

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT**

Tuesday 23 August 2011 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Tuesday 23 August 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/gnso/gnso-jas-20110823-en.mp3>

On page :

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison - WG co-chair

Avri Doria - NCSG

Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Andrew Mack - CBUC

At-Large:

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

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

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large

ICANN staff

Kurt Pritz

Rob Hoggarth

Seth Greene

Wendy Profit

Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Karla Valente – ICANN Staff

Alex Gakuru - NCSG

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

Dev Anand Teelucksingh - LACRALO

Alain Berranger - Individual

Michele Neylon - RrSG

Krista Papac – RrSG
Cintra Sooknanan - At-Large
Dave Kissoondoyal - At-Large
Elaine Pruis - Minds and Machines
John Rahman Kahn - Individual - Adobe Connect

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

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the 23rd of August. On the call we have Rafik Dammak, Carlton Samuels, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Carlos Aguirre, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Alan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch, Avri Doria and Andrew Mack.

For staff we have Kurt Pritz, Seth Green, Wendy Profit, Rob Hoggarth and myself, Glen DeSaintgery. We have apologies from Alex Gakuru, Cheryl Langdon-Orr who will try to be on the Adobe Connect because she is on a ccNSO Council call, Cintra Sooknanan, Baudouin Schombe and Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Have I left anybody off?

Just before I hand over to Carlton and Rafik may I ask you please to say your names before you speak for the transcription purposes.
Thank you very much, over to both of you, Carlton and Rafik.

Carlton Samuels: Hello everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Good to see you all - good to see you all on this JAS call. Today we are going to look at the support application review panel that is - to introduce a new acronym here - SARP pronounced SARP. And this

piece of text is beginning on Page 29 of the most recent version of the final report - draft final report - which has been posted on the wiki landing page. And the parts of it is in the notes section of the Adobe Connect room.

I will also encourage you to look at the other piece which is - it says support recovery which is just one small piece. I thought we might as well throw it in today; I don't think this will - too controversial a piece.

To remind everyone your SOIs should be in to the staff and to chairs. And we would like to - I want to make one small - before I go to Alan - one small note. We neglected to give some recognition to Dev Anand Teelucksingh who was the original person that we put to look at the workflow support - application workflow that was discussed last week.

I personally asked Dev to begin to look at it. And he of course diligently went about it and presented a first pass at it which was subsequently changed by additional input from members. So I just want to make that correction that it was Dev who was looking at this flowchart for us from the start. And as usual I thank Dev for his support; he's always been very supportive of anything I do.

Before we begin to look Alan has his hand up. Can I have Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: You have the floor.

Alan Greenberg: Before we start on the substance I'd like a review of the timetable. I know there's been discussion on the GNSO Council list and - but as of

the last schedule I saw this is our second to last meeting. If that's still the case I think we need to address how we're actually going to get the report completed in that timeframe. If the schedule was changed I'd like to know. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: This is the second to last meeting on the schedule, Alan. What I'm going to propose for the chat and then I have to speak to Rafik before we do that is that we kind of (telescope) the funds and foundation and FAQ into the meeting. And we go - for Friday. And then we go to next Tuesday to do the final review and approval. I am going to suggest to Rafik based on what he knows of the GNSO processes. So we will look at it.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Carlton. Okay I send the request last week to the GNSO Council if we can have any extra days and to delay the deadline there is no action yet from the GNSO Council. The - how to say - there is a kind of deadline but if there is not the real objection in Wednesday so it means that we will have a few days in September so we can work in the - on the report.

But I cannot guarantee that now. So until tomorrow if - I think how the discussion will go on the GNSO Council I can't update that matter. So now we - I think we are following the previous planning and schedule. But if there is any change I will update the working group as soon as possible.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Rafik. So, Alan, that's the best we can do. We have it online but we can't make a determination. But as I said that - we

anticipate that we'll have at least one more by the (unintelligible) next week to finalize...

