SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 29 October 2010 at 1400 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 29 October 2010 at 14:00 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-20101029-en.mp3   On page:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

ALAC
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Carlos Aguirre - At Large
Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair
Sébastien Bachollet – ALAC
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Dave Kissoondoyal – At Large
Baudoin Schombe – At Large

GNSO
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison
Andrew Mack - CBUC
Tony Harris – ISCPC

ICANN staff
Karla Valente
Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:
Avri Doria – NCSG – Co-Chair
Alex Gakuru – NCSG

Coordinator: The call is now recorded. Please go ahead.

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

                everyone on today's JAS call on Friday, the 29th of October. We have Evan

                Leibovitch, Baudouin Schombe, Tony Harris, Carlos Aguirre, Sebastien

Bachollet, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alan Greenberg. From staff, we have Karla Valente, Glen deSaintgery, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies today from Alex Gakuru and from Avri Doria. We are also shortly expecting Dave Kissoondoyal on this call.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, excellent and Dave is with us in the Adobe chat room, so I hope he will be there.

Okay, so what I'd like to do is go through the current draft that Karla has (capitulated), essentially incorporating a lot of the suggestions that have gone in along with a lot of little cosmetic clean ups as I understand it. So my goal right now is to essentially go over the things that have been defined by Karla as needing more clarification and then get to the one area of the document that we really haven't paid much attention to, which is the FAQ.

So what I'd like to do then - before I go any further in keeping with the request, is there anybody here who has had an update in their status that would affect their SOI? If there is, please say something within the next 15 or so seconds to indicate, otherwise I will take silence as no change.

Okay, thank you for the moment of silence. I guess we will take that as no changes and so Tinjani welcome to the call and go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, it's only a suggestion on a proposal. Not the proposal, information. We already did receive from Karla what was proposed to the board by the staff, and I read it and I understand very well the decision of the board. The board cannot decide otherwise, because what was presented to the board is exactly what you decided, so I wonder if we have to convince the board or to convince the staff.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, that's a very useful and important point and I guess it gets to the heart of why we asked for the stacks of documentation in the first place. Well there's a couple of ways to deal with this, one of which is to make a specific representation on behalf of the chairs of our two sponsoring bodies to make a representation directly to the board. The other possibility is to create an executive summary that details things in one page for the board in such a way that we get to control that narrative and not the staff. I'm open to other suggestions of ways to deal with this.

Cheryl, are you on the call?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I am indeed.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, do you have any suggestion how we can address the issue of staff filtering our output in a way that guides the board in a specific direction? That is not necessarily what we wanted.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You probably need to do it in two ways, but the same information coming out in both. You need to go back to the two chartering organizations. You know address both the ILAC and the GNSO and say what the workgroup believes is a difference in the output of the workgroup and the way that the output of the workgroup was then presented to the board for information is a concern. And ask the two chartering organizations to address that in their own way, because we have the ability for the advisory committee involved, the ILAC, to have input directly into the board as a piece of advice.

And you have the GNSO I suspect particularly concerned about how output from their policy development processes is being treated and how the council can be ensured that what is happening in its due and proper process is internally in PDPs needs to be -- how to say it -- full frankly and fearlessly, but with out bias and intent passed on.

The second approach, and one that I think is very timely - sorry. Can you hear me? There's an awful lot of noise on the line. Okay, would be to copy that concern of the workgroup to the accountability and transparency Review Team. Because one of the things that a number of constituency members and in some cases wholesale rank and file membership of constituencies or parts of ICANN has raised as a concern is that in the absence of knowing how the products are being presented to the board. In the absence of that being available to the community at a point in time when they can make any complaint or redress about it if they don't feel it's accurate prior to decisions, the better that timing needs to be considered.

And as we know whilst we have board books and things coming out respectively, there is I guess pushback from the community to ask why information and staff briefing information cannot be made available either at the time the board receives it or close to the time that the board receives it.

So you sort of have two aspects there, and you've got your liaisons, which need to be activated here to go back to this chartering organization and raise its concerns to indicate to the GNSO, the council. And in the case of the ILAC, the ILAC.

Evan Leibovitch: Our liaisons are and I think Rafik.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, both of them are on this call. Do either of you have anything to add at this point and are you cable and...?

Carlos Aguirre: Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, hi Carlos.

Carlos Aguirre: Sorry, because I joined the call late, but my understanding is that you were talking about the ICANN board material.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, essentially the fact that the results of what we had done was (heavily filtered) and presented to the board in such a way that it really had no alternative but to make the resolution that it did. So the issue right now is how do we work to ensure that our message gets to the board without that level of filtering.

And so one of the issues that is just now being raised by Cheryl is that our liaisons to the supporting organizations should be going back to those groups and ask for their support not only in advancing our position directly to the board, but also in advancing the entire issue about this to the ATRT related to having the community input being across the board without having opinions inserted by staff in the interim.

So are you comfortable as the GNSO liaison with bringing this issue to the council on two different fronts, one being to council the ability to submit directly to the board perhaps as a PDP issue so that it can go directly without filtering by staff? And also, that council could possibly deal with it as an ATRT issue.

Carlos Aguirre: Okay, as liaison, I will bring the issue to the council. Importantly, we had yesterday the conference call, but I will send by email the request to - so I will explain the situation to the council what is exactly the request from the working group.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Carlos as the ALAC liaison, are you comfortable with doing the same things at the ALAC level?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, of course Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so I will be more than happy to work with the two of you and perhaps this is something that could go as a (subset) in the email list - in our email list of trying to figure out the best way to bring this forward to the supporting organizations and ultimately to the board and the ATRT.

