

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 29 April 2010 at 1100 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) 29 April 2010 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/joint-soac-wg-new-gtld-applicant-support-20100429.mp3>

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

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/joint-soac-wg-new-gtld-applicant-support-20100429.mp3>

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

Participants on the Call:

ALAC
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC
Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Evan Leibovitch
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large
Carlos Aguirre - At Large

GNSO
Tony Harris - ISP
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison
Avri Doria - NCSG
Alex Gakuru - NCSG
Andrew Mack - CBUC? (in the process of being accepted as a member of the BC)

Fabien Betremieux - Individual - AFNIC
Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachines
Richard Tindal - Individual

ICANN staff
Olof Nordling
Glen de saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:
Dave Kisoondoyal – ALAC
Chuck Gomes –RrSG

William Drake - NCSG
Baudouin Schombe - NCSG
Olga Cavalli - NCA
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Vanda Scartezini - ICANN Board

Rafik Dammak

Gisella Gruber-White: Recording started and finished the dial out and then make sure that she locates the echo and we'll ask the person to mute.

Coordinator: The call is now recorded please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Go okay thank you. So hello everybody for the - today's conf call. I think that we can start by the roll call and to approve the Agenda. As a reminder that I think that we - everybody should thank taking of interest to Glen please as soon as possible.

Glen can you start the roll call please.

Gisella Gruber-White: I'll do that for you Rafik. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's call we have Rafik Dammak, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alex GakuruTijani Ben Jemaa, Carlos Aguirre, Sébastien Bachollet, Alan Greenberg, Fabien Betremieux, Evan Leibovitch, Richard Tindle, Avri Doria, Elaine Puis, Tony Harris about to join again, Andrew Mack. From staff we have Olof Nordling, Glen de Saint Géry myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Baudoin Schombe, Olga Cavalli, Michele Neylon, Chuck Gomes, Bill Drake, Vanda Scartezini.

If I can please remind everyone to state their names before speaking for transcript purposes and also if your line is noisy please use star 6 to mute and star 6 again to un-mute. Thank you. Over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella.

Tony Harris: Hello.

Rafik Dammak: Hello, hello. Go ahead.

Tony Harris: Just Tony Harris I'm joining but I didn't get called out.

Rafik Dammak: Hello, hello Tony.

Tony Harris: Hello.

Rafik Dammak: So okay let's start - we start with (unintelligible) the Agenda and as I state before that everyone should send its SOI to the - to Glen so any objection to today's Agenda?

Okay I think that we can go ahead to the ICANN (2) which is about nomination of and chair election. Any idea or suggestion and...

Man: Is there any volunteer?

Rafik Dammak: Any volunteer yes.

Man: Yes, yes.

Man: Cheryl you online?

Sébastien Bachollet: It's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I...

Sébastien Bachollet: Sébastien Bachollet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...am online but I'm heavily committed with the accountability and transparency review process. So I would be loathed to take a formal position in the workgroup that I might not have 100% attendance at.

Sébastien Bachollet: Yes it was the - sorry Cheryl it's Sebastien because that my pointed we - you want me to say what we suggest as a - as that large I guess it was (unintelligible) (unintelligible) was it Cheryl's working group? You want me to go ahead or you want to do?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well Sebastien you'll have to tell me exactly what you're talking about because to my knowledge we didn't make any...

Sebastien Bachollet: Okay...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...considered ruling, we simply appointed our formal liaison to this workgroup and said that as liaison Carlos would be available to assist Rafik in co-chairing this introductory part of the meeting.

Sebastien Bachollet: ...okay, okay, okay.

Rafik Dammak: So okay Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I'll just note that certainly from the GNSO side but I believe it was the intent of the ALAC also that the liaison specifically not be the chairs unless someone want - wishes we take on that role because normally the liaison is acting as the go between but not necessarily chairing the group. I don't think there's any hard fast rule on that however.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well there will be strong guidelines if we're going to adopt the current draft workgroup procedures which does outline the independence and role of liaison very clearly and I do have a role in assisting in the chair's activity but yes I would strongly agree with Alan just said.

Sébastien Bachollet: I do agree yes with Alan.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so who - we need...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri...

Rafik Dammak: ...someone...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...what are you doing in all your spare time?