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I just wanted to get it on the record before we started the substance of this meeting. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan. Rafik, you had something else to say, sir; your hand is still up or is this from the last time?

Okay. So can we now go and look - focus on the text? We are beginning in Paragraph 74 of the current draft report. And you'll find that on Page 29 of the current draft report. As I say the current draft report is on the landing page. You can get to it from the wiki landing page if - those of you who might not be able to find it you will see the information that we are going to talk about in the notes window of the Adobe Connect.

Any comment on 74 as it's stated here? Let me ask the question to term the right sort of panel. Are members happy with the use of that terminology or should we be a little more specific?

Andrew, you have your hand up, sir.

Andrew Mack: Thanks. I went through the document yesterday and last night so my comments didn't make it all the way through (unintelligible). Yes, that's one of the things that I pointed out was that the right source seems a little bit too vague.

One of the things I think is important for us is to maintain the same tone throughout the document and the same kind of level of precision. And this one didn't seem to make that - make the bar.

When we're talking about the right source we're talking in specific terms about a group that is - that has the right expertise that comes from the different appropriate stakeholder groups and includes - if I'm understanding correctly - at least some people who are not volunteers partly because we recognize the limitations of the volunteer - an all-volunteer group and partly because it's just good to have some people whose job it is to do this.

Am I understanding the sense of our working group correctly?

Carlton Samuels: No, (unintelligible) I'm on a teleconference. I'll call you back. Yes on my phone (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Okay so our chair is taking another call. Anyway did that make sense to everybody else?

Carlton Samuels: Well it certainly made sense to me, Andrew. I mean, what is important, as you say, is that we have the right - we keep the tone of the document consistent. And, you know, I try to delay my comments until everybody has said anything. But it's what I wanted to - well it confirms what my thinking is, your thoughts.

Avri, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Why thank you. Yes, I mean, in 74 perhaps the language there is, you know, wordsmithable. But what we're trying to - I think that we do want

to say is that we do need the right mix. And in fact when you get to Paragraph 75 it does start talking in more detail about what the right mix is.

Now there's the question that's been going back and forth in the discussion between Alan and I as to the foreground/background discussion of volunteers or staff.

And I think at the moment having listened to Alan issues and I'm sort of proposing a middle ground but I don't know I've gotten into this yet is that at its core I still believe it needs to be a volunteer panel with people with the right skills and even perhaps set up on the model given below.

But it needs to have a fair degree of experts. My problem with the normal external evaluation panel that the staff has been doing is that those have been set up completely by the staff with absolutely no say-so by the rest of the community on who does it, on how it's done, on what kind of agreements are made with experts, etcetera, so completely black-box thing between the staff and the dispute resolution panel.

So I'm definitely arguing that we do not want the dispute resolution panel model and I was arguing more for something similar to the AOC panels that we've set up. Alan has made very good arguments about that not being appropriate. So at the moment I think what I'd like to be arguing for is something that's hybrid that at its base, at its core is the volunteers of community-wide distribution and of the right skill sets.

And for example the ICANN gaming experts have to come from the community; no one knows how to game ICANN like we do. But the experts in development economy, in funding models, in, you know, such as that need to be gotten external but need to be gotten externally under the supervision, I mean, by the staff but under the supervision of this panel.

So I think I'm arguing for hybrid. But of course the words - the right sort of panel, yes, it sounds like we want people with dainty teacups and their fingers in the air and the right sort of people. And so that expression is problematic. But we do want the right sort of panel.
Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: I will leave it to Alan to - because he's next on the board. But my reading of Alan's comment about his reservations about a AOC-type panel, Avri. I think if he explains it we will probably see it meet where the hybrid line is. But, Alan, you have the board, sir, you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, first of all thank you. Just to clarify one thing Avri said she said the discussion between us has been whether to be volunteer or staff. I never - and I don't believe anyone ever said it should be staff.

Avri Doria: That was an accident. What I meant was a staff-created dispute resolution panel.

Alan Greenberg: Okay fine. Okay because clearly we don't want staff on this group.
ICANN needs to isolate itself to some extent.

