

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 05 May 2010 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) 05 May 2010 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-so-ac-wg-20100505.mp3>

On page:

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

(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

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)

Michele Neylon - RrSG

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

ICANN staff

Olof Nordling
Glen de saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White
Heidi Ullrich

Apologies:

Carlos Aguirre - At Large
Dave Kisoondoyal – ALAC
Baudouin Schombe - NCSG

Olga Cavalli - NCA
Vanda Scartezini - ICANN Board
Coordinator: You are now being recorded.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you very much. So hello everyone. So Gisella, can you please do the role (on).

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes, with pleasure. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's call we have Rafik Dammak, Alex Gakuru, Tijani Ben-Jemaa, Avri Doria, Sébastien Bachollet, Michele Neylon, Elaine Puis, Richard Tindal, Evan Leibovitch, Tony Harris, Andrew Mack, (Fabian Bitrameu). From staff we have Olof Nordling, Glen de Saint Géry and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologies from Olga Cavalli, Carlos Aguirre. And if I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella. So we can now start with the first item of the agenda review. Any comments on this? And so if we everybody agree we can move to the second item.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof here. I would like to add two items to (unintelligible). Perhaps...

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Olof Nordling: ...another review of the call Michele. And also information about if possible questions from staff (unintelligible) information purposes to the group as well as perhaps mentioning a bit about the upcoming Brussels meeting although it's early days now.

Rafik Dammak: Olof can you please add this to the notes in the Adobe Connect?

Olof Nordling: Yeah, yeah, I can add it on there on the notes, yes.

Rafik Dammak: So any comment or - okay Alex, go ahead please. Alex?

Alex Gakuru: Yes, I just wanted to request that maybe somebody's breathing very heavy on the phone (unintelligible) star 6 (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Hello?

Olof Nordling: Hello.

Woman: Hello.

Man: ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thank you. So I think we can go to the second item. It's about the update of first statement of interest. I think that Gisella or (Grant) just send email to remind everybody to (unintelligible) for the statement of interest. So please do it as soon as possible.

So I guess that we can go quickly to the third item, selection of co-chair. And to now that we have Avri Doria and Evan Leibovitch as - who were nominated. I don't think that there was another candidate.

Okay so maybe - I'm not sure but I think that they are our new co-chair for this working group?

Sébastien Bachollet: Sébastien is on the queue.

Rafik Dammak: The problem that I cannot see in Adobe Connect but please go ahead Sébastien.

Sébastien Bachollet: Sorry (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Sébastien Bachollet: ...to everybody.

Olof Nordling: There still some very heavy breathing. I can't really hear the people who are talking.

Rafik Dammak: Okay (unintelligible) I have some problem in Adobe Connect but please go ahead Sébastien about the second item, okay.

Sébastien Bachollet: Yeah it was to suggest to Glen to check from the ALAC members already existing SOI because I'm sure that they will answer that but they are not participating for the today call. I would like to (unintelligible) to that that you will less people to chase on that.

And for the second or the third item I just want to guess that there are just two candidates to co-chair and we are happy to have co-chair one from each - one from the GNSO and one from the ALAC and (unintelligible). It will be great to have them if they are still willing to do that. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you.

Olof Nordling: You have Avri on the queue.

Rafik Dammak: Okay please go head Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay yeah, thank you. I appreciate being nominated. And as I said on email, you know, if people actually want that to happen I'm willing. I pointed out my one issue of perhaps having too many opinions on this.

The other thing I wanted to point out is from my statement of interest before people make a decision. I frequently made a point over the last five years that I've never made a cent from anything to do with ICANN and that's been part of my ongoing persona.

While that is still strictly speaking true as of today I have also though made an agreement where someone will be paying me for occasional advice. So I wanted to make sure before anybody decided that, you know, I - and it will be possible applicants for community-based TLDs, the kind of people I've been advising for free up until now one of them has actually graciously decided to give me some money for it.

So I just wanted to make sure that people knew that change to my public ICANN persona while considering this. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Just to make clear, did you put this in the (all) statement of interest?

Avri Doria: Yes most definitely. In fact I can read it (unintelligible) multiple applications for community-based gTLDs. For the most part I provide this as an incidental service in exchange for coffee and pastry while for others I set up a long term consultant agreement that includes payments.

My consultant agreement includes the following, "Nothing in this agreement commits Avri Doria to take any particular positions within ICANN, any ICANN internal organizations or working groups. With regard to internet technical or policy work Avri Doria remains a free agent accept as constrained by nondisclosure agreements agreed to by both parties."

So that's what I say about it in my SOI.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you very much Avri. So we can maybe have some comments from the other participants so if they - so what they think of it. For me it's my personal opinion I don't see any problem that you can be - you would be selected as (co-chair) so...

Olof Nordling: We've got Sébastien in the queue again.

Sébastien Bachollet: Yeah, (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Go ahead Sébastien.

Sébastien Bachollet: Thank you. Yeah, it's not - from my point of view there's no problem with that. And I think we are maybe ICANN or you, Avri, or people generally we have pushing too much on that issue. And that's a US way of life. I think you need to leave, you need to get some money.

And one thing to - you do - it's - you know what's happening within ICANN and I don't know why you wouldn't be able to use that for some living parts. You are not a registry; you are not a lawyer, you - okay you give advice to one possible candidate.

I hope that it's possible for every one of us. And I think specifically for this working group it's maybe my first thing to ask people involved and who chair about that and just people who runs the working group. Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Sébastien. So...

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: I am on the queue, (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Olof Nordling: And I think Tony Harris was in the queue as well.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Okay so please Tijani and Dr. - Tony.

Tony Harris: Okay, okay.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: I don't see any problem for Avri. I still want her to be co-chair; that's all.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Tony please.

Tony Harris: Yes, I just wanted to say that I have no problem with Avri being co-chair. I think she'd be an asset.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So I think that there is consensus about that there is no problem that Avri to be selected as co-chair. So...

Gisella Gruber-White: You have three people in the queue. You have Andrew Mack - you have three people on the queue at the moment, Andrew Mack...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Sorry guys but I have really big problem with this (unintelligible) which is Adobe Connect. So thank you for your help. Okay Andrew and who else?

Andrew Mack: I understand those as ticks...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...to say we agree.

Gisella Gruber-White: Oh sorry, sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So what - so is Evan is on line or no - not?

Olof Nordling: Not everyone is online on Adobe Connect. I think Tony Harris (unintelligible) and perhaps somebody else.

Man: Is Evan - is Evan on...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: To answer your question Evan is online.

Man: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so he - maybe want to say something before...

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: He says no need to speak; I'm fine with Avri's choice.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you. So I think that we can congratulate our new co-chairs Evan and Avri. And I would say good luck for you for continuing to chairing this working group.

I think that maybe we can go to the next item, but, sorry Olof can you please manage what is the next item because I cannot see anything in the Adobe Connect.

Olof Nordling: Charter approval.