Cheryl, is it worthwhile at this point sending a letter to staff expressing our concerns about the amount of staff filtering going into our recommendations?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would assume that would be an output of the chartering organization deliberation on this. If both of your liaisons can suggest that the chairs of the GNSO and the ILAC consider writing or looking at some form of mutual response that could be included there.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so we will take this up in the email list and the action item out of this is that our liaisons, Carlos and Rafik, will take back to their supporting organizations these initiatives hopefully with the support and help of the rest of this group in making that happen.

Tinjani, does that sufficiently address your questions? I mean I do agree we need to move on this. It's serious; it's the reason why we asked for the briefing (unintelligible) in the first place.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, do you hear me?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Do you hear me?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, I can. Go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You hear me, okay. Yes, it addresses the issue and we have to be careful for the future really. We don't have to submit anything without being sure that everything would be presented to the board in the right way.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Even if it will be person by person, number by number, we have (all relation) with numbers and we have to go to them and present our output correctly.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, don't forget Cartagena is coming up. There's going to be interbody meetings where a lot of these things get to be expressed perhaps on a less formal level, so maybe we can do something with that.

In the meantime, Sebastian you did make a note about the ATRT in the Adobe Connect room. Did you want to add something?

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you, Evan. No, you cover it very good. It was very good coverage, and I don't have anything to add to it. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, no problem. Okay, so having said this, we will move on to the contents of the document. What this is is essentially the last version of the document that we were looking at on Tuesday with the comments from Tuesday incorporated in as well as some general grammatical and other clean ups by Karla.

So what I want to do is go through quickly to the points that she has highlighted in yellow of things that we need to look at, and then also ultimately to get to the FAQ section, which as I mentioned before is an area that we really haven't touched much in these discussions.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: I believe that we have achieved at least reasonable common ground in wording on most of the rest of the (subsets). Yes, Tinjani. Go ahead.

Tony Harris: Evan, this is Tony Harris. I have a comment on something that's highlighted in yellow.

Evan Leibovitch: I was supposed to get to them one by one, but go ahead.

Tony Harris: Well, I'm sorry. I don't mean to jump queue on this, but if you go to Page 22, it says for example, "ICANN communicated that the 2001 round was to be followed soon by new rounds. Nevertheless, it is taking almost (almost to the gate) for a new round to materialize." Well that's not true. There was a round in 2004.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, can I ask you to hold on to that because we're going to get to all the parts in yellow in sequence and that's near the end of the document.

Tony Harris: Sure. I'm sorry. I thought you know it was open to comments.

Evan Leibovitch: No problem. Okay, so Tinjani you have your hand up. Go ahead. Tinjani, the floor is yours.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Pardon.

Evan Leibovitch: The floor is yours. You had your hand up.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. Yes, I am speaking. Do you hear me?

Evan Leibovitch: I do now.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, I said that I want to understand what is the difference between the italics characters and the non-italics characters.

Evan Leibovitch: Karla, is there...?

Karla Valente: Hi, this is Karla. Well it depends on where you are in the document. So for example some of the italics characters are quotations from text like a board resolution or something else that we just copied like the GAC. Something that

we copied and pasted from somebody else's text, so it's under quotations and is in italics.

And there was some others that are just as a highlight, so the italics was used really to highlight to enhance either a quotation or to enhance some parts of the document. Because throughout the document, we have used a lot of bold and underlined for things like consensus, so I needed to find an alternative to highlight some other things.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, the first item highlighted in yellow is on Line 111 on Page 5 of the document that is in the Adobe Connect room.

Man: Sorry, Evan. Can I again request (unintelligible)? Can you please read those parts that you are going to talk about, because I don't have my PC and I'm trying to follow over the phone.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, no problem. Okay, so I'm calling your attention right now to Line 111 and Line 112, and essentially Karla has highlighted the term Emerging Markets/Nations that appears here. Only the phrase Emerging Markets/Nations are highlighted here. Karla, I'm assuming that you're asking for a sense of definition or clarification of this term.

Karla Valente: That's correct. Throughout the document, we use Emerging Markets, Emerging Nations, Developing Markets. We use different types of definitions. And I remember having a conversation about trying to adopt some kind of standard definition that we could point to. For example, Developing Countries. We are using the definitions United Nations, and here is the link to what countries they are referring to.

Evan Leibovitch: Does anyone have any comments about any particular definition we should use? Should we just refer back to the UN definitions or does anybody have a different yardstick they'd like to use for this? Sebastian go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yeah, I understand the question, but in fact my question is do we already have a list of countries where we agree upon here? Do we say something more vague and to be open to any discussion later or suggestion by (anybody) who knows about the list we need to use.

Evan Leibovitch: It's my understanding Sebastian that if we use an existing definition such as the United Nations, the UN itself maintains a list of which countries fit into each definition. So in effect, by using a terms such as the UN definition of the economies - you to use the definitions that do exist. It's indeed organizations like the UN that would in fact be deciding which countries fit into each category.

Sebastien Bachollet: And I understand this point, but I understand that it's better than somebody else taking care of the list of the countries, but is it this list we would like to push? I know that (unintelligible) using the guidebooks and maybe you can say we use the same, but we didn't look into the terms.

That I don't want to have any feedback saying that, "You made the right choice because my country is a developing country. It's not on the list set up by the UN and that's a wrong decision for domain names," and so on and so forth. If we take the decision, maybe we say why we take that as a definition. Thank you.

Tony Harris: Evan, this is Tony.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Tony. Tinjani first and then Tony.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, I suggest that we use developing countries as defined by the United Nations, because if we use another definition, another word that is not

defined, we may be in a gaming case. So the best under - and essentially also because (Region 20) spoke about the developing countries. So we are in harmony with what the board decided.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Tony go ahead and then Karla.