Carlton Samuels: That's my understanding of what you were saying.

Alan Greenberg: I understand I just wanted to clear up the wording because there was never a discussion of this being done by staff. I don't disagree with Avri that there has to be involvement from the community in determining exactly what the composition of this group is.

I just think that relying primarily on the community, number one, is a - is fraught with problems because of time commitment issues. You know, and it's a real problem, you know, people have real jobs, they get sick, they have personal lives.

And doing something such a tight timeline with what I believe may well be - we don't know to what extent it's going to be - but may well be a large job because we don't know how many applications are going to become like this but, you know, there could 100 of them.

This is going to be a very, very time consuming job potentially. So I worry about that aspect. I worry about the concept of using the AOC model which essentially says equal representation from all the communities which, you know, translates to, you know, forgive me but the GNSO ended up saying, you know, we need one for each stakeholder group or one from each constituency.

I'm not sure that's the way you want to set this kind of panel up with everyone representing their own constituency. We're trying to look at something for the good of the community first and not the who sent them first. So I have some real problems with what's being described. I can live with it but I'm not - it's certainly it's very far from optimal in my mind. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan. So just to - before I go to Tijani I'm trying here to see that we keep focused on this. The question of a hybrid panel is accepted by the arguments it's just the detail as to how we choose the panel and the kinds of expertise that the panel needs to have is the issue.

We are all agreed that this is not a panel for staff to choose but for us to make into. That's what I'm hearing. Tijani, you have the floor, sir.

Alan Greenberg: Excuse me, one more thing before I finish. The question of whether these non-community people are paid or not has not been addressed.

Carlton Samuels: Ah.

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Ah, yes, yes, you know, that's something I wanted to ask too. Because if they're paid where would the funds come from? Would we have to say that we would not expect them to be paid from the fund or from - or from monies raised to support. Would that be appropriate? That's something that we have to address. And we would have to add a paragraph I presume here.

What I'm thinking of is that we can expand Paragraph 75. As Avri pointed out some of the things that we are talking about is already included there. There might be some expansion that is possible. But the issue of - depending on the balancing of the panel and its required expertise on the outside who pays for that.

Tijani, go ahead please, sir.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you. While I fully support the position of Avri I do understand the worries of Alan. And it gives a real problem, if you want. But we don't have any other choice; there is the staff or the community. And I do prefer the community.

Second point the experts must be paid. There is not - we cannot have real experts without paying them. So the idea is to have a panel composed of volunteers from the community based on, first, they're willing because if people doesn't have the willing they will not attend - they will not work and we will fail. So first they're willing.

Second the competence, very important, you will not put people that don't understand the question to be on the panel. And third availability. So those things have to be clearly defined and said to the people who will volunteer to be on this panel.

The panel will be the core or the body that will decide on the evaluation. And the panel will be assisted by the experts. So the experts can be engaged by the ICANN staff but they will report - they will help the panel. So the panel is - if you want - is the decision body.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Thank you Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Second point, second point, moment please.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Second point, Paragraph 75 we are talking about the panel who will - should be (unintelligible) and you said that he will decide on the

financial support and for the fee reduction only. I prefer to say that he will decide on the eligibility so any kind of support - in kind support, financial support, fee reduction, all kind of support will pass through this panel. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Tijani. So with respect to the panel and the hybrid nature of it Tijani has made one very important process proposal that while you have experts - experts there to advise the panel and they're not necessarily a part of the panel but they are advisors to the panel.

Avri has also put up in the chat a quick response to the payment of non-volunteers issue but I'll leave it to her now. Avri, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes, okay on the AOC I understand Alan's point and probably, you know, it would be a modified AOC but it would be, you know, for example just sitting here I would think that for example all of the regions of ALAC should be represented on such a panel and perhaps the four stakeholder groups or maybe just the two houses of the GNSO.