Avri Doria: Oh what am I doing? I'm participating in all sorts of (unintelligible). Oh one thing - and this is Avri speaking. One thing I - since they started talking one thing...

Sébastien Bachollet: Oh I can't hear.

Avri Doria: ...okay I'm sorry. One thing I might suggest is that perhaps because one of the things we did talk about also in the (unintelligible) that Cheryl was mentioning, is that perhaps a group won't be necessary to either appoint one of its own or someone could jump up and volunteer.

At the beginning of a first meeting and that perhaps the liaison can sort of chair through the first meeting, be a volunteer sort of becomes apparent during the meeting or even start the second meeting with that so that the liaison while like totaling agreeing with the (unintelligible) who spoke before that they shouldn't be the chair can certainly facilitate and chair the beginnings of the group as it begins to form. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: So as a (unintelligible) it's a liaison we chair simply that working group and that's why we need to nominate and to elect a chair. So if we cannot maybe to select someone today we can at least do - to do it before the 10th of May when we have (also to) across our working group charter.

Man: Rafik you've got several people in the queue.

Rafik Dammak: Oh yes, so Alan go ahead please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I was - Avri beat me to the punch in suggesting that the co-chairs stay on the chair at the moment. There's another rationale and that - this meeting was scheduled on very short notice and there's a large number of people who are not attending. So although we may find it easy to pick one of them to be chair I would suggest this is better at discussion held over the list and then perhaps at the next meeting at the beginning (name) to try to identify the chair. And there's still...

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...a very bad echo.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Alan. So (unintelligible) please go ahead.

Man: Yes I do support what Alan said but first can we ask if there is any volunteer among people who are now on the bridge?

Alan Greenberg: I think we would have heard if there was.

Rafik Dammak: Okay but so any volunteer? Okay I think that we can ask Alan please do...

Alan Greenberg: Not...

Rafik Dammak: ...it.

Alan Greenberg: ...no I'm sorry I was just hadn't (lowered) it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh I thought you were a volunteering Alan.

Alan Greenberg: No, no, no.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so maybe if - as we need to move ahead so we can let this issue to be (discussed) in the mailing list and to elect the chair into next conf call item. So any objection to this (unintelligible)...

Man: No.

Alan Greenberg: I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not...

Alan Greenberg: ...spoke.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...an objection Rafik it's - and when you say (unintelligible) it is Cheryl. But I did wonder I don't agree with us moving forward that why whether or not we could spend a moment however discussing whether the group believes we need a chair or a pair of coaches, because that would make a difference to some volunteers for example if they felt that there was a role sharing rather than a huge role to be taken on that may influence some people's decisions.

And the other thing is of course as every and I spent quite some minutes discussing this morning in another workgroup if all else fails we could have the Charting organization point a chair.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so please can - and really I didn't get your point Cheryl sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Should we have a call for a chair singular or does this workgroup believe the role could be taken on by co-chairs plural?

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you it's more clear now. (Unintelligible) please.

Man: Yes I do think that we need two co-chairs for the reasons that everyone knows. I mean availability any problem can happen.

Rafik Dammak: Okay yes thank you. So I think that that's (unintelligible) maybe later about if we need the chair or co-chair with all the participants and (unintelligible) of the working group and the mailing list. So and so we can go ahead to the ICANN (3) for about the working group charter.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof here if you allow me Rafik...

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Olof Nordling: ...I think.

Rafik Dammak: Yes go ahead please.

Olof Nordling: Probably it calls for some kind of action point here. And I would like to take what take that on me to send out to the list that nominations for - and that's the question I mean, a volunteer is for co-chairs and their - I want to drill a little bit into this so that we have one co-chair from the GNSO side, one co-chair from the ALAC side or any other conditions about this.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thank you Olof good point. Maybe if also that it has to get participants so we need to maybe get co-chair and that working group, you know. So can you - so please can you send that email to the mailing list and.

Alan Greenberg: Rafik it's...

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible)...

Alan Greenberg: ...Alan.

Rafik Dammak: ...oh yes.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I...

