

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 16 November 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) Tuesday 16 November 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-20101116-en.mp3>

On page:  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:**

**ALAC**

Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair  
Dave Kissoondoyal - ALAC  
Carlos Aguirre - At Large  
Alan Greenberg – ALAC (end of call)  
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC  
Baudoin Schombe - At-Large  
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison  
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair  
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large

**GNSO**

Avri Doria – NCSG – Co-Chair  
Andrew Mack – CBUC  
Alex Gakuru – NCSG

Richard Tindal - Individual

**ICANN staff**

Gisella Gruber-White  
Karla Valente  
Glen de Saint Gery

**Apologies:**

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachine  
Michele Neylon - RrSG  
Tony Harris – ISPCP

Coordinator: The call is now recorded, please go ahead.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the 16th of November. And on the call we have Baudouin Schombe, Carlos Aguirre, Alex Gakuru, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Rafik Dammak, Sebastien Bachollet, Evan Leibovitch, Alan Greenberg, Richard Tindal and Dave Kissoondoyal. And for staff we have Karla Valente, Gisella Gruber-White and myself, Glen de Saint Géry.

We have apologies from Michele Neylon. And is there anybody else? Elaine Pruis, apologies. And we have apologies from Tony Harris as well. Is there anybody else?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: And I think we should mention we have apologies too from Tijani because he is not able to join the call. I don't think - he is busy getting his visa to come to Columbia. Thank you, Evan, over to you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay I see both Tijani and Tony in the meeting view display so does that mean that they're on the call, not on the call?

Glen de Saint Géry: Tony is not on the call. Tony Harris is not on the call. We called him and there's no reply from this office. And Tijani there's no answer from his phone.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Glen de Saint Géry: That's why he's on the meeting view is because we had to call out to them and we've had no response from either of them.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay then. So I guess we will start moving ahead. Before we do I just want to make a request to find out if anybody on this call has made a chance to their statement of interest since the last time we had a call? So if you have something to state about this please say so in the next few seconds.

Okay having heard nothing...

((Crosstalk))

Alex Gakuru: Evan, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry?

Alex Gakuru: This is Alex. I don't know if it's any change but I just received results today that I have just been reelected as the NCUC representative for Africa so I'm still - I'm part of the NCSG. Maybe it's not a change but it's just to update the status.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so the updated status is that it's still the same. Okay.

Alex Gakuru: It's still the same.

Evan Leibovitch: No, congratulations and thank you.

Alex Gakuru: Thank you. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: To the extent that congratulations are in order for being - having one year more of this. Anyway so thanks everybody for coming. And I think I see Andrew has just joined the call.

Andrew Mack: Yes, how are you doing? Sorry about the delay.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh no problem we've been late starting anyway so you're just on time.

Andrew Mack: Great, you're beautiful.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so in Avri's absence I guess I'll start things off a bit. What we have for an agenda is mainly planning for Cartagena. Karla would you like to start things off in terms of going through the meetings that we have scheduled and any specific activities that you have down for our group?

Karla Valente: Hi Evan. We have the main session scheduled for Thursday. And this is on the main room with scribes simultaneous interpreters and all of the things that we need. I prepared - I started a PowerPoint presentation and I sent to all of you for review. Disregard the first one that I sent; that was a mistake, it's the second one.

And basically Avri is the one is scheduling updates for the GNSO, GAC and, you know, other SOs and ACs, I am not doing that. So the only session I have is the one on Thursday.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Is there anybody on the call that wants to add or comment to - about the workshop meeting? So everyone has seen the slides by this point?

Andrew Mack: I've only seen a very early version of them, I'm sorry, I've been a little out with other stuff. Is there something specifically that we should be taking a look at? And would it maybe make sense for us to go through them quickly now?

Karla Valente: So, Evan, I don't think there is anything too specific. I think what needs to be decided is how the session is going to be structured, who's going to speak to what before we decide what goes on the slides.

Evan Leibovitch: Understood. Now there was mention of trying to get some other speakers outside of this working group to come in and either (unintelligible) board or from the community elsewhere who are not normally on the working group to come in and to give their support or, you know, their comments on the value of this group. How are we with that?

