

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

Friday 15 July 2011 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Friday 15 July 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.

<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-jas-20110715-en.mp3>

On page :

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#> <<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#jul>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison - WG chair

Avri Doria - NCSG

Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Andrew Mack - CBUC

John Rahman Kahn - Individual

At-Large:

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

Dev Anand Teelucksingh - LACRALO

Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

Cintra Sooknanan - At-Large

Dave Kissoondoyal - At-Large

Sebastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

Alain Berranger - Individual

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Gisella Gruber-White

Glen de Saint Gery

Kurt Prit

Seth Greene

Apologies:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO
Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison – NARALO
Alex Gakuru - NCSG
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Tony Harris -ISPCP

Coordinator: Please go ahead. This afternoon's conference call is being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning. Good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Friday the 15th of July.

We have Rafik Dammak, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Carlton Samuels, (Dev Antilixing), Carlos Aguirre, John Raman Khan, Baudouin Schombe, Cintra Sookanan, Sebastian Bachollet, (Alan Deronge), Avri Doria, Evan Leibovitch, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond. From staff we have Karla Valente, Glen de Saint Gery, (Seth Green) and myself, Gisella Gruber. And as a guest today we have Kurt Pritz from staff.

Apologies noted today from Alan Greenberg, Michele Neylon, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Alex Gakuru.

Can I also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes? Thank you. Over to you Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Gisella. Hi everybody. Welcome to the call. We are still where we are. We are still trying to get to a point where we have exhausted all of the ideas surrounding methods, parameters and terms to in-kind services as well as update funding models, funds and preface aspects of how we deal with funds.

We have all the persons, Elaine for the first one, Avri for the second. Welcome Kurt. I'm going to last few minutes or so come to you directly with a question.

I hope you've seen the mail we've sent to you. And we want to start by getting and update on the in-kind services from Elaine. Is Elaine on?

Gisella Gruber-White: She's not on the Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Okay so let's move then and ask Avri to come on and lead the discussion and the funding models, funds and (prospects)?

Avri Doria: Okay, this is Avri. I'm not sure - okay, I was just in the process of opening up my Windows so I knew what I was talking about.

But on the two documents that we've got, the one we discussed a lot which is the proposal to the board to basically put together a group to come up with the funds, et cetera.

That I made the edits that came out of the last one which is really just they use JAS qualified all the way through as opposed to any other variant terminology that I was getting.

And that's done. I had no other substantive comments on it.

Then there's the other document that I had that has been there since the same time this one was since June. I'm - I was going to say I'm still in the process of opening up my Windows so I actually know the names of my documents.

And that was the one where we were - I'm trying to present an argument because we're still kind of waiting on the - I think I believe we're still waiting for the board to basically deal with the issue of fee reduction.

And one of the questions that we always got back from the board on fee reduction was yes, but how do we meet the break-even requirements, you

know, the neutral costing requirements that the GNSO's set in its original - in its original policy recommendation?

And so that document is sort of an attempt to explain why reducing the fees as we have suggested in both our first and our second was reasonable...

Man: Thank you.

Avri Doria: ...and could be done and basically still maintaining that strict division between, you know, the fee reduction and the application of positive assistance and, you know, the purpose of the fund, et cetera, being the positive assistance but that's still relying upon the notion of their being a fee reduction.

So but I don't know that anybody's ever discussed that first document. And so I'm not sure where we're at on it.

That was a document called -- I finally got things opened -- please forgive me -- fee reduction and program self-funding requirement.

And I will put the link address in there so that anybody that doesn't have it has it. Oh somebody else already beat me to it.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, yes...

Avri Doria: Thank you (Dev).

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes.

Avri Doria: I didn't expect to talk until later in the meeting so I didn't have any of this stuff open. So there's that and I haven't seen any comments or discussion on that.

But other than that I have no changes since Tuesday other than as I say, the editorial changes I made in the funds and foundation to hopefully be consistent in the language though I'm sure some of our better copy editors will find the errors that of course I always end up leaving behind because I'm me and can't ever see all my errors until somebody else points them out to me so...

Carlton Samuels: Thanks Avri. Would anyone like to comment on the - in the area generally or any of the documents that Avri has put up?