Rafik Dammak: So we hope - yes please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: ...yes I would suggest that we send out a call for chair, co-chairs and vice-chairs and we - based on what response we get we do a selection. I think we're spending far more time than we need to at this point on worrying about the structure of what may be a very short lived committee and we need to start talking about the substance of what we're going to do. The Board gave us what I consider effectively a very impossible criteria that is too (unintelligible) sustainable support for these unspecified groups of people.

And I think we need to start talking about that and.

Man: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Worry less about the.

Rafik Dammak: Yes...

Alan Greenberg: Management structure.

Rafik Dammak: ...yes I agree Alan that's why I'm trying that so...

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: ...you can maybe stop at this point with all the members on the mailing list and to go ahead to maybe the Item 3 and 4 which more I think that more important now for our.

Alan Greenberg: We stated if we get any volunteers we'll be lucky.

Rafik Dammak: Yes I think so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan as I did say it's very easy if there are no volunteers the charting organization or in this case, organizations plural can make appointment or appointments.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes. I think Avri said in (unintelligible) go...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: ...ahead please.

Avri Doria: And hopefully I can be heard now I dialed back in. And basically people can nominate but once we see the whole group of people we listen to how people are participating over in this meeting and the next.

People can nominate people sometimes people may not be strong on, you know, putting themselves forward and volunteering and especially if we want to pick some chairs who have shown themselves to be good participants in groups in the past but who have never, you know, put themselves forward in some of these roles especially if we're going for co-chairs we may find that it's reasonable for someone to nominate people.

I've certainly inflicted nominations on other people in other groups many times and I find that it works quite well. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Avri. So okay go Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes just one very quick thought. Traditionally a chair is a relatively independent person who does not have views on the subject itself. Again in this case I think we can be flexible in that and because I - just because

someone wants to be an active participant in the group should not preclude them being the chair, at least I would like to see this group have that flexibility.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you. So anyway as I think Avri state people can nominate other people to volunteer for the chair, co-chair or even vice-chair and so we can continually be the discussion in the mailing list. And I think that we should go ahead with the Item 2 - Item 3 because we are almost in the half of our conf call and (unintelligible) so let's people think about that.

Man: Yes, yes I second.

Man: That sounds good...

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes let's go to the working group charter. I think maybe Olof can present it is the draft - preliminary draft that you sent to the mailing list?

Olof Nordling: Yes and I have it up on the Adobe connect thank you Rafik. This is Olof here and it is a very as I say preliminary draft because - well the (unintelligible) and the tasks is comparatively wide open one could say so this is very tentative. And what I've actually put into it was to explore a few of the lines that one could think about and well just from the preamble, on one hand I'll say - well I'd draft that the working group expects to identify suitable criteria for provision of support. To identify suitable support forms and identify potential providers of such support.

And again since there is no limitation that it should be handled in any particular way, at least not from the outset that however, there's no presumption that the outcome will imply and in particular governing structure since it could - the final recommendation could be that this would be wholly on a voluntary nature. And in such a case the governing structure would be inappropriate. So this is just the very first attempt to write down something to

see the reactions rather than that it is a suggestion of any sort, just get the discussion started.

So thoughts from that perspective on the preamble perhaps they were added.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Olof okay Alan please.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I've got a few thoughts on the preamble but I'd like to give the overall impression also. First of all a question I'm not sure what the term dedicated support means in the second line of the Preamble. Olof can you elaborate...

Olof Nordling: I...

Alan Greenberg: ...on that?

Olof Nordling: ...well you say something that of course to some degree there would be a general support or information of such to all applicants. I mean what's part of the application - the application procedure one could say. There are supports in the sense of we have a (unintelligible) system and question and answer possibilities and such support. Dedicated support would be rather focused to a limited set of applicants that's what I meant at least (unintelligible) it.

Alan Greenberg: Okay I'm not sure that dedicated implies the right thing to someone reading this. But that notwithstanding, I find the - some of the objectives and the order of the objectives I guess presumptuous is the best word I can come up with to - and I understand the order may not have been important in suggesting them but in reading them it becomes important.

Since we are talking about this group developing concepts of how - of who and how applicants may be supported with the explicit comment that essentially we are putting zero ICANN resources into it other than this perhaps the staff that it assisting us and helping this. I find it rather presumptuous that we may even consider that we are identifying the criteria.

Whoever it is that's actually going to be providing the support is the one that's going to make the judgment whether they want to support someone or something in this area.