Karla Valente: Yeah so I haven't worked on that yet because I didn't really know that we had any direction on this.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay well what's the feeling of the group? Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes well I think it may make some sense but I think we should be very careful. If we're going to do it we need to really know - it's almost like we need to work backwards to get there. Looking at what we'd like to get accomplished on the basis of, you know, if we have new people in the mix what are we looking for them to give us? If it's validation then let's script that.

If it's not, you know what I mean? I just - I could see us going off - anytime you bring in somebody new at a late date there's always the risk they'll go in a different direction than you expect.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay then just to pick up - just to pick up on that keep going. What I want to do is to - then what do you think? Okay, do you think we need someone from the outside? I mean, I was thinking along the lines of validation; somebody from the board saying this is why we need this just to, you know, remind the group, the audience, in light of, you know, the board resolutions to date on this.

Essentially what's your thought on that?

Andrew Mack: I guess having some portion of it being - looking at this issue, you know, getting some validation from the board is a great idea generally. But I think that if we get too much down in the details or down in the weeds of it then the value of that board person becomes less because they weren't involved in the process. That's just my intuitive take on it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. And my gut reaction right now is that you're 100% right. Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Evan. Just a question (unintelligible) do we know when on Thursday the session is planned? An early planning schedule I saw had it (flushing) both with the (PEDNA) and with the ALAC and regional leader wrap up meeting.

Karla Valente: Hi, this is Karla. I don't have the schedule right in front of me, sort of having difficulties to get to my computer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: But I remember pushing the schedule, you know, I think it starts at 10:00 but I can confirm with you a little bit later today. But I remember that was a conflict that was raised earlier and I addressed that with the meetings team.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh terrific. I was just concerned that, I mean, I was aware of an early conflict and I was hoping that it has been addressed. That's all, we just need to watch that fairly carefully. Although if it's at 10:00 it would be clashing - oh no it'd be just the end of the public participation. But as where it was last time I saw a main schedule in early draft form it was smack bang in competition with both the ALAC and regional leader's wrap-up session and (PEDNA).

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, I think (PEDNA) got moved to a breakfast meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: When I saw it it was 8:30 to 9:30 unless it's gone earlier, right.

Alan Greenberg: Oh okay, I thought it was earlier than that but maybe not.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And the ALAC meeting is running 7:30 - starts at 7:30 that day. Dial-in at 9:30 and then public participation is immediately after that. I mean, until we see the final main schedule it's all guess work but...

Alan Greenberg: I thought it was supposed to have been posted yesterday?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes that's correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Andrew Mack: I won't say it's typical.

Alan Greenberg: No it wouldn't be nice to say that.

Andrew Mack: It's early isn't it?

Alan Greenberg: There is something scheduled. There is something online.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay is there anybody on the call who wants to add something onto what Andrew has said about what we should do in terms of planning for, who we should ask for and what we're looking for in for better or worse a guest speaker coming in and giving support? Does anyone have any comments, suggestions or anything?

Plus we had agreement in this call that that's even something we want to have.

Avri Doria: This is Avri joining. Sorry I'm late I thought it was in an hour.

Evan Leibovitch: No problem. I missed the meeting yesterday that had a similar daytime saving time switch so that's okay. Avri, welcome to the call. We're just started to get into the discussions of what to do in Cartagena.

And Andrew basically - we were talking about whether or not we had - want to have say a quote, unquote guest speaker; somebody from say the board or elsewhere who's not normally a group member to have them come out and speak in support.

And so we're just picking up on that point right now. Andrew you've got your hand up again so go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yeah, just another quick - these are all small things. But one big thing is if we have a limited amount of time I think it is extremely important that not only do we discuss with whoever would be a guest speaker in advance what they'd like to speak about but also let's give them some sort of real time bound, you know, some sort of time limitation.

Because I think we may end up - I've seen this happen so many times where somebody comes in and they do a guest speaking and they kind of get going and ramble on and then the key pieces that the committee members themselves want to mention don't get mentioned.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah I'm actually not in favor of inviting a board member or other illustrious speaker. Basically if we had someone from the board who had been active supporter and sort of encouraging us on as was the case when the group was first chartered I would say that we should invite them.

But at this point I think we only have an hour and I think I agree with Andrew on this; we only have an hour, we want to explain what we've done and we want to set the ground for where we think where we want to go.