Avri Doria: I see no hands. The only other issue I've got is that at what point do we start taking...

Carlton Samuels: Do we break and not wait on the board decision and fee reduction?

Avri Doria: No, no, no. What I was going to ask is at what point do we start moving things from these separate documents into, you know, the - starting to put together the final docs? And that's just a pending question I've got. I see you've got (Dev) with his hand up.

Carlton Samuels: Yes (Dev) has his hand up. But my thinking just to answer you quickly Avri, my thinking was that once that we see a slowdown in the comment or so on, we would ask the drafters to put it in the main document, begin to...

Avri Doria: That's not me.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: It's somebody. Oh, thank you. So I mean I'm assuming that if there's nothing happening from now - as of now I would say we recommend that the drafters move the content into the main document and do the usual adjustments that are required. That's my feeling on it.

(Dev) you have your hand up sir?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, this is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Thanks Carlton. Just a quick question, the statement here regarding in terms of the cash flow for processing applications the ICANN staff budgets they showed at 99,000 US dollars of each VP his needs for processing an application.

I just wanted to like do some more research into this. Is - I mean I'm not asking for the exact link now but could a link be point to the actual ICANN staff budget figured at where this \$99,000 figure comes from? I'm really not asking now but...

Avri Doria: Right. No certainly in fact I thought I had it in there. I think what I'd lost was my footnote references or something. But it's basically in their budget documents. So yes, I'll certainly go through it again and put through the actual documents that I got these figures out of.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay. Yes that's all. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay. Yes and that was in their budget document.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: All right, thank you. Rafik you have your hand up sir. Your floor.

Rafik Dammak: Yes just wanted to answer to Avri. Yes I think as we said that we move the final document. But I think first maybe we need that to put the first part that (treated) by Avri for - to reach consensus so sending message to the mailing list to ask people to check and then sending their (best) comments.

And so trying to reach consensus as soon as possible so that we can close that issue and we continue in that way with the part lead by Elaine and so on so that maybe to foster the process of making more progress. Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Rafik. Yes I mean a last call today, I agree a last call to the mailing list would probably be helpful. We just cover all our bases to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to know that we - that that is the thinking and see what comes out of it.

So we'll check the tree one more time and see what falls. That's a good idea.

Avri you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Just on the last call I would also assume - I think it's a great idea. I would also think that of course even after that last call once it gets put in the final document there would still be, you know, discussions especially since the text would be kind of cut and pasted in different ways so that there would still be it's a last call but not a very last call.

Carlton Samuels: Yes Avri. Once the text is put together in the final document we will put it up and we will have a last (groan) on it.

The idea is we're going to have a document finalized and everybody look at it as it would be in the final report before we close off on it. So that's - that I think is what we would do. So yes, that is a part of it.

Rafik you have your hand up again. Is it you...

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I just want to say that what we - yes, you call on the last call just to have the consensus I think about the ideas.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: But in the final document I guess it's more about rewarding and to make the part - all those part consistent and clear.

And so it's - just we will avoid to have to change for example the whole part or something in - at the end so because it can be really time consuming and it can be really back walled.

Say just at the beginning if we can reach consensus and then at the end, the final report just to make all those (part current) and maybe working more on the wording, et cetera.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Rafik. That's exactly what we anticipate will happen. That's why we're spending so much time ensuring that all of the ideas are caught now in the working document so that when the wordsmithing is done for the final document then we have very few substantive changes applicable there.

So that - that is what we are proposing to everyone and that is we - we are - that is why we have this process. And we are hoping that all of (Hercules) agree and treat the document as we are suggesting.

And no more hands up for this portion of it. Is there any other comment, question, proposal?

Okay so we're - I guess we can pause in this one. Can we go to the in-kind services? Is Elaine on the call?

Elaine's not on the call, no?

Gisella Gruber-White: No she's not, sorry Carlton, it's Gisella. She's not on the call.

Carlton Samuels: Oh thank you Gisella. Okay so Elaine is not in here for in-kind services. I wonder if anybody has seen - look at the wiki or have anything else to offer that might be useful? Even she's not here we can certainly offer it to the group. And then hopefully she could pick up on it. Nobody?