Man: Charter approval, Item 4. And (unintelligible) for handing over to Evan and Avri at this moment.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Man: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay with pleasure. So guys, good luck.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Even you I didn't coordinate before this. Do you want to do the meeting or should I/

Evan Leibovitch: I'll tell you what, you do everything until 40 after the hour and I'll take it from there.

Avri Doria: Okay. In which case - okay thank you all. And let's move onto the charter. So I guess what we need to do now is get a charter that we're all comfortable with because if I understand the council - and I don't know what the ALAC schedule is but the GNSO Council schedule who still have to approve this and I guess ALAC would also have to approve it and then whatever negotiated language they would need to do needs to be dealt with.

I think that this Thursday or perhaps later today - I'm not quite sure - is the deadline to get motions is; is that correct Rafik - for next week's council meeting?

Rafik Dammak: I think we have - there's always deadline for that so they said that we have to start working in - after 28 days but so...

Avri Doria: Right. Now what I was thinking of since the Council still has to approve the charter I'm just trying to figure out our deadline. And you need to have a motion on the table in the council a week before the meeting. Is it - am I correct perhaps, Glen, if you're on the phone, or Gisella, tell me is the council meeting next week? And is therefore the deadline today - tomorrow?

Gisella Gruber-White: I believe the council meeting is on the 20th of May.

Avri Doria: Oh okay so we do have another week.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes so the deadline is eight days before that. It will be the 11th or 12.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you very much. All right guess it's further than a few weeks between them this time. Fantastic. So where were we with the agenda? We had basically had the four objectives if I remember. A fifth objective was proposed by Tony. And from the discussion I saw on the list at least in principal people seem to be agreeing to it being there.

There had also been discussions about perhaps reprioritizing them because there's the notion that if there's an (ordinality) of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 we're saying 1 is most important and 5 is least important though I don't know that that's necessarily the case. And I don't think anything determines which gets done first. But do we want to talk any more about the precedence?

And do we want to talk some more about Objective 5 which currently reads, "To identify how the application fee can be reduced to accommodate applications that fulfill appropriate criteria to qualify for this benefit." And I guess those were the words that Tony suggested.

So I guess I'll open up the floor and see who wants to comment on what edits do we need to any of them? Do we want to shift the order? And where do we go from here? Anyone?

And I am looking at the Adobe so speak up if you're not Adobe. Okay I see Evan. Okay go ahead Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: I guess my point is - I'm very happy that Tony proposed Objective 5 because all of the other objectives seem to make an implication of what I think to myself as the charity model as opposed to Objective 5 which has shall we saw a more holistic view to the possibility of reduced cost through lowered fees as opposed to subsidy.

Are these objectives ordered by priority or interest? Or do we make it clear that there is no particular priority to them in this document?

Avri Doria: Thanks. Olof, you were next so...

Olof Nordling: Yes and I wanted to clarify that there was no such intention in my very, very preliminary draft. So it was just lining up in the - in some kind of pattern of thought that came to my mind.

So maybe we could add a line to say that the order of the objectives make no - is not for priority purposes or something of the sort if you wish.

Evan Leibovitch: That would be appreciated.

Avri Doria: Yeah, yeah.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Avri Doria: Thank you Olof. I have Alex and then Tijani.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: We agree, that's all.

Avri Doria: Oh okay, sorry that's right I'm misunderstanding...

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: ...was just to agree.

Avri Doria: Right, okay.

Andrew Mack: Mine was just to agree.

Avri Doria: Okay I apologize. I keep mistaking my symbols. Okay great.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...not agreeing...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri, Cheryl here. If I was able to connect to the Internet which clearly I'm not this morning because after all I'm in a hotel for an ICANN meeting then I would have a little green (tick up) agreeing. But it is very much up to the work group to make the prioritization if any is going to made clear.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Yeah, in fact I would think that if we're going to meet objectives in the milestone we would be working on several things in parallel.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...you have your hand up.

Man: Yes, thank you very much. And I wanted to make two - to ask two questions, in fact in the Objective 1 as we add Objective 5 maybe we need to change something about the wording for dedicated support. I am not sure that dedicated support is the same fit well if we have a charity type of sport but maybe not if we have a decrease of the fee.

And my second point is that in fact Objective 2 and 5 are two objective to - are decrease the cost or give some (unintelligible) help the applicants and maybe we can put them close together. And really we have the criteria, we have how to give them money or decrease the cost and - (unintelligible) providers and the condition to be followed by the new (unintelligible).

And I think it's not the priority it's the order I guess it's understandable that we need to go through this way of thinking and then we will go from 1 to 5 in different order. But and my suggestion it's at least to change the 5 to 3 and the 3 to 4 and the 4 to 5 to put the 5 in between the current 2 and 3. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And you also had a recommendation to change dedicated support perhaps just to support if I caught your other conversation. Okay. I have Olof then (Fabian) then Evan.

Olof Nordling: Yes, and two comments. I know that Sébastien, you found it a bit odd with dedicated support. I want to make some kind of clear differentiation between support that is provided to each and every applicant in the process and some special support or dedicated support to those in particular needs.

So that was the reason for using it. I don't know if this makes it - if we could replace dedicated with something else or if just having the same support would be too - actually be too wide of a concept.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Olof Nordling: I don't know.

Avri Doria: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: And secondly - well all right. I just want to indicate to you that I have a (unintelligible) with notes up in the right hand corner where I can make edits and I'm busy doing that.

Avri Doria: Oh fantastic, thank you. Okay I have (Fabian) next.

(Fabian Bitrameu): Hi. I would like to express my agreement with Sébastien in terms of increasing - the idea of like making Objective 5 Objective 3. It (unintelligible) closer to (unintelligible) document. And I actually wonder if those two shouldn't be merged because even reduced fee some kind of support we are trying to identify or that we are identifying (unintelligible).

Also if we consider ordering I would suggest that the current Objective 3, right, which is to identify potential providers, identify candidate support. As a last objective as I consider the need to identify criteria and kinds of more important than (unintelligible) providers in terms of our work.

And a third comment or it's actually a question can somebody explain what to identify support condition is compared to criteria, that's (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay.

Olof Nordling: I'm sorry, I can't hear well.

Avri Doria: Okay yeah there was a resorting suggested. And please, (Fabian), tell me if I got it wrong that you'd basically in addition to supporting moving 5 up to just after the current 2 you had also suggested switching 3 and 4 so 3 was the last. And so it's hard to call them by their old names.

The other thing you would ask and so maybe Olof can jump in with a quick explanation before we move on was you had asked for an explanation of what it mean to identify support conditions. So you'd explained - basically asked for an explanation of what Objective 4 was about; is that correct?

(Fabian Bitrameu): Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Olof can you jump in with Objective 4 explanation before I go on with the rest of the list?

Olof Nordling: Yes absolutely. This is Olof here. And in particular if we go into some kind of let's say we're now - the current Objective 5 would have some kind of - well particular support meaning in this case a lowered fee, financed in some interesting way which of course needs to be decided.

But in order to do that we must be very aware of the risk of gaming of such systems. So that there are conditions that must be fulfilled also in the future and won't be sort of disappearing the following day.

I think that's - would be a obvious requirement for any such message so that was the meaning with the conditions that will then have to be fulfilled not only at the time of application but also for the future.