And we want to get - hopefully have some time for people who are, you know, attending the session to be able to join in and speak up. So I would think given that, you know, especially since we don't have any famous people that are going me, me, me.

Now of course if one of our own has been risen to the level of board member between now and then and I guess we've got two shots out of three for that to



happen then certainly I would think having one of our own who turned illustrious say a few things would be a cool thing to do.

Sebastien Bachollet: I am not on the Adobe chat room but I would like to be on the queue. It's Sebastien, please.

Evan Leibovitch: Go right ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah I'm done, thanks, I'm sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Avri, do you want to take over chairing or...

Avri Doria: I just as soon you kept doing at least through this one then maybe I'll take over if we're talking about the charter extension stuff.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Sebastien go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yeah, thank you for what was just said by Avri. But I wanted to raise two points. We are targeting two populations; the one it's a needy applicant and the other one it's organization who could help those needy applicants.

And it could have been interesting to try to find but I know that one hour it may be too short - but to try to find one representative of each of these categories to comment, to explain why they could need help and the other one why they could give help. But I don't know, I am not sure that we have enough time to build that up. But it would have been an interesting exercise. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Alex, go ahead.

Alex Gakuru: Yes Alex speaking. In view of the letter that was written by GAC might it help to give somebody from the GAC a slot for five minutes, strictly five or so minutes to just speak in support of why this is necessary? Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay what does everybody think about that? Avri has spoken saying we don't need anyone from the outside but considering the GAC letter. Avri what's your take on that? Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Sorry, I had to wait for mute off. I'm sitting in an office where I'm interrupting people by speaking. So okay I'm hoping that I get to speak to the GAC for at least 10 minutes on Saturday and gauge where they are.

Again looking at the GAC I can't point to any specific person that from the GAC that has been vocally supportive so I wouldn't know exactly who to invite at this point. I have, again, no objection but I'm not sure who from the GAC would be in an appropriate speaker that would help the cause.

If we want to leave a 10-minute slot that, you know, that is sort of tentatively set and to see if we could figure out who the right speaker would be, yeah, I would be supportive of the idea. But I'd also be very careful of, you know, using the session too much as the propaganda marketing selling session on getting the donors and more the rolling up our sleeves and figuring out what other work needs to be done.

I don't think we're going to have a large, you know, donor population there even though one could say any registry or registrar is potentially a donor except - especially the rich ones. But at the moment unless somebody could tell me who do they think is the right GAC supporter I have no idea who we would ask. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I see no hands up so can we possibly get a consensus amongst the group that says, you know, let's go with what we've got within the group unless it really strikes us that we could find somebody, as Avri says, who is the champion we can point to? Other than that I guess let's keep going and figure out what we want to do on the call, specifically what our goal is and take it from there.

First of all how is everybody with the way things went in the Brussels workshop? I mean, do we want to simply pattern ourselves off of that or where if I recall essentially we had the liaisons that opened things up and in talking about the desirability of the working group's goals from their points of view and then we presented the slide show and then we took Q&A.

I mean, do we want to keep with a very similar format? Will that work for us this time as well? And if not what should we replace it with? I'm not seeing a whole lot of hands. I don't know if I take that for assumption that we keep going with the format we used in Brussels in that nobody likes the format we used in Brussels.

Avri Doria: This is - okay I see Andrew has his hand up, I'll wait.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Andrew and then...

Karla Valente: I have my hand up.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh Andrew, Avri and Karla.

Andrew Mack: Okay I'm happy to defer to Avri and Karla. I think that - I think that something like Brussels is probably fine. I'm more concerned with making sure that we're all on the same page in terms of what are we trying to get out of this? What's our - what does success look like? Because if we work that then everything else will be a little bit easier.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have Avri and then Karla and then - Karla, you're not in Adobe Connect from what I can see.

Karla Valente: No I have a back problem; I cannot get to my computer, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so I have Avri then Karla then Rafik. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah, I thought that we had a few too many people on stage. But then last time we were doing an overall group, a Working Group 1, a Working Group 2. So, I mean, if we wanted to do that and what we ended up getting into was a problem of once we had one or two people up then of course we needed three or four people up so that we had parity between all the groups.

