

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 08 June 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) 08 June 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-jas-20100608.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

ALAC

Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large
Carlos Aguirre - At Large
Alan Greenberg - ALAC

GNSO

Avri Doria - NCSG
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison

Andrew Mack - CBUC?
Tony Harris – ISP
Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachines

ICANN staff

Olof Nordling
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Olga Cavalli - NCA
Alex Gakuru - NCSG
Richard Tindal – Individual
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Michele Neylon – RrSG
Vanda Scartezini

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's JAS call on Tuesday the 8th of June. We have Evan Leibovitch, Avri Doria, Carlos Aguirre, Tijani Ben Jemaa, (unintelligible), Alan Greenberg, Andrew Mack, Elaine Pruis. From staff we have Glen de Saint Gery, Olof Nordling, myself Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies from Olga Cavalli, James Galvin, Ram Mohan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Alex Gakuru.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes and we're still trying to get hold of (Richard). Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Before starting on WT1, I just wanted to say one thing regarding the charter. They're - even though both GNSO and ALAC approved it, we have some insecurity about whether they approved the right version. We're operating under the version that we put forward and basically just notifying most of them to we're operating under this one. Please check and make sure you've approved the right one, etcetera. So I think that's it for the updates.

On the agenda, we switched around WT1 and WT2 because Evan has a hard stop. Evan it's yours.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually, in - yes, and now that I'm considering some of the email that's going back and forth, maybe other people on the call can correct me, but it almost seems like people in WT1 are coming to an impasse because we're trying to talk about some of the methods, some of the issues, some of the areas where money can be - where costs can be reduced while still maintaining the rationale of, you know, of cost neutral.

On the other hand, it seems like we're getting stuck very frequently on who - on the who issue which is a WT2 thing. And it seems like it's going to be more difficult moving on to figure out how we're going to reduce the money until we have a clearer idea of who's going to be actually doing the applying.

I don't know if anybody on the call would disagree with that but it seems like WT1 - I mean there's some discussions going, but there's a little bit of an area where we seem to be stuck that's not - that stuck isn't going to be cleared until we have a clearer idea of who.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I ask a question because I don't see any hands up yet? I don't quite understand that. So I'm wondering if you could explain why talking about methods for reducing and if the methods of reducing are dependent on the who, is that something that perhaps WT1 can explain to the folks working, you know, to the rest of the group as why it is the case that they need to know who it is.

Evan Leibovitch: I can answer that best I can because I guess I'm the one bringing it up. At least this is my observation. I'm trying to sort of not be front and center in the discussion itself which is lively enough as it is. But it seems that some of the issues such as well can we ask for reduced cost because there's reduced complexity to ICANN in the process?

And that also has - that also is affected by who's applying. Do you see what I mean Avri? So I...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...depending on the organization, some organizations may have to go through a greater or lesser amount of due diligence or some things may be less confrontational, require less work by ICANN to process, and in that case, allows us to justify reducing the cost while maintaining the cost neutral.

Avri Doria: Okay and...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: I'm guessing that's what - that's - I've been reading that into some of the discussions. Are there others here that would either disagree or want (unintelligible) further?

Avri Doria: Can I ask a further question?

Evan Leibovitch: Please.

Avri Doria: In taking that into consideration, I've often heard that from, you know, like for example, established registries sort of thing, we exist already. We're established. We obviously know how to do it. Nobody has to check us for technical capability. So if we're talking about differential rates, then we should pay less too. Is that being taken into account or there some notion that still there would need to be some merit reason for that happening or is it just that it is easier therefore they should pay less?

Evan Leibovitch: At least from what I've been reading, I would say there's definitely a merit issue. We've had a couple of go rounds on - I mean one of the issues should - these should just be restricted to non-profit applicants or for-profit applicants. And the resolution to that is I think going to have something to do with merit as well as do you just meet a certain amount of hard criteria.

Okay Alan. I see your hand up. Go ahead. Alan?

Avri Doria: Are you mute?

Evan Leibovitch: Hi Alan.

Alan Greenberg: ...about that. I thought the question Avri asked was not should we give preferential rates to established registries but should - could the same argument be used for them because they're - the cost would be lower for their evaluation also.

And I thought the issue was when the costs were originally presented that these were averages factoring in, some are easy, some are not easy. And if we're trying to counter that right now, I think we have to at least acknowledge that's what they said and say why the situation has changed.

Evan Leibovitch: I don't know if the situation has changed so much Alan except for the fact that we are trying to find ways of demonstrating that there are ways of reducing the cost for "worthy applicants" that will still maintain the policy of, you know, cost recovery.

Alan Greenberg: I understand what we're trying to do and I strongly support it. But the issue is, if some applications will cost \$1 to evaluate and some will cost \$9 and they set the component of that evaluation at \$5 averaging it out, telling them to only charge \$1 right now for those who are at \$1 will raise the cost to \$9 for the others. And I - well I - if I'm not wrong, and I may be, my understanding was they had said that is how they did it.

So if we're asking for the \$1, we need a rationale that factors in that original logic otherwise we're asking them to raise the price on some people and that's a no starter I think.

Evan Leibovitch: Well either they want - look. It sounds like they're asking for three separate goals which are mutually incompatible. They want fairness between all the applicants. They want cost recovery. And they want an ability to give a break to some applicants. It would seem between those three that one of them has to give.

Alan Greenberg: Remember this whole thing came in at the very end of the process.

Evan Leibovitch: That's only because ICANN put it in at the very end of the processes. As you know, ALAC has been campaigning for this for some time.

Alan Greenberg: And not only ALAC, but we can't change history. I'm just saying...

Evan Leibovitch: Right.

Alan Greenberg: ...that if we pretend that that statement about averaging never was stated, that's going to be their answer. We should make sure that it's mentioned and they understand we know about that and still believe there is an opportunity to do something. I'm just trying to take away the easy rejection.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Do you have one? Do you have an answer?