Tony Harris: Yeah, well I agree with Tinjani because emerging may not include countries that are not emerging - you know that they are really underdeveloped. I think Tinjani made a valid point.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay and Karla.

Karla Valente: Hi, so we have a couple of options. One is we decide and adopt you know the United Nations list and say that this is the list that we are recommending here for the applicants. The upside is that this list is very clear and also backed up by this policy. Because when the GNSO did the policy, they did mention the Level 4 United Nations countries. We might want to revisit whether Level 4 only or maybe Level 3 too, because Level 3 are more emerging markets and we talk about them in this document. So there's one way to do it, which is adopt that and you know be consistent throughout the document.
Another way to do it is you know just use our own definition and explain that our own definition is open to give flexibility for organizations that we will be financing or we will be providing aid in the future and their own programs. So that's my five cents.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so I mean do we have consensus for Karla to put in the definitions from the UN and to just use that? Is there anybody on this call who is opposed to that? Please speak now or put in an X in the chat room.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I put up a little - it's Cheryl here. I put up a little checkmark earlier. I think there could be merit in articulating the Level 3 and Level 4 categories that Karla mentioned in this text - in Lines 111 to 112. So if I'm also using the UN

definitions, I think we need to state it's not just Level 4, it's Level 3, and Level 4 from those defined criteria that we are discussing.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay I see checkmarks and I see no Xs, so I'm going to assume that we have consensus on that direction for Karla and that we will move on from there.

(Andrew) go ahead.

(Andrew): Just a second. Sorry. Yeah, can you hear me? I'm sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, (Andrew).

(Andrew): The only question I had is is it their - I know it's a minority view, but there are a couple of us who want also to make it possible for people who are trying to serve these communities and these nations who may not be from those communities and nations. And I'm wondering whether we tried to make that a part of this language or whether because it's in the preamble, we just let it be.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. Cheryl here. (Andrew), are you suggesting Level 3 or Level 4 categorize countries and their delegates? Or do you feel...?

Tony Harris: No, no, no. What - there are - remember Cheryl. There was some question about whether or not people from outside the communities who may wish to offer support to those communities, especially where those communities may not yet be able to do for themselves so that the applicants might not necessarily be from those countries, but might be just in alliance with those groups for example.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So you mean on behalf of.

Evan Leibovitch: Tony, we've dealt with that in the heart of the recommendations. I don't think it belongs in the definitions.

Tony Harris: Good enough. So that's fine, that's fine. I'm happy to let it go. I just wanted to flag it so you don't appear inconsistent. That's all.

Evan Leibovitch: No, I mean your point is taken, and we do have a point in the document itself where we talk about the minority positions. It's just when we have a definition of what is a developing country, I think we can push those definitions back.

Tony Harris: No, no, no, no. Okay, fair enough. Just keep - that's fine. Keep going please.

Evan Leibovitch: Karla, as I scroll down here, is there anything that - I don't see any other major text in yellow inside the recommendations. So as I don't really would prefer to revisit the recommendations since we appear to have nailed most of this down, what I would...

Karla Valente: Right. Evan, this is Karla. For the record, I did take some redundancies, standardized some language, and simplified some language, so I would ask the group to please take a look at all of the work that I did. And if there's still something that you believe is not according to the earlier discussions, I would be happy to change back.

                 On Line 468, you still - on that next steps. You still have something in yellow, because I wasn't clear what the group wanted to do here.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so on Line 468, which is in the next steps, we will read the part that is highlighted in yellow. And it was raised as a question I think by Sebastian, but maybe by somebody else, but I wanted to be - let's be clear about this.

                 The line that is highlighted reads, and I quote, "There appeared to be full consensus on the following list of recommendations. But as the issue is really one for the chartering organizations, the issues were not discussed in any great depth." That is the area that's highlighted in yellow and definitely needs to be changed before we send this out in report.

So that is what's up for discussion this moment. Tinjani you have your hand up. Go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So we finish this point and then I will speak.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh, you're not speaking to this point.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, not to this point. I will speak to Line 188.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: All right, so right now we're dealing with Line 468 and this particular issue. Now as best as I can read out of this is that the issues being dealt with essentially are things that the working group is recommending to sponsoring organizations that they are going to have to deal with. And so is there agreement within this group of that particular point?

So in other words, based on what I'm reading, it's just a matter of clarification in saying that, "The points that follow achieved consensus within the group, but their implementation is outside the scope of this workgroup and in fact needs to be taken on by the sponsoring organization." Is that an accurate reflection of this group?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was earlier going to just suggest to you know delete what's in yellow. But with what you just said, perhaps delete what's in yellow and replace it with text that doesn't say that sponsoring organizations need to deal with these

issues, but ICANN Board needs to ensure that the ICANN community deals with these issues along with - in terms of advising the Implementation Team for new gTLDs. You know it's work still needing to be done.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, can we - okay, then what we need to do I guess is wordsmith it so we can have something to this effect. So maybe we can change this to saying, "The following recommendations achieved full consensus for consideration by the board as implementation requirements by staff and the community," or something like that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, that's the flavor of what I think having listened to throughout deliberations at this point. It might be better to replace the text, because earlier on I was just going to say delete the text, but I think it should be deleted and replaced with something else.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, is there anybody on the call that can suggest some specific wording? Alan, you are really good at this. Do you have any ideas?

Alan Greenberg: Not really.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that's typical Alan.

Evan Leibovitch: Is there anybody else on the call that can suggest something? I mean essentially between what Cheryl has said and I said, Karla do you have enough perhaps to craft a line that will bring across what we were trying to do?