And I think in the end - and this is just my personal evaluation we had too many people up on stage. We had a little bit too much conversation that went into sort of 10 gentle areas of people's own issues and own things.

So I would like to keep it, A, stricter to the - what is in the report and what is hopefully either in the charter extension but have been approved or that are waiting for approval and then getting people in the house to talk as opposed to - and take less chance on things that might end up people on stage sort of arguing their particular issues which I think we got close to last time.

And I think that partly came out of having too many people on stage looking for what they could talk about. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So Avri, let me make a suggestion that maybe we should have four people up there; basically you, myself and the two liaisons who would be Carlos and Rafik. Is there a reason - is there a reason...

Avri Doria: And possibly Karla but, yeah.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, sorry, sorry, as well as Karla. So is there any reason to have any more than that on the podium? Okay Karla, go ahead.

Karla Valente: Yeah so my - I agree with everything Avri said. I think in the last time it was - it was in some ways hard to follow. I'm looking from an audience standpoint and from a remote participant standpoint. If we could keep less about the

process that this work group goes through and more about what we tried to accomplish to Andrew's point in the beginning that would be great.

The session could be about our work and this is what we are going to do next and this is what we're requesting from support, right, what we want to see happening in this program and what we want to see happening in the new gTLD program.

But the session could also be something about this is the A, B, C, D types of support or types of participation that we're looking from individuals and organizations. You know, so in addition to explaining what we've done, what we're trying to accomplish is okay for the next steps is there is anything that we can add to this (task) that would be useful? Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay I have Rafik and then Andrew. Rafik go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Oh hello. Just to say that I won't be in Cartagena meeting so I'm not sure if I can participate even remotely.

Evan Leibovitch: Rafik do you have a suggestion of somebody who would then represent the GNSO on the podium? I mean, if we're going to do this format then we want somebody up there that's representing one of the stakeholder groups; that's core to what we're doing.

Rafik Dammak: Maybe I don't have any idea but...

Evan Leibovitch: Maybe there - well is there somebody else that would like to - okay if Rafik cannot attend Cartagena or may be able to attend but only remotely is there somebody else who would like to be up there and speaking? I guess the next - would make a good segue, Andrew, go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Well, you know, I've been very involved and I would love to be up there if that's okay with, you know, if that's appropriate. I again - I agree that there were probably too many people on stage in Brussels but I also think it was probably appropriate for where we were at that point.

And so I just, I mean, I'm just going to keep going back to what I think I'm hearing and what I think Karla said and I think Avri said which is let's work backwards to what we'd like to get accomplished. And if our primary focus area is to try to make sure that we get both visibility and mandate from the rest of the community that would be what I'd like to have, again with - it would be best if it were kind of a coordinated approach in that direction.

But I'd be happy to do this and I think I'm pretty familiar with a lot of the issues.

Evan Leibovitch: Is there anybody else on the call from GNSO that would like to be in that position? Or are we okay with Andrew doing that?

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure we can say whether he will be (unintelligible) to represent GNSO.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, Andrew, do you - well okay the people that are on GNSO on this call does this need to be approved by council? I mean, we'll make every effort to have Rafik in by remote participation but we probably still need somebody up on the podium. Does that need approval from the council?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I don't know that we need a representative of GNSO. I think giving our two liaison - and in fact it'll be curious because Carlos who at that point will still be the liaison from ALAC will also be two days away from being a member of the GNSO.

But I don't think that we necessarily need a representative from GNSO and from that. When you mention the idea of having the liaison speak what I think they could possibly speak to is the status of the renewals and stuff as that.

And, you know, I think that, you know, we could find someone from the GNSO to do it, we could find that.

In terms of other speakers if we have other speakers then we need to really be careful about the topics and we need to make sure that, as I say, I don't - would like us to avoid getting into well if so and so speaks then I have a slightly different opinion so I need to speak too. And that's the situation I want to stay away from and basically just put people up there who can hopefully just sort of take the neutral reporting and collecting position as opposed to the proponent of a particular viewpoint, of a particular way of doing things.

I think having our members in the house getting up to the microphones and speaking on issues and being in a position of not being on the stage and thus being free to assert their opinion is a good thing and would add.