But I think that's something that we should probably put in the recommendation and then otherwise for - and then some notion of GAC representation and how we go from there. So I think it would be a modified - I certainly don't see us going to every constituency.

And I do think that probably ALAC should - or At Large rather should because of its, you know, closeness to the user community and the GNSO because this is about gTLDs should indeed have the major representation in such a panel.

But I do believe that having people from ccNSO and SSAC because remember that it should extend - and this is I think going to Tijani's point but beyond to any aid which includes if somebody comes with the proposal for how to create a registry service provider in one of the regions that's something that they would bring to this panel as well.

And so you want people there that also understand so you want the RSAC person there to be able to look at it and say that's a bad proposal, that's, you know, and you want the security people there to be able to raise the flag on security. So they may not need to be there in the same proportion but you definitely need them.

In terms of volunteers I think that people that volunteer for these AOC panels have indeed done amazing work even though they were volunteers. And of course they have to be volunteers who know that they can commit from January to, you know, six months later an immense amount of time. And that's their personal responsibility. I agree that the staff is there to help them.

So - and on the payment, first of all there was a Paragraph 76 that talked about where the expenses would come from and I think that was in the original proposal. And, you know, obviously we have to pay non volunteers otherwise they are volunteers. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Avri. Andrew, we'll go straight to you; you have the floor, sir.

Andrew Mack: Okay thanks very much, Carlton. I am hearing what you say, Avri and Tijani and agree in principal that we want this to be as much as

possible community-driven. I have grave doubts based on just the experience that we've had and some of the other experiences that I've heard from other people who are working on these kind of longer term working groups that we'll be able to maintain the level of volunteer support if it's really only a volunteer grouping.

And I don't know whether the right answer is to try to find a way to compensate for some of the volunteer time or whether the better response is to have some sort of a blended group. I agree completely that we don't want this to be dominated by staff or experts or, you know, some sort of paid group.

But realistically I think we're asking a tremendous amount of volunteers. And what may very well happen is to some extent what happens with a group like this which is that you have four or five or six or in this case on the call today what is it nine people who are really committed and have the time but also that they suffer from burnout.

And when we have even more on the table including more resources to give away on the table I think it makes it very, very difficult. To some extent I think it would be very helpful for us to have some people who were just paid for their time so that they really, you know, they really could devote a little bit more fairly constant focus and of no other reason than to give us a sense of continuity throughout.

I don't think it's fair, frankly, to ask a volunteer to serve for - if this is as big a responsibility as it sounds like it might be - I don't think it's fair to ask them to serve for a year on this I just think it'd be a lot to do. So I'm trying to find the right balance between the two but to really take into account the fact that people do have real lives.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Andrew. I am - I think you said some things here that seriously require some attention. Avri has responded very directly to what you were saying. Because if I'm hearing you correctly you're saying that we - it might be useful to consider actually compensating some volunteers; that's what I'm asking.

And I am also hearing you saying that you should include directly in the panel some experts - outside experts as working directly as members of the review panel as opposed to Tijani's proposal that experts are advisors to the panel not exactly on the panel itself. Would I be correct in that assessment, sir, Andrew just to get back to you before I go to Kurt.

Andrew Mack: Right, sure, I will try. I am - in terms of your first question as to whether or not we compensate volunteers I don't know if that's the right way to go with this. I do know that it's very, very difficult for there to be a diversity of opinion and to get more people into this process without having some way to account for their time.

And if we look at just the amount of burnout that we've had on this panel and how much people are really committed to but, you know, it's been going on for a year and a half now and it's a lot.

And, you know, weddings and vacations and actual paying work and all kinds of other things I think we have to try to find some way to balance that out otherwise we really are asking of people something that I think is unrealistic and in many instances will get a very, very narrow group of people who have the time that may or may not be

representative and may or may not, you know, just be - may be able to stay with it. So that's - I'm not sure is the answer to the first question.

The answer to the second question about including experts as part of the vote I think especially as we get to technical issues that would probably be appropriate. But again it depends on the composition. If the volunteers can find a way - if we can find a way to get enough volunteers with enough diversity then I have no, you know, I have no problems with doing what Tijani says.