And again conditions for that have to be followed I think is something out of our domain until we get to the meat of the question and say, what kind of support are we talking about and who are the potential sources? So I think the Objectives 2 and 3 are really the focal point. I'm going along with that, I think the issue of governing structure for a group that is not us we don't know who it is and it's certainly not our money I think is overstepping the bounds until we have at least identified that and start to get a feel for what it necessary.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Alan. We hope that (unintelligible) that you and Avri please go ahead.

Man: Yes I would like to talk about the Objection Number 4 which is part I think that the conditions are part of the criteria of (unintelligible) Objective 1. So I do see that it is almost a duplication.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you. So Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay hi this is Avri. I actually get - I've taken a slightly different task than Alan on it. I mean I think and perhaps absolutely term certainly this group is not going to put out a perspective for perspective applicants sort of saying if you meet these criteria you will get money.

But I also think that if we don't have a certain number of criteria, recommended criteria albeit that we intend to put forth to the donors or to any other methods that we may come up with for dealing with providing support or finding a way to, you know, come up with technical teams that can provide in kind support or any of these things. If we don't have a set of criteria of who

we think these things need to help, we have absolutely no way to bring them on board.

You know, if it's sort of a general - well, you know, there's going to be some applicants and they're going to have some problems maybe financial, maybe technical, maybe business and going to need advising and perhaps grants, perhaps loans. But - and more than that we can't really tell you that they're going to say, hey, you know, and I have gone to people asking for money for various things. And they say, you know, give us a perspective of what it is you want to support and we'll discuss it with you and we'll negotiate.

And yes maybe we'll give you some feedback and say, we'll we buy into it except that, you know, we're not willing to give it to associations that are advocates for political goals but we're willing to give it to those who are advocates for the homeless or, you know, some type things like that that does happen in a negotiation.

So I actually do see all four of these objectives as being necessary. I think this group is going to get to its position in sort of a process of stepwise reassignment that will come up with a first approximation or hopefully will come up with a first approximation of what it is that we think we're talking about because at the moment it's really too early in the area of hand waving. We think that there's a normative we ought to do something but we don't really know what or who, why, how and I think that that's when these four Objectives start to outline.

So I actually see them as all useful thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri so just for clarification that you mean that first we need to define what kind of needs and for which applicants? Avri?

Avri Doria: Oh yes, yes, yes. No as I said, looking at the objectives I think that, you know, what are the kind of criteria that applicants would fulfill? Are we talking

about any applicants that want to apply? Are we talking about applicants from certain regions? Are we talking about IBN only? Are we talking about people that have budgets, you know, or have existing financial resources above, below, you know.

When we're talking about kinds of support are we looking to provide, you know, business advice, you know, on how to write an application that has a prayer of passing without needing to pay hundreds of dollars an hour for a ICANN pro to help you do it. Are we talking about technical assistance to help you understand what the technical requirements are and how you can meet them with a, you know, registry service provider or if you really want to create one in your own country how you can do that in cooperation with perhaps your (unintelligible) or somebody else, you know, et cetera.

So what kinds of help do we want? Looking at providers who are we thinking of going to? Are we thinking of, you know, of making a recommendation to ICANN that they can up a foundation that uses, you know, profits from, you know, auctions in the future? Are we looking at going to, you know, the registries and registrars that we've got now? Are we planning (to go) - excuse me - are we planning to go to Ford and other foundations and ask them for money.

So what type of fund raising are we talking about? What kind of structure are we saying? Is this money that, you know, we're going to hand to the implementation's team and the staff to do or are we going to recommend some sort of structure?

And then the fourth one is sort of, you know, what could we plan to ask to these people we give money to or, you know, not we - but the group that said that we recommend being set up. What are we going to ask them to do, you know, whenever you give money in Ford Foundation giving money to an NPO or something, you know, you've got certain conditions that you put on them. You've got certain financial oversight, you've got certain, you know, maybe

project officer oversight just to make sure that, you know, you're not throwing in for some and it just use proper so et cetera.