Andrew Mack: Not sure I totally got that Olof, I'm sorry. This is Andrew.

Olof Nordling: I didn't get you there. Olof here.

Andrew Mack: No Olof it's Andrew. I'm sorry, I'm not quite sure I totally understood the explanation. Could you try again?

Olof Nordling: Yes. Let's say we have a lower application fee financed in one way or another for a particular needy applicant. Now in order to prevent this system from some kind of gaming which is pretty much commonplace in our circles or in very many circles there would of course have to be some kind of recent condition that not only should be fulfilled at the time of application but also would have to be fulfilled for the future.

So it's not game, I mean, the gaming...

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Okay so...

Olof Nordling: ...that I'm looking for.

Andrew Mack: So just to clarify what you're saying is is that there is a bar to entry in terms of getting the support and then some sort of an ongoing test to make sure that

the applicant continue to deserve this support based on who they are and where they are correct?

Olof Nordling: That's - in deed that was my intention when drafting this.

Andrew Mack: Got it, okay thank you very much for the clarification.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I had Evan and then Andrew. And if any of you who aren't on Adobe want to be in the queue just, you know, shout out. Okay Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay I'd like to suggest to modifications to the wording. To Objective 4 I would like to change that to, "To identify required measures in order to minimize the risks." And the reason I'm asking for that change is because the way it's worded now all of the onus for reducing gaming rests on the gTLD applicants. I don't think that's necessarily fair.

The TLD applicants that are gaming the system are not going to be interested in - are not going to be interested in policing themselves. So I'm just suggesting that Objective 4 be a bit more broad-based that essentially we need to determine some ways of minimizing gaming. The way it's wording puts the onus on the new applicants squarely. I think it has to be more broad - a more broad objective than that.

And on Objective 2 I'm going to agree with (Fabian) and suggest that we add reduced fees into the list of examples that are in Objective 2.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. I have - actually one person has indicated support of at least part of that. One question I have for you before moving on so you would have reduced fees mentioned in both Objective 2 and the new Objective 3 which is currently Objective 5?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Andrew. And others (unintelligible) comment, right.

Andrew Mack: Yes.

Avri Doria: Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Yes, Avri, thank you very much. Well I was going to say something slightly different but let me respond to what Evan just said. Evan, I'm not entirely sure that I got your - I'm sorry to be landing on Objective Number 4 - I'm not quite sure I understood the changes the way that you said them whether they get you what you want. And maybe we may need to wordsmith that a tiny bit but I get the idea which I think makes good sense.

Avri, in terms of when we add the lower price into Objective 2 I don't know if it makes Objective - the old Objective 5, the new Objective 3 moot or not, whether we need it as a separate thing because if you - I think it does make sense as a kind of support. But if we want to emphasize it then maybe it does make sense - the two just shouldn't repeat each other, that's all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri, Cheryl, when you've got a moment.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Andrew Mack: Otherwise I think that the order makes great sense and it sounds like we're making progress. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I had Cheryl next.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, I didn't realize I was next in the queue; I was just trying to get onto it. Thanks for that Avri. Look I think that we probably could look at Objective 2 making a complete and at this stage we may not have named all mechanisms of support because of course how could we we haven't explored all of that. So, yes, I'm happy to have price put into that.

Five, now becoming new 3, I do agree I think that's possibly repetitious what we probably need to tease out is a set of criteria and the set of support that matches those criteria. And in the column next to that for the want of a better sort of mental image I'm trying to build for you would be the ongoing and maintained criteria for that type of support to continue.

I'm not sure it needs to be objectified. I think by just reducing us down to 1, 2, 3 and 4 at this stage - there may be another one put in - we probably can meet that. And we look at teasing out the mechanisms for avoidance of gaming.

We can state to avoid or minimize the risk of gaming as an objective without it putting into the objectives who's responsibility, what type of ongoing that could be because even in the basis of a reduced fee if you've been the necessary - necessarily qualified in whatever way to have a reduced fee put in and then later you're no longer fitting into that established criteria we're not going to find the mechanism terribly easy to get people to top up to say that they didn't pay five years earlier.

So there's a whole spectrum that we're going to need to look at. And it may be that under certain types of agreements you have lengths of time for repayment or reduced facilities is a (unintelligible) of possibilities.

And I think rather than try and tease out all those possibilities now and have them taken care of in our objectives, if we make higher level objectives that might be the safest way to go. Thanks Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I don't have anyone else in the queue now.

I'd like Tony, since you put in the first objective, suggestion for objective five, to perhaps comment.

I also see that Olof and Evan have put on their hands so, sorry to put you Tony on the spot on this, whether all that's been discussed here sort of fits with your notion of that.

The other thing that I just wanted to throw into the mix is as I'm reading through the objectives, I noticed we don't have one that I know would at least be important to the GNSO Council which is -- and this would probably be the last one -- is do nothing that slows down the process of starting up the new gTLD process.

That seems to be something they do want to see in just about every working group dealing with this. So I just throw that out as a possibility that we also do want to say that.

So...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri, Cheryl here. Every time we've written anything on behalf of the At-Large Advisory Committee to do with gTLDs, that's been the mantra at the beginning.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We are supportive of the process and we do don't wish to delay. Occasionally we've been going on to say, however, the following things need to be considered.

Avri Doria: So that's almost at objective zero. Okay, so I had Olof, Evan, and then Elaine.

Olof Nordling: Well to follow-up on the last comment, maybe that's something that should be put into the preamble.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Olof Nordling: There's a very large (unintelligible) separate objective as such.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, (unintelligible).

Olof Nordling: And secondly Cheryl, I didn't follow you completely on your wording of Objective 5. How would you like to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Olof I would love to be able to type it to you in the comments. And I think what we need to do is make sure the objective sees a match between minimization of risk of gaining and a matching of criteria established when it is established for such support at whatever level and in whatever mechanism is decided or deemed appropriate and the ongoing maintenance of that criteria.

Olof Nordling: Right, okay.

Avri Doria: Okay...

Tony Harris: This is Tony. Actually I was asked to comment but I think I got lost in the shuffle.

Avri Doria: Yes, please.

Tony Harris: No, it's okay. I just wanted to say that I'm happy the way that this is going and that we - Objective 5 has been deemed worthy of moving forward.

And also that I think that this is not really exclusive of the other main issue which is of course developing alternative mechanisms of support and the idea of this foundation which was raised I think is a good one.

And that perhaps - well hopefully, we'll be able to achieve that one also and not move forward on all fronts.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I've got Evan and then Elaine and then it will be time for the 940 (unintelligible) pass over to Evan to express the meeting forward. Evan...

Evan Leibovitch: Boy that was...

Avri Doria: Oh, Elaine just dropped her hand.

Evan Leibovitch: ...awfully quick. I just wanted to call attention to and suggest a rewording of Number 4 that I put into the Adobe Chat that I'll read out loud now; that I suggest changing Number 4 to a bit more generalized to identify conditions and mechanisms required to minimize the risk of inappropriate access to support - simply to make it a little more broader.