Karla Valente: I'm not quite sure if I get it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so to come back to this, what we were trying to say I believe is that, "The following recommendations achieved full consensus as directions to the ICANN Board in..."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I help you here, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Remember that the preceding part there is referring to the potential of a joint team of staff and (SOIC) members. We already have the Implementation Team.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Don't we need to tie these consensus points to further consideration by the Implementation Team and recommend that community input be sought on them.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, that's - well not only is that perfect, but it also serves as an initial task list for the Implementation Team. Okay, so there appeared to be - okay, "The following list of recommendations, which have achieved full consensus, are recommended as initial tasks for the Implementation Team, and require further community input."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm happy with that language, but I would change your second recommendation to proposed.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Karla are you okay with that?

Karla Valente: I think so, yes. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, good. Is there anybody else that has any comments on this particular issue before we move on?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We need to go back up to 118 was it rather than on?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm heading back there myself.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Tinjani had raised that as a placeholder I thought.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Tinjani go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, we are looking - well the only words that are highlighted is emerging markets and nations on Lines 111 and 112 and I thought we dealt with that. I don't see anything else in yellow. So if there's something you want to (bring up) here.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Evan, do you hear me?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, perfect.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, so if you look to 188, you will find italics text that is not a decision or something, which waives the costs of programs development and for applicants meeting, et cetera. It's all in italics. I don't understand why.

Evan Leibovitch: Karla, is there a reason why that's in italics?

Karla Valente: I'm sorry. Can you go back to - it's Line 188.

Evan Leibovitch: Lines 188 to 189 in italics.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: 188.

Evan Leibovitch: Page 8.

Karla Valente: There's a number of things in italics like options for states, lower registry fees, which seem to be you know just short for that specific recommendation. It

seems that the specific - each one of these bullet points or items here for cost reduction could have like a title head and then an explanation. That was the only reason why.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So for applicant meetings, the criteria is not a part of this chapter if you want. Do you understand?

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, Tinjani is that...?

Karla Valente: The idea was just to highlight to just be easier to read. If you think the highlight is confusing because we are highlighting the wrong thing here, I will just remove the italics.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, I think the issue Karla is that for most of the rest of them that these little headers in italics is normally one or two words, and this ends up being a whole sentence.

Karla Valente: But only the first sentence or the whole paragraph.

Evan Leibovitch: I get it. So Tinjani I wouldn't get too upset about it being in italics. It's essentially trying to put the very first part of it as a little bit of a header with the rest of the text as being descript. I don't think it means more than that.

Karla Valente: It wasn't meant to mean more than that.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, Evan. I wanted only to understand, because there is other italics in other places that I cannot understand the reason, so no problem. If it is not for anything, it is not a problem.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, I mean the intention of the italics is not to make - stress one point more than another, but I think so much as just to you know offer a little concise highlight of it at the beginning of the paragraph.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. And just in terms of convention, Karla I wonder whether if something needs emphasis it could be in perhaps - if this is in 11 point, it could be in 12. And if something is a quote, it could be in italics. That might assist Tijani's concerns about understanding the meanings of the formatting choices.

Karla Valente: Okay, so if he wants me just to change back or remove the italics that are not quotations, I'm happy to do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. But if emphasis is intended, then perhaps finding another way to give emphasis and a mechanism that certainly I've used in other documents and seems to work is if the whole thing is in 11 point make it 12 or 13.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Do you understand what I'm saying Tijani? So there's a clear convention of a difference between emphasis and quotation.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I think we're good. Okay. I will call attention to the next part which is in yellow which is in line 558. So Karla you've highlighted the words 2001 round. So I will read the entire sentence. ICANN communicated that the 2001 round was to be followed soon by new rounds. Nevertheless it is taking almost a decade for new rounds to materialize.

Karla you then - you've highlighted the words 2001 round. Please...

Karla Valente: I highlighted - that was from the document. And when I read that it's not taking consideration the 2003...

Woman: Yes.

Karla Valente: ...around. And that was the reason I highlighted because that statement is not correct.

Woman: And isn't that what Tony raised earlier?

Man: Yes.

Karla Valente: I think so too.

Man: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Sebastian your hand is up. Go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes. Depending on the way we read that, it's correct because there's a - it's the same round because it was an extension of the proof of concept 2003/2004, twas not a new round formally. Now we can say this round was true faces whatever we want to say. But it's not so false that it seems to be.

Tony Harris: Can I get in the queue? This is Tony.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead. Speak now.

Tony Harris: Yes. I disagree with that. I think it counts pretty much as a round. It was postponed several times and not as long as the postponements we've had with this one, but I think we should try and work around this statement to make it a little more accurate.

Evan Leibovitch: Can we not just change 2001 to last round?

Tony Harris: That would make more sense.

Man: Yes.

Woman: Yes?

Karla Valente: Yes but then we need to make - the whole reference about taking a decade doesn't make sense.

Man: That's true.

Man: Perhaps you could use something like an extensive period or, you know, along...

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: Over...

Man: ...I mean it's several years or something like that.

Evan Leibovitch: Well it's taking almost a decade. And if we're talking even from 2003 we're now...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...up to the end of 2010, so we're talking eight years.

Woman: Yes. I'm happy to do the sort of rounding up story there if...

Evan Leibovitch: I think we're - I think the case is - I think it's worth making a case that we're on the upper side of near a decade. It's not inaccurate...

Man: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: ...but if we change 2001 to last round, I mean we're not - we don't need to really do surgery on this do we?

Tony Harris: No.

Evan Leibovitch: Is anyone opposed to changing 2001 to last?

Woman: Works for me.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Moving right along, then the next part in yellow is another reference to developing economies on line 589. We've already addressed that. And Karla is there anything else that you wanted to call our attention to before I most us back to the FAQ?

Karla Valente: No. Just on the very last page which is page 31, NXT, the description of the document that should be part of NXT of the addenda, Avri added record on discussion on bundling removed from final report. I don't understand what this is and why is it there.