All those four things make sense and as we need to take a (first) at them and have some idea of what we're talking about thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. So we have Alan after Evan and (Unintelligible). Okay go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I - just a clarification I wasn't meaning to imply the other of the objectives 1 and 4 specifically were not relevant. They are very relevant. I was suggesting that the order of them was inappropriate and that first we should be thinking about what business are we in and then setting the rules for the business as apposed to vice versa. But I do thank Avri for being a one person think tank. I hope we are having - we'll get a transcript out of this big call because I think she's identified a very large number of our - both questions and many of the answers that we need to come up with.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan so.

Tony Harris: Yes can I get in queue I kind of lift up my hand in Wiki. This is Tony...

Rafik Dammak: Oh...

Tony Harris: ...Harris.

Rafik Dammak: ...so oh yes, you're also A, so okay.

Andrew Mack: I am A actually it's Andrew Mack. I hit it accidentally before it put my whole name in. Sorry about...

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Andrew Mack: ...that it's early for me.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so Evan and Anthony and the A person and Alan okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes I want (unintelligible) and I don't know if this is right forum to ask it but this is an outgrow of informal meeting that was done in Nairobi on categorization and I'm wondering if we are either duplicating placing the mandate of that. And the reason I asked that is because many of the questions that Avri asked were actually starting to be addressed by that categorization group where one would substitute a TLB applicant and that would be suitable for a subsidy or something like that.

So I'm not quite sure is this replacing that group or is this running in parallel? Because if it is some of the issues Avri mentioned would be sort of duplication what that group was already starting to talk about.

Rafik Dammak: Maybe Avri can you reply to.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan I can also comment on that.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I think Evan is incorrect that the meeting he's talking about in fact was going on in parallel with the Board meeting privately to come out that among other things came up with this resolution. So I think that they may be complimentary to say one followed the other or replaces the other I think is - doesn't tell history the way it was.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay...

Alan Greenberg: But there are in deed.

Evan Leibovitch: ...okay...

Alan Greenberg: There are in deed areas of overlap.

Evan Leibovitch: ...but not thinking the history I'm thinking simply in terms of purpose. Are we duplicating some of what that group is doing? That's my issue what...

Alan Greenberg: Depending on how that group goes it may end up being overlapped and we should benefit from that. There's a lot of membership overlap also.

Rafik Dammak: So I should confess I'm not too worried about this working group but maybe it's...

Alan Greenberg: This is (Burt)...

Rafik Dammak: ...(unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...(Burt) (unintelligible) working group on categories of gTLDs.

Rafik Dammak: So maybe we need to get more information I'm not sure how we can handle this like maybe we - if we can get more information so we can avoid to overlap with their working and going (unintelligible) working groups. So...

Alan Greenberg: Yes my point was simply - some of the questions that Avri was asking were absolutely relevant but they may already been - they may already be getting addressed elsewhere is my point which could sort of sharpen our own focus here.

Avri Doria: Can I comment directly on that I don't have my hand up but on that?

Rafik Dammak: Please go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay just quickly. I think that that cross community group that we're (unintelligible) put together first of all is sort of a new effort to try and come up

with categories and this group is sort of - there was a Board resolution and an SO and an AB and actually formally formed this group. I think we certainly can use that and I think many of us are participants in both.

But I think that this is a formerly chartered activity and has a certain mandate to go do something, whereas the cross community group is something like a bunch of us got together and were trying to do something thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. So the next is Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Yes well Avri - thank you, sorry I signed in as A accidentally, I started typing my name and I hit the return. The - a couple of things first of all I agree very much with a lot of the questions that Avri set out and I think it has a excellent lift. It would strike me that it makes the most sense to start with our identified audience who are we really trying to be helpful to? And then the way that we go about it will fall out fairly reasonably from that.

In terms of the bit on categorization because I was at part of that meeting, if I remember correctly in Nairobi the sense that I get that that's a pre-determined destination that the assumption is that we should end up with categories. I'm not sure whether that will end up - whether that's where we'll end up going as a community or not.

And I don't know if it makes any difference for this group. I wouldn't worry that we're overlapping too much with them because either way some of the things that we're trying to address whether or not they're categories I think we'll still need to address the - some of the issues that Avri brought up. But I would start off with our audience. Who are we trying to support?