Alan Greenberg: No I don't.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Does anyone else here have something to comment on that?

Avri Doria: Andrew has his hand up.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh. Go ahead. Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Evan can you hear me? Yes sir. Can you hear me?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, absolutely. Go ahead Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Okay. It sounds like a couple of things. First of all, I think what you're saying has some real merit but there are these three goals or 2-1/2 goals or whatever. And if there is a level at which they may be a tiny bit incompatible.

But I think that there - there may be ways to square the circle, in part by trying to break through a little bit about - I think fairness is a bit of a difficult one to quantify in a sense that they're - everybody comes with some significant advantages or disadvantages.

And one of the things that we can make an argument about is we're trying to actually level the playing field a little bit for applicants that might otherwise have a really hard time getting in.

In terms of cost recovery, I get you about the principal, but I also think that there is - there's no (certain) but there's a little bit of wiggle room as long as we come out relatively close. And part of that is going to depend on volume. There were - as I recall, there were an awful lot of - an awful lot of this depends on the number of applicants that end up coming into the system.

So, can I make a suggestion though? Based on what we have done so far, what we - what the conversation's done so far, maybe it wouldn't extent to try to dive into the Working Group 2 ideas and then see if that helps us with Working Group 1.

I originally wasn't sure whether that would make sense, but based on this conversation so far maybe it does.

Evan Leibovitch: Well you've touched on a very important point Andrew, and that is - and I guess I didn't state it very well at the beginning that the issue that we need to get back to WT1 is not necessarily just who but also that relates to how many.

And, you know, if, you know, the end results of what we're doing is that maybe ten applicants may be able to apply, that's far different from well there's a hundred that will meet our criteria.

So, you're right I think that this has a bearing and thank you for expanding on what I should have done at the beginning, that it's not just who but the who also gets into an issue of how many. Okay. Andrew did you have any follow up?

Andrew Mack: No. I'll hold off and let other people speak but come back probably.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I have Alan and then Tijani.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think the issue of how many is absolutely critical. We've talked around it a number of times but because we don't have the answer, we keep on forgetting it. The smaller the number, the more palatable anything that we suggest is. And again it comes out that the averages were based on certain assumptions they made with the...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: But that...

Alan Greenberg: We don't know what those assumptions are.

Evan Leibovitch: But do you agree that that brings us brings us back to who?

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Oh...

Evan Leibovitch: That creating a sufficiently set of tight criteria is going to reduce the number.

Alan Greenberg: Yes certainly. But all I'm saying is again when we present this case, if we - we need to say we understand how they're calculated. But this is why it is not as important as you might otherwise have thought it was, that type of thing.

Evan Leibovitch: Got it. Okay. Tijani, you're next. Go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you. You know Evan, if we stick to this program of how many, we will not go forward because we don't have the answer and nobody can give the answer. So I think that we have to work on both tracks. I will not say

absolutely independently but we have to address the questions as they are asked. And then when we compile all together, perhaps we'll change or modify something according to the input of the other group.

But and if we stick to this notion of being stuck because the other group didn't give the number or something like this, it will be a problem for us.

Evan Leibovitch: Tijani (all) I just answer that at least from what my reading of the discussions is not saying that we need a hard number, but we need something that will at least give some confidence that there's not going to be a flood of applicants under this reduced cost program.

I'm not saying that the two or that the idea of the two work teams have to go away. Obviously there's still significant work that needs to be done in the methods for reducing the cost, but we've heard a couple of speakers on this call already say that the salability of this program to the Board and the rest of the community is going to be determined partially on whether or not this is going to create a new flood of new low cost applicants or whether the number is going to be significantly small that we're now going to get a lot of complaints about the fairness issue.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. I understand. I absolutely understand. But we don't have any to know or at least to have an average. We don't have. So shall we be stuck?

Evan Leibovitch: Shall we be stuck? Yes, I guess that depends on us.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No. No. We don't have I think okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question? This is Avri. We had - I guess what was put forward was the beginning of a document that is in the Adobe screen now on the new

gTLD applicant support. And we did need to produce some sort of where we are at now paper or what have you.

So I'm wondering - and it's in the Adobe screen now. I'm wondering to what extent that is a base we can build on before moving on, before losing you Evan, I'm wondering if we could address that a little.

Evan Leibovitch: So in other words, you want to take the document that we have in front of us right now and start to turn that into a report to be given for Brussels?

Avri Doria: I don't know. I'm asking the question whether that is a suitable place to start whether we need something different. I also see Elaine and Olof both have hands up now too.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: I just wanted to see if the question's on the table.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Yes. Elaine you were first, go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Good morning. This is Elaine Pruis speaking. The document that we have in the Adobe room, I don't think we have enough consensus to put that forward as what we're proposing to ICANN. There - we really haven't come to agreement that eliminating the big cost of risk is something that we can agree on.

And - but I would like to point out that we haven't really discussed - in the second page there's a bullet point allowing special applicants to pay on a per phase basis. I think we should put some attention there as a working group. I think that as an applicant, you might be able to get, you know, some funding up front. And then if you succeed at first evaluate the trade, you get some more as you go on. I think that's a worthwhile path to go down.

Evan Leibovitch: So in other words, rather than the conventional pay everything and then apply for refunds, just pay the stages one at a time.

Elaine Pruis: Yes. I think that's a more viable way of financing this project for someone who might not be able to get all of this on the up front.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So that doesn't reduce the cost but it helps spread it out and reduce the risk of an application that may not get all the way.

Okay. I have Olof and then Alan and then I'm going to have to run.

