelligible) I'd like some comments on the idea of the proposal that we would through ICANN, (IPAC), (W-SYS) into (ISP) trade groups, ccTLD supporting organizations, anybody else we can think of, basically just publish our charter and list the types of (unintelligible) identified and ask people to do reply to us and let us know if they're interested in what services that we could provide. So I think that's objective (unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Elaine your line is breaking up, I don't know if you know.

Elaine Prius: No. Can you hear me now?

Avri Doria: Yep. And we were getting some cross talk also.

Elaine Prius: Okay. Yeah. So basically I just would like us to discuss the idea of reaching out to potential applicants and potential providers to find out not only what further support that they can identify as what they need but also who is (unintelligible) might be.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I don't see any hands up yet so I would like people to come in with comments. I have one question on minds and machines doing this. To what extent does this, is this a sort of giving back to the community and to what extent is this a bringing people in as customers or I didn't get a notion on how those things were divided and such.

Is this a free program if somebody was with another registry service provider would, that didn't offer this service would minds and machines still be providing this assistance? Just curious.

Elaine Prius: Yeah. So we haven't fully discussed this within minds and machines, it's sort of just, you know, as we're looking at our criteria and who our applicants might be and also at minds and machines talking about whether or not this is of interest to us.

And back in Nairobi we had talked quite a bit about offering this idea that you know, there was a lot of talk about some applicants being excluded from this process because they might not have the technology that that was necessary to get through.

So we were actually at that point ready to make a public statement that we were willing to provide just the technical side of things on a cost recovery basis, which would be outside of our commercial interests, minds and machines is definitely a commercial entity that is for profit.

And it's, you know, it's not in our business model really to give away our services for free, but if we also want to give back to the community and that's

one of the reasons why we are very supportive of (CCCA) is because they've done a fantastic job of doing that.

So it's definitely something that we're talking about. We don't have any sort of defined parameters of who we would help and under what circumstances, I think that needs to come from our working group where we propose to (unintelligible) and then the providers decide whether or not they want to assist and under what circumstances they would provide that assistance.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So in other words we could recommend something like a clearinghouse with the registries to help the, you know the applicants, or anything that occurs to us to suggest. Thank you.

Sébastien you have your hand up.

Sébastien Bachollet: Yes. I wanted to suggest that we need to set up a working group on horizontal integration and that would be, very care about what we do in that area. It's once again not just a joke about vertical integration and horizontal integration, but I am a little bit anxious on what I heard about minds and machines, (CCCA) and (unintelligible) we'll work for the rest of the committee.

On the other hand I think we need to have in mind what is discussed in the vertical integration working group, because one of the ways to have different type of business model and gTLDs is also to have different types of possible providers.

And I know that there is not just (very fine) and (unintelligible) but I am sure that some ccTLD have already offered, will offer or can offer some help in this area. And I would like very much that we, sorry, we not concentrated in one possibility but to see how we can leverage...

Avri Doria: Sébastien, you need to speak up.

Sébastien Bachollet: Yeah I am sorry, I am very far, I will stop now because I am very far in France land and with very little coverage. Thank you. Sorry.

Avri Doria: Okay. No, the points were good just people were having trouble hearing you and that's why I interrupted, I didn't mean to stop you.

Okay. I don't see any other hands up at the moment. Does anybody want to speak? I mean I think that within (WT2), okay I see Andrew. I'll finish my statement and go to Andrew. I think within (WT2) we've got a couple important issues.

I think we have to get some notion of the criteria nailed down and several people have been sort of saying this to me because even from the work that (WT1) is doing, unless we go for a blanket approach we need to know what kind of you know, not that criteria will necessarily give us a number, but it'll give us an idea of what we're dealing with.

And two I think we need to start writing down the bits and pieces of the components of any program. We've talked about technical assistance, we've perhaps talked about financial assistance.

But in that I've noticed A, there's sort of a distaste for going for it, and B, there's a real, on some people's part and B there's a realism part that as part of a first round that one may be a longer shot than it would be for a second round proposal. And of course we've got the criteria.

So Andrew over to you.

Andrew Mack: Sure. Thanks Avri. A couple things to summarize where we are with some of the conversations that we've had that I think were very good. We've identified one, two, three, four, five, six, seven different possible areas of support, fee reduction subsidization, work with infrastructure, (IPV6) compatible hardware networks.