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Andrew. Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Yes good morning. I have some thoughts about the objectives that are presented. For Objective 1 I think that if we could actually present some

scenarios based on some known needs that would be helpful in determining what criteria we must develop and some thoughts around that are if we look at the criteria that are already established for fellowship applicants, I don't know if those criteria are based on perhaps the GDP of a country or things like that but that might be a good place to start.

And for Objective 3, Identifying Potential Providers, I'm well aware of several companies that are willing to provide reduced cost services such as DNS (unintelligible) clearing house provides free DNS services to ccTLDs in third world countries and I know for a fact that my company (Unintelligible) Machines also provides reduced cost services. And so I think - I'm sorry - I can't remember if was Avri but someone had a very good point about needing to consider the providers and what their criteria might be.

So I think that we might want to have a call for volunteers asking which providers would be willing to provide these services and making sure that they're involved in these discussions.

And finally I do like the idea of setting up a foundation with any auction revenue if we need to offset the costs of the actual application fees. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you so.

Alan Greenberg: Don't forget Tony...

Rafik Dammak: Anthony, yes Tony go ahead please.

Tony Harris: It's my turn now?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, yes go ahead please.

Tony Harris: Yes okay I just have a question for Olof and I may have misread the Objectives so I have some oversights. But I don't see anything in the

Objectives that addresses the main line of comments on this that I have seen and participated in, in the public forums in every ICANN meeting which is, I think the basic question here is and I mean Avri really hit it on the nail when she outlined where all of this is going these Objectives that are just going in all kinds of directions.

But does - it has been scrupulously avoided in the Objectives. I don't see any mention of the basic problem which is the application fee is outrageously expensive and particularly for a non-profit organization. It is - as we have commented we've gone online commenting on this from my Federation in Latin America, it is way beyond anything that has been done in the past as far as (unintelligible) previous rounds. The application fee was in the order of \$50,000 and I mean the TLDs came online that there was no rocket science involved in the evaluation.

And that would seem to be we've come up with four Objectives from what I can see here that are talking about as Avri said, "Who are we going to go for support?" Do you have to find foundations who would do this? And in the Objectives there is absolutely no mention of the fact perhaps the simplest solution is in justified cases this application fee might be reduced. Whether it's no contention there is no need to go into extended and complex of and solutions to contested strings.

It just seems to be I mean completely deviating from the what I interpret is the original intent of the community which is this is very expensive for a non-profit organization. And I can hear appears to be completely out of the loop as far as being a potential provider. It's just a comment but I may have misread the Objective.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof may I respond or...

Tony Harris: Please do.

Olof Nordling: ...wait for - yes, well please. Rafik make the queue and I've tried to respond had a very (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: So Olof please go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Well first of all I note that at least the Objectives served the purpose of launching the discussion which was obviously the reason. And secondly, there's no underlying intent or whatsoever. This - I tried to make them both generic so of general applicability rather than very specific and I tried to stretch them a bit which may or may have done too far. But - well the starting point is providing support. I mean that's the starting point of the Board resolution and it's also the starting point as I've interpreted from the launch and initiative from the GNSO.

Well it's all one aspect and that's the financial aspect but this is much wider. A (unintelligible) much wider, it's not necessarily confined to financial and not necessarily confined to any particular solution that it should be handled let's say you come to the conclusion that it should be handled by ICANN and it should be take the former shape of some kind of subsidy to certain applicant. That would be a full grown conclusion wouldn't it?

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Olof so we have Sebastien in the queue.

Sébastien Bachollet: Thank you. Yes I would like to support what (unintelligible) say that's from my point of view, one essential point which we need to work on. And I think it's - we need to incorporate the fact that some cost of ICANN could be decreased less important for some of the applicants is if we feel some (unintelligible). It's - and I - it's just - it's not just about the level of the fee to be candidate, but it could be also to find a way to decrease the need of US lawyer for an applicant from some countries where it's not the same type of law or it's not the same language and so on and so forth.

And it's like everything here it's written in complicated English with a lot of terms that's difficult to understand that it could be one way also to decrease the difficulty to be an applicant in some areas of (wealth). And my second point it's - I agree with Alan who say about his auction what to do with this money. And I think we never really discussed at that point I guess in the ICANN arena certainly but it could be a good interesting way to use this money is to help some possible applicants to come alive in some areas and well again.