Okay can I then just - while we have Kurt on the call, can I just then just point to Kurt and he doesn't have to respond fully here but just to point out that on behalf of the group we had sent a note to him when he was off on vacation requesting some support, some specific support.

Kurt I hope you have received and reviewed it, the request?

Kurt Pritz: Hi everybody. Yes I have.

Carlton Samuels: Okay lovely. And I presume you will respond in due course?

Kurt Pritz: Yes so I - it'd be good if we have a - could have a conversation about the points here. I'd - yes, I'll just start.

So yes, I want to keep the - so I'm referring to your email dated July 5 is that right?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Kurt Pritz: Okay good. So I want to keep the tasks as specific as possible. So my idea is not to pick one or two or three ICANN staff people and say support the JAS but rather as specific tasks come up or requested we find that the best person on this staff that can help provide, you know, closure for that one item and get it done.

So we just, you know, sort of pick the ICANN staff members who are best suited to do a task and help out.

So if it's an administrative task that's one type of person. If it's a (unintelligible) task it's another. So I'd just like to briefly review each one of these three items so Karla and I fully understand them. And then we can know what the timeframes for the work and what the reference documents are and then get the right person on it.

So if we could Carlton, the very first one is establish a framework for applicant evaluation, applicant evaluation sufficient to meet the requirements for needs assessment.

So I know the working group here has done quite a bit of a work on this. So I want to understand exactly what the task is. Is it to evaluate the work that's been done or format a document using the works that's been done? What do you everyone on the call picture this task as being?

What do you want us to start with and then what do you want to get out the other side?

Carlton Samuels: What we want on the other side is a set of, a process that is defined almost procedurally to say this is where you enter and these are the things that you go through. These are the things that we look at. And at the end you're either in or you're out.

It's a stepped process that an applicant can understand in a way that allows them to come in the one end and step through the process so they at every point they know what is required and what the output is going through.

Kurt Pritz: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: We have some...

Kurt Pritz: Yes?

Carlton Samuels: ...criteria that is set up that we have defined. And we have to take that criteria, procedurize it and add some others to it as the (unintelligible) administrative is required.

Kurt Pritz: Right.

Carlton Samuels: That's...

Kurt Pritz: So there's...

Carlton Samuels: ...our intent.

Kurt Pritz: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: If anybody has any other idea about this you can all jump in here.

Evan Leibovitch: Carlton...

Carlton Samuels: Oh Evan is - Evan's hand is up. Evan you have the floor sir.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, sorry. My hand was up in Skype because I don't have Adobe Connect. Hi
Kurt.

Carlton Samuels: Oh I'm sorry.

Kurt Pritz: Hi.

Carlton Samuels: I wasn't in the...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: ...sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: When the folks that were writing the Milestone Report that was released
before the last meeting we almost - we had almost a (vision) that there would

be a parallel applicant guidebook for those applications that were what we called needs assessed.

So we sort of thought that there was a - I mean people have been dicking about the name. But the concept of a needs assessed applicant guidebook that would be almost an appendix to the conventional applicant guidebook that says if you're going to go through this path of being assessed of - as being qualified as being needy here are the criteria you must fit and here's the processes you must do to demonstrate that.

Having met those criteria then you become eligible for A, B and C. I mean maybe I'm oversimplifying things. But I think the intent was to try and come up with a document that potential needs qualified applicants would be able to look at and have a very stable idea of this is what we need to do to demonstrate that we meet the criteria for need and then the document also has an idea of what we can expect at the end of it if we pass those hoops.

Kurt Pritz: Okay that's helpful and...

Evan Leibovitch: Using the Milestone - using the second Milestone Report as a basis with the full knowledge that its authors know that it's got an absolute ton of rough edges, missing detail and blanks to be filled in.

Kurt Pritz: Right, so essentially yes, so using the criteria in part three of the report.

And so if I think about it it's really in three parts right? One is a process which is the flow chart putting your applications by this date, fill in these blanks. It'll be - you know, it'll be evaluated for so many weeks. Here's the form of the answers that come out. Here's - you know, if there's iteration that has to be done between the applicant and the evaluator here's how this done. So that's a procedural part.