Education around (DNS) implementation, (DNS SEC) implementation, translation of relevant documents, which is an early Stage 1, which a lot of people have mentioned to me, help with writing, getting through the process for the application, another one that people have very strong on.

Awareness and outreach to new potential applicants and then some sort of possible technical waiver or step up such that an applicant might be able to come and rather than having everything, all of their certifications ex ante work into them.

Of those they clearly in my mind fall into two different categories, so one is a category of getting to the plate if you will, or getting to the edge of the pool, the translation, the help with the process and awareness and outreach to new, for new applicants that might be done especially in underserved or historically underserved markets.

So if that's helpful in terms of batching them together, one of the questions that I had is, because we also had this group A and B the, the A group being ethnic and linguistic communities about which we thought there's be relatively little controversy, and then a secondary group being non-profits and others who might make the case that they were underserved.

And I think that the consensus of the conversations that I have had and we have seen is that that A group might be the place for us to start. One of the questions that I have though is about these legal structure or (derivical) structure of the applicants themselves. There is an assumption that a lot of these, if not all of them, will be non-profits. That may or may not be a good assumption.

In my mind I think it may not be an accurate assumption, if only because some of them, you know, it may make more sense from a sustainability

perspective to have things that might start as a non-profit with the thought of morphing into more of a for-profit model depending on pick-up things like that.

So I just wanted to throw those out as kind of a where we are, things that I think that we've pretty much agreed upon but this idea that everybody, that all of the applicants that we would be supporting would be now and forever non-profits, I'm not sure that that's one, that may be worth revisiting. Anyway, some comments from my side.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. I think also on the whole issue of non-profit that that's very context defined in terms of how each country, how each region identifies what its companies and structures are.

What I'd like to ask on this one is you seem to have a very not only a good list of things that are being considered, but also some putting them into sections notions.

Is this something that's written up, is this something that you and the others you've been speaking with are able to write up so that we have sort of the beginnings of a proposal that we could talk through at the next meeting that people could have read, that could be edited?

And when I'm thinking of proposals for both (WT1), and I guess there's already some writing on (WT1), and on (WT2) is then some things, you know we're not submitting them to the meeting because it's too late to do that, but to have something that basically has started to identify what it is that we're looking towards. So is this something that you and others would be able to write up in the next couple days?

Andrew Mack: Avri I apologize, the combination of the long weekend and the little bit of vacation I had hoped to have it done before this meeting. So I will pull this out in the next couple of days with inputs from Carlos and anyone who has, who wants to add and we'll start to get that out there as soon as possible.

Avri Doria: Okay. That'd be fantastic because at the next meeting we can have the two proposals on the table then we actually have something concrete to start, you know, working against and working for.

Does anyone else have a comment on, okay Olof I see your hand, please.

Olof Nordling: Very, very briefly what I've done since the start of this is to actually copy paste, copy paste the e-mails in the various threads. And I've collected them in what I call a scrapbook, Working Team 1 and Working Team 2. So I just wonder would that be helpful to somebody or everybody if I sent it around or would it just muddle the waters? You all have the e-mails, it's nothing new in that but I just tried to you know, pool them together out of Working Team 1 and Working Team 2.

Avri Doria: Okay Olof I see one hand saying yes, I have to say as someone who makes at least half of her living from writing (unintelligible) reports I have to believe that's a useful thing to be doing, so I would certainly appreciate seeing it. I see Alex has a check mark so I think that would be helpful.

I think that the people that are writing up reports can then certainly refer to it if they don't include something in there's we will have a record of it and we can understand why it was included, why it wasn't, etc., so I don't think it would muddy the waters.

I don't think it serves as necessarily the papers that I was looking for, but I think it's certainly a good aid to those who are creating those. And I don't see any big red checks, I've seen a couple more green checks but no red Xs, so please I would say put that out, you know on the mailing list or perhaps even make it a wiki page where people can edit, add comments, what have you.

In other words, we're not quite using the wiki as a living tool quite as much as we could. Does anybody else have anything on this before we move to

discussions of the Brussels meeting? Okay great. So I'm hoping that we have by (WT2), by the next meeting that we have something concrete on the table to start, you know, talking about and changing and such.

I apologize, I'll maybe do, able to do limited, I've been, I'll be traveling all week. Elaine I see your hand.