I really think that we need to (unintelligible) that in those in maybe new objectives in (unintelligible) thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Sebastien. I'm not sure Elaine you (raised your hands).

Elaine Pruis: Yes thanks. I'm wondering if we could just.

Man: Hello?

Rafik Dammak: Hello I think that we lost Elaine so.

Man: We lost Elaine.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so.

Olof Nordling: I can still see her on the meeting view so connected. This is Olof.

Rafik Dammak: Yes I'm not sure maybe she's in mute or some. Anyway...

Olof Nordling: Oh well.

Rafik Dammak: ...not that she, well who is talking? So we have Alan in the queue.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I think we're going too far at this first meeting before we even have the charter to start brain storming on the possible solutions. I mean all of the ones mentioned are relevant and in fact have been discussed going back at least three or four years that I'm aware of, you know, in terms of foundations and revenue from auctions and reducing the price. We're operating under a specific Board by law or Board motion which in the Preamble says, we're working under the principle of cost recovery.

That doesn't stop us from perhaps coming up with some rationale of why we should analyze cost recovery differently but that's addressing the real problem that we're looking at. And I think we're going too deep into problem solving today and that's not the chart - that should not be of the order in which we're doing this.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. So just I think (unintelligible) asking is we have a charter or not. We have the direct charter but we are discussing about it and so maybe if people need to rather - discussing maybe if there is need for specifically wording or something like that maybe we can (discuss) this more about that and the mailing list. I think it's more appropriate because we already have this 14 minutes and so we - I think we have one week to approve this charter so. Avri you have any question or?

Alan Greenberg: I think before the call ends it was scheduled for an hour we need to talk about when are we going to schedule meetings?

Rafik Dammak: Yes that's very (unintelligible). Okay about the schedule. So Olof can you go into the put the schedule for the.

Olof Nordling: Certainly thank you Rafik this is Olof. And while we've got a very, very, tough deadline to provide something to - before the Brussels meeting the ICANN Brussels meeting and - well what I've just put up as a few milestone a bit further down you can scroll yourself on the Adobe Connect - the part on Adobe Connect where you have the (unintelligible) below that. We have the

first conference call and forcing something like a ten day period a little over a week to get the charter approved.

That means we need to agree in the draft and it needs to be approved. I suppose by the GNSO and ALAC at some point in time and presumably before then. And then we have weekly conference calls that's sort of the proposal starting around the 12 of May when we have the charter approved going into early June and doing those four, five calls perhaps we need to get some kind of recommendation that we can be presented and discussed.

And subsequently I suspect it would need some further refining. I think it's very, very ambitious and the question is now of course also that general approach what can be achieved within this period and would for example, having weekly conference calls on Wednesdays at some defined time that we set up we're proposing that we set up a doodle for various time slots in order to see where the majority - there is a majority of support and go from there for the planning of the calls.

What - the calls can be kept at one hour or should be kept two hours or something else that's also something that would appreciate input on, but of course we've got a very, very, heavy task in front of us and very short time. That can serve as an introduction.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Olof. So (unintelligible) Avri and direct you in (unintelligible) so Avri go ahead please.

Avri Doria: Yes I'd like to suggest then that we start immediately with planning for the weekly meetings and certainly not wait until we, you know, finish the Charter to do that. I'd also like to suggest that we, you know, discuss the Charter over the next week on the list as heavily as we can and try to close the subject of a Charter by next week.

I think that, you know, as much as possible we should try to accept what's here taking into account, you know, Tony's point although it will be difficult to include that but perhaps we can include some objectives that sort of says, if we want to make any recommendations not that anybody would listen to them necessarily. But I definitely think we should start with the, you know, meet next week and do as much as possible on the list and on the Wiki and if the charter is in the Wiki then we can start working on it and making comments and not wait for a next meeting to do the next step. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri it's very good and (unintelligible) I think the best way that we can follow so to get this in the mailing list and to come up in the Wiki so in the I think in the next conf call we can approve quickly the Charter. So we have (Jeni) after Alan. (Jeni) go ahead.

Man: Is (Jeni) mute?

Rafik Dammak: I'm not sure okay so please Alan in the meantime.

Woman: Yes (Jeni)'s on mute.

Alan Greenberg: Perhaps someone can un-mute him.

(Jeni Benjerma): Do you hear me?