Olof Nordling: I just wanted to add to introduce that this document was the second document that Tony Harris sent to the list some two weeks ago. And of course, a lot of things have happened since. I just wanted to be able to bring up one of the documents. But actually (REO remakes) and the working team won, so things have advanced since this.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Next in the queue I have Alan again and that'll be it before I have to go.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks for being here.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I haven't been able to follow all the emails so I'm not quite sure what the current status is. One of the positions I made way early was that we ask for a waiving or significant reduction in the \$25,000 ongoing fee and move some of the application fee into that. So in other words, it still may cost them \$25,000 a year, but it would be - that something that would be deferred from the application fee.

Evan Leibovitch: So the \$185 up front would be reduced to some other but that \$185 would not be waived so much as deferred. It would be the ongoing cost that would be waived and it would sort of be like an installment plan.

Alan Greenberg: You got it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. On that phenomenal note, I've got to go. I'll try and rejoin the call later on but no promises. And okay. So Avri it's all yours and I'll be following you guys on the Adobe Connect as I can.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Bye.

Avri Doria: Okay. So continuing on this, Olof is this - so now you're showing just I guess what is the second page of that...

((Crosstalk))

Olof Nordling: Yes. It's...

Avri Doria: ...that was up there.

Olof Nordling: And made reference to that. I've showed there is a second page.

Avri Doria: Right. So if I - is that - is there a suggestion that basically this be what is reported, just that second page or is that?

Olof Nordling: I think the idea was to special care about and that perhaps there was consensus on the second bullet point on that page. We allow special applicants.

Avri Doria: Right.

Olof Nordling: On a per phase basis.

Avri Doria: Yes. But in terms of - but all the options seem to be being discussed and I don't think that any - there's also has there been a consensus to throw any of the particular bullet items out. Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Yes. I think the things that we have agreed on are that there may be ways to reduce the \$185 by asking for the sum cost to be eliminated for our applicants. The thing that's contentious is this idea that the risk costs could be tossed out for applicants, and we haven't really been able to agree on that because of the definition of what is that risk cost.

And the idea that our applicants might be of lower risk, but that's not really what the risk cost was intended to be. So that part right there, the risk cost, is what we haven't been able to agree upon. We have agreed that we could ask for a lower application fee for our applicants, and we have agreed that it might be a good idea to ask if we could be on a per phase basis or as was just stated that we could sort of have the applicants pay as they go or pay back as they go.

So I think we can - I think we need to write up something else. I don't think this actual document in front of us should be put forward in a...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. If publicity could not - if - and I'd like to put on the table as a suggestion, is if the second page was what was built on, not the first page, if there was basically two sections, one of them would be some options that seem to be gaining general support and then listing the ones that Elaine listed if that could be the case.

And then a second bullet, some items that have been discussed but have not yet reached, you know, a need determined level of support or some such words and then listing the ones that are far less, and it came to something that was less than a page, would that work for people? And I'll go to Tijani

and ask others to respond to that as we go on. And I see Olof's hand is up also. But Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. Avri, I remember that we said and we explained that the resolution talks about application and the ongoing costs. So we can work on the content of the resolution 20 and the elimination and all the reception of the development and risk costs is very - I think is very acceptable.

And there was a lot of support to this idea. So for the first bullet point, I think there was - I don't say there is an (eminfinity) but there is big support for this point.

Avri Doria: Okay. So okay, so you're objecting to it being listed as something where there isn't support yet. That it's mentioned just as an item that's under discussion but support has not been determined yet. You're arguing that there's strong support for that point at the moment. Okay. Olof?

Olof Nordling: Oh very quickly, I mean when we come to discussing what we can put forward, if we don't have agreement or something, it's perhaps easier to put something forward as a question to the community because we can open the public comments period as suppose we should do in conjunction with the posting.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Good idea.

Avri Doria: Okay. So basically, if - it sounds though if there's still - if I'm listening correctly, there's really two categories of idea. There's ideas that seems to be generally accepted by all, and I mean there still may be some objective what have you in terms of front costs, in terms of the variance of phasing and paying as you go, and then there are issues that are still open questions that

require further discussion such as the development and risk costs etcetera. Is that a fair way of putting it?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: (Alee)?

Avri Doria: Yes. Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I didn't say that I am objecting for the second bullet point. Both can be valid and both are valid for me.

Avri Doria: What - I understand. What I was try - and I didn't say that you were and I probably didn't make myself clear. I was saying that there were some points like bullet two that everyone seems to be accepting, no one has spoken against.

And then there are other points like the development risk costs where some people still have questions and discussion about it and haven't reached quite the level of support that I'm hearing for, you know, sunken costs and for phasing, etcetera.

So that's how I was sort of dividing those that there seems to be general agreement, more discussion is still needed to develop the ideas and that there are some where, you know, there are still questions and more discussion is needed.

So it's kind of a nuance between the two categories. But I was proposing that if we could layout those in that way, then we're at least putting something before the public as sort of a here, these are the things we're talking about. We seem to be finding support - strong support here. We have some support here. You know, we still have questions and discussions, let's talk. Does that make sense to people?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...one check? I see Andrew with a hand up. Go ahead Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Yes Avri. What you're saying makes sense. I mean you're basically saying, you know, if our goal is to report back to the community where we are, we have agreement on some things and we have some issues that are still at issue. Fair enough.

My only caution would be let's see how far we can push it to get some sort of an agreement because if we really want there to be action on this, then the smaller number of issues that we throw out to the public for, you know, for their input, the more likely we are to get to some real action in the near term.

That - my only concern would be is that this turns into kind of a long conversation and involves, you know, millions of people, we may never really get where we want to go. That's all.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay thanks. Yes Andrew I think that that's good and I'm going to ask Olof something in a second. I think one of the things though, at least within GNSO, and I assume it's similar within ALAC that at a certain point there's an initial report that goes out where you do have to collect people's opinion.