I do think to follow on one of the things that Avri said we do want to make sure that we have the expertise there at the table. And so for those instances it strikes me as logical that those people would have some sort of a vote. But again the mechanism I'm open to. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Andrew. Just before I go to Kurt who has his hand up can I just make two small things? Rob has put in a very helpful point and says do we also need to discuss timeline in this work to be done because as Andrew said that it might involve a long term commitment and potential conflicts of interest maybe and - this is Rob asking that.

I'm bringing that up now because as I look to where - I think we are pretty much at the point where we are suggesting that the text here be augmented. Evan has put a talking point in that says preference 1/3 ALAC appointed - he's speaking of SARP - 1/3 ALAC appointed, 1/3 GNSO appointed, 1/3 staff contracted experts.

So he's back to the idea of saying that we have a panel and the panel is a mix of volunteer and outside experts - where the outside experts themselves are directly part of the panel. That was ALAC.

Evan has pointed out the issue there it goes back to the issue of - well, you know, if we start saying that Alan was worrying about that then we have all kinds of politics involved in coming up with a panel.

But the overarching concern I have here is that we need to think about the kinds of augmentation, the (text) augmentation here because it seems to me what we are saying is that we have to tease out some more the attributes of the panelists, the kinds of expertise that would be required here.

And if we could think about the exact text that we need to augment this - the statement it would be very helpful to Robin and the people who have the pen on this.

Kurt, you have the floor, sir.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks for letting me speak here. First I agree with what I think is the majority of the sentiment that this should be - this evaluation effort should be independent of staff and the evaluation panel. It should also be independent of staff.

And staff is in the business of, you know, receiving the applications and, you know, I don't think should be involved in a preliminary evaluation in any way even in forming the panel although it stands by ready to assist any volunteer group.

Second I think at the end of the day we want to treat the dollars we have to give to applicants like liquid gold. And so, you know, I would urge that we use the - we use volunteers as much as possible.

And then third as a possible solution for that we might look at the RSEP model and that's the Registry Services Evaluation Panel where there's, you know, something like 25 or 30 panel members on standby but they're convened in groups of four or five. In that way the work is spread out.

And so there's a - and so not so much work on each of the panelists so the work can be spread out. In this case the work can be spread out by regions because you probably want people from the same region at least some people from the same region involved in the evaluation of those panels.

And then second the - some of the workload is kind of (unintelligible) because this will be I think a short term effort so, you know, for considering applications up through the application window. So I think that if we have a short term window and we can spread the work around several panels (unintelligible). Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Kurt. So this is an interesting takeaway here. Kurt is suggesting that if we think about the panel and we look at the attributes of the panel and the expertise required we might want to have a large pool of panelists and we empanel people to work on the evaluation based on the origination of the candidate. That's what I'm hearing him say.

So for example if they're - you have a panel, you still need the same set of experts but you may rotate them where they come from based on what has been discussed and what has been decided. That might be a good way to look at it.

Well it makes sense to me. Tijani you have the floor, sir.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. I think that paying or giving money to the volunteers will not give them more time to be available. So it will not solve the problem. So I still - I stick with the proposal of the volunteers. We have a very good example, the AOC review team, they were volunteers and they did a wonderful job in a timely manner. So I don't know why we are so afraid of this point. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Tijani. Kurt his hand is still up. Kurt, do you have anything else to say or is it from the last time?

Kurt Pritz: Yes, it was from the last time, I'll take it down.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Okay so we have two other bits of grist for the mill as it were. The first one is that we have - with regard to the panel the - we have a model that Kurt has suggested that we might look at for guidance, that's the RSEP model.

And essentially it is a question of having a large pool and then we have working groups - working members from that panel. We choose a panel and the panel we choose is somehow going to be influenced by what is before them by virtue of origination or whatever. So what I'm hearing is that we have a large panel - a large group from which we can choose people who will work on different applications at one time.