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible)...

(Jeni Benjerma): Okay, okay I was muted that's why. Now we have a Charter a draft Charter that thanks to Olof we have a draft charter that we would discuss during the week and we'll comment it and perhaps we will modify it. Inside the Charter that is a point a link to the working guidelines. And it's a document of 30 or 40

pages that we also have to go (in) if we'll put it in the Charter we have to go in and we have to discuss it also. Shall we be able to do that during the week?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry I'm not getting the point of - about the working group deadline. The - (Jeni)'s working group deadline.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof indeed it's a long document and it's - it is a draft which is up for public commentary I think still. So it's a lengthy document and just in order to have some kind of reference to some kind of rules but if there is a general feeling that we shouldn't refer to them at all, well then we shouldn't.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Wash your mouth out with soap immediately Olof.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well if I may...

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...if I may Rafik I just want to say, yes it is a longish document. It is draft, it is the product of input from both GNSO and ALAC personnel. I think if we look at it as in principle guidelines and we won't - we don't need to discuss it if anyone has great problem or variance with something at the time when it is needed to be looked at, referred to or implemented during our workgroup process and I think we can deal with it.

But I think as a general framework for us to work with and that's totally biased of course on my part I'm more than happy to have it as a major reference and they allow some flexibility in the rare and unlikely circumstance that we have a problem with it.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cheryl. So Avri and Alan.

Avri Doria: Yes I want to quickly endorse what Cheryl said. I'm on that group with her as well as several other people and if we start discussing that document we will never get to the rest of the work we've done. We've been discussing that document weekly for months now. I do recommend that people read it, I do recommend that people can, you know, make comments. The way we've used the document I think already in one other group is almost beta testing the document and the process...

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...this is really almost the best we've come up with at looking at the experience we had doing working groups over the last couple of years. So while I hate to say take things on, say, you know, this certainly hasn't been approved yet by either the GNSO and certainly not by ALAC and its executive committee, et cetera but the work has been collaborative and it is the best we've got at the moment thanks.

Rafik Dammak: So thank you Avri just that we don't have so much time I think maybe you can get more 10 minutes but so everybody can contribute quickly and briefly. So please Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I - Cheryl and Avri said almost everything that I was going to say. My only additional comment is in addition to it may make interesting reading for participants I think it is required reading for whoever ends up being the chair.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yes.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Cheryl...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And Avri and I may make reference to it from time to time as the urge takes us do you think.

Alan Greenberg: And some of us who didn't write it may make reference to it also.

Rafik Dammak: So okay, so I think that the best way to end call of (unintelligible) so just have to do the regular calls to that some time slot and so we can decide how though we will make weekly conf call and so we decide about the time. Okay I think maybe we can go to the Item 5 but maybe we did a lot of (unintelligible) discussion about the working group charter. Any - I don't see anybody in the queue so.

Alan Greenberg: (A)...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Alan is now in the queue. I'm not absolutely sure if one of the items in the draft working group guidelines is that we try to adhere to our cut off time for these meetings but I really would like to do that. Meetings that run over especially run over a lot really make complicated days a lot more complicated. So if this is an hour meeting or an hour and a half whatever we decide on in the future I would like to see us try to keep to that and that includes today to the extent possible.

Rafik Dammak: Yes I agree. Okay so maybe because we are running the time maybe we should change the conf call (soon) maybe one minute or two if anybody have any suggestion or comment? Okay...

Alan Greenberg: I think we made good headway for the first day with only half the people here.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so maybe we can (unintelligible) is meeting today?

Woman: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay and...

Alan Greenberg: In that case...

Rafik Dammak: ...I think (unintelligible)...

Alan Greenberg: ...Rafik...

Rafik Dammak: ...(unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...Rafik I thank you for taking the lead on this.

Woman: Thank you...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well...

Man: Thank you...

Man: ...done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Rafik.

Woman: Yes.

Man: Bye bye.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Hello, oh please stop the recording, Gisella.

Coordinator: Hello there I've stopped the recording for you sir.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you very much so...

Coordinator: You're welcome.

Rafik Dammak: ...you did like - are you here?

Alex Gakuru: Thank you Rafik. Alex here. Bye bye.

Rafik Dammak: Bye.

END