And so, while this isn't in the shape yet of a first initial formal report, what we're doing at this point is trying to put stuff on the table and solicit the community's first opinion. That's sort of the process we have to go through.

Andrew Mack: And Avri to be clear, I understand the process. What I'm suggesting is only a nuance to that which is the following. If we give the - if we throw - if we say to the community here's what we like, here's what we think and here are the three questions that we are trying - we are really grappling with, we're going to get a better output from the community than if we give them ten questions. That's all.

Avri Doria: Okay yes. Okay fine. Certainly. Olof I said I was going to come back to you with a question. Have you heard enough in this discussion and for following and of course there's still going to be a little bit more discussion although we're really getting pretty close to the end of, you know, we perhaps have one more meeting.

You know, we're already beyond any formal report publication date. Be that as it may, I think we have to get something out real soon now. A, can you tell me what real soon now is and B, on at least WT1, do you think you have enough from this conversation to be able to put a draft on the table and can you, do you have the time? That sort of covers what we just said.

Olof Nordling: On the question of plan, well there is in our planning we have something like the 15th of June.

Avri Doria: Yes. I remember that.

Olof Nordling: That was the aim for date. On the question of drafting, that was not my plan nor with the number of other things I have to do, do I feel really comfortable in trying to condense this into - I've seen this working group as much more in the similar vein as IRT meaning that this is drafting to start with sort of mine trying to condense it into something.

We can talk offline about how we perhaps could evolve this, but it's from - from two perspectives it's a difficult matter.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay. So we'll have to find another way to get it written. Okay. Okay. I guess I don't know where to go on that one. We'll have to talk about it offline. Either that or Evan or I, I guess at the end of the day or whoever's will have to write that. But at this point I want to try and get something written from a fairly neutral perspective that can put out a report of where things are.

Okay, is there anything else on WT1 at this point? Is there anyone from WT1 that is - feels comfortable writing up this neutral one pager and getting it in front of the group for discussion. You basically have seven days until the 15th which means at the next meeting we would need to basically do whatever final wordsmithing needed to be done on it and then put it forward for, you know, and then basically decide yes this is what we're going out with.

I don't see any hands.

Andrew Mack: Avri it's - Avri this is Andrew.

Avri Doria: Yes Andrew.

Andrew Mack: A question for you, does it make sense because we have some issues that bleed from group 2 to group 1 and back again, that are we really trying to do two separate reports or should we try to combine them to the greatest extent possible?

Avri Doria: Oh we should try to combine them, but we've had two WTs working and so I think in the first instance, it's rightly that we should have each of them writing up its status.

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Okay. The reason...

Avri Doria: And then perhaps if we need a chapeau or an introductory thing that sort of explains how their interrelated and hold it together as a single report, that that's sure.

Andrew Mack: Okay. The reason why I mention this is because there are a number of issues that bounce back and forth such as things like bundle pricing which we

talked about, such as things like the number of applicants and how that's going to affect pricing and how that's going to affect the cost calculation.

And I don't know if it's possible to just untangle them completely. And, you know, I'm just asking from a practical perspective, what's best for our audience? I don't have a strong sense of the right answer. I'm just throwing it out there.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay thanks. Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Yes. I will be happy to take a swing at writing up a one page summary of where we're at in WT1. And I think that you're correct in saying that we can't really separate the two so how about if we put out a two page document, one page covers WT1 and the other covers WT2?

Avri Doria: Okay. I thank you Elaine first of all for the volunteering. I tend to agree. We might need a third page, just a cover page, that talks about the relation between the two and the group in general. But I think that's a good idea.

Elaine Pruis: And Avri is this something I can put on the wiki and can it be a working document that?

Avri Doria: I think so.

I think so. I think we can open up a subordinate page for it, a subpage and make it a wiki document because it's trivial at the end to cast it off into Word format and then turn it into PDF. That's quite easy from the wiki so I would say sure. I think that'd be a great way to go about it and other people can help edit it and whatever as it goes on.

Elaine Pruis: Right.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Anything else on WT1 before we move on? Okay thanks. Than on WT2 we have - I guess there's a couple pieces of writing. I think Andrew you were the one that submitted the latest updates and I'll also pay you (unintelligible). Thank you. Am I correct Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Yes. Avri I was the primary put her down on paper but it came with significant inputs from Carlos and from Alex both.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Andrew Mack: So I want to give them - want to acknowledge the fact that I'm not the only author nor the only contributor.

Avri Doria: Right. I understand. You were the one at least holding the pen. I see power of the pen.

Andrew Mack: That's right. You got it. I'm the person with the keyboard.

Avri Doria: Right. Yes I know. We still call it a pen even though people...

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Yes. It's pretty funny isn't it?

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

Carlos Aguirre: Thank you Avri. Thank you Avri. We worked a lot with Andrew in this point. But we consider that it's not very easy to define some points who, what, but our idea was to maintain the groups. We seem to support, for example, who would receive the support? We think that (edmick) I mean with the communities, if there are the groups what need to receive support, it's clear in have not - we think that it's not controversial at this point.

I think (unintelligible) need to commute this need to we should support. For example - another group, for example, (Iron Joe)'s other group is more problematic because it's necessary, it's needed to define what kind of groups need to receive support.

We think it's necessary to discuss point by point of our document because it's long and we discussed a lot during the week. We need the help and support of the other members of the working group at this point.

For example, Alex says in the email list or mentioned the idea of a civil society of wiki concepts. And seems to me very interesting to put here in the who would receive support. More than I think a linguist - a linguistic communities seems to me civil society with the concept containing in a wiki page, in a wiki, sorry, Wikipedia is very interesting. What do you think Andrew please help me.

Andrew Mack: Okay. It terms of - to amplify a little bit on what Carlos said, we were trying to do exactly what, I think it was Alan mentioned earlier which was to try and narrow the field so that we actually get approval in the early stages by starting with what we believe to be the least controversial groups. And that's why group A struck us as the easiest. It's more self-defined and all of that.