Andrew Mack: This is Andrew. That sounds great. It's very clear, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I'm happy with that type of language - Cheryl here.

Olof Nordling: Olof here; yeah, me too, which is the previous Objective 4; the now Objective 5 as we have reorganized them I take it?

Woman: Okay, so you've got the wording and I see lots of checks.

Evan Leibovitch: And secondly regarding the issue about that we don't want to slow down the process, arguably by our very existence we are slowing down the process.

So while it's very nice and all to be able to say, you know, we want to keep things going as fast as possible, if we really cared about expediency we wouldn't be doing this.

So let's be honest with ourselves and say we want things to move along as fast as possible but there are some things that need to be addressed.

Avri Doria: Okay, that may be a problematic.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah Evan I'm not as comfortable with that.

Avri, I'm not as comfortable with that as I think there is a number of mechanisms and a number of previous experiences where we can continue with a process ICANN wide to get for example, a go-live or launch or dare I use the dreaded word, fast track mechanism going, and then go in parallel with other criteria establishments and community driven changes that didn't get added in.

I doubt that we need to actually - perhaps we could have that debate at some other point. But at this point in this meeting's life I'm not sure our work group needs to be concerned about getting their ducks in order and saying it has to be done before all those ducks in order can - that has to be done before we can then move to next steps on the new gTLD process.

I think the new gTLD process should continue on.

Avri Doria: Yes, that's...

Tony Harris: Can I get in queue - Tony?

Avri Doria: Sure Tony. If I can comment and then - I think one of the things that we'll need to look at in terms of trying to meet that goal is I think that there are some things that we may be able to do quickly...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...and maybe that's what you were saying Cheryl...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...and that they should be front-loaded. And there may be things that do take longer like, you know, the whole notion of a foundation and how it works and whatever which will take longer but are sort of parallel to - and as the foundation and it's money would need to be placed before the start but it wouldn't slow down a (unintelligible) or anything like that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mm-hmm.

Avri Doria: So we can possibly look at staging things.

I take what you say Evan that anything that anyone does has the chance of slowing things down. However we really have to be careful because we'll meet - if we don't try not to, we'll definitely meet kinds of resistance that might stop, you know, this process from happening actually.

Evan Leibovitch: Understood.

Avri Doria: Okay, Tony.

Tony Harris: Yeah, I just wanted to say, getting to the concern that was just voiced, I don't think that we will slow down the process. Thank god we have not been called and (unintelligible).

So if we're not an (unintelligible) we can sort of work as Cheryl has said, in parallel. And perhaps with the expertise of everybody in the working group, it shouldn't take us too long.

Woman: Here, here.

Avri Doria: Elaine I've seen your hand go up and down a couple of times, did you want to say something?

I'm sorry to put you on the spot but...

((Crosstalk))

Elaine Pruis: I just was going to request that the last sentence of Objective 1 be changed. It was referring to Objective 2 which has been changed to Objective 3, but it looks like Olof is doing that.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) doing that, okay.

Okay what I'd like to suggest, unless anybody has anything else on the Charter is that -- and then for the next item I will pass the Chair over -- that Olof take this. I guess he's got it there.

We do have a couple of more days before we need to craft the motion and such. So people can read it, can talk about it perhaps online.

People can talk about substitutions for dedicated support if that's still an issue, you know, specific support, you know, or whatever; come up with different words as I say, if that's an issue.

And just read through and check that so that either on the list or at the next meeting -- which if it's at this time I won't be able to make. But at the next meeting we can solidify that.

Yes, Elaine I see your hand again.

Elaine Pruis: Yeah, so I was looking at the notes on the right. Objective 4 and Objective 5 look almost the same to me.

Can you review the language there and see if that's a duplication?

Avri Doria: Yeah, they do look rather similar at the moment.

Man: Five is the old four.

Avri Doria: Okay, well I think Olof is still...

Woman: (Unintelligible) edit.

Avri Doria: He did edit, right.

Olof Nordling: I'm still editing and - well excuse me, I'm sort of trying to do multiple things at once.

Avri Doria: Yeah, okay. I'll...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Olof you are only human - you are only human.

Olof Nordling: Right, so I apologize for that. Could I just ask Cheryl to provide me with the wording (unintelligible)?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And is it possible for me to do that rather than hold up this meeting?

Olof Nordling: Yeah, I'd rather off-line than...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, if I ever get online Olof, I'd be delighted to contact you off-line on that, yes.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes. And so if Olof can put out a clean and updated version of the Charter on the list...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...then we can continue to discuss it and hopefully close out any of the issues.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that's where the (unintelligible) needs to be.

Avri Doria: I see Alex, you have your hand up.

Alex Gakuru: Yes, thanks Avri. I was just saying that since we are on record, what we are saying I think we could give Olof a bit of time to go through what we have been saying and get (unintelligible) and he can post to us and at least then we can review. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you Alex. Anyone else want to comment on the Working Group Charter before we move on to the next item?

Okay in which case we go to Substance Discussion Next Steps, and Evan the Chair is yours.

Evan Leibovitch: Alrighty. Okay without further ado we've got two people (unintelligible), Alex and Sébastien. Alex, go ahead. Alex, hello? Is Alex there?

Woman: He's there but he seems to have a problem with his muting and unmuting.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right Sébastien, go ahead.

Sébastien Bachollet: Yeah it was just because we (unintelligible) beginning of the meeting when GNSO will have to make a decision on that is just to tell you that the ALAC Meeting will be on the 25 of May.

And we need to be ready, if it's possible, one week prior to give our members time to read it and to discuss (unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, all right. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, that actually works out well because with the meeting of the GNSO on the 20th then ALAC will be able to review not only the Charter as we sent it but any - but if any edits, comments or whatever are coming out of the Council, you'll be able to process those...

Woman: Yep.

Avri Doria: ...also. And if any negotiation between the two, you know, management bodies is necessary, it gives you a chance to do some of that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed, yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, now does anyone else have something that they want to add right now?

In terms of the next issue about where do we go next, what are the next steps, one of the things that was mentioned just before is that there might be some things that we can do quickly that could make their way immediately into the process and other things that will be more slow.

Does anybody want to comment about the kinds of things that we could or maybe should prioritize so that we can get them done more quickly and perhaps move them in to the current process without a lot of delay?

Tony Harris: Put me in the queue please - Tony Harris.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Tony, you're on.

Tony Harris: Well I would just suggest as one of the initial Charters that could get us going towards the gate with something productive would be to look at the way the application fee was constructed originally, and the rationale and justifications that I can put out in a document explaining why this fee and how it was devised and put together.

Perhaps if we do that piece by piece we will discover some things which people have already identified in mails yesterday.

I think Andrew Mack mentioned something very interesting about cost recovery which we did bring up in the public forum back in Cairo actually. And there is - there would seem to be no good reason for (unintelligible) to need cost recovery for application fees.

And so forth, you have several concepts or several let's pieces of the application fee which are described by ICANN and we could take them one at a time and see what everybody thinks about them.

That would be just one thing we could do initially.

Evan Leibovitch: Are you saying...