Two is the criteria part which I think this group has provided a lot of material.
And three would be, you know, who does the evaluation?

Evan Leibovitch: Well also and a fourth is what you get if you meet it.

Carlton Samuels: What you get at the end of it, yes. Thank you for that.

Evan Leibovitch: And also Kurt there's actually been some work done on the flow chart by
(Dev) who's also on this call.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: So there's actually even been some work done on the first part of that in
trying to document the process flow.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Again there's probably going to be more refinement needed but at least we've
got a start on that thanks to (Dev).

Kurt Pritz: And we're - I know - sorry for this ignorant question. Is it possible for me to
find that? Is it right in front of me on my computer somewhere in that...

Carlton Samuels: Yes we can give you a link to the document. I think it's available. (Dev) do
you want to put it in the chat there so Kurt can see it?

Thank you Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Avri you have your hand up.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Just to say yes, I'm looking for
the links so...

Carlton Samuels: Wonderful.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: And I'll post it in the Chat.

Carlton Samuels: And as soon as you get it you can post it in the Chat. Thank you sir.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, yes and as soon as...

Carlton Samuels: You have the floor.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And as soon as (Dev) puts it up I'll also link it into the wiki page so there's a permanent link to it.

One of the things I was thinking of in terms of this Kurt is when we were doing the GNSO policy you and several members of the staff were constantly in the background you were running a well how do we implement this?

And you were starting to put together the first level of your implementation plan. And you - and we had a really good dialogue going of yes we see how this will work. We see how this would work.

You say this here but we don't quite see - and that would open up this problem.

Kurt Pritz: Yes.

Avri Doria: And so there was a great give and take that both helped refine the policy recommendations to be something that were doable and got you guys, you know, going in your first directions on the implementation itself.

So I kind of visualize just to give a background, that relationship sort of being similar that, you know, this great body of work that this group has done but it's all...

Kurt Pritz: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...words. It's not implementable, deployable something.

Kurt Pritz: Yes.

Avri Doria: And so I thought we started to need to have that interaction now. Thanks.

Kurt Pritz: Okay so you see this - that was really my next question Avri. So you see this as sort of an interactive process in other words that I'd say okay on number one we'll get some staff working on that and we'll show you the product in so many weeks but rather we'll get some things out and then have a meeting with a subgroup or something like that and have some discussion and then go back. Is that how you...

Avri Doria: That's certainly how I've been visualizing it. I don't know about the rest of the group but I think that that is definitely how I've been visualizing it.

Carlton Samuels: Actually Avri I think that is a great idea. That's the way to do it so we have immediate access to it. Olivier I see is endorsing that concept. But I think that's a great idea. That's the way to do it.

Anybody else...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: ...might want to say something here?

Kurt Pritz: These boxes are too tiny for me.

Carlton Samuels: Sorry Kurt. Well I hope if we just click on the link it will link you with it.

Kurt Pritz: No I figured it out. I've made it bigger.

Carlton Samuels: Get to some place. All right, so I ask the question again, Dev Anand Teelucksingh is in - just let him in.

The approach to working with - presented by Avri I think is the one that we should endorse and we should all support.

I feel Olivier is - was very quick to accept that it would - the work of a solution. If anybody else have no objection we would then expect to move this way.

What it would mean though is that instead of having - we will have - of having a small group we will use this as part of a committee of the whole. So we - from now on maybe for the next - until next week so we will have a few minutes of the time dedicated to this effort to let us all be in tune with what's happening in this area so staff will kind of show us what happened so far. And then we can move it along so unless anybody else has an objection to that approach. We can always endorse it.

No objections. Kurt you want to go on with the other...

Kurt Pritz: Yes I think my only note on this task is that, you know, and it goes back a little bit to the funding that, you know, the board suggested that they create a seed fund of \$2 million and encourage others to contribute to that too.

And that has some - that has some legal ramifications for how ICANN can set up such and operate such a foundation. And in the future actually if there are auction revenues that can be redistributed to the community in some way.

You know that would be a- that could potentially be a bigger pot of money. So ICANN has to be very careful about how it sets that up.

So you'll probably this work and this flow chart when we augment it, you know, will probably reflect some legal thinking too with regard to how the process needs to run and how it's set up.

