

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)  
TRANSCRIPT  
Friday 08 April 2011 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Friday 08 April 2011 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnsso/gnsso-jas-20110408-en.mp3>

On page ;  
<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar#apr>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:**

**GNSO**

Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council  
Andrew Mack – CBUC  
Avri Doria – NCSG

**ALAC**

Cintra Sooknanan – At-Large  
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO – ALAC  
Dev Anand Teelucksingh – At Large  
Baudoin Schombe - At-Large (on Adobe Connect)  
Dev Anand Teelucksingh - At-Large  
Evan Leibovitch – NARALO – ALAC  
Alain Berranger  
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO  
Dave Kissoondoyal - (AFRALO) – At large  
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair  
Elaine Pruis – MindandMachines  
Alain Berranger

**ICANN staff**

Karla Valente  
Glen de Saint Géry  
Gisella Gruber-White

**Apologies:**

Carlton Samuels – LACRALO - ALAC - WG co-chair  
Alex Gakuru – NCSG  
Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair  
Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board  
Michele Neylon - RrSG  
Tony Harris –ISPCP

Coordinator: And this call is now being recorded. Please go ahead. Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Friday the 8th of April.

We have Rafik Dammak, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Cintra Sooknanan, (Dev Anna Philip Sing), Elaine Pruis, Dave Kissoondoyal, Alain Berranger, Andrew Mack,

From staff we have Karla Valente, Glen Desaintgery and myself Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies noted from Sebastian Bacholett, Carlton Samuels, Alex Gakuru, Michele Neylon and Olivier Crepin-LeBlond.

If I could please also remind everyone to state their names when speaking. This is for transcript purposes. And we are still trying to join Carlos Aguirre into the call. Thank you, over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella. Thanks for everybody for joining today's call.

So first we'll start with our proposed agenda. I would like to remember everybody if he has or she has any update of his or her SOI or DOI.

We have a new member in our working group. I wish welcome to Alain Berranger and just to remind him that he should send his or I hope that he already sent his SOI to (Claire).

Okay so any about agenda? Do you agree about this agenda any comments? Do you want to add any items?

Okay. So today we will start with the Item 2 which it's about the report from the different work teams. We can start with the work teams A&P which is

about the definition of criteria for needy applicant. We have Cintra and Tijani on the call.

I see that Andrew right here, raise your hand. Do you have a comment Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Right. Excuse me. Yes, Rafik, you and I had chatted over email really briefly yesterday about the - where we stand with the GAC. Did you want to discuss that very quickly before we launch into these other things?

Rafik Dammak: Okay please go ahead. No problem.

Andrew Mack: Well just briefly the last time we spoke we exchanged emails at the very, very tail end of last month. And I guess all I really want to know is where that stands.

I was under the impression you were going to take that forward to the people on the basis of the comments that Elaine and I had given you.

Are you planning to interact with the GAC representatives? Is there - if there's a plan let's - I just wanted to make sure that we are clear on that. If there's not a plan to spend two seconds and get one.

Rafik Dammak: I think you are asking me.

Andrew Mack: I am yes in fact asking you.

Rafik Dammak: I think the idea was that we finished the question then we submitted before to the working group members to have their feedback before that we send that - those questions to the GAC. That's what I recall.

Sorry that I couldn't attend the two last calls. But I think that we agreed - that what we agreed before that we finish our draft allocation questions and then

to ask the members of Working Group about their comment and their feedback and then we can move to the GAC.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Do you have what you would need, must have given the input. Do you have what you would need to put together a quick proposal or I'm just - we hadn't heard back and I wanted to make sure that this didn't fall off our agenda, that's all, if it's something we want to do.

Rafik Dammak: I think that - it's for this I think it's still at the level of that small work team. But we need to finish the question and then we can move to the Working Group.

Anyway the idea was that we don't hold the working group for - from working on the different items and tasks and then we just we can discuss with the GAC because it will take...

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: ...less time.

Andrew Mack: That's fine. We'll pick it up later off-line then. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Andrew Mack: No problem.

Rafik Dammak: No problem. Just that's - I'm sorry because last days I couldn't attend. I was sick and then I had this problem to join the calls by phone.

Okay I think we can move to the - as I said before to the Item 2. And I was going to ask Tijani and Cintra to give update about the work of Work Team 1. Any volunteers Cintra, to Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you, yes. I have seen that Elaine has got a part of the report we submitted. She crossed the - how we define the need with the thresholds.