Tony Harris: I think Olof already circulated that document to everybody if I'm correct.

Evan Leibovitch: Tony, are you saying that's one of the things that should be fast tracked by us?

Tony Harris: I'm sorry; that should be?

Evan Leibovitch: Are you saying that's one of the things that we should do faster to try and become part of the current process as opposed to something in parallel?

Tony Harris: I'm saying that that's - we could probably have two or three good things - quick things moving forward.

This would probably be an easy one because we have something definite to latch on to whereas developing external means of assistance may take a while longer because that - you know, we'll have to figure out well where's that going to come from and, you know, where will we source this type of assistance.

As far as the other thing which was mentioned which is inappropriate access to this or gaming, well that's something which shouldn't be too difficult for us to sort out.

Basically the applicant's should be able to show, as an NGO he was not set up, you know, 24 hours ago if he's being active as a non-profit for a reasonable amount of time -- two or three years -- that's one way of closing that door.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so that would be in the criteria, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Evan sorry, Cheryl here. Now I'm actually at least at the beginnings of Internet access starting which is getting me all very excited and probably distracted.

I think that's one of those matters that probably should be considered as one of our early priorities. Notice I'm saying early priorities, not giving it a value writing on high, medium, or low.

But I think we do need to start looking at the criteria and the mechanisms and the methods because that is after all, one of our main objectives.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right, I have Andrew and then Elaine. Andrew go.

Andrew Mack: Okay, thanks very much. First of all I like Tony's idea a lot. I think that that gives us a solid grounding in some of the economics of this and I think that that's pretty important if we want to move forward.

I also agree that some of the - the idea of trying to find funding sources, it will take time and so I think we can begin that process. But I agree with other people who said that that's probably not going to be the first order.

Looking at these it would strike me that the number - one of the parallel number one priorities would be to try to identify and define some sort of criteria or tier to who we're trying to access because that's going to really help define this an awful lot.

So we have a first group of people that we're trying; is there a particular group that we think is really in the greatest need?

If we can start to identify that, a lot of these other elements such as the gaming regulations and things like that, those should - I think that this will help them drop out.

And so I would suggest if we could identify our audience or our audiences as a first priority or one of our first priorities then (unintelligible). Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So if I hear you right Alex is basically we identify who before we identify how?

Andrew Mack: This is Andrew. And - well I think that we have to start trying to narrow the field to get a clear sense of who, because there may be different how's depending on who we work with.

There also will be different needs for funding depending on how widely we define the who.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Andrew Mack: But then...

Evan Leibovitch: All right, Elaine you're next - go.

Elaine Pruis: This is Elaine speaking. So I'm concerned about Tony's suggestion that we go piece by piece through the reasoning for the (unintelligible) as it is if this is a process that's already...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's not our mandate.

Elaine Pruis: If this is a process that we've already gone through with ICANN, if it's already been commented on, I don't want to rehash - I don't want to spend time rehashing an argument that has already been lost.

So I would caution against spending a lot of energy and effort on what might be a lost cause and I prefer as Andrew said, to identify appropriate recipients of whatever support we can come up with. That's my main (unintelligible).

Tony Harris: Can I get in queue - Tony Harris?

Evan Leibovitch: Tony, go.

Tony Harris: Yeah Elaine, I see your point but basically I don't think any of these things that I've mentioned are being actually turned down. They're just sort of being, you know, ignored or it hasn't been much of an outcry to be quite honest.

And so basically - I mean what have we got to lose if you say for example, why should an applicant pay \$60,000 which is a what they call a cautionary fee which is collected from every applicant to pay for conflictive developments that might happen with different TLD applications.

Well perhaps we shouldn't have to pay the \$60,000 up front but only be asked to do that if our TLD application runs into conflict.

For example - but nobody has ever said that I mean, not as an individual voice at the mic in a public forum.

As a substantial group of opinion, none of this is really being placed before the ICANN Board so I'm a little hesitant about saying this is a lost cause.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I have...

((Crosstalk))

...I have Cheryl, Sébastien, Avri, and Tijani. Cheryl, go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually I do think Avri was first so I'm happy to (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) action first.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay - all right. I had Sébastien first but, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, did you - okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Sébastien, go.

Sébastien Bachollet: No, no, you need to take off my microphone because I didn't request a hands mic and I can't...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Sébastien Bachollet: ...take it away. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: All right Avri, go.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Yeah, I kind of want to back up with Tony said. While the Board mandate does say, you know, we have to keep the cost recovery basis, and that's that.

And while there certainly have been individuals who have gotten up there and questioned the cost recovery basis as it was defined and what's been lumped into what cost recovery includes, I do think this is the first time that the Board has sort of enabled a group of people -- in this case a joint, you know GNSO/ALAC group to say we question this basis for the following reasons, to make a reasoned argument and, you know, request a formal response to that.

So - and I don't even think that has to necessarily wait for the end of the working group to get such a request out, formalize, sent to the Board, sent to the Implementation Team and say, you know, cost recovery yes, that must be maintained, however.

And, you know, as I've heard people make the comment but you know, it was just an individual or two making it and not a joint working group that's been enabled by the Board. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I see a couple of check marks for this.

One quick question Tony, does there exist any kind of position paper in writing that you could send out to this list, essentially trying to map out the position?

Tony Harris: Well I did actually in the email I sent a few days ago. I can resend it.

I attached the comments my federation made when DAG 1 was published.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tony Harris: And that addresses each segment of the structure of the application fee with a comment which would serve at least to - for us to begin discussing or people can, you know, improve on it or whatever.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tony Harris: I can resend it if you haven't seen it but...

Evan Leibovitch: Well let me...

Tony Harris: ...happily.

Evan Leibovitch: ...just ask the staff. Gisella and Olof, is there a Wiki page for this group?

Olof Nordling: Oh yes, there is a Wiki page and we sent out the information about that one actually twice, inviting and also in the follow-up from the last call.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I'm going to suggest putting up Tony's paper in the Wiki as something that is sort of an attachment that people could and should have a look at.

Olof Nordling: Everybody is free to put items into the Wiki.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Tony Harris: Olof could you do that for me - this is Tony.

Woman: Yeah.

Tony Harris: I think you have them with the attachment that I sent.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Tony Harris: If not I'll repeat it happily.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Cheryl you've got...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, two things actually now. First of all there's going to be a whole lot happening in the wonderful world of Wikis in ICANN, and I think it's important that we certainly maintain the existing (unintelligible) Wiki for our own use but realize there is probably in the not too distant future, going to be a period of time where we won't be in a position to do as Olof says and that is make it at our whim or will.

So it's very important that we want captured in the public view done promptly, effectively, efficiently, and probably by delegating individuals in this work group.

(Unintelligible) people from various work teams or parts of the process, whether we have it administered in an action items as to who is to do what and when. What we don't need is for things to fall through the cracks.

Coming back to why I put my hand up in the first place, I - what Tony is saying and certainly with what I think a number of (unintelligible) organizations or subsets of ICANN or interested parties in public comment programs put out for DAG, whatever iteration it was, are not - you're right Tony, a lot of us have said we questioned why these costs are this.