So I'm not saying that I don't want the group members to speak; what I'm saying is I'd like the group members to speak more as resources from within the community as opposed to the neutral presenters up on a stage.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Avri can we take - can I take it for an action item for you and anyone else on this call from GNSO to work it between you guys who from the GNSO will be up on the stage?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right so that's an action item takeaway. So the GNSO folks on this call will between themselves designate somebody to come up on stage. So it'll be Karla, Avri, myself, Carlos pending, oh Carlos, you had your hand up, did you want to say something?

Carlos Aguirre: Yes, Evan. A short comment only. In Cartagena I still ALAC member not GNSO member. So I can represent only ALAC as liaison.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so - and you're okay with being up there on the podium with us in that...

Avri Doria: I mean, one other possibility is, you know, I was thinking that when I talk to GNSO if Chuck is free, I might ask Chuck to just get up and say something on the GNSO perspective on the work and then perhaps - and again, I don't want to get in Carlos's way, if we were to do that, it might be appropriate to get Cheryl to do the same. I don't know. I'm just very much hand waving. The people in this office could probably tell you that I'm sitting here talking and waving my hands around. But, you know, that's another possibility.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, no one is going to tell you the GNSO position unless the GNSO has taken formal action and if it does then anyone can recite it and if it isn't, no one's going to tell you what the GNSO thinks because the concept doesn't really exist until it takes formal action. So I'm not sure I see the value other than a public relations for having someone represent the GNSO or the ALAC for that matter.

Avri Doria: Alan Greenberg, this is Avri again. I have a feeling that Chuck is pretty good at giving what he thinks is going on in the group but you may be right. I mean, no one can say definitively but certainly Chuck, you know, for example, he's the one that posed various questions about our charter and they - according to him they weren't his questions. They were questions that he supposed the GNSO would ask.

Man: Okay but this meeting's being held on Thursday if I remember correctly.

Avri Doria: Right, so you should decide it by then.

Man: Which is after the GNSO meeting so it will either have taken (action) or it will have not being able to for some reason.



Avri Doria: And then that can be reported.

Man: Well indeed but I think there's going to be some definitive status at that point.

Avri Doria: Right. But in either case that's something that can be reported.

Man: Sure. I mean, if Chuck is free to do it then clearly there's no problem. If he isn't then no someone can act his. I mean, you have a huge - you're - you have a huge history on the GNSO. You can probably ad lib it as well as anyone else so.

Avri Doria: And Rafik could possibly dial in.

Man: Possibly. Although I think he said he can't participate remotely.

Avri Doria: Right. Probably can't. Okay. We'll take care of it. We'll do something but I think we're doing the minimum (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: So Avri, can I withdraw my offer?

Avri Doria: You don't need to withdraw it but I would opt for not putting members on if possible. But I'm only one person. I mean, I'm not deciding. I'm just sort of - that's my view.

Man: Okay. So humbly offered either way. No worries.

Avri Doria: Thank you. But I'd love to have you getting up doing - and that's one of the things I hope. I'm hoping for a less talking heads on stage then an active group discussion. At least that's been sort of my hope, is to get more enthusiasm, get people talking. And so having you guys in the house actually talking and stating your opinions and being, you know, emotional and

committed to this program and to the work and to your viewpoints, and being able from the floor to say, "And I think the group should be doing this," is far stronger than having you on stage speaking just what can be said neutrally.

And so that's where I'm driving. You know, look at the IGF model of an hour where there's as few talking heads as you can possibly get away with and there's an audience. And the audience is peppered with people that can state an opinion and get a conversation going. So I hope you do speak humbly.

Man: Rafik's been waiting. Go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: So just I said that I'm not sure that I said but it's really that can help, I will try. Just I was wondering that because this will be a whole week, I'm not sure I can attend all the sessions because the time difference is 12 - almost 12 hours. That's why but if it can help I will try to be there even just for a few minutes and so.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Man: Okay. Is there anybody else that marked a comment on this? Okay, well I'm not totally sure where we go from this and I mean we've got a set of slides. We certainly have the two (posters). And so Avri, your suggestion is just to have the three of us up there and have everybody else comment from the floor?