We discussed last time and we said that the charts, since we don't have the rationale behind the figures we gave we don't have to put them like this. I agree but if you raise all this paragraph what is the criteria for the need in this case, I don't know.

Second point I do think that if we - if everyone will intervene on the text we will not know what has changed. The best is to put comments down and then Avri who is holding the pen will change the text according to the comments when those comments are agreed on sure.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: That's my question.

Rafik Dammak: I see the problem that the text was changed but you are not sure what kind of change that we're down there and by whom.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: By whom I almost know because I have the name. But what was changed I don't know. What is across I see it. But if there is a text changed I don't know.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I see. The problem that sometimes if you just maybe because that we only put comments it's not that easy to link between what is - what was the comment to - how to link for comment to which part of the text.

So maybe if people want to change in the text to just not to strike or remove any part of the content but to just put their name between the brackets and to put their own comment in different colors or something like that, something that to leave the existing text and to put comments. So maybe it's this workaround can be helpful.

Avri Doria: Can I comment?

Rafik Dammak: Oh Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes if you're - I mean they've got the tools there. If you look up at tools and you look up that version history you then basically can do a comparison of any two versions and see what was changed.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Avri but I think it's in need to know which is - there are many versions...

Avri Doria: Right but...

Rafik Dammak: But no?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: May I...

Avri Doria: Well there's many existing versions, that's true. And you can compare any two of them.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Avri.

Avri Doria: So you definitely can see it. For example, if you go to the tools on this page now you could see that the current Version 11 is Elaine's and then 10 is hers, 9 is hers but then 8 is mine and you go all the way back to Tijani's which is 1.

So then you just basically click the versions in the margin that you want to compare and then you can view it.

So I'm just saying the fact that it says you can't see what was changed. And then there's a key that says if it's striked in red it's removed. If it's green it's added. And so I'm just trying to point out. I'm not trying to give (enormative)

statement of what people should and shouldn't do. I'm just trying to give this statement of what can and can't be seen.

Rafik Dammak: But...

Avri Doria: And you can always go back to an earlier version.

Rafik Dammak: Yes as you are the...

Avri Doria: Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: ...(unintelligible) holder. Is it okay for you? Can you...

Avri Doria: I'm not going to mess with those versions at all. What I'm going to do for the document is cut it into another version as it develops.

Rafik Dammak: So with that we have the track of the edit and comments. And then we have a clean version. So I think it's...

Avri Doria: That's what I was thinking.

Rafik Dammak: ...is a good way to work.

Avri Doria: Maybe it's not the best way to do it. But I was thinking that these were still people's working efforts.

Now at a certain point, you know, I may pull in just by reference and then we'll see it there.

But my versions can also be seen when I edit it. So it can always go back to them. So it's - it really gives a lot of flexibility.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes may I continue Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Please. Go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. Thank you Avri for your comments. I know that we can see all the versions. But you have to open all the versions and see everyone which is not I - in my opinion which is not the most easy and the time-saving manner.

If it is the manner that would be used I don't mind. It will be so. But as we worked before it was very, very good because everyone gave his comments then we discussed the comments and then you incorporate all the comments and within the text.

I agree with you that you have to have a clean text, a compilation of all the working groups text that every time you (unintelligible) according to the discussion, according to the agreed modification that's all.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. I think there's just a problem that...

Avri Doria: I put my hand back up.

Rafik Dammak: You want to reply?

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry. We have Evan here has his hand up as well please.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Avri you want...

Gisella Gruber-White: He's not in the Adobe Connect.

Avri Doria: Yes I'd like to comment now on to things.

Rafik Dammak: Go ahead.



Avri Doria: One is that - and please to come to an agreement here. There is no text for me to be taking and controlling. At the moment this is just work text. There is no agreed text yet.

And so until such time as there actually is agreed text, if we're talking about the easiest way to do it, for me to keep making changes on so and so said this or then so and so said that, that's not what I'm doing as an editor.

What I'm doing as an editor is once you guys all arrive at a conclusion and say yes, this is it, then you was, as the chair say okay, Avri, this is agreed now and make sure that it has that.