But I just wanted to - and that doesn't really have any effect on that we're going to get to work on it and work interactively on it. Did you have something Avri?

Carlton Samuels: Yes Avri is...

Avri Doria: Right, I just wanted...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...to comment that the first document that I was talking about earlier on the funds and foundation sort of acknowledge that that legal issue had to be set up.

And part of the recommendation was that there was a board appointed committee to work with...

Carlton Samuels: (Unintelligible) committee.

Avri Doria: ...staff on figuring out what the right configuration for all that was, that this was basically here, the recommendation that I was making to the JAS group which I think we're getting closer to...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...accepting was that we would recommend to the board that they put together a high level committee, a board high level, you know, where they get people from the various parts of the community that worked with you because there's always been that issue of how exactly under California law can this happen.

You know, when people have looked into it they'll say well maybe you could do it this way, well maybe you could do it that way. So figuring out what the right way to do it is within the legal constraints that...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...ICANN would have. And basically so it's part of the problem that we've certainly acknowledged and have given or are trying to give the board some recommendations on how to move forward on.

So that too is part of what perhaps you could look at and sort of say that committee kind of makes sense but not this way, that way, et cetera.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. You want to have a quick response to that Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: No I think understand what Avri said.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Alan you're on sir. You have the board.

(Alan Deronge): Yes thank you very much Carlton. Just a question on the ICANN Foundation. It may not need to be registered in California. It could be registered in any of the US state so - or perhaps outside the state.

But some - I know that some states regulation are easier to cope with than others. That's just one point, the small point.

The second point I wanted to make is about the fundraising cost. If donors are going to come in, while they can come in to the core fund of the foundation or whatever fund is set up and there the fundraising cost accrues to ICANN staff and ICANN volunteers there is another model and enough exclusive is to ask is the challenge, the challenge fund approach.

In other words we would say to in the process to the needy applicant that he or she representing that organization could bring in some outside funds or the possibility of outside funds to match the funds that ICANN would or the fee reduction equivalent that ICANN would be contributing.

The great feature there is that of course it empowers the - it leaves the - it puts the needy applicant in the driver's seat and it makes that needy applicant more responsible and more accountant, accounting - accountable if they can bring at least part of the fund.

So there just a thought from my fundraising years.

Kurt Pritz: Well having - knowing that you have fundraising experience is very good to know. No those are good comments. And your comments about, you know, the location, the foundation I think whoever on staff is working on this has already read about that too. So that's a correct comment I think.

Can we move on...

Carlton Samuels: Avri has her hand on.

Avri Doria: Yes just one quick comment.

Carlton Samuels: So just (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: ...and then we move on.

Avri Doria: Right just one quick comment. I - when I was talking about the constraints on funds on creating a fund, a foundation, ICANN as an entity that was already a California corporation had certain constraints on its behavior in terms of creating a fund wherever it created it. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Thank you Avri. Kurt can we move on now? You...

Kurt Pritz: Yes on the - so on the second item regarding the final report, how much of that task do you see as developing content versus how much of that report do you see as proofing, formatting and more administrative?

Carlton Samuels: I will - Evan if you want to jump in here as the lead pen on the report. To my mind it's more about proofing and formatting. But I'll defer to Evan here.

Kurt Pritz: And then Evan if you can talk about the timing of that too, what you think the timing is?

Carlton Samuels: Evan - Evan's not hearing us?

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) mute?

Kurt Pritz: And Avri was first (unintelligible) Evan was on mute.

Carlton Samuels: Evan is on but...

Avri Doria: Perhaps he's mute.

Gisella Gruber-White: Hi this is Gisella. Evan is not on mute. He should be able to speak. Evan?

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: Just while we're at it if I can just remind everyone just to state their names it will then allow the transcript to be more precise. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Oh thanks Gisella.

Gisella Gruber-White: Evan still seems to be...

Carlton Samuels: Evan is probably disconnected somehow.

Gisella Gruber-White: He's still connected on our screen...

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Avri Doria: I was on that drafting team, what was the question again? Once you said Evan - this is Avri, I stopped listening, but I was also on that drafting team.

Carlton Samuels: Sorry Avri, I just sort of wanted to lead (pin). So the question was...