I also note Tijani's comment that it is - it's not a question of just compensation volunteers. And when I was making reference to

compensation I was presuming that this panel would need to meet face to face at some point. And so there has to be some expenses incurred.

And those are the expenses I was thinking of. I'm not talking about paying for time so much as the expenses that incur from serving on this panel just to make sure that what I was saying is not about compensating people for time but meeting the expenses which is what is covered in 76, the issue of the time that Andrew raised as also some implications because it's always about how much time is available.

And like Tijani I don't believe that just saying you're going to compensate people for time is going to make the time available. Tijani, you have your hand up.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, do you hear me?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, yes I'm hearing you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay thank you. I am okay with a large panel; it's a good idea. But even if it is very large each member of the panel must commit to be available any time for the panel. I propose - the idea of Kurt is good and we can imagine that when we will discuss something there is member they are compulsory to attend this meeting or this call and others can attend but perhaps can be absent.

And for other items to be discussed some other people are compulsory to be present and others can not. But all can attend; all can be on the panel on the time. The most important thing is the commitment and availability. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Tijani. I - you didn't say it, Tijani, but I also hear you say that the expertise of the panel this is also important.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, sure, sure, sure, sure, sure, sure.

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Yes. Does anyone - there's nobody on the board at the minute wanting to speak. Do you all believe we have exhausted this? Okay so we have some - a sense of what is griping this group. We need the text augmented, we need the text augmented in terms of more - attribute definition of the panelists. We need the text augmented to perhaps give some guidance as to how this panel could operate.

And we need some guidance - we need some augmentation in the text to recommend a set of criteria for the panel. Rob, you have your hand up, sir. I was hoping I would tease you out.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Both Avri and Evan had some suggestions about the panel makeup in the chat. Do you think it's worthwhile to try to get some consensus on either of those? Because what I've picked up is that, you know, clearly the makeup is primarily not staff. It's not primarily community volunteers but it's a combination of volunteers, outside experts and some staff management.

It would be helpful if you did have some specific numbers, you know, whether there's a consensus that gathers around Avri's numbers of I think 25% breakup or Evan's 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 that might be helpful if you think as Chair you can tease that out in the next couple of minutes.

Carlton Samuels: Yes that's a good idea. If we - we can go back to that let's add some definition here. Evan had suggested a panel that was comprised of 1/3 ALAC appointed, 1/3 by GNSO and 1/3 staff contracted experts which is to say the panel is - the experts contracted are included in the panel itself. That was Evan's suggestion.

Avri's suggestion was that you have 1/4 from the At Large, 1/4 from GNSO, 1/4 from other AC/SOs. And she made the point - I don't remember exactly but the RSAC people for example would be key to this. I think that's where she's trying to bring them in - 1/4 expert members. And she has specialized advisors from the outside. So her advisors in this instance are not part of the panel per se but are expert advisors.

So these are the two models...

Avri Doria: Can I make a correction on that?

Carlton Samuels: Yes please do.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. What I was differentiating was two kinds of experts that 1/4 of the panel would be in the wording you used for Evan's would be staff contracted outside experts and then there were - so they would be members of the panel; they would be 1/4 of the voting members of the panel as in Evan's model and as suggested I think by Andrew.

But there would also be other specialized contracted experts for who knows what topics that the panel needed that would not be voting members of the panel.

So basically that the experts were of two varieties is what I was getting at that if the panel is sitting there and saying oops we need someone who's an expert on economics in Botswana and none of us has have expertise you could go out and get that person to help you evaluate that one particular set of applications is the kind of flexibility that I was thinking of there.

Whereas you would have a person who was a development economics person as a permanent member of, you know, and that's just a for-example of the panel. So it was doing that. And of course I think both Evan and I left out the and of course staff management and administration. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay thank you. I was about to say, Avri, that in response to your suggestion I see some closing of the gap because Evan did respond in the chat and said that works too. So I would sense a suggest that he's now closer to your position. So what we have to do is to look at this proposal that you have made here.