We have heard some of those rationale but we haven't had the full frank and feel debate opportunity as Ari outlined, we seem to have now.

Can I suggest this as an ideal opportunity for this work group to start a subset work team to look into that as an early action item.

In other words, it might be nine-tenths of us; it might be 50% of us; it might be five of us - get on to that very important discussion and debate in the Wiki, on

the list, and come back with at our regular meeting to us, with the current state of play of what - of where that discussion is.

Because in many cases we need to do that to help us establish our types of support and our mechanisms for support and our criteria for support because we may wish to link that to a particular aspect of the cost model.

So until we look at the cost model and say this support for this type of NGO is as simple as this part of the fee established in the cost model being waived or something else.

So I think it's really important that that get's going and sure whether it needs to be the only work that involves the work group members though.

So if we (unintelligible) to get on to it, I think we should get on to it sooner and more aggressively than we've done or had an opportunity to do before in any of the public forum efforts, that we sort of perhaps pass that as a sub-team in this work team to get on with that job.

Man: I second that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

(Alan): It's (Alan) here. I've had a problem, I couldn't get on until now. I do have a comment I what Cheryl just said though.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. (Alan) can you get on the Adobe II please?

(Alan): If I knew where it was I could. It wasn't in the announcement. I'll get on Skype if you can send it to me.

Evan Leibovitch: Alrighty. Okay, (Alan), you've got something to say.

(Alan): Yeah, just one small comment. When the initial pricing came out there were a number of items that were identified that were probably not applicable to cultural and related domains.

It may be important for us to note from staff, did they factor that in and that effectively lowered the average? In other words, because they know some domains are being over-charged because items don't apply to them that was used in the calculation?

What I'm saying is the fact that some may actually bear zero costs may not lower the cost - the total cost if that was already factored in. It would be important to know that before we - or as we go down that path.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have Tijani next.

Man: Who is that?

Avri Doria: You Tijani.

Evan Leibovitch: Tijani you're next.

Man: Hello - hello.

Tijani Ben-Jemaa: Okay, thank you Evan. You know that I am one of the most concerned about the application fees and about the cost recovery. I have expressed that in all the public comments for the three versions of the DAG and I have said it verbally (unintelligible) of times.

But if I understand well the reservation of the Board, we don't have to change the DAG; it's not in our mission.

And second, the cost recovery is still one of the principles of this (unintelligible) process.

So I think we are asked to see how we can help or we can support applicants that need support.

So first I think we want to staff well, to have to (unintelligible) first who will need the support first. And then second, to see how we can - ICANN or how we can help them to do the application and to operate it after the litigation.

So I don't want to - I don't want our group to go and think that we will not be able to if you want to give recommendation on it because if it is not in our mandate if you want.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Elaine you're next.

Elaine Pruis: Elaine Pruis speaking. Thank you. So thank you for considering my concerns about re-doing work that's already been done.

Obviously I don't know the whole history of the development of the fee structure. And my main concern is that we don't put forward a suggestion that's already been thought through and argued against.

So if you could post - if the staff could find any sort of communication or text, if you have any comments regarding how the fee structure was established that would - on the wiki, I think that would be very helpful as we go through this process.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Well based on the last couple of comments I want to ask a couple of things. Number one would it be a good idea to have either (Current) or somebody from his staff attend our next call to be able to answer questions like this?

I also wanted to address Cheryl's point whether or not it is worth having this group sort of either formally or informally take on two different tasks in parallel

one of which is starting to proceed with who needs assistance and then what form that assistance takes.

And the other thing in parallel being the issue that Tony has raised about, you know, how do how can we address the overall fee structure and see if we can deal with that?

Is the group okay with the idea of having these two things sort of going in parallel either formally or informally. And what does everyone think about having the gTLD staff actually come on a future call to address some of these issues of what's already been taken into account?

Andrew I've got your hand. I've got a checkmark from Elaine. But Andrew you're in the queue to talk. And then...

Andrew Mack: Okay great.

Evan Leibovitch: ...Michele.

Andrew Mack: Thanks Evan. First of all the idea of giving up the labor in the way that you describe it seems very intuitive and very logical.

I think that a lot of our decisions will be impacted by the actual costs and the understanding of the - how we got to our costs and things like that.

I mean for example one of the questions that I have is about whether or not this is really an average cost or whether we're looking at cost recovery for each individual applicant or whether cost recovery over the broad group?

There are enough little issues that wouldn't factor into how we would offer support that I think it would be worthwhile looking at although I do understand people's desire to not, you know, reopen things that are really legitimately closed.

Based on that I think it would probably be wise for us to get our act together, get our knowledge base built up internally and discuss it before we invite staff if only because if I were staff honestly Evan I would say hey look guys, I spent a lot of time on this. I'd like this to be a closed issue.

And if we think that there are pieces of it that should be - that are open issues still I think we're going to be better placed to have a good conversation with staff if we've done our homework beforehand. So that's just my only suggestion. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Good point. Michele?

Michele Neylon: I'd agree largely with what was just said. While I like the idea of staff giving input and be able to talk and explain, explain their reasoning behind why things have been done the way they've been done I still think it might - I think it might be a bit premature to bring staff in at this juncture.

I'd also be very supportive of what Cheryl was saying on the chat there with regards to identifying clearly the types of organizations that will require that require support, whatever that support may be, be it financial, moral, professional -- whatever.

Until such time as we can identify who this is all meant to be for apart from the entire kind of gaming issue, I mean all I'm hearing is people go round, and round, and round and a large part of this call talking about moving numbers around on a sheet.

And until such time as we actually know who we're meant to be assisting in some way I can't really see what the point of this is.

But that as far as I'm concerned is key. If you can't identify who you're meant to be helping what's the point?

Evan Leibovitch: Understood. Okay Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Evan. Cheryl here and following on I think from a rather worthwhile segue. Thank you Michele for all of that because one of the things I was going to propose at this juncture is we had some (administrivia) -- and I'm not trying to minimize, that administration and the (administrivia) that goes with it, these types of work groups and our activity is very important.

But we do have action items and tasks that are going to the GNSO that are going to the ALAC and that are moving us forward.

We have some action items that are also honing in on stuff we need to do on wiki or lists.

And we also I think I'm hearing sufficient support for at least a formal I would like to suggest Evan and Avri that we do have the capabilities in the guidelines for workgroups to have work teams formally established and facilitated and supported within our work group's activity. And I think that is the way we should go for efficiencies sake.

If we are going to establish a work team to look at the cost modeling and aspects of those cost modelings where our support can be levied and used.

Then we've got to some meaningful metrics and points where we can say well this lump of cost when we discover whether it is or is not averaged out can simply be removed from the calculation for a particular type of entity as opposed to what's happening in whatever model until we have a better understanding.

So doing the homework, getting that work team going and at the future point in time have staff invited into that work team to present.

The rest of us can come and listen if we want to, I think is a more efficient way of getting on with the work group job.