In terms of group B, when Alex was talking about group B, we had down the whole idea of NGOs. And Alex suggested that we broaden that to include civil society because there are elements of civil society which is from my experience defined in terms of, you know, not being private sector, not being government and all that.

That's - I'm (unintelligible) talk to civil society that might very well fit into this group B definition. But the same point holds which is that group B is a lot mushier, more controversial. And in terms of us getting ourselves organized, in terms of us coming up with a program of support that is bounded by time and bounded, you know, that doesn't lead to a flood of applications and very

vague applications that will suck up a lot of resource, we thought to start with group A.

To go through the rest of this category, we looked at reference being given to - obviously to historically underserved region. And then we have a list of people - the least - list of groups that we thought made sense for there not to be given support.

So maybe at this point it would be worthwhile to hear from anybody saying - any comments on the who would receive support, any questions and maybe any unanswered issues that we haven't come up with so far.

Avri Doria: Right. This is Avri.

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Aguirre: Sorry Andrew. Another point interesting to mention is we think that the who could receive support is also the applicants who should (unintelligible) located in emerging markets and developing countries. We consider very important this point, other groups who their languages have a limited presence into the work, so to complete your idea Andrew to put in the table to discussion.

Andrew Mack: Thank you Carlos.

Avri Doria: Fine. This is Avri. I wanted to mention two questions and then I'll go on to the (half). One is in this work, when you're talking about receiving support, are you differentiating per group, for example, which would receive the financial level of support versus which would receive all the support in kind type of issues? And does that make a difference?

And in terms of the differentiation of groups, do you consider for example in your group B that you say is more controversial, for example, how do you

deal with the fact that many NGOs are advocacy NGOs? Does that make a difference?

Many NGOs, it's difficult to tell whether they're a government organized NGO or just a, you know, actual civil society NGO. How do you propose dealing with those issues?

And also I noticed that there was a discussion of non-profit, profit organizations and I wonder whether that distinction is necessarily as clear in all developing areas and such. So I'm just wondering on some of those issues whether you might find some where there's a notion that one group, you're talking about any and all kinds of aid and one, where you're talking about aid in kind perhaps. You're not excluding but you're not giving much - just questions.

I have Tijani with his hand up.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you Avri. In fact you're right even if I understand very bad because I hear you very bad. But I think that I understand what you said. I think the most controversial point is the for profit or for non-profit. Who - shall we select only the for non-profit, the non for profit applicants or even some for profit applicants?

There is another point about the emerging market. It's absolutely right because even the Board and its Resolution 20, they spoke about developing countries so the target was there.

Third point, I think that we need to consider both the applicant and the string because I think Alan gave an example about the (chugar) or the (scossy), the (scossy) exams. And her point is very valid. You can be a society organization and you can be for non-profit etcetera.

But if you apply for a string that is common that any immigration can apply for, it will not be relevant in this. It would not be possible to support this kind of string. So - and there is other cases where the string is very important so we have to consider. We have to give criteria for the applicant and criteria for the string. And inside the matrix, when do we match we can give support.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you Tijani. I have Andrew and then I have Elaine. Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Okay great. First of all, Avri and Tijani, those are both excellent questions. And I will do my best to try to reflect what our little subgroup has been thinking about these and some of the conversations that we've been having online.

Avri to your point about NGOs, government and the like, I couldn't agree more. It's one of the reasons why we divided the world up into an A group and a B group. I think offering to the A group is relatively straight forward. And for all the reasons you mentioned and a number of others, offering to the B group will take more time and will need frankly a little bit more study because of all the nuances that you mentioned, because of the possibility of, you know, because of the conflict in terms of things like advocacy groups and government penetration and all kinds of other things.

So that's why we suggested that we start with group A. The hope, and perhaps it was a heroic one, but the hope was that if we get going in that group, then we can learn enough to get farther forward on the - on that - that will allow us in a later point in time, depending on volume also, to go forward with the broader civil society group.

In terms of aid, there clearly are three different kinds actually if you think about it of aid that might be - that we think are likely. One is direct aid. Here's consulting help. Here's translation help. Here's whatever it is, right, that directly goes into an application assuming that it is approved.

A second kind of aid would be in kind aid, might be the same kinds of things that are approved in the first group.

And the third kind of aid is something that facilitates language build out like bundled pricing which is the other thing. It's farther down.

In each of these, I think the question is where we've tried to take our point of departure is what's the goal that we're trying to accomplish with this? And in each of these the goals to try to do it is to get cup - or is to get languages and cultures that are not currently on the Web on the Web to the greatest extent in their own language and in their own script. So that's from that perspective.

From - to Tijani's point about the non-profit for-profit, I think Elaine made a good point on the - in the conversations earlier on this week where we - where there were a lot of us who said hey look, there are some non-profits that function like for-profits in some ways and some for-profits that function more like non-profits. There are actually some hybrids.

What it means to be a non-profit depends on the jurisdiction in which you are. And so therefore from my perspective and from the perspective of our little group, we thought that it mentioned that it would be probably better to focus on what the purpose of the (unintelligible) kind of be, what the end goal is going to be and to be a little bit more agnostic.

We do have down farther in the document, the notion that if it is - if it - whether this thing starts as a for-profit or starts as a non-profit but becomes so big and profitable and money generating that it can self-support earlier on that the notion that there should be some sort of repayment of the assistance funds, which might go back into a revolving fund.

So again, the goal is to make sure that people who need resources to get out of a disadvantaged position get out of that position, but then if there's money that comes into it that can be repaid then did that make sense.