Woman: Damned good question Karla because I know I missed a few meetings but it's not gelling with me either.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: We've had many discussions about bundling but they were, you know, I think didn't turn into a separate report.

Woman: Exactly.

Evan Leibovitch: We had the survey. The survey said it was not to be an appendix. It was to be part of the core report. It is part of the core report. I guess we would need to back to Avri to explain that particular bit.

Woman: Andrew.

Evan Leibovitch: Andrew go ahead.

(Andrew):   Yes. Evan I think you're right. I think that's just a remnant from an earlier version of this because if it - it is included and that doesn't seem to make any sense where it is now.

Woman: Yes. Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So pending a quick talk with Avri when she lands that comes out.

Woman: Yes.

(Andrew):   Um-hmm.

Woman: Works for me.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right. So what I'd like to do in the last part of this call is to draw everyone's attention to the Frequently Asked Questions section which starts at line 5-2-0, five hundred twenty if only because it's probably one section of this document that we have given least attention to while we've been working. Tijani, go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: The - do you hear me?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes I can now.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. I wanted to clarify that in some cases we have full consensus point consensus. So it is full consensus or consensus. It's not - it cannot be both.

Woman: Actually it can be Tijani. They're two different things.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Why?

Woman: And if you're concerned about the definitions I suggest you attend the definitions as per the - it's not finalized yet so they're still drafted. I'd call them final draft definitions in the GNSO guidelines for work groups.

Evan Leibovitch: Tijani, standing full consensus is either unanimity or unanimity with possibly minus one person. For instance...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: And full consensus is full consensus. Consensus would be unanimity with one or two dissonants.

Man: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I thought he would say - I thought he was commenting that some of them have both categories.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: That's it.

Alan Greenberg: And I think that was left as a remnant from the drafting that we need to decide which is the appropriate one in any given case.

Woman: Okay. Well where is that? What lines and then we can decide.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It's exactly what Alan said.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, well which line are you seeing...

Woman: Which line?

Evan Leibovitch: ...that in Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I have to go back to the text but now I don't - I have to verify. But it is - it exists.

Man: Okay.

Woman: I'm sure it does but let's deal with it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So Tijani we're going to start talking about the frequently asked questions. While that's happening, I'm going to ask you...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...and maybe anybody else who wants to essentially just to have a look through the document and see where we might have an instance where we've accidentally put both simultaneously consensus and full consensus.

Woman: Yes. If we have...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...so we can decide.

Evan Leibovitch: ...on an issue there's no need to mention that it's consensus.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. That was the notation that Avri used before we decided...

Woman: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...when it wasn't clear which it was.

Evan Leibovitch: Right.

Alan Greenberg: So it's a remnant of that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Agreed. Okay. So what I'd like to do is - Karla your hand is up? Go ahead.

Karla Valente: Just for the record, I wanted to say that I reworded some of the questions and to my understanding, you know, some of the answers just for clarity. The rewording of the question did not change the essence of the questions. I just felt that it was better to pull the question in a simpler way especially because if this document is going to be translated, we need to be very careful in how we word things and wording them in a simpler way at least gives us a better chance that things don't get lost in translation.

So for example, did we take this figure of $10,000 or $10 million out of the hat? Well the term out of the hat doesn't really translate that well so I changed things like that. This is just for the record.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Now, since there's a couple of people that don't have access to their screens, the FAQ section is a couple of pages. And I don't know if it's able to just read them all out loud. What I'm hoping to do is to find out if those of you that do have computer access and those can spend a couple of minutes looking through the Frequently Asked Question section if you have not already done so and see if there's any clarifications, matters of fact, matters of inaccuracy that exist.

And we're essentially talking from pages 20 - from pages 21 to 20 - sorry to about 25 if I remember correctly - no to 26.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Twenty-four, end of 24.

Evan Leibovitch: No, the end - yes, at the end of 24 which goes into 25. That's actually quite a long answer. So the answer to that actually goes to the end of - into 26 Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, okay. There I have a fir - get back to 26. If I were you - not you. The - there was a - in at least the last copy I read and I must say it's not now, so let me get into the FAC room space and go to page 26. I thought there was a point where we'd maintained - yes, here we are. Line 618, you've got 5.5 and it should be 4.5. Sorry it was just a little bit of pet injury. Line 618 is marked 5.5, How Did the Work Group Decide? And it should be 4.5, not 5.5 How Did the Work Group...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Ah. Okay so Karla on line 618 slide dot slash should be 4.5.

Karla Valente: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Karla Valente: I changed that. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Sorry. It's just a little bit of pet injury...

Evan Leibovitch: Well...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...but it's...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...anyway, just to recap, the line numbers we're talking about in the FAQ section go from lines 520, 5-2-0 to 660, 6-6-0.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Those are the lines in - that we're talking about right now in the FAQ section. (Andrew) you've been patient. Go ahead.

(Andrew):   Thanks very much. I just have a few. They're mostly very small. On 533, we got the that says not delivering an inclusive report program in time for the first round would be a great disappointment. Well I agree that that would be true, I don't think that's particularly compelling to the Board.

I would say - I would prefer if we were to reference their own words with their own commitments or leave that out entirely just because it didn't strike me as to having the same tone as the rest of the document.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Slide 3-3?

Evan Leibovitch: That's a good point and the matter of judgment as opposed to fact. So I have no problems taking out that sentence between 532 and 533 in total.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

(Andrew):   Yes. It's not that anyone on this call would disagree with that but I want to make sure that we sound as serious in our presentation as...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

(Andrew):   ...we can given the opticals we're facing.

((Crosstalk))

Man: You're right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. No I agree. I think it's...