As long as we're still going back and forth and nothing is agreed on I really don't have any text to own. And so it's far easier for me for all of you to be so if we're talking about easier, it's far easy for me to all of you be working on the text back and forth comparing and getting it somewhere. That's using it as a group work tool.

Once we get to something and the group has said yes that's stable, you know, then I take it, I control it and then you guys tell me change this, change that in a clean version. But at this point there's nothing for me to take ownership of. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri.

Gisella Gruber-White: Evan's still got his hand up Rafik please. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there Rafik. And I think I've just been able to connect in Adobe so I'll be able to do this myself.

I just wanted to support Tijani's way, suggestions as somebody who's had to have the pen and edit a very long document, when you have multiple different people who are making multiple edits sometimes on the same paragraph one after the other it doesn't take very long before you start totally losing track of where things were in the first place.

So like I say, I just wanted to support what Tijani said about the idea of having one person holding the pen, people having comments on the (blog), leaving comments underneath and having the person with the pen integrate them.

And sometimes you find when the comments are contradictory as some people are, you know, some comments are saying different things about the same word change, then it's up to the person with the pen to either resolve them themselves or go back to the people and try and find out if there's a way to do this that works for both.

Although the wiki is capable of allowing, you know, dozens of different people to edit the same piece one after the other. At least in my own experience it doesn't scale very well and that once you have like more than three or four people editing the same paragraph each, you know, unless they're just adding things it becomes - I just find it becomes very problematic.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Evan. If I understand well I - have two different problems. The first problem that I - was people editing on the same terms so maybe we can lose the track.

But also as I understand from Avri's comments that we need also to have agreement from members about different parts of the text and how we can deal with that so she can as pen holder work on a clean version.

I'm not sure how we can fix this to a different problem the same time. And do we wish to have like a the comment period that everybody comments on the text?

And then after we have a clean text then we need after to work on to have agreement on the different parts or to have agreement since the beginning and then we have - we will end up with the clean text anyway?

Avri do you want to comment because I saw some of your comments...

Avri Doria: Yes I - yes thanks. I actually don't think I'm qualified and I don't think I have the time to hold the pen on this. It's just not working out right.

So I think that perhaps someone else that knows better how to do it should do it and I'll step down from the role. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: I'm - Avri I've - in this...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: I really I don't agree with your suggestion. I don't think there is a problem. We just need to work a way that can work smoothly.

Avri Doria: No as I'm saying I really don't have time to do it the way Tijani wants it done. In other words, I have time and I'm willing to and was willing to get to the point where you all had agreed on something and then I would take it.

To constantly be day to day listening to phone calls and changing this work and then changing that work while everybody's not agreeing on something is a full-time job that I just don't have time for. So therefore I'm resigning the role because I can't do it the way you all want it done. So thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, okay Avri. That's why I was suggesting that we need - that if we will wait to have - the better to wait for to have agreement by different part of the text then it will make it more easy for the pen holder to edit a clean text.

And then we don't end up with the long discussion and the problems between the clean text and the previous version of the text. Maybe we need to work in different approach that can satisfy both parties.

We have in the queue Elaine then Tijani and then Evan. Elaine, please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. Good morning. So I am the one that struck out the text. And I would like to just say that was because we had some requests from I think it was oh shoot, I'm sorry, I'm so bad at names when I don't have this right in front of me.

Carlton, who's the other co-chair? Someone was saying there's been no work done on the wiki. So one day I open it up, I look at it I go oh, well that's a problem. If we can't provide rationale which we're fully expecting our board to do any time they make any sort of decisions then we shouldn't have something in that document. I strike it out.

Now it's a topic of discussion. If I would have just made a comment and I don't think we would've never gotten around to it. Last week we discussed it. I didn't hear anybody say oh my gosh we have to leave this \$70,000 to \$100,000 window in there. It's the best thing ever.

It seems to me that based on the discussion we actually had some decision by either the original author or one of the chairs should have been made do we strike that out and keep that or do we revert it to text that should stay in the document?

So I yes, I think there's a little bit of a confusion about how we're working. But I think we also we need to actually make some decisions as we do work.

And I think whoever the author is on the paper should be the one who determines the best way for them to actually have the material presented to them. That's all.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Elaine. Tijani, please go ahead.

Gisella is Tijani in the call or still in mute?

Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Sorry. I was muted.

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: He's on mute.

Rafik Dammak: Oh, okay. Please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Now Avri I really prefer that you keep the pen. I know that you don't have time and I know it's really a time-consuming.