Evan Leibovitch: Hello, this is Evan, I'm back.

Avri Doria: Oh...

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Avri Doria: Good.

Carlton Samuels: The question - just let me repeat the question. Kurt asked, you know on the second item from the letter to him - from the email to him was about helping with the (Tyler) report. And he wanted to know where do we see staff time most required. Whether it's content or in formatting and so on - administrative things. And proofing and so on. And I said proofing and formatting, but I would refer to in my opinion, I refer to (Kevin).

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I guess there's a couple of things. Number one is giving another eye to the document and identifying the holes and gaps that need to be flushed out by the volunteer community that may not have been considered. There may have been issues raised that haven't been fully flushed out in the document as it sets now. Another set of eyes that have been independent from what have been going into it now, would probably be useful in identifying some of those. There may be things we just may not have considered that have to be taken into account. Secondly, there's level of detail, you know, if this is going to be a document the applicants are going to use, there has to be a certain level of legalistic language used that probable is not deterrent of what exists in the document right now.

And beyond that essentially, completing it, filling in, you know, filling in blanks where the wording in the report itself is big and needs to be flushed out into something that applicants can use. So, I don't know if this answers your question Kurt, but essentially it's not just editing and formatting, but essentially also to discover issues of, "Hey when you said this, did you really know what you were meaning, because there's implications to this that may need to be thought through in a little bit more detail."

Kurt Pritz: So this is a bigger (iterate of) task two, because what, you know, do a fairly early review of the document further identifies holes or gaps so that there's time to do follow-up work and then...

Evan Leibovitch: I think that needs to happen. Because I think simply just adding more detail and formatting to what exists right now is still going to lead to an incomplete document.

Kurt Pritz: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: I mean, the people that were working most on the report were under an awful lot of pressure to get something done in time for Singapore. And at a certain

point, we basically just had to draw a line in the sand and say, "We send what we've got, knowing that there are gaps."

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Evan, Andrew you have the floor so your hand is up.

Andrew Mack: Yes, thanks very much, it's Andrew Mack for the transcript. Kurt, I wanted to emphasize what - one of the things that Evan said. I mean, we recognize that this is very much a (wet) work in progress. Some of this stuff, we're going to, you know, I think we're going to perfect it - in the use of it, if you know what I mean. Because once we have a live example to work with, it's going to give us a chance to look through some of these additional questions and such. But certainly to have your comments and your questions, things that you've already been thinking about and other members of the community, that's going to be good.

One of the things also that we were really strong on is trying as much as possible to not reinvent the wheel. Which is to say, all of the things that we are trying to do and to propose, we'd like to (dog tail) as much as possible with the existing (tag) and existing process so again it is more practical all around. But we recognize that there - some of this is going to have to happen in the use of a real example.

Evan Leibovitch: Carlton and I - this is Evan, I have one more thing to add.

Carlton Samuels: Yes Evan, go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry. One other thing Kurt that I just remembered as we were going through this. One of the things that definitely has to be looked at is that the group, as we were writing this, anticipated that this process will be the source of gaming attempts. And that one of the things we need is to have an eye taken to this almost from the approaches of people who would want to game it. And how do we build in mechanisms that implement what we want to do, but still make the process at least reasonably resistant to gaming?

We're going almost under the assumption that the moment this is rolled out, somebody's going to try and game it. What can we do to make that as difficult as possible? You know, how do we erect a filter that is sufficiently strong that really the people that are generally needy get in, and the people that are gaming this don't.

Kurt Pritz: Right and I agree with every thing you said. This is Kurt and, you know, I don't know where to go with this except to say that, we can't let especially in a short timeframe the enemy is good. That we want to roll out a program and, you know, after looking at it, we might even acknowledge that some people might take advantage of this. And if they do, we're going to learn from that.

And so we don't want - at the end of the day, if in fact there is gaming, we, you know, we almost want to say, "Yes, we kind of knew there would be gaming, we did the best we could in the first round. Now we understand some more and we're going to make it more bulletproof in the second round." So that if it does occur, you know, at least we can show we anticipated it and did the best we could with no prior operating knowledge. And then we'll make it better in the future.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, that works for me absolutely fine, as long as both you and us are aware that if there's going to be criticisms when this gets rolled out of, "Oh yes, someone's going to game it" - that we be prepared for an answer exactly like that one.