Andrew, I see you're trying to write something. Do you want to say it so we can close off?

Andrew Mack: Sure, so I think I'm agreeing violently with what I think is Avri and Evan's evolving position. We have two kinds of experts; one kind of expert would be on the panel as voting members and participants over the long term providing both expertise and a sense of longevity as volunteers come and go.

And then the second group would be more ad hoc like consultants who would advise the panel as needed, as contracted on the basis of

specific pieces of expertise that the panel did not otherwise have. The Botswana example might be one, some specifics related to security or business model or whatever might be another that jump into my mind. So - but I think we're all on the same page now.

Carlton Samuels: Wonderful. Thank you, Andrew. Tijani just to get your (boat) on this sir do you see this as something that would work for you too?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: The proposal of Avri works for me.

Carlton Samuels: Oh wonderful.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: All right so, Rob, there you have it.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, thanks. That was helpful.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you very much, Rob. We are good to go. Okay so can we just deal with this last piece and so we can get out for this - and the support recovery portion. This is in the current draft Paragraph 78, 79 and 80.

This is the sense of it here is that if somebody gets - grants some support then depending on how successful they are the expectation is is that they would pay back into the fund. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes...

Carlton Samuels: You're on the...

Avri Doria: Okay we're on 76 or 77?

Carlton Samuels: No we - I think we are - I thought we had...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Yes we are in support recovery, 78 and 79.

Avri Doria: Yes, okay that one - there was still the issue and I don't think we've ever discussed - we discussed the issue at length of people paying back the monies they were given so if you've gotten funding to start an RFP that's money that goes back to the fund. If you've gotten funding because you got a grant to, you know, to buy equipment then you're able to pay that back into the fund.

And I suppose with the nonfinancial grant the only way to pay that back is to pay it forward and you've got an obligation to help people in the future. And I'm not quite sure how that's structured.

I don't think we ever got into the - what is the responsibility for payback from those that got fee reductions. Now there's one part of me that says yes that should be paid into the fund as well for future applicants. And so I guess my starting position on is yes that should be included in the payback model but I don't think we've ever discussed it so I figured I'd say both of those things. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Avri. Andrew, you have the floor, sir and then followed by Alan.

Andrew Mack: Thanks a brief comment because I also have to go at 10 o'clock. This something I made a comment in - when I reviewed the document. I'm a little concerned about this. I hear what you're saying, Avri, but I'm a little concerned about this in terms of our position on fee reductions generally speaking. I wonder if that doesn't undermine our argument for fee reductions.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Andrew Mack: And that's partly because we're making the argument that some of these fees either are overstated or shouldn't really apply to this - that class of citizens. And if we're offering to rebate that portion of it - the other parts I completely agree but if we're offering to rebate that portion of it I think that we jeopardize our broader argument and I don't think that that's - I know that that's not anyone's intent but I think that's the way it might be read. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Can I respond? Well I put myself in the queue.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, yes, please just one right away.

Avri Doria: Okay...

Carlton Samuels: Let's give her one moment, Alan, please.

Avri Doria: I actually disagree; I don't think it undermines it because remember we're saying that if you become a financial success and I think that whatever reasons we have for why these fees shouldn't apply the point is if the fee is reduced and they get rich then retroactively them putting

money in the pot for people who still can't apply becomes very reasonable.

The criteria though is that they have to be financially successful. It's not that they owe the money and have to pay it it's that they owe the money if they get to be very rich off of their thing. If they don't well then it's not an issue.

Carlton Samuels: I wouldn't even say owe; I would say that they have an obligation.

Avri Doria: Yes, yes, yes.

Andrew Mack: If I can make a quick comment to try and square the circle? I think that the answer to this is to not connect the one to the other. To say that for anyone who receives JAS supports who becomes very successful we should have some sort of payback provision but not have it connected to the specific fee reduction.