Elaine Prius: Yeah. Sorry (unintelligible) and basically I would just like to hear the groups response on the proposal to send out and request from potential applicants and providers identifying what sort of services they might need and what they could provide. If that's okay with everyone I could go ahead and work on that, get something ready for us to look at next week and approve for sending out, any objections on that?

Avri Doria: Yeah. I don't see any. Please people put your checks and Xs. I think personally I think it's a great idea to have a draft of something. I think the more people can concrete on the table that we can talk about as long as you're not, you know, terribly tied to it I think it's a great way to help us move forward. Does anyone disagree? I see no strong disagreement, so and I see a couple, okay that would be helpful.

Elaine Prius: Okay (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: So, okay thanks. Okay. Olof, I don't have the schedule in front of me and maybe it's a question to ask Glen or someone else who's on the phone call, what do we have scheduled in terms of sessions in Brussels and once we know that then we can start talking about what we need to prepare, what we're doing with them.

Olof Nordling: If I may start?

Avri Doria: Please.

Olof Nordling: As a public session it's now on the just recently published agenda for the Brussels meeting, it's scheduled from 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. The public session then with this working group on Wednesday and it's in the silver room.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) very appropriate.

Olof Nordling: And the general approach will then be that this would be a panel discussion by working group members and chaired by Evan and Avri, as moderated by, sorry.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes we had discussed asking a board member to be a moderator but then decided that if we could get him to be on the panel as a contributor it would be much more useful. We need to follow-up still on that invitation because I haven't seen it.

So one of the things that I think we would need in this if we're talking about you know, sort of preparing for it is someone from both, or several ones. And that's what we started talking about in terms of panelists, several people from each of the two working teams to be able to give presentations of maybe ideas that are being generated and worked on so that those can basically get (unintelligible) and reviewed.

I'm hoping that - and one of the things we're trying to balance I think on this is how much of it is panel and how much of it is getting contributions, feedback, and more ideas from the people that are sitting in the house as opposed to those that are sitting on the stage.

Olof you still have your hand up, did I interrupt you?

Olof Nordling: Not at all, I'm just (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Go ahead Olof (unintelligible).

Olof Nordling: No I'm lazy getting it down, I should've removed it (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: I understand. Okay. Would anyone else like to comment on this? So...

Man: Is Tony here?

Avri Doria: ...basically what we're looking at is having the panelist of some board, some participants want to make sure that we have some development country participants on the panel, you know, we have development country participants in the group. And basically we just want to sort of err where we are, err the ideas and get give and take on them.

Man: Avri?

Avri Doria: Does that seem like a reasonable to people?

Man: Hello?

Avri Doria: Okay.

Man: Hello?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm hearing Olof.

Avri Doria: In terms of the meeting having talked about that is there anything else to talk about in terms of Brussels? I think one thing there is, okay Andrew I see your hand, one thing I think there is that between Evan and I we will also be reporting to each of ALAC and GNSO.

But that won't be a scheduled meeting, hopefully that'll have a scheduled time slot so that Evan and I know when to show up at each other's meetings or however we end up doing it.

We've also had offers of help from some of the other you know, members of the group that are active in their respective (SOFC) to help us with that.

Okay I've got Andrew and then I've got Alex. Andrew.

Glen de Saint Géry: And Avri then can you put me in please, it's Glen.

Avri Doria: Are you on mute?

Glen de Saint Géry: I'm on mute?

Avri Doria: Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Hello yes can you hear me? Hello?

Avri Doria: Okay while waiting for Andrew, Alex would you like to comment?

Alex Gakuru: Yes I just want - Alex speaking.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) on the call.

Alex Gakuru: I just wanted to inform the group that we have quite a lot of applicants...

Woman: (Unintelligible). Please mute.

Alex Gakuru: Am I disconnected? Am I still on?

Man: Yes you are.

Alex Gakuru: Oh okay thanks. I just wanted to inform the work group that there are a lot of African applicants who are actually collecting their names who would want be applicants, and I think they issue a statement at Brussels.

And so indeed the interest in application for the new gTLDs from Africa is overwhelming, they're quite a large number. And so the work of this work team will definitely impact on what it is that (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay. I have two people with hands up. I think people still hear me, does anyone still hear, I was about to hang up and call back in.

Man: Yes. We can hear but Glen was trying to get in also.

Avri Doria: And I have Andrew and Alex raising their hands.

Woman: Yeah. Avri can you hear us?

Man: Can you hear us Avri?