I'd also like to suggest that a separate work team also be established. And of course I've disconnected from the Internet. This is going to be a fun couple of days for this meeting here if the Internet isn't stable enough to keep me into an (Adobe room). Sorry, it's me being grumpy.

The second work team should also be established to look at this matter of establishing categories types or probable criteria that such recipients of assistance are going to be fitting into.

So I think if we sort of gather into two separate major headings and get onto some of that work in the next bunch of days while the administration matters of getting charters up and accepted goes on, it would be a productive use of our time.

And certainly it would be a matter then of having feedback from those two work teams happening at our next meeting which will get us beyond shuffling numbers on a page.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Avri go ahead.

Man: ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

Evan Leibovitch: Avri go ahead. Avri?

Avri Doria: I guess I'm not off mute.

Woman: We can hear you now Avri.

Evan Leibovitch: No we can't.

Avri Doria: I think there's - I think that's right. I think part of what has to happen is sometime after this meeting while we're working on things on the list and figuring out how to get various teams together Evan and Olof and I need to sort of coordinate how we're going to process all this (administrivia) and come back to, you know, the group with suggestions.

I think it be good that if people do agree that having two work teams sort of cranking together on stuff we have yet to decide whether we want to do it all visibly on the same list or what we want to do about it. But I think that's a good idea. I don't know that we want to isolate it.

I think that perhaps people taking leads on things but carrying on public conversation may be a good way to do it because these are mostly tasks. And a group of people go off and do a task come back, another group of people go off and do another task.

But I was just sort of saying that perhaps Olof, Evan and I can talk because we haven't talked at all yet about how to organize this effort and how to meet the milestones and such and come back on the list in a couple days with a proposal that people can talk about and see if it works as opposed to spending, you know, much time doing it now. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: I would tend to agree with Avri. As a matter of fact my gut inclination is to meet Cheryl halfway in that I do think we need a working team to sort of go off into a corner and examine the issues about general fees.

But the issue of who qualifies for help, I mean that's I think one of the core objectives of the group. And I would not want to put that off onto a subgroup. I think that really is something that is for this entire team.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Evan, Cheryl here because I'm not in the Adobe room. I'm just going to jump in.

Working in a work team does not mean it is not the act. It is not - it's not disconnected. Sorry I'm getting extremely frustrated with technology here.

A work team is not disconnected from the activities of the work group. A work team is a mechanism whereby individuals who self identify and are recognized get on with a job is a subset of the community as a whole.

So it's not working in isolation at all. And it's the sort of thing that we should simply have depending on how you want to design it, you know, a link to this piece of project work as opposed to that piece of project work off the master wiki page and that these people are primarily involved and tasked with specific actions.

But it's still open to all. It just is a mechanism of getting on with jobs and getting them done in parallel. Those of us who have the energy and the inclination or the insanity to involve ourselves in every one of the work teams that a work group happens to decide upon do so.

Those who simply want to focus in their particular area of interest or expertise do so. And it just makes work group (decisioncy) much better.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Alex has made a comment on the Adobe chat (sync). For transparent sake you should maintain the conversations on the same list. I don't think that's out of line with what you're saying at all Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh no absolutely not.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's all in a goldfish bowl. Everything needs to be in a - heavens I'm here for accountability and transparency Review Team. Of course it's got to be in a goldfish bowl.

Evan Leibovitch: Got it. Okay. (Alan) you're next.

(Alan): Yes, just a quick one. When I originally mentioned consulting with staff as to regarding what has already been averaged in and what they did not factor in in that way, I was not implying that we come and ask them to join a meeting for that.

I think the journey meeting may well be relevant after we've done our homework. I was talking about a very simple question. I think we can phrase that quite quickly just to boot - just so we know what they believe they have already addressed and then we can question whether they've done it properly or whether they, you know, or point out something they missed.

But I wasn't - I (was insisting) having staff interact with us at this point, just give us the story of what was involved.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have Andrew and then Olof. And then we'll probably bring this part of it to a close because we need ten minutes to go through the any other business part of it. So Andrew, go.

Andrew Mack: Yes another real quick point. I agree with (Alan) and I agree with Cheryl. My understanding of these ways that these little subgroups might work is just that you have a group of people -- two, three, four whomever -- who have the responsibility for collecting all of what's going on and effectually reporting back to the people who - to the broader group to create if you will a - kind of a straw man proposal. And that if we were to do it in that way, I think it could be useful.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Then if that's the case I'm going to suggest that if anybody on this call is interested in either leading or participating in either of the two work groups one to do with identifying the who of who qualifies and the other one to do with general issues about cost recovery in the ICANN TLD pricing structure, please take it to email and make your intentions known there. Olaf go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Yes very quickly responding to (Alan)'s request and from my simple perspective, this is an (aberration) to the extent that it's possible to identify certain specific cost elements that would be clearly belonging to a particular applicant notably where there are oppositions and others where there are separate cost elements along the process.

But for the rest it is an average of the different kinds of applicants that could be imagined.

Man: As a follow-up I guess the specific question -- and it's almost a yes no answer on each of them -- is did you - under - did you in the calculations assume there would be zero or very low cost for some classes of applicants and use that low number to lower the average, or did you in your mind know that some might not have it but you put the number in any way?

Olof Nordling: Well now...

Man: I don't think we need to have the discussion now but that was the question...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible) run by me. And this is something that you can have a close look at the cost build up structure which is I sent it to the list in response to the tolerance request. So it's there. I put it on a wiki as well.

And well these are - there's a cost elements that have been being counted in. And while in some kind of future I guess you need to talk to Kevin our CFO and how these elements were arrived at. But there it's very well documented actually.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Guys anything more like this it needs to be done but it needs to be done in email. We need to end in half past the hour to keep this online and

besides I have a hard stop because I have another call to go right to from this on the High Security Zone Group.

Anyway we have eight minutes left to deal with the any other business. First question about the call time, is this day of the week and this time of the day okay for everyone?

I have a request from (Carlos) in (Lac Ralva) who says that because of his commitments he can't make this time of day this day of week at all and has asked for reconsideration. I need to find out from other people on the list is this good on a regular basis or not?

Okay Michele?

Michele Neylon: This time's good for me. It's the middle of the day for me which makes (a live) change.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Evan, Cheryl here. I'm not in the Adobe room and it's probably not worth me getting back on now. I'm back on the Internet.

I think perhaps what we could do is look at a Doodle on day then if the day and time isn't possible for the designated ALAC liaison to this group to attend, then the ALAC has a problem with that strangely enough.

So we perhaps could call for a Doodle if the time is generally suitable to the majority of us. And I don't know what time it will be in my real world but it doesn't matter. But perhaps look at an alternate on day.

And but can you also establish - can you and Avri also establish the period, also the expected is it weekly or fortnightly meeting cycle as well please?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay that's something I guess for Olof, Avri, and myself to take off line.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No well it depends - sorry. It's not an off line issue it depends on other people's commitments.

For example if it's weekly some of us will select certain days. If it's fortnightly we may already have fortnightly meetings and we can do this meeting at this time on the same day alternately. So it does need to be Doodled.