We can accommodate - we can try to help in the way you want. But we have to find a way that everyone can contribute. And it will be easy for everyone to contribute and for you to edit to finalize the text. I will not propose you any method. But I tell you that I prefer that you keep it.

The second point for sure we have two decisions. The problem is that till now we was on always discussing.

I thought - I said last time that we don't have text. Now Elaine did something it's very good. And I hope everyone will do so so that we will discuss the modifications. We will discuss what we will do instead of this text. That's the question.

My first remark is that is what was about the visibility of the modification.

If we have to go to all versions it will be time consuming for people. And you - as Avri said we don't have - everyone have - is daily life and we don't have time to see every version.

That's why I saw it more visible to put comments or to use other colors with the name so that people will know by seeing the text what is happening on the text. That's my remark.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thank you. Evan please go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi. My first choice is still for Avri to hold the pen. But Avri if you really don't want to do it I've gone off-line with Cintra and she and I are willing to coordinate taking the initial doc that Elaine put forward and incorporating comments into it.

Rafik Dammak: Evan I don't really understand what you are suggesting. Can you please repeat?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm just saying that my preference is still for Avri to hold the pen on this. But if Avri if you're really insistent on not doing it then I've been off-line briefly with Cintra and she and I could possibly do the integration of comments into the - into Elaine's document.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thank you. Please Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes I'm perfectly fine with having handed over the editorship to you. As this thing has progressed and as I've watched it over the last couple weeks and I've watched my schedule develop I just realize I can't do it justice. So I'm fantastically happy that you're taking it. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think that it's at the end we can divide the work that if I understand correctly Evan and Cintra want to volunteer to integrate the comments and that still that Avri can keep the - still hold the pen but...

Avri Doria: No, no, no, no, no.

Rafik Dammak: No?

Avri Doria: No. I'm giving all responsibility for anything. I've come to realize that in this group as it's currently going and given my other requirements I no longer have the ability to serve the function.

Okay Avri it's sad but anyway it's still up to you. Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Right, okay. I did not volunteer to help pick up the pen because I also have some travel responsibilities. But if there are two other people I'm more than willing to be part of the editing group. I think we'll need a fair amount of hands on. If that's helpful I will volunteer to help Evan and Cintra.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Now we have three people on it and so before we just have a pen holder. But how you will see that you will coordinate between Andrew, Evan and Cintra, how you will coordinate between the - among you - that you have to - for editing how to see that just to avoid any new problem for editing.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. I think why don't we - why don't the three of us get on Skype or something after this call and we can work out how we're going to work together, (come at) the group with that if you'd like.

Rafik Dammak: Okay just present us to the Working Group update how - about that okay?

Okay thank you. So but I think we talked a lot about process of editing the document but not so much about the document itself.

If I understand we still - many members still have some comments about the text. And there are still work on that.

Do we have specific substantive questions or to reply? Sorry, Evan and Tijani do you want to comment or is...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: ...your hand or is - okay Evan please go ahead and then Tijani.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh sorry no. I thought I put my hand down.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Okay. So I propose to Evan and Cintra and Andrew to compile all of the text produced yet and to propose them to the Working Group to comment on them. And then everyone has to give his point of view on the parts of the whole text and we discuss it during the - we discussed the comments during our meetings, our calls. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you for that (suggest). If we also to first of the process, if we are going to discuss the document during the text I think the editors should also take care about to integrate the comments that we will have during the call and to integrate them in the text.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Exactly.

Rafik Dammak: So does it make sense?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.



Rafik Dammak: Can you hear me?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Oh yes, no because there is a strange noise in the...

Man: Yes I've got - I'm hearing the same strange noise Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Oh okay. Anyways let's - I suggested that if we will - the volunteers will compile the comments and then we will discuss the text again during a call about the different point.

And then the volunteers should integrate the comment that we will have during the call and the text again so just to not - to avoid problems or - okay.

Okay. Andrew do you - we have Evan and then Andrew. Evan, go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: No my - I haven't put my hand up.

Rafik Dammak: Oh. Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: I guess I'm sorry, I did accidentally.

Man: It was still up.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Andrew please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Okay Rafik is it my turn?

Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, yes. I can hear you but....

Andrew Mack: Okay. Okay great. Okay. So here's what I am suggesting to the group if this makes sense to them.