Kurt Pritz: Right, right.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Evan and Kurt. Olivier, you have your hand up, so you have the floor. Olivier, you have the floor.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks Carlton. Thank you Carlton. Do you hear me?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I'm hearing you now sir.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Okay, I was on mute, that's why. I just wanted to ask actually, with regards to the gaming issue, would there be a possibility to amend the program whilst it's - or after it's launched, even during the first round, in case any severe gaming was found?

Kurt Pritz: Yes, this is Kurt. I think the short answer is yes. The mechanism is uncertain, but if, you know, if you recognize something that's the right thing to do, you should always do it, right. So and the guidebook itself was developed in the mechanism per se, you know, here's the process for amending the guidebook. You know, sort of tiny-winy changes can be made without approval of the Board and if there's larger changes, they have to be approved by the Board and there'll be rent controlled, and those sorts of things and so...

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Okay, as long as we're aware of that, thanks.

Kurt Pritz: I think, yes I think the - yes it's not easy. You can't - at the end of the day, you have to be very careful about putting applicants for this program at a disadvantage if you change the rules. But, on the other hand you have to - you can't close out all flexibility.

I think I understand the second one and so let's talk about the third one a little bit, which I think is then - that to me is more taking the report and other work that's done and putting in an applicant guidebook-like document.

Carlton Samuels: Correct, that's what we are proposing Kurt. Something of the quality and detail of the applicant guidebook. That will be the official kind of document for the community. I mean, including applicants to look towards in trying to access the program.

Elaine asked a question and it's a process question, I think very impressive in processing applicants. He says review of financial statements by violation code committee could be a way in filtering a gaming attempts. And he's asking if this is one way to do that. This is a question he's asking. Would this be one way? And I'm putting it to the group.

Avri has her hand up. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, I mean I think that's part of it. I think, as I mentioned slightly above, I had put together a couple of paragraphs on review and on gaming and indeed, yes. That would be part of it. And just to go on a little bit, part of what stops gaming is having a talented review committee. And one of the recommendations that I make, I don't remember whether I made it in that form or not - I mean in that contribution or not, is that, you know, within ICANN, we have some master gamers.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: And we make sure that that review panel has at least one or two of those master gamers on it. You know, I won't quote any names, but I know within the staff, there's some that say, "And what would X do with this rule?" Well make sure that X is on the panel. So that, you know, the one or two people we have that can smell a game from a mile away are part of the human review, you know, filter. And I think that would go a long way. Indeed, looking at the financial statements and all the other supporting documents that this process ends up requiring from applicants for JAZZ qualification. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. I see you have full support from Andrew there, on the issue of having a master game as review process. Are there any other comments for the (unintelligible)?

All right, so it seems that we are now together on what we think we require from staff. We have a process that we think will work, it's going to be a

(integrate) process. It's going to be one that is open to all of us as we go along. I'm reminding you that we have another thirteen - well, less than six weeks to go for this, to deliver what we're talking about here, at least. Most of it, if not all of it. So, I'm hoping that folks will pay attention and join the process as soon as it comes about. I am going to propose that maybe from now on to the end, we have a few minutes of each call dedicated to looking at what is going on in this - the areas we've been talking about. We'll put it on the list, if there's no objection we'll make good the standing item on the agenda here forward.

Thank you Kurt for taking part in this call, and providing answers directly to the question for all members. Olivier you have your hand up sir.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Carlton, I just wanted to get an idea from Kurt on how soon we could see some movement from his side with regards to staff allocations or resource allocations.

Kurt Pritz: (Unintelligible), this is Curtis. It's not an easy problem and Paul and I have been (IM) identifying some candidates that would be suitable for each task. So we're going to start to work on at least identifying staff members right away and hope to have those identified in the next couple days.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: And then do you require - would you require any more information on specifics of time scales as to when the group thinks what types of staff might be required or might be called upon?