Okay. I have Avri then Andrew and then Olof.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think that if we're missing our liaison on one of the two groups we have to look at the schedule the meeting. We also do have to look at the geographical spread for the time.

I think in terms of deciding whether it's weekly or biweekly it's looking at the schedule which we didn't talk about this time and which we'll have to do on the list of milestones and whether we think we can mic the milestone going biweekly or whether we need weekly.

I think the default for most meetings in the GNSO is bi unless you've got a schedule that says the only way you're going to meet your target is weekly.

And of course it also depends on how this group works. If this is a group that can work a lot on the list on the wiki commenting on documents and getting work done on the list we can meet on the phone less.

If it's like most of the groups we've been having lately where nobody does anything until there's a phone call. And the phone call is either a forcing function to do the off list work or it's where the work it's done, then we'll meet more calls. And that's just - you know, that's up to you all in terms of how you decide to work.

The last thing I want to point out is because of the ICF meeting next week where I'm acting as part of the secretariat I can't do any meetings that aren't at nighttime in Europe. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have Andrew and then Olof and then we need to move onto some other stuff. Okay Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Great. Yes sir. Well first of all selfishly 9:00 am in the Eastern Time Zone in the United States is perfect for me. So if we can keep it almost regardless of the date at this time that's terrific. And I know it - but I honestly don't know how that fits everyone else.

In terms of the question about weekly or biweekly, obviously biweekly is easier for a lot of people.

I think a lot of that will depend on whether and how we decide to use these subgroups. If we use these subgroups to get us well prepared so that our - we can get more done in a biweekly meeting then I'm happy to go with biweekly meetings.

Part of this I guess will come down to our co-chairs and helping us to frame what exactly we realistically think we can get done by Brussels and what, you know - I'd rather us do a good job of a few things and come back with something useful than to be 30% through everything.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here.

Man: Cheers.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Well we don't have a lot of time before Brussels. Olof, (Edgar) I'm going to have to cut you off unless you've got something real quick.

Man: No I'm done. I thought I put my hand down sorry.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Olof (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: I had the mail exchange with (Carlos). And he's - he can do it on Wednesdays but starting one hour later than we did today. But that would confine us to a one hour call.

So I would suggest that we put up that as an alternative on the Doodle.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Olof Nordling: And that would enable him to join the call if there was one hour later.

Woman: Well Gisella is brilliant at sorting out Doodles that seem to manage to find mechanisms that the majority of us globally at least in the world of at large can manage to find spaces in. So perhaps we leave that to the (administrivia) team.

Gisella Gruber-White: I'll take this off line with Avri, with Evan, and with Olof to find out the 60, 90 minutes lots and get out the Doodle ASAP.

Evan Leibovitch: And we'll also see whether or not it's better to have a one hour call every week or an hour and a half call every two weeks. We'll try and sort that out ourselves.

Now regarding the - do we have time in Brussels as a meeting - has a meeting space been allocated for us in...

Man: We have requested - and that was one of my points. We have requested a time slot on Thursday, a one hour timeslot for making a presentation of some sort of the result we may have.

Also I would like to bring up if I may since I've got a mic, the mic that would like to propose that we have some kind of presentation from the staff slide from the new gTLD team on what support mechanisms are already foreseen sort of for all of the applicants.

So there's no double working on such matters if it's that's of interest to the working group.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have Sébastien and Elaine. Sébastien go.

Sébastien Bachollet: Thank you. Yes you answer a lot about meeting schedule for gives result of our work. Do we scheduled to have working group meeting prior to that in Brussels?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. We'll work out about conflicts especially conflicts with GNSO and ALAC related meetings so we can take it off line. Elaine you're up. Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Hi sorry. Yes so the meeting in Brussels on Thursday I would suggest that we try to find a timeslot before Thursday's so that whatever we work out can be addressed in the public forum. Should we (unintelligible) on Thursday 10:00?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have a check mark from Alex. We'll see what we can do. My guess right now Elaine is that most of the schedule is already pretty tightly packed.

We're well past the deadline that ALAC was given for requesting meeting space. So we're, you know, we're just going to try and do the best we can and work around existing commitments within ALAC and GNSO.

Obviously getting something in time to be able to put forward at the public forum would be great. I have a feeling that our options are going to be fairly limited.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Anyone else about - okay not only Brussels we're now into the last minutes of any other business. We're one hour - one minute over the meeting limit. If you've got something to say something new, make it quick.

Olof Nordling: Very quickly do you wish to have a staff information of some 15 minutes or so for the next call on existing support mechanisms or foreseen support mechanisms?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry Olof, could you repeat that?

Olof Nordling: Yes. Do you wish to have an intervention at the next call for staff information on foreseen support mechanisms and such?

Evan Leibovitch: The...

Man: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: ...consensus that I heard at the meeting is that we don't need external staff in at this point. It's a bit premature.

If there's specific things that come up in email we can make requests in writing. But the consensus of that I've heard so far is that we don't need gTLD staff intervention at this time. Is that reasonable with everyone else on the call?

I don't see any hands. Okay, now Olof I think we're going to be okay at least for the next meeting. We'll be in a position to identify that later on. Let's not use up the staff time until we really need them.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Woman: Avri's trying to get in.

Avri Doria: I just wanted to point out that I think is different than what we had talked about earlier.

Earlier we had talked about a period where we would be asking questions about, you know, the pricing and decisions made, et cetera.

And we decided that it - in terms of that we needed to have our ducks. This - what I think Olof is offering here is basically so just a brief presentation that informs us of what support mechanisms are already contemplated so that we don't go around saying well we need somebody to do this when that's something that's already being planned for everybody anyway.

So I'm not making a judgment one way or another whether we want that but I just wanted to make sure that we knew we were looking at something different.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. Can I make...

Olof Nordling: That's right.

Evan Leibovitch: ...a suggestion that we can get that in email as opposed to needing staff for 15 minutes on the next call?

We have a lot...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. Evan can I suggest that what you should be doing is getting agendas organized with the people who are charged with (agendering) the - (agendering) a meeting in a work group or a work team. And that is you, Avri,

and staff. You put out a draft agenda and we shoot it down or we agree with it.

Evan Leibovitch: Works for me. Alex go.

Alex Gakuru: More or less what I want to say has just been said. It's been summarized. And I think that's a direction I was going to take. So thanks. Let me not repeat it. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry Alex I couldn't see that you were...

Alex Gakuru: No problem.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Is there any other last minute things that need to be said?

Okay. If that's the case we're four minutes over but I think we've got a lot done here.

And I guess that's - Avri do you have anything else to add?

Avri Doria: No other than - no, other than to thank people and say do stuff online so that we have less to do in phone calls.

Woman: It's a great theory.

Avri Doria: Yes it's a great theory. I keep pushing it and someday it'll happen. Thank you all.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay everybody...

Woman: Thanks Avri.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) for confidence in the meeting.

Woman: Thanks Avri. Thanks Evan. Thanks staff. It's really good.

Man: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible) about my (frustration) side.

Man: Thank you all.

Man: Bye everyone.

Woman: Thank you (Tim).

(Tim): Okay. Thanks everybody.

END