I think like a lot of people I perceive that we've got an awful lot to do in a very short period of time.

So what I did yesterday was to go through the charts that (Dev) and Cintra had put together and tried to add a little bit to our flowchart and specifically to outline what all of the unanswered questions that I think we have in this process.

And if I can suggest I think if we're going to get this thing done in the time that we need to get it done in I really think that we're going to have to have our calls, try to have our calls be very, very crushed down, very specific, try and pushed through a specific line item in our agenda.

So if we have thinking questions that need to be addressed and we have, you know, ten calls or five calls or less we really need to dive into that and make sure that by the time the call is over we have some level of agreement.

Because otherwise we'll be in exactly the same situation that Avri mentioned earlier on the call which is a lot of discussion but not enough agreement to be able to put together a document.

So I guess that that's my recommendation to the chairs is that if we can narrow the field of our agendas for the next few calls and really dive in on some of these key questions I think we can get them all taken care of.

And I'm happy as soon as I get off the phone with Cintra and with Evan to share the list of questions that I had and see what the group thinks about that.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Andrew I think that's the main ideas that we have specific questions from the call. And we need to find agreement for text or question because it's more easy then to have the whole discussion, the mailing list or trying to do that through the wiki.

Avri do you want to comment or - okay Elaine please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. I would just like to point out that I think any discussions that do happen should be on the mailing list and not on Skype or not through individual emails. It's important for me to know how decisions are being made so I could be supportive of them. If something just shows up without any discussion or rationale behind it I think we waste a lot of time then in our meetings talking about why did somebody do something.

So could we please to the group on the mailing list and any work that's done make it very transparent as to how and why it got that way? Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Elaine. Yes, I understand, yes, yes. It was (you) that we need to have - to work in transparent way and manner. I think when everybody make any comment in the wiki or in the mailing list usually - or usually give the rationale behind so it will make it more easy for discussion.

And for cause as we have only really one - less than one hour to decide in many items I think that we just try to - if we think that the discussion will take long time to do that through the mailing list. We try also to make comments in the wiki to track the - also the discussion and comments and the rational there and also to make it more easy for addition.

And then in the calls we have we need to really focus on specific questions - substantive question and also to try to reach some agreement at some level because we need really to move forward. We are - I think we are still in the same stage discussing about many points but there is time to decide that - if we agree about that or disagree about this.

Okay please any further comments? Elaine you still want to comment or...

Elaine Pruis: Yes thanks. So I just heard you say that we are to comment on the wiki? So if you could please when this call is over would you just write an email that says who's allowed to do what where? That would be helpful. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Just who - I think for wiki everybody can edit. But just we are trying to make some level of coordination that's all. But if - can you clarify what you want - what you mean exactly? Maybe I am misunderstanding.

Elaine Pruis: No I'm just - I'm saying that - so I've heard Evan - shoot, yes, Evan, Cintra and Andrew say that they were - would be willing to edit the wiki which to me implies that no one else should be editing the wiki. Only once some agreement has been reached - and I don't know where that agreement is being reached because we're certainly not discussing the topics on the call, we're talking about methodology.

And I would really like to make some comments and participate towards the development of the paper but I don't know where or how to do that. If I just make some comment on the mailing list a lot of time it just goes unanswered or it doesn't get discussed; it's not very - yes, I just want to know what the rules are for how to work because we really need to get some work done. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Elaine. Evan please go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay a couple of things. Elaine, I'm hoping you don't take the offer to hold the pen, so to speak, as an intention to shut anybody out. Right now it's just a matter of here's a document; we've got to put it into a polished form that this group is comfortable in giving to the public and that means incorporating any comments that are going to come forward.

As you say it's a little frustrating, we've been dealing a lot with how to do things in these calls rather than actually what gets done. So I'm going to make a suggestion of actually starting up - actually going to the opposite thing. I found that Skype chats do work extremely well in a compressed timeframe in allowing people to talk to each other in real time in between the officially scheduled calls.

So what I'm actually going to suggest is to create a Skype chat in which everybody is a member. So if you're looking for transparency you'll have it in the sense that absolutely none of the discussion will go on without you having access to it.

So what I'm actually going to suggest is that I'm perfectly happy to create a Skype group chat that includes as many members of this list as I possibly can. I think I have most of you as contacts and anybody who I don't I can get afterwards. So I'm actually going to suggest the creation of this chat.