And finally in terms of the question about string competition, look it's a legitimate question. But again, we go back to the initial point which is to try to get new things, new communities on the Web. And so if a particular - my personal inclination, I'm only speaking for myself, but we've had this conversation a number of times, my personal inclination is that if there is a string like dot copy which will likely be picked up by the private sector, we do not wish to be with our very, very limited resources encouraging competition between one subsidized group and any number of potentially non-subsidized groups but rather to try to find a way to, you know, to get that competition to not happen.

Did all of that make sense?

Avri Doria: Yes. I'm sure.

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Sorry to go on so long.

Avri Doria: Okay. I have Elaine and then Tijani was your hand back up?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, no, no. Excuse me. I mean...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. So Elaine, close your...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Elaine Pruis: Yes. So thinking about who and we've identified two different groups, one we all seem to agree on, the ethnic and linguistic communities and then the other is sort of more open and trickier as is stated in the document.

I'm wondering how much flexibility in our interpretation of providing this assistance is. And my thought here is, if we say for the very clear communities and strings that obviously need help, that would obviously raise public interest in the Internet and serve our communities, that we would provide much more assistance to.

And then for the others that are sort of, eh, maybe they need help and maybe it would be good for their community, we could just sort of guide them towards identified providers of assistance rather than pull them into our group.

So I'm - what I'm thinking is we have sort of two levels of assistance where there's - it's clearly obvious that this group would benefit from our help and we have no question about providing funds. And I think this is mostly about funds in my mind to them. So that's one level where we do everything we can to help them.

And then another level of assistance could be offered where we're just sort of identifying ways that they could be assisted. And it might not be through our program specifically but more of we're an information clearinghouse for them so we can say well, we know this particular provider's willing to do, you know, less expensive legal advice or something along those lines.

Does anybody have any thoughts about that?

Avri Doria: All right. This is Avri speaking again. I think that's actually probably a very good suggestion. I think that was kind of the direction - I think the other thing that needs to be applied to (a process) a third category of is there's the providing of financial aid. And I'm really hoping that there is a way to do that.

But there's also the to whom to the WT1 effects apply and as to whom do the reduction apply. And is that just a subgroup of A? Is that - for example, one of the things that is kind of not been talked about, like, I mean, I've seen a little bit of conversation is sort of the preference on IDN versus non-IDN. Now I know that at a certain point, that that prejudice is from marginalized groups who happen to be in an ASCII world and so that's a hard bright line to draw.

But I'm wondering, you know, and then the other thing that Tijani mentioned that I have concerns about is string determination in that one of the things that, you know, from a GNSO perspective, they've tried to keep ICANN away for is making determinations on strings.

I understand the - if somebody else is competing for it, but I think we also have to be concerned there because if we get to the point that sort of we started working with someone some indigenous groups have come up with, you know, the Indonesian dot coffee in their own script.

And the purveyors of that coffee and ASCII say hey it'd be great for us to have both. And they decide to enter a competition with them. Do at that point we sort of say well okay, now someone's decided to bid against you now that you said what you're going to do, therefore, we're no longer supporting.

And I know that's putting it in a sort of brutal box, but that seems to be one possible outcome of saying if there's competition for the strings, you know, then support doesn't make sense.

And so I worry about a (posteriority), you know, competition first string where one says no, someone starts to compete. Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Yes. Avri I think your concern is a very legitimate one. I - the reason we were going back to Alan's initial point which is to try to narrow our criteria as much as possible, right. And so that's why we wanted to stick with as much as possible in this initial round, groups where we didn't think that there was going to be much overlap or much bleed between potential commercial communities and the like.

And at the same time try to address the IDN issue in the other way - in the other direction. So I think you're right. I think that there are some real risks in the thought that we would be judge and jury.

And I'll throw out another one which is at a certain point in time, if we received or if we are supporting or trying to support a - offer support to a candidate and then there's conflict, where does ICANN or the supporting agency connected to it fall because we are no longer a neutral party if we're offering support and there is a question as to who gets the string right?

And in a normal legal case, you'd recuse yourself because you'd be an interested party having - on the basis of the (sports) you've offered. So, I think it becomes fairly complicated.

We thought that the best way to approach this was to go with the less controversial string in the short term. Make sense?

Avri Doria: Thank you. Olof.

Olof Nordling: Yes. Let's not forget what's already in the applicant guidebook when it comes to string contention. Preferential...

Avri Doria: Oh the echo's back.

Olof Nordling: (Vorteck).

Avri Doria: You're breaking up and the echo is back.

Olof Nordling: Okay. The guidebook already gives preference for community applicants in cases of string contention if they so wish provided they fulfill all the requirements that we put up then for being a bona fide community applicants.

So we - I think we should stay clear of the string contention cases in this particular endeavor because there are - there is already quite an elaborate suit to handle that which goes some way in providing particular support for the groups that I see that you put in group A which typically would be a community.

So, I think it's really there in the applicant guidebook and it's already foreseen that we have that kind of - that that kind of preferential treatment for bona fide communities when it comes to string contention situations.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you Olof. Our - I have - I see Elaine's name. The question I'd ask are these limited to community applications? Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Yes. That was also my question Olof if you're suggesting that we only assist those who can identify themselves as communities according to the applicant guidebook standards. And the second part of that is do we then - if someone can identify themselves as a community, can they go for a more generic string and then do we support them?

Olof Nordling: Well, it's limited to those being identified as communities. So that's very, very clear. All other cases, if there's string contention, there is no other solution than voluntary resolution of it, of course which is always an option or the ultimate solution which is an auction.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, which of course anybody that would be supported would automatically lose. One other point that I wanted to bring up on Andrew's question and Andrew your hand's still up so I don't know if you're wishing to

speaking again which is of course a sign, is, when we talk about parties and neutral parties and who's doing what, I think one thing, and perhaps you have discussed this and I've just not seen it, is if there is the - if there is a being given of a financial sort, not talking about the fee reduction and not talking about the in kind or support aid, is that something that is actually done by ICANN or is that something that is done by a separate foundational entity that we would recommend being created to do this?