That way the outside audiences that might be looking at this won't connect them in their minds thus making it - that's avoiding any potential for (unintelligible) understanding or for undermining of the fee reduction argument. That's my personal reading of it.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Alan, you have the floor, sir.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry, did you say me? I...

Carlton Samuels: No, Alan, it's you - it's you, you're up.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, sorry my - the call cut off for a second. I know Rob has hand up for ages I don't know if it's to talk on this subject or something else.

Rob Hoggarth: My apologies, I'll take it down.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. There's a whole bunch of related things here. I tend to agree that there should be some concept and repaying might be not the right word but reimbursing ICANN for the discount I think is appropriate.

One of the things that changed when we went from the financial support in lieu of a discount to the discount...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...is...

Carlton Samuels: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Hello? Am I still on?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: You are. He's not.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. One of the...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Why don't I come and see you then because I am...

Alan Greenberg: Carlton, you're on our call.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay let me try again. One of the things that disappeared when we went from the - from the financial support to the discount concept is the discount becomes an all or nothing thing. We can't say we're giving you \$50,000 off the fees because that's all you really need; it's either we give you zero off and you pay \$185,000 or we give you \$138,000 and you pay \$47,000.

Therefore it's going to be - we can expect situations where the person gets no other financial support other than the discount because the discount is more than enough to cover their needs to be able to step up and apply for a new gTLD.

Therefore not - it may be more than they need in fact but we'll - it doesn't look like we have a mechanism for implementing less than \$138,000 if they get the binary decision of yes they're supportable.

So the concept of being able to put something back into it I think is very reasonable. And I think we need to find a way to do that. It may not be repay - we may need another word for it. But because we now have a binary decision on the 138K funding or not it becomes really problematic if there's no obligation. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan. So we - it seems to me that we've got convergence here on the concept that what we're talking about is if

you're successful in this - the sense of the group is that we are talking about putting something back into the fund if you're successful. And maybe we should have the text simply make it very clear that we are really talking about success and giving something back to the community.

Okay it's a minute until the top o the hour by my watch. Do we have anything more to make of this? I see no other action. Can I therefore call this discussion to an end and this conference to an end?

Alan Greenberg: Are we reconvening the drafting group and so...

Carlton Samuels: We are reconvening the drafting group right after this.

Alan Greenberg: On this call or call in again?

Carlton Samuels: We're going to call in again using the traditional call which is the number you called - the (ADIGA) number and your 7308 I think is the code. Am I correct, Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: I'll let Seth - can confirm that.

Seth Green: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Sorry.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Seth...

Seth Green: That's right, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Okay so we call the traditional (ADIGA) number...

Rafik Dammak: Sorry?

Carlton Samuels: ...and the code is 7308.

Rafik Dammak: Carlton? It's Rafik.

Carlton Samuels: Oh yes, Rafik, I'm sorry, you go ahead, sir.

Rafik Dammak: So we are going to have the - that extra call but is it possible to have dial out?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I'm sure - can you give us a number here, Rafik, and Seth will collect it and ask for the dial out.

Rafik Dammak: Okay I can send it to...

Glen DeSaintgery: Hello, Carlton, Rafik, this is Glen.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Glen. Go ahead, Glen, please.

Glen DeSaintgery: You were staying onto the (ADIGA) call now, is that so?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: I will get you - I will get (ADIGA) to call out to you.

Carlton Samuels: Oh okay so you have Rafik's call out number so you can call, great.
Thank you, Glen, very kind of you.

Glen DeSaintgery: It may take a few minutes.

Carlton Samuels: Yes we will - we will take a five minute break between now and then.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay thanks very much.

Carlton Samuels: It's 7308.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: That code. So okay we are going to bring this to an end. Thank you all for showing up this morning. I think we made some progress. We are going to convene a small group afterwards to make a best sense of what was said this morning so that - and you will see that showing up in the text in a little while on the list. So thank you one and all. This call is ended. Take care.

Alan Greenberg: Bye all.

Andrew Mack: Thank you.

END