I have found it very useful for working in real time and compressed timelines. And to deal with any issues of transparency to essentially make this chat open to any member of this group.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, in fact I won't make it open I'll automatically subscribe and add everybody to the chat whom I'm aware of is on - is in this group.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thank you Evan. Alain - Alain please go ahead.

Alain Berranger: Alain Berranger from Montreal. I'm a newcomer so I have a lot of reading and catching up to do. I just wanted to ask a general question, is there a feeling that the current shape of the report is very close to a final product or is it a very, very rough work in progress? If you could give me some sense of where the group think - where the progress is.

Rafik Dammak: Okay quite tough question. I think it's still ongoing work and that we have different (text). We divided to work in four different work team. And we are focusing now on some texts more than others in particular about how to define the criteria about needy applicant and that's why we are - we were discussing about.

And so I'm not sure about the feeling among other working members; maybe they - if someone can tell you about that because I am just the co-chair; I should - how say - cannot give really my own opinion but I am - I would be happy if someone else from the working group can give you about this feeling about the ongoing work. I see...

Alain Berranger: Okay...wait just to remind me of your name - I don't recognize everybody's voice yet.

Rafik Dammak: I am Rafik.

Alain Berranger: Oh hi Rafik, thanks a lot for that.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. We have Evan who is also from Canada who - in the queue and then Tijani and Avri. Evan, please go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, I just keep forgetting to put my hand down, never mind.

Rafik Dammak: Oh okay. Tijani, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you. Alain, this text was produced by one - by a group - a work team. It was produced after long discussion so we cannot say there is any consensus on it. We didn't decide on anything right now. But this proposal was the fruits of a lot of discussions. And still there is people who are not okay with the text so we are there now.

Alain Berranger: Okay great, thanks a lot that's clear.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, Alain, this is Avri. First of all I want to thank you. Alain is someone that, you know, that's why I feel sort of guilty; I convinced - actually I went begging to a particular group of people for someone that could come in and work with us who had experience in a lot of the stuff.

And, you know, I sort of - he volunteered to come in and then, you know, all of a sudden I sort of drop out but that's beside the point; I apologize to him. My view and part of my frustration was I don't believe we're anywhere on almost any of this stuff yet.

I believe we've talked a lot I believe on this first working group. There were two, three people who did do a lot of work, who came up with a suggestion but it's a suggestion that's not really been bought into the by the group yet. So the frustration I was having is I didn't see us having arrived at any conclusions on anything yet.

And I think that's similar to what Tijani just said possibly slightly more negative. And so that was part of the frustration that made me reach out to you and others to come in and join and help from an experiential point of view and part of the frustration that made me run away from my job as editor.

Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Maybe it's also the mistake or - of co-chairs to help to correlate that and to help for reaching some consensus. The different topics that we are discussing about but it's always the problem that we need to find a compromise and to need how to reach some consensus in those different topics. So maybe we need to have a different approach for that.

We tried that we have to - the comments and the wiki and then that we can - it can make it more smooth and easy to end up with a clean text that working members can have consensus about.

But anyway sorry for that - that's the feeling amongst the working group members. And I hope that we can fix that as soon as possible. For myself I am open to any kind of suggestion. And okay I think maybe we spent a lot of time. Elaine, please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you for being open to a suggestion. My suggestion is that we take a look at what we have written down and talk about it and try to decide if we want to move ahead with that text or not.

I think instead of giving reports from the working groups we need to start looking at what the - each work team has created and talk about...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Elaine. Okay any further comment about Work Team 1? Okay we don't have so much time for the other work teams. I think just nine minutes. I'm not sure if the work team lead by Avri has any...

Avri Doria: No update.

Rafik Dammak: No update?

Avri Doria: Yes, no update since the one I gave last week - I mean, Tuesday.



Rafik Dammak: Okay. And I think Andrew sent email - a long email about the IDN thing last time. I'm not sure it was discussed on the last call or, Andrew, you want to report about this and that we can have some discussion now?

Andrew Mack: Sure if you'd like. I - as requested I put together all the thoughts and we had a little subgroup with Carlton and Cintra who were talking about this on the last call. So I sent that out to the group. I hear you, Tijani; I've heard nothing back really from anybody.