And so that's something that - and so then the notion of advocating for a supported organization or supported application is not actually being done by ICANN or any subgroup of ICANN but is being done by this affiliated entity that we have recommended the creation of. And that's again just a question.

So Andrew I see your hand is still up so you must of intended it to be there.
Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Yes. Okay. These are excellent questions and they're right on the edges of kind of what we've been working on. So I will attempt to address them, okay?

To Olof's point about the community, we did start with what we perceived to be communities that would fit in with the DAG. From my personal perspective, the coffee community would not necessarily be, you know, like that might be a different kind of community entirely.

That said, I think we're a little bit reticent to try to get into a full on definition of who would and wouldn't fit the bar for the community. I think it'd be to some extent the outside world should send us a pretty clear signal about that.

Avri to your point, you were just - remind me, you were just asking something I was - it was going - going to give you a response to. Can you repeat your question real quickly?

Avri Doria: Okay. The one that I was - I think the last one that I brought up was the one of when you talked about interested entities and applying and supporting application. And I had asked the question whether - assuming that there is financial aid being administered, is...

Andrew Mack: Oh right. Who would do the administering?

Avri Doria: Exactly.

Andrew Mack: Okay. I think if there are, you know, this is a world I know a little bit about. And I think if there's some benefit in eventually maybe moving this slightly off shore just because this is slightly outside of what I perceive to be ICANN's core expertise but also just to avoid some of these, you know, conflict of interest issues and things like that.

However, in the short term, I think that that will be determined in part by who we can get to support this and how much support is on the table. If we're talking about a pilot program with a relatively limited amount of support, then I think it's less of an issue.

If we're talking about a much larger amount of support, something that's institutionalized, my inclination would be to set it up as a separate trust fund perhaps connected to but slightly off shore of the, you know, slightly outside of ICANN as a legal entity just to avoid any kind of conflict of interest issues.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Carlos I see you have you hand up. Carlos?

Carlos Aguirre: Thank you Avri. In relation with all of this before talking about the applicant guidebook, the - on bona fide applicants, I'm lawyer. It's difficult to me to think in bonafide applicant or in other words, we need to define very, very well the - what group we want to give support. Because in the business world it's very difficult to think in bonafide, so it's a great risk to put bonafide applicants. It makes comments.

I don't know if you think the same than me, but we need to define very, very, very well the idea to what group we want to give support. It was very difficult for us. Andrew and I, to put the definitions in the document but this is needed to discuss more because a good definition means the success of our work.

Avri Doria: Thank you Carlos. Olof you have your hand up.

Olof Nordling: I'll just comment because when I said, "Bonafide," that was my little shorthand. And I'm not a lawyer, my son is. But that was shorthand for the rather elaborate scoring mechanism we have for the community priority evaluation with four different criteria and the maximum of 16 points, and you need to score 14 to be considered a proper community applicant. But it is - there is an overlap. Rather it will say that your Group A here is typical - is a subset of the total definition of communities that we - that can apply.

So for example, let's take the coffee example. If you have all - or let's say, the coffee growers as an example, of the global association of coffee growers applying for dot coffee grower and the global association of association of national coffee growers or something like that. Well then you would score high in well what one could call the reach of the string, because you have a commensurate ability between the actual size of the community, which is then global and the reach of that particular string, which is also -- could be considered since it's very generic -- global.

So that's the kind of comparisons which are made in the community priority evaluation. But I just wanted to imagine it because as a subset, your Group A would most certainly fit under that community definition.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. We're at 10:12 - I mean, we're at 12 minutes after the hour, so we've got about another (unintelligible), so I wanted to bring the WT discussion to a close. I wonder if anyone had any final points to say, had waited for the very end of this session to make. Okay good.

Andrew Mack: Yes. Avri can I ask...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Andrew Mack: ...can I ask real quickly? If we got down the - let's see. So everyone has taken a look at the three different kinds of support. In terms of the other recommendations -- co-financing, sunset period, transparency -- any of that stuff each clarification, anyone thinks that there is a problem with those general principles?

Avri Doria: Good question. Okay.

Man: No it's okay Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Okay good enough. So just checking in. I want to make sure everyone is happy, right?

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes thank you. So what I'd like to move into now is the preparing of the snapshots. I - We've already talked in terms of when we talked about WT1 and Elaine offered to prepare the one pager, and of course we're not being (unintelligible) one page, one-and-a-half you know, but the short update on that. Andrew, if I understand you're still driving the keyboard as it were on preparing an equivalent thing for WT2 based on the document that's been in front of us; is that correct?

Andrew Mack: I'm about to leave town for...

Avri Doria: Oh okay. That's not...

Andrew Mack: ...but hold on, hold on, hold on. But if we can get it done in the next - you know, if you're comfortable - what are we looking for? Something that basically captures the three pages that we have in one?

Avri Doria: Something that is basically explanatory, where we've gotten to. I think that the three pages we've got now can certainly be something that is referred to, but basically yes. Basically giving a position, giving the sort of that same type of there seems to be agreement building on the following, there are still questions about the following, there's certain organizational -- something slightly more explanatory than...

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...the bullets here.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Avri Doria: But it's something that basically states where we are and what's being sought. I see Olof with a hand up.

Olof Nordling: Yes, just to say that of course, we'd be happy to make the introductory few lines on the chateau of the posting. I think that's - that will be quite easily done, and then be followed by the Working Team 1 and Working Team 2 reports, and then sort of the arrangements for having public comments received and all that. So I'll take care of...

Andrew Mack: No...

Olof Nordling: ...the...

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Olof Nordling: ...the thumbs of the hamburger if you'd like, but if I can get (unintelligible) meat in between, that's fine.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you Olof.