Avri Doria: I - kind of, yes. And as I - I really - I think what we need to get is greater involvement and I think part of the way we get greater involvement is getting people who are attending the meeting to start being involved. And last time we actually - and see, we kind of have something almost to make up for.

Last time we had a session we kind of told people inadvertently perhaps, is we only wanted their comments on A, B and C but we really didn't want their thinking. Or at least that's what people heard.

And so what I'd really like to do is to report, is to open for questions and is to especially on the second half of the work that we hope has been approved on the thing there is to get people thinking about it, to get people making suggestions, to get people volunteering, to hear people with good ideas get up there and say, "Wow, great idea. Will you join us on the phone call?" And to do that kind of meeting is what I'd hope as opposed to just a (ever portage).

Man: Okay. So I guess we can take the specifics of that into email. Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Mack: I guess I'm going to disagree with you a little bit Avri. I'm a little bit concerned. If we just throw this thing op- we've done so much work and I think we've got so much kind of a consensus about most all issues and we have a small number of issues that are less consensus but even then we're got it all - come an awful lot of way toward a common position.

I - the way that you described it just now it sounds more like a brainstorming session and I think there's some value in that but I'd really like - I guess that would be a missed opportunity. Am I misunderstanding you?

Avri Doria: I think so.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Avri Doria: For the first part, we're reporting what the group did. That's done, that's out for comment, that I don't see a lot of work. So the second part, now we've got a whole list of new agenda items that we really haven't worked for - on yet, that come out of how to build donor groups, how to build this - if this foundation thingy's going to happen, how that happens, what are we talking about, to all of those items there that take formal concrete work.

So you're right. On the work that we've done and that we've reached consensus on, other than receiving comments and questions, there's not that far to go on it. But on the new stuff that's just going to have been chartered, I think, you know, we need new energy. We admit we need new experts on how funding goes, on how it's done, on all of that.

And I think that that's where I say not quite brainstorming, more directed, and that's where I'm hoping that you guys when the questions come up, you know, get up and state your opinions and start getting conversation going so that you feed the conversations with where you're already at but that we start to get that energy going.

But certainly no, I'm not talking about brainstorming on what's been done. I'm talking about how do we move forward.

Andrew Mack: Okay so on that basis, then, let me again go back to this idea of what we want to get out of the meeting. I would suggest that we have two objectives based on what you just said there. One objective is to get what is effectively the greatest amount of endorsement we can from the general public on the work that we've done so far.

And that's one closed up objective and somehow or another we want to get that information out there, we want to make it fairly clear, entertain a little bit of conversation about it and then everybody, you know, hopefully gets some people from the audience saying, "We think this is great. Go forth," right.

And then the second piece of it which might be a half or it might be a third of our hour would be to say, "Okay, and now we have these three or four issues that we like to begin the conversation around and we like to solicit your support and we're - as part of that we'd like everyone who's here to go to their networks and ask for, you know, to help us identify new people who might be able to even join this group to help us address these new issues." Am I understanding you correctly?

Avri Doria: I think so. I think so. I'm not sure that I focused it down quite as narrowly to two or three issues but yes.

Andrew Mack: Yes, I - just because the likelihood with the amount of time we have that we're going to get anything meaningful out of that conversation is low unless we - my thing is - it's low unless we focus the new item conversation around a small number of issues - two, three, maybe four things - just to get people, you know, the frictional time of getting people up to talk and things like that.

Avri Doria: Sure.

Andrew Mack: And that's my two sense.

Avri Doria: Ye- no, I think that finding a couple of those issues, you know, the sort of higher category of several of those issues is probably a good thing to do and yes, I think you're probably right.

Man: Did you want to go deeper into that for the remainder of this call?

Avri Doria: One question to ask, have you guys already talked about the motion that's in front of the GNSO and those issues? Did you guys start there?

Man: On this call? No.

Avri Doria: In which case I'd like to give some time to that if I can because I wanted to get some feedback for Rafik especially before the council call on Thursday on a couple of Chuck's issues that I sent out, specifically on the one where he adds an additional work item, so I wanted this group to have a chance to voice in on that before this call ended? And there's only ten minutes left now but - and again, it's partially my fault because I thought the call started in ten minutes as opposed to ending in ten minutes.

Man: Avri, take it away.