Evan Leibovitch: You're right for just appointment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

(Andrew):   Okay. Another one, line 546...

Evan Leibovitch: Hold on. Is anyone opposed to removing the sentence at 532 and 533? Let's wrap this up before you move to the next one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No.

Karla Valente: Before you move Evan, can I make one point? This is Karla speaking.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Karla Valente: When we make our statement here that this is something that has raised a hope, the only thing that we mention as a reference is that the Board has recently expressed a need - any problem to be inclusive.

This is not quite true. The inclusiveness or the concern about the less developed countries is actually something that is earlier expressed in the policy. And the reason why I made that point is because people can look at this and say wait a minute this Board resolution was done right now, you know, few months ago and we're not supposed to be starting the new (degirty) program or anything on the timeline because, you know, few months ago there's a Board resolution.

You know, it's a matter of this is not an issue that is new. I think we don't make here a point that this is not a new thing.

Evan Leibovitch: No. I don't think anyone's disagreeing with that Karla but I agree with Tony's suggestion that using words...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): It's (Andrew) but okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Right?

Woman: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's (Andrew) not Tony.

(Andrew): It's (Andrew). I'm Tony today for some reason but that's okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi (Andrew). Sorry, sorry, sorry.

(Andrew): No no, not at all. I don't want - mean to insult Tony in any way.

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: This is before...

Evan Leibovitch: Thank you. You...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...put me on (unintelligible). Go ahead.

(Andrew): Okay. In any case, if we wish to make a statement about having raised expectations, I think that we would want to do it in a slightly more business-like fashion but I'm not sure that that's necessarily going to get us anything so I recommend we pull it out.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. I agree that the word disappointment probably isn't useful in this tone of a document.

(Andrew):   Right. Can I go to the next one which is small?

Evan Leibovitch: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sorry - hold on.

Karla Valente: His decision to remove the whole lost sentence.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. To get agreement to take that out that sentence between not delivering and disappointment on lines 5.32 to 5.33.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Is there disagreement with taking that out? Three, two one, okay, that goes. Okay go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Whoop, Tijani has an (x).

Evan Leibovitch: Well, Andrew go to your next point.

(Andrew):   Okay. Five forty-six, we have informal market research indicates that there is built up demand for new gTLDs particularly IBM gTLD should be a plural.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The (es) gTLD is, yes.

(Andrew):   gTLDs because we're talking about built up demand which means that there's more than one, right?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

(Andrew):   Okay. When we go...

Evan Leibovitch: ...forty-six.

(Andrew):   Yes, three - 546.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Pages and pages until 546.

Man: Well - do you see it?

(Andrew):   It's the last letter that is missing in the sentence that ends - the line that begins gTLDs particularly IBM gTLD and it should be gTLDs.

Evan Leibovitch: I see it. Karla do you have that?

Karla Valente: I do. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Move on.

(Andrew):   Next one, the - on lines 549, we're talking about the one main - one main concerns is without some sort of assistance program the most obvious and valuable name will be taken by wealthy investors. This would lead to an unfair process and leave little opportunity blah, blah, blah.

Again the leading to an unfair process is a value judgment of the pen holder and I don't think it helps our argument. It may hurt it. Why not just say this would limit - this would likely limit opportunities especially in - for applicants especially in developing regions...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

(Andrew): ...or something along that.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

(Andrew): Just the fact that it's fair or unfair is in the eye of the beholder and it might interfere with the reading that we want to get.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I'm going to suggest dealing with that by changing the word would to may because...

(Andrew): I think that the idea of calling it an unfair process is likely to - may rankle some of the people that we want as an audience. I think unfair is unnecessarily loaded.

Woman: Yes.

(Andrew): And since the output really is - what you're talking about is a limitation of opportunity for these people, let's focus on that. Whether it's fair or not, you know, one man's fair is another man's or is another woman's unfair. I'm not sure we even need to go there...

Karla Valente: Right. How about...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew):   ...so why go there.

Karla Valente: ...this likely - how about this may likely limit opportunities in developing regions for local community institutions and developing country entrepreneurs.

(Andrew):   How about just say this may. If you say this may likely, again you're supposing an outcome. If it does - if it leaves that door open, that's all we need to say I think.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Karla read back what you said except for the word probably or likely.

Karla Valente: This may limit opportunities in developing regions for local community institutions and developing country entrepreneurs.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm okay with that. (Andrew)?

(Andrew):   Yes, that's fine.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Is anybody opposed to that minor change? Okay. You have something else?

(Andrew):   I have one more which is just - it's more question. It's on 641. We go down, pardon we while I scroll. We have - we're talking about the cost of a - of translation if I understand. And we've got two million - we've got two comma, six zero zero comma zero zero. I believe that that's meant to be 2.6 million is it not?

Evan Leibovitch: Well not...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): And four point - 4.1 million because I don't think we're talking about $2600 right?

Evan Leibovitch: So that's...

Karla Valente: No I don't...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They're all (commas) to me.

(Andrew): Say it again. What I - the way I put it - put it this way gang, the way I read this was we're trying to tally up the total costs of I guess it was translation support or something like that. Those can't be - either we're missing a zero which would make it $2.6 million and $4.1 million or it's not clear in the way that it's written as I read it.

Karla Valente: Yes. I (unintelligible) change what I had from Avri here but I agree it was confusing.

(Andrew): So, if you read it through with me real quickly I just - again I wanted to - if we're be - trying to be as exact as possible. Up in 636, we're talking about one full-time person that's (nine to mends) the program. In 535, 635 we're talking about $1.2 million per year in terms of overhead assistance. And so then you've got at 640 taking the previous calculations into account, the estimates reach between - I just think we're missing a zero in each case.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Karla this is - is this not something we can check out factually somewhere else?