Andrew Mack: Avri just to be very clear. Is there any part then of the discussion on the Working Group 2 that people feel - and there are some really obvious thought lines on Working Group 1. I have not heard a lot of people say that they had concerns about what we were discussing, only that we are looking for more clarification as time goes on. And so if that's okay, I'm going to take this and turn it into, you know, or here's where we are unless someone has a very strong feeling, you have something that is up...

Avri Doria: Right.

Andrew Mack: ...you know, that they're uncomfortable with...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Andrew Mack: ...which (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Thanks. I see Elaine has her hand up. One thing I want to say on that is unless somebody gives you something now, I would go on that assumption. But of course, be prepared for - one of the good things about writing an exercise that says, "I think there's consensus building or I think there's strong support," is that it often provokes the, "Wait a second. I don't think we're quite there yet," type of comment.

So if somebody gets to you, you know, before you've written it or now perhaps Elaine or others get to it now, I think take it now. Otherwise I would suggest write down what you think is necessary and leave it to the rest of the group to basically say, "That's why getting it out the next day and then we've got the week and we close on it at the next meeting." Give people a chance and then we can always quickly, you know, shuffle things around and sort of say, "There's two groups as opposed to one." Is that an acceptable way of looking at it?

Andrew Mack: Sure. I just wanted to make sure I had the, you know, I mean...

Avri Doria: Yes...

Andrew Mack: ...you know, I mean...

Avri Doria: ...understood. Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Yes. So on this argument that Andrew has put together, there are two points that I don't remember any group discussion on, which is the co-financing and the sunset period. So if we don't have time to discuss it now, Andrew when you do write this stuff, if you could just add a little explanation on how you came to those points. I would appreciate that.

Andrew Mack: Okay Elaine, I can do a 20 second explanation if you'd like.

Elaine Pruis: Great thanks.

Andrew Mack: Okay sure with pleasure. Co-financing. One of the things that came up in the conversation that we had both our little group, as well as -- they were hinted at in the larger group -- was that we wanted to make sure that there was a sense of accountability, which from our experience from the number of people who mentioned it, the experience is that for people who are themselves on some level financially committed, there's a higher level of follow through, there's a higher level of sustainability.

We were concerned as a number of people mentioned, that on one hand we want to provide support, from the other hand we don't want to be providing support to people who aren't likely to make it.

And so we figured some level of co-financing. I picked from - the 50% was an arbitrary number that I proposed to Carlos who said it sounded fine, but that it was the principle more that we were after.

In terms of the sunset end, what we are both for practical reasons, that is to say the amount of money that's going to likely be on the table as well as principle reasons, we thought it was important to say to people, "If you are still in need of support after a date certain, whether that date certain is three years or five years, (unintelligible) indifferent because I guess - I think that depends on the process and how fast it goes.

But at a certain point in time, you need to know that either you will sink or swim on your own. So if you can't attract enough side financing to maintain yourself or whatever at a certain point, then that's okay. We'll have to accept the fact that this is one that just doesn't have a strong enough economic rationale. Does that make sense?

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Both of those are principles designed to keep - designed for sustainability frankly.

Elaine Pruis: Okay thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I mean, it may be worth also when you're writing this sort of thing that, you know, these two are still under discussion given that there hasn't been a lot of discussion on them. But I don't know if that's necessary but you may...

Andrew Mack: My biggest concern Avri is trying to fit it under one page or some (unintelligible)...

Avri Doria: The one...

Andrew Mack: ...there too.

Avri Doria: Right. The one page is a manner of speaking.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Avri Doria: If it takes one-and-a-half, if it takes two, I don't think that that's necessarily the issue. I don't think - I think calling it a one page -- and Elaine correct me if this is going against what you were suggesting -- is saying that you don't have to drag it longer, you don't have to go in to great expense. If it takes you longer than a page, just say what you need to say. I don't know that that's a problematic issue but Elaine it was your idea. Let me know if I'm misunderstanding.

Elaine Pruis: No Avri, I just - I prefer a document that is concise but also doesn't leave many questions, so that we can...

Avri Doria: Right.

Andrew Mack: Sure no. Sure. Sure. Sure. And we try to include everything that we could that would be helpful to narrowing our field. My question is it's just -- because I'm very focused on getting this out to you before I leave -- is in terms of the way that you think that this would be most useful to the community, are we looking at mostly text or mostly bullet points or a combination thereof. And, you know, I mean, because we wrote it in terms of bullet points because we thought that would be easier for digestion but I'm open.

Avri Doria: I think - I don't know if it matters. I think bullet points sometimes don't give people enough information so you sometimes see the line or two above explaining it, and sometimes the bullet needs, you know, a line or two of explanation that is not enough. But I don't think it really matters.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible). I see Olof with a hand up.

Olof Nordling: Yes, on a very, very practical note, if we put it out for public comments, I would suggest we go well into July with a deadline for public comments. So if we could have time for that, yes. But here an experience in discussing Brussels and we don't have a pushback from - for having it too narrow and too close to the Brussels meeting. So I would say something like the 15th of July as the deadline for comments.

Avri Doria: Okay good.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: But the...

Avri Doria: Any objections to that?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Tijani I see your hand up.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. That means that we'll have one month vacation. We will not to work during - from the 15th.

Avri Doria: No it does not mean that.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: I don't think. But we can talk about that later, because I think that there's work we can do in terms of developing some of the ideas while waiting for comments, I would suppose. But, you know, we can certainly talk about that. I don't know that taking a vacation - maybe we can go to an every two week schedule and have at least one...

We will have, for example, just coming out of the meeting and this gets into the next thing which is preparation for the meeting. We will have just coming

out of there, a number of comments already that we can start thinking about processing on some of the things where, you know, we think that we are finding general consensus. And the