Avri Doria: Okay, so did everybody see the email that I sent to the group the other day with basically Chuck's basic questions. I'm looking for it myself. Chuck's basic questions about the charter that we put in front of the GNSO. As I said, I sent it out to the group. I'm looking for it now. I should've been ready for this but I wasn't. There it is.

Okay, so what we had was, I mean, one of the - some - the main issues and I'll go to that one first and just see, that in addition to the charter item we have, which was review the basis of the U.S. 100K application, base fee to determine its full origin and to determine what percentage of that fee could be waved for applicants meeting the requirements for assistance.

Chuck has basically recommended that either added to that or possibly as a completely separate item - and he's offered this as a friendly amendment, which means Rafik and Bill Drake, who second his motion, will need to accept the amendment but Rafik is basically, you know, sort of putting it to us to sort of say is this a friendly amendment, is that the ad work with ICANN - work with the ICANN new gTLD implementation staff to determine how the fee waivers would be funded.

And so that - at first I misunderstood and I thought he wanted to replace our charter item on the hundred K to this charter item. Instead what he wants to do is add this phrase as either another charter work item or as an extension of our current item. I see Rafik has his hand up.

Rafik Dammak: So...

Avri Doria: Go ahead Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. So I think that's, yes, again the - we are agreeing that it will be in addition and I was going to - Chuck said that he's not stuck to his wording

and I was going to suggest that the wording to the amendment but that he didn't send (ETF) with that council but I can share it with working group, so would add as an amendment, working with ICANN using GTLD program staff about based (T) components and also a recommendation for cost recopy of those fee waivers.

I think that it - respond to Chuck's questions and I - it will be helpful to have your feedback about that.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay so does anybody in the group have any issue with this addition, either as Chuck put it or as Rafik put it or in whatever way it works out between then to that? I see Tijani. Yes?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. First of all I'm sorry to be so late. I was rushing from the Consulate of Columbia in Madrid to get my visa. As for the proposal of adding the paragraph or a state- or a phrase about the work with ICANN staff to see how to refund the fee waiving, I think this says that this can change all the stature of our report because we - inside our report we said why we are commanding to waive or to reduce these fees and telling also that this will not affect the cost recovery system.

So if we add this statement, this phrase, it will be - it will not be relevant with our - with the stature of our report.

Avri Doria: Okay, so in other - you're saying that we should not add this to the chart if - I want to make sure I understand. We should not add this to the future charter because an account report we said that is made no difference to the other fees. But I think for example, Chuck is sort of asking, is this something where we would look for donor money to come in and fill or are we saying that staff should be free to raise everybody else's fees so that that sum total.

So yes, we gave our reasons for why this should happen and we even explained that according to the GNSO it wasn't that everybody's fees had to

be cost recovery but that the program had to be cost recovery but now - but Chuck is basically okay, so you're saying that the program is still cost recovery and that you aren't increasing the fees for these people?

How, therefore, does the program remain cost recovery? And so I don't see that as actually discounting our work. I think it's basically asking us to do one extra piece of work which is make recommendations on how, working with ICANN staff, on how the program can still be a cost recovery program even though we're reducing the fee for this many people.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: On Report 100K, yes?

Avri Doria: Well, no, no, no. Adjustments for the 100K I think - well, especially for the 100K, but I think it was in terms of all the reductions, is how can, you know, we said it ought to be. You know, we said the GNSO says it's cross recovery. We didn't say it shouldn't be cost recovery. We said that the GNSO had said that cost recovery is for the overall program not per applicant and we also said that we are justified in recommending lowering these fees because it's just and other reasons.

But we did not say and we think that you can maintain both of these by doing X, Y and Z. And so what he's asking now is in the second part of your program are you willing to work with ICANN to figure out how they can do what you asked plus keep the costs even, which is slightly better than what the staff and board said which is forget it. We're not lowering your fees. At least the GNSO perspective is sort of saying, well, okay if you want to lower these fees, how do you recommend that we do it?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay. So Sebastien.



Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. Yes, I understand both arguments from Tijani and from you and I think maybe we can have a sentence less - discussing the subject and not already giving the answer. My point of view is that all these questions of recovery, okay, it's done because gNSO said five years ago that it must be exact and then we don't have to discuss that.