Kurt Pritz: I don't know, you know, it's such a - I appreciate the offer. It's such a tight timeframe that, you know, I think that we want to identify the right people and get them started to work on it. And the time it would take to try to nail down with specificity exactly when the staff are required, you know, the margin of error is great - it's the whole timeframe almost. So I think - I don't know if that would be time well spent or we'd rather just, you know, get to work.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: All right, well your swift action is well appreciated, so thanks.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, well I wouldn't say thank you yet, but.

I have one more question and that is on number two where we're creating the final report. That's in chapters, so you think there is a way for the group to kind of say, you know, we think this chapter is done. You know, even if they're introductory chapters or something like that, you know to be able to pick some things off. I'm thinking, you know, as the working group thinks the chapter is near completion, we could break that apart from the whole and, you know, pay specific attention on - to that.

Carlton Samuels: Well Kurt, this is Carlton to respond. The idea is that we have the redline document and what we would hope - our hoping that unless the area of the chapter is redlined, it means that it's pretty much, you know, closed - or not closed exactly, but certainly the opinion is that it requires less work than most. And you can see those chapters. I agree, maybe if we start by just going back through them one more time with the drafting team, and then putting those to the staff. Then you could probably begin to put those together and make sure that they're, you know, all right administratively and, you know, the way that Evan pointed out.

Kurt Pritz: Okay and you see the final report looking similar to what the milestone report looks like now, as far as the organization of it.

Carlton Samuels: My sense is that there - it is going to look fairly similar. But I - again I will open it to the members of the team especially to keep in here.

Evan Leibovitch: Carlton, this is Evan.

Carlton Samuels: Yes Evan. go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi. Kurt, to be honest with you, I'd almost want to defer your judgment as having written the original application guidebook, together with the rest of the staff. I imagine by now, you've had a whole bunch of years to try and figure out the kind of information that the applicants need, and the way that they need it presented in a way that gives the most clarity on both sides. So if you're comfortable with the layout as it is now, I mean that's wonderful. But I mean one of the things that at least I'm hoping that you - that staff brings to this, is the perspective of things from the applicant side of, you know, whether or not we've presented this in the structure of level of clarity that's going to be necessary to make this a useable document.

Kurt Pritz: Right, thanks Evan - this is Kurt. So I saw two (cats), one is the final report, number two and then number three is an applicant guidebook. So number three I think is where you're talking about applying that experience in how to describe a process so that's - I agree with that. And for number two, the final report is really the report of this group and try and find....

Evan Leibovitch: Actually you're absolutely right. We've sort of amalgamated the two into one document and probably you're going to be helpful to us in saying, "Well this is actually, you know, this is advice in report and this is procedure and documentation."

Kurt Pritz: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Avri, you have your hand up - you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Thanks, this is Avri. Yes, I wanted to reinforce that. I truly believe that the final report and the document on instructions for applicants for JAZZ qualification or whatever it gets called, are two separate things. And in terms of the format of the document that is the final report recommendations, I would think it would remain similar unless, you know, someone comes and recommends that it would be improved if it was reordered or encapsulated in or had the following added to it.

So to answer Kurt's question as, you know, a member of that writing team that Evan is supervising, that, you know, that document will probably grow a little and may change a little. But will probably remain consistent unless there was an indication that no, no, no, it's not really working and it would be stronger, more understandable, more accessible if you did X. But certainly, I don't see the linking of the two documents. I see them as separate efforts. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Are there any other comments? Any other comments? Okay, there being no more comments, I want to thank you Kurt and staff for being enrolled on this call. I think we have something to move forward on. We're looking forward to working with this stuff and ensuring that we have the end products we are now all agreed on. We will continue on the next call to see if we can flush out these. I would like to remind members that we're going to put on the list the final list - kind of modify the final. But certainly milestone call for closure on items in the areas we are discussing here. It's going to be essentially a call for folks who might have additions to the ideas that they've posted and ready to add them now, so that we can begin to move those into the final report.

The drafters will make the decision of what to take out and so on. But it will be good for all of us to ensure that we don't have too many changes to the report once we have put it together and say this is what we're going to approve as the final report.

That said, I want to thank each and every one of you for participating in this call. Thank you Kurt, thank you (unintelligible), thank you Karla. I think we can call this conference to an end. Thanks all.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

END