Olof Nordling: Avri this is Olof.

Man: Avri can't hear us I think.

Man: (Unintelligible). Okay so and we can all hear her but she cannot hear us, is that right?

Woman: Correct.

Man: It would seem so.

Man: Okay.

Alex Gakuru: Have I adequately reported back on my statement?

Man: Alex you were saying that there will be a large number, you believe that there will be a large number of African applicants or potential applicants interested in our session?

Alex Gakuru: Yes and because they're interested in the new gTLDs they're actually collecting names as we speak.

Avri Doria: Okay I can't hear any of you so Evan please take over the call and I will dial back in.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Okay very well. Yes I'm just saying there is a reasonable number of African applicants who are expressing their interest in applying, so definitely the work of our work group will impact on what they're interested in, so we indeed do expect them at Brussels to stick a keen interest on the workshop. Thanks.

Man: Are you specifically referencing the (FOSFA) mentioned in the e-mails or is this something else?

Alex Gakuru: I beg your pardon?

Man: There was mention in some of the e-mails of (FOSFA), the free and open source group from Africa that was interested in this. Is this more than that?

Alex Gakuru: Yeah there's more than that, that is just one of them. There is another group that is actually collecting names. I'm not involved with that but I think that's the one I'm mostly talking about, the bigger group. (FOSFA) I'm quite involved with it, but the other larger group is what I'm mostly mentioning about. But (FOSFA) is only one, there's the other one, they are quite a number.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Alex Gakuru: (Unintelligible) I was not on call, thanks.

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

Andrew Mack: Thank you very much. Alex a suggestion, given that this falls very, very neatly into some of the work of Working Group 2, perhaps we could speak afterwards to talk a little bit, to get, to maybe do a little bit of market testing with these specific groups that you know are interested. Some of the things that we're trying to determine they've got, you know they're a perfect test case so I think that that makes good sense.

I would also - just a word of suggestion, which is that to the extent that we could make it very, very clear as we're trying to do this in Brussels that there is a permanent fixed period of time for our presentation and then a brainstorming session -- I think that Avri mentioned it or suggested it -- I think that's really going to be strong and something that will get people interested.

And my last question is do we know what we are running up against in terms of our timing because I would hate to see us having the same time slot as something where a number of people from our core audience, you know where we might have competition for the same people that we really, really want to reach?

Alex Gakuru: My quick reaction, this is Alex, yes I'd be delighted to take it off line with you and see what we can test case with them. Thanks.

Andrew Mack: Perfect. Thank you.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof, if I just may briefly comment, we have simultaneously as we have our time slot on Wednesday afternoon we have brand management in the age of new gTLDs in the big, the golden room. We have got a CCNSO council meeting, we have an affirmation of commitment meeting and we have

a working group meeting from the GNSO regarding inter (unintelligible) policy.

So it's not as crowded as some other days.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: Avri this is Glen

Avri Doria: Hi Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Hi. If you would like to give the council an update may I suggest Sunday afternoon between five and six because there's an update, working group update to the council at that time.

Avri Doria: That works for me. Is that okay with you Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Yep.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay. So I'll add you in that slot, is that all right?

Avri Doria: Yep. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. We have two minutes left. Sorry for being weird and talking at you while you were all talking. So strange, but anyhow Alan I think we have two minutes left and you still have your hand up.

Alan Greenberg: A very quick one, okay. Am I on?

Avri Doria: Yep.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah okay. I wasn't near by computer during Working Group 2 presentation so I couldn't easily put my hand up. One of the things I think we need to include in that list of things is information to make it clear to potential applicants what their ongoing responsibilities are going to be. We don't want to set expectations that the only hurdle to get over is the application fee and the application process.

And I think when try to take the names and identify potential applicants that we set expectations properly so that we don't have people applying who are not going to be able to carry out the ongoing process.

And as a complement to that that we identify the things that will be needed in terms of steady state support to allow some of these to go ahead. Just a matter of setting aspirations and expectations properly I think is very important in making sure that we're doing a good job. That's it.

Man: Managing expectations.

Avri Doria: Yep. Thank you. We've made it to the end of our 90 minutes with only a few mishaps along the way. I thank you all for the contributions and I guess we'll talk again next week and hopefully we'll have some written work produced between now and then that we can start basically discussing point by point.

So Evan any last words?

Evan Leibovitch: No. Good to go.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you very much everybody.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

END