I would like very much like to discuss that but let's (put that aside). If we don't discuss that what we can discuss if it's - if we lower the fee for some applications, if it changes the balance of the overall problem. What we say is that we don't need to put more money because you will - ICANN staff or ICANN will have less expense and then we don't need to find money. We need to find a way to decrease the expense and here are some solutions.

And if we don't discuss the overall problem balance maybe we can add the sentence more balance itself, not saying we need to find money to replace what we want to decrease but which way we will to add the overall program cost recovery of. Yes.

Avri Doria: Right. Right. And I think that that matches. You know, that's almost what Chuck said, determine how the fee waivers would be funded. So if you just change that word funded to, you know, determine how the fee waivers would be accommodated.

Man: Oh yes. Okay. I think it's a much more - it's a better word and more appropriate to - I get the feeling we - Tijani and myself have on this subject. Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Rafik, are you willing to offer that as a counter proposal to Chuck? Basically his phrase but the with the word accommodated replacing funded?

Rafik Dammak: Accommodate to replace funding?

Avri Doria: Yes, basically work with the ICANN new gTLD implementation staff to determine how the fee waivers would be accommodated.

Rafik Dammak: Okay yes. No problem. Can we - I have...

Avri Doria: Let's see if Chuck is (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Can you please share this in...

Avri Doria: Sure. I'll send you an email, right.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Okay. Yes, yes.

Avri Doria: Okay, Cheryl, again I apologize for time - we're almost out of time - I see your hand is up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No problem. I just wanted to come in and say that there are things that (unintelligible) would - is very important and one that I think that on Tuesday, the 23rd at the ALAC meeting, when the same gratification that changes to charter would have to come under us, I'd be strongly supporting that as well. Otherwise I think...

Avri Doria: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...and leveling ourselves otherwise.

Avri Doria: So we're adding a charter item as opposed to amending the 100 one. We're adding a charter item that says work with ICANN new gTLD implementation staff to determine how we - fee waivers would be accommodated, period.

Man: Good.

Avri Doria: And suggest that as an alternate to Chuck and see if he accepts it. And I guess if ALAC puts that in and Rafik can say that, you know, ALAC, you know, discussed that and is looking at a similar change, that might be a good thing.

Okay we've hit our hour 01 mark again. I'm terribly sorry about being on hour off and taking a slow lazy lunch when I still had - thought I still had like 40 minutes to go. I'd like to ask everybody to take a look at the email I sent with the other issues where I provided answers and come back with any feedback if they think my answers were off the mark or unreasonable so that Rafik can take that back to the GNSO council with them.

But this was the only pending amendment but I wanted to make sure that you all had had a chance to speak to. Any last minute other things that people want to add?

Okay we - the doodle poll will be coming out. I don't know if Evan mentioned this - to try and find a time either Tuesday, Friday or some other day of the week where we can do a certain amount of rotation and save the pain and it may be one week Tuesday, one week Friday. I basically gave Gisella a very hard problem of looking at the whole schedule and looking at the people's geography and please to come up with a couple suggestions that we could doodle about.

So any delay in seeing that answer is because it's a near impossible problem that I wouldn't want to have tried myself. And I suggest that none of you try this at home either. It's for a professional.

So anything else? Any other closing words? Again, thank you Evan for catching the beginning of the meeting for me. I will try to get my clock straight. I just came over to Europe the other day and I thought I had figured it

all out correctly. I obviously didn't. And I better check all my other meeting schedules for the rest of the day to see how messed up I really am.

Yes Tijani. I see you put your hand up again.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, just so to inform you and Evan that you are invited to our - to the (FLO) ICANN meeting in Cartegana that will deal with the follow up of the statement done in Brussels in light of the board recommendations and the (advancement) of our work. So you are invited and one of you will speak there.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And, you know, we'll take a look at schedule and we'll make sure I keep that (stickied) in.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks again everybody and talk to you all I guess next week. Try and see what we can get scheduled but don't know exactly when yet, don't know exactly how. But please keep the conversations going on the email list. And please read the email I sent yesterday about Chuck's issues. And thank you.

Man: Okay bye.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Bye. Thanks.

Avri Doria:       Bye Carlos. I hope your back feels...

END