Karla Valente: Yes we can. I - this is - this con - this whole logic of the numbers comes from Avri. And honestly I didn't have the logic. I just look whether or not the sentences were coherent.

Woman: True.

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: But I didn't check the logic of the numbers. We need to check that.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. Regardless of the logic, the format we have there is not valid in an
English language document, so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew):   Correct. Correct.

Alan Greenberg: ...something needs to be fixed.

(Andrew):   Either there needs to be a - either it needs to be a decimal place instead of
the last comma or it needs to be another - there needs to be another zero.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Karla Valente: Yes. I added another zero to two million and six hundred and then four one-
hundreds too, and another zero involved.

(Andrew):   Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: And instead - we expressed is $2.6 million and $4.1 million as opposed to
spelling out all those zeros?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Evan. That's exactly what I wanted to say. Yes. You just do 2.6M. You don't need all those zeros as exciting as they are to look at.

(Andrew):   Anyway, those are my points. Thank you very much for your patience.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: No problem at all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good points Andrew. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Does anybody else have any comments, suggestions, clarifications? Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay I...

Evan Leibovitch: You've raised your hand. Did you have an actual...

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I found - I...

Evan Leibovitch: ...so I'm sure if - who aren't - anyway go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. I found where we have both consensus and full consensus. It's on line 171. It's the very beginning.

Karla Valente: Sorry as I (unintelligible) documents my lines get...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: That's the very core one. There is consensus in the working group to release the following recommendations for approval by the (unintelligible) organizations. Well...

Man: That's funny.

Man: Of all the things to have confusion about.

Evan Leibovitch: And actually that almost makes a little bit of sense because that's the last thing to be determined. Once all the ink is dry on the document, do we have full consensus that this (unintelligible) organization? So that almost makes sense to keep that open till the very end.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Aren't we at the very end?

Evan Leibovitch: Alan you've got - you marked text there. Did you want to explain that?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. It's fine to keep it for the end but we should highlight it to make sure we don't forget it...

Man: Right.

Alan Greenberg: ...or at least add an or between the two.

Evan Leibovitch: Tell you what, is there anyone here on this call that doesn't believe this should be forward to the supporting organizations? I mean I'd like to...

((Crosstalk))

Man: No, no, no.

Evan Leibovitch: ...all that now and say we have full consensus that this should be sent to the sponsoring organizations. Is that not reasonable?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It is reasonable Evan but I'm wondering whether we need that language of consensus or full consensus and rather more turgid as the preamble it is rather than some sort of weighted debate and value vote. I'd just say the work group releases the following.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm okay with that. Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. I had my hand to say we have to remove full and full consensus and consensus because if we - and inside the recommendation, each recommendation we say if there is consensus from consensus strong support etcetera. This is the general statement to say those are the recommendations that we want to submit to the chartering organization and to the Board. That's all.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. But there's a possibility Tijani that somebody may say after all is said and done, this report's good to go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well...

Evan Leibovitch: I disagree with that but that's a possibility. But I like what Cheryl was saying in that this is not really a decision matter. The working group is releasing these recommendations.

Karla Valente: Yes. That's it.

Evan Leibovitch: It's not a judgment call.

Karla Valente: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. The work group releases the following recommendations for approval by the chartering organizations. That's all line 171 to 172 needs to say.

Evan Leibovitch: That's absolutely fine with me. Does anybody here have a problem with that? If you disagree put in an X or say so now. I have one check mark and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Quick I'll put a rush on my check marks. Woo-hoo.

Evan Leibovitch: Well okay. Essentially I'm looking for X - I'm looking for dissention right now. Does anyone here dis...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...from me.

Alan Greenberg: Evan if you - Evan it's Alan. If you really want dissention I'm sure we can offer some but I don't think it will be on this issue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Don't tempt us Evan. Come on. It's only quarter past two in some of our lives.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes that's - yes, that's too easy. Okay.

Karla Valente: Evan this is Karla. So the working group releases the following recommendations for approval by the chartering organizations. That's how...

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Karla Valente: ...we're going to leave it right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Karla Valente: Perfect.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So Tijani thank you for catching that one. Now, does anybody have any other comments on the FAQs or is there anything else because if that is the case, then we may just have finished this thing.

Karla Valente: I still recommend we read through this FAQs because some of them I'm not sure we made all of the arguments that we should make. Just please take (unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Well, since anybody who has gone through it right now has already given forth their suggestions, all of which have been of brought in. Perhaps maybe we should take between now and Tuesday to give everybody a one last chance to look over and make sure they're comfortable that there's no inaccuracies and that the FAQ is sufficiently complete and accurate. And maybe we can just finally put this to bed on Tuesday. Does that sound reasonable to everybody?

Take the weekend. Take the last look over. Make sure that, you know, if we're all looking through it more eyes will catch flaws. Okay. I have Tijani and Andrew. Tijani go.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. We have to do so during this weekend and we have also to look in the comments because we would not - I think - I don't want to be - to get another week to finish this. So if we can everybody look at the comments and next call we will discuss the comments plus the very - the questions and answers.

Evan Leibovitch: So does anybody have a problem with essentially taking the week to go through this, go through the comments, go through the document as a whole and especially pay attention to the FAQ, come back and on Tuesday we'll

make our fine tuning that's left and with a little luck by the end of Tuesday we will have a document ready to send.

(Andrew): Quick question for you Evan if I could.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

(Andrew): When does this need to be in and what's our send in date?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. The problem is is that we have not really been given any hard and fast deadlines. We've been trying to do this as fast as possible to get this into staff before they do the new applicant guidebook.