But that's a sample text that we could work off of and have been trying to figure out a way to put that into our flowcharts as well. And I'm open for people's thoughts and then comments and questions and all of that. Did everyone get it?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, Andrew? What did you mean?

Andrew Mack: Did everyone receive the text because I think...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: I think it's indeed in last Tuesday?

Andrew Mack: That's correct, yes.

Rafik Dammak: Oh yes, I think so. Okay we have Tijani, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. Yes, Andrew, I received your email. And I begun to reply but at the end I decided not to do but I will do by written; it's very important. We had a lot of discussion on it together and I still have problems so I have to give you written comments on it.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Anyone who would prefer to do - I mean, it may be more efficient for us to do written comments. You know, I'd be happy to be the pen on this particular section and just try to put in an add-in and move things around to fit with the comments that we received.

Rafik Dammak: Just a question, Andrew, did you put it also on the wiki or not?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Not yet.

Andrew Mack: You know, I don't know if I did, I'm sorry. I can certainly put that today that's not a problem at all. I know it went out to everybody so...

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Okay for myself I will try to reply to your email and give my comments.

Andrew Mack: Thanks. If everybody could do that by say Monday close of business then I can make a best effort to try to incorporate those comments, review them and come back with something concrete for the Tuesday call if that's - if that's something that people can do.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. For myself I will do that but I'm not sure for other, I think so.

Andrew Mack: It's a request that's all. In the spirit of trying to get things moving a little bit faster in one of our subgroups that's all.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes, thank you Andrew. Okay I'm not sure we have other - Elaine you are the leader of the work team about - how do you say technical and other support that can - provided by service provider. Any progress from your work team that you can report?

Elaine Pruis: Thank you, Rafik. Nothing new has been done.

Rafik Dammak: So how to say do you need any help that we can make some progress on that or do you need some more volunteers just...

Elaine Pruis: Well so basically what's happening now is we have - we've decided that the ICANN staff is putting together a Web page which would sort of outline the kinds of support that is available and the applicants that might qualify for that support. And that would be sort of a matching effort.

What I've done is gone through the evaluation criteria in the applicant guidebook, made a spreadsheet that shows what sort of provider would help out on the specific questions. I have a spreadsheet that I'll upload to the wiki today.

I've also put on the wiki that evaluation criteria grid from the applicant guidebook so if you look at it you can see the questions that are being asked and who might need to answer those questions.

So if for instance there's a question on the policy of that potential gTLDs so that, you know, you would have - you need some attorneys involved in that - development of that policy probably. There's also questions on DNS actually you need some technical advisors then.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Okay. Thank you Elaine. Any - Tijani, you want to comment?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you. I hope that for the next call the drafting group will provide a clean text with the text that they have already and we will go - we will work - we will walk through the text and decide on any part of it so that we will have something agreed on as we did for the first part if you remember for the milestone report we always did that.

Rafik Dammak: Okay but just - I don't think that we will have all comments for Tuesday so we can start discussing about that. But not sure that we will - can make - or we can make agreement about all points...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: ...of the call but just we can start to working on that.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes please.

Rafik Dammak: Okay I don't know, Operator, we have some problems with the line? I'm not sure what's happening; there is (trans) noise. Okay I think we should almost - one hour of our call today. Is there any other business? And just to - any suggestions for the next call, for Tuesday call?

Gisella Gruber-White: Rafik, it's Gisella, if I may?

Rafik Dammak: Yes Gisella, yes.

Gisella Gruber-White: With regards to the chat that we're going to set up for the JAS workgroup which as, Evan would - said it's an instant way of working. If I can just remind a few people that what we usually do for the chats is that it's great for people to work with instantly as in those who are connected and those who are taking part. It may just be worth saying that we don't expect people to arrive in the morning and read through pages and pages of chats.

Because I know that - some other chats we have people tend to get carried away and it's not - it's not something that we need to catch up with every morning; it's something that if there are a few people online and they wish to discuss something - if there's any action item or something that the whole group needs to follow up on it really requires an email.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes, thank you Gisella. I think you just say that is not like an (ERC) and just maybe we need to (access) about sometimes to discuss and think on this way. Okay any further comment? Okay hearing none thank you everybody and this call is adjourned for today. See you on Tuesday call and have a nice weekend.

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. Bye, bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you, everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: And as you probably all know the Skype chat has been...

END