(Andrew): Right.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: So it's - understanding that they're working on one. They're trying to come up with one before Cartagena. Our goal is to put something in their hands as soon as possible in advance of that. There hasn't been...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...hard and fast deadline given to us but the longer we take the less likely there's a chance of anything getting in.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes Well...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): So, on that basis...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...see that document deadline still looming.

(Andrew):   On that basis - excuse me, excuse me. On that basis then, are we in agreement that after our call on Tuesday, we will barring any unforeseen major change or objection we will be ready to send this thing in?

Evan Leibovitch: That is my full intention and I hope Avri will...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew):   Okay. And then the other question is related to the early part of our conversation which is if we - if we are assuming that we may have - we may not be getting the treatment from staff that we are - we would like based on the work that we've done, the - we'd need to have the coordination such that the people who are representing us from the supporting agencies are going to be able to get in at the right time to make sure that the things that we send in are actually going to get - be getting the hearing that we're looking for. Is that timing correct as well?

Evan Leibovitch: Well Andrew, I mean, we're in a bit of a strange situation because if our complaint was - is with the spin that staff put in front of the Board, then it seems staff is the one - are the ones that are putting together the applicant guidebook. So, you know, there's a little bit...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew):   I guess that's why I'm ask - that's why I'm asking Evan is whether there's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

(Andrew):   ...whether there's a way we can play this best.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here.

(Andrew):   Please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Andrew), that - you've really (unintelligible) that particular issue back over to your GNSO Council and the At-Large Advisory Committee.

(Andrew):   Okay.

Karla Valente: Evan may I just add a few - little bit of information?

Evan Leibovitch: Go right ahead.

Karla Valente: The (unintelligible) plan opposed saying the next integration of the applicant guidebook whether this is a proposed final or version 5 it's still under discussion. But we are planning on posting that by November 5th because we have certain deadlines that we need to meet for the Board. So...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Definitely, yes.

Karla Valente: ...if what we are trying to do for the applicant guidebook. Now if the Board met...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: November 5th is a week today.

Karla Valente: ...last night, night before and they also are talking about timelines. And we don't have the Board resolutions from that meeting two days ago yet, but if you look at the agenda, there was a discussion about timelines. So I'm waiting for to see what the resolution is and whether or not they further address anything from this working group in two days ago basically. Maybe (Kartine) could shed some light on that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Karla Valente: So I just wanted to...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: The thing I would just...

Karla Valente: ...to make - we understand that the translations of a document like that because there's a huge queue...

Woman: Yes.

Karla Valente: ...in translation that may take up to ten days or more.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I would simply note November 5th is exactly one week from today. So what I'm going to suggest is (secure) that Karla that you and any other appropriate staff are ready that by the end of the call on Tuesday if there's nothing major, that almost immediately that document (unintelligible).

Man: Hello.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hello. I'm still here.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right.

Karla Valente: If the document is ready I will be ready to post it. I will have the announcement and everything ready to post. My understanding is the posting is for public but then it would be posted in English with the additional languages following up later.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That'll work.

Evan Leibovitch: Just say because time is of the essence. I mean we may have very, very low expectations about how much of this are actually going to get into the guidebook between now and the fifth but we still have to try. And we have to have - unless there's anybody that significantly disagrees on that point.

Okay. Andrew, you still have your hand up. Is that - do you have more or is that residual?

(Andrew):   That's residual, sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: No problem. Okay. Does anybody have any other comments before you take your homework and go off for the weekend? We are fifty minutes...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I simply won't be doing my homework. I should report that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. We are fif - into the...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The dogs - the dog has already eaten my homework Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. Well I'm just happy that we've actually finished this call 15 minutes early before schedule. And so I guess I thank you all for coming. We'll see you on Tuesday and let's see if we can wrap this pony up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Looks good to me.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

(Andrew): Great call everyone. Thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Bye-bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Okay, bye-bye.

Evan Leibovitch: Or sorry Sebastien you had your hand up.

Sebastien Bachollet: That's okay Evan. It's too late. But maybe you need to have a look to the sentence at the end of - because it was changed and not discussed, the change at the end of I guess it's number 2 about establish a publish (apartly) or not (suppartly) just to check that it was the agreement everybody this just barred because Tijani raised that at the last meeting and it's the other document and we didn't discuss it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Woman: Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

(Jane): This is (Jane). Sorry (Tevy), is the meeting on Tuesday?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

(Jane): Okay thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Sebastien, could you just make that point quickly in email to everyone because they missed it? So the sooner...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...the sooner we can...

Sebastien Bachollet: No I would like you to check if I am wrong or not because it's not the straight I send the mail. If you think that it's done, I don't want to raise something that you think is done.

Evan Leibovitch: I...

Sebastien Bachollet: Just check. If you do - if you think that there's something to tweak then send me a mail and I will send a message.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I - personally I don't think there is.

Sebastien Bachollet: Okay then good, good.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Sebastien Bachollet: We don't need to put more work where we don't have work.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm not going to disagree with you there. Okay.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. Take care. Bye-bye.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks. Bye.

Woman: Thanks.

Glen DeSaintGery: (Louise)?

Coordinator: Hello there.

Glen DeSaintGery: Hello. Can you put the recording off please?

Coordinator: Yes. That's fine. I'll get those disconnected now for you.

Glen DeSaintGery: Thank you ever so much please. Have a nice week.

Coordinator: You too. Thanks Glen. Take care. Bye-bye.

Glen DeSaintGery: Thanks. Bye.

Woman: I cannot spend (unintelligible).

Woman: Okay. Well they kind of...

Woman: If you want us to (police) that would not say (unintelligible).

Woman: Okay. Well the less you've got, do it. But being said, it would be - but what I said was if I ever catch any operator on the Internet and they've got parts list to do in the absence (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes but they kind of (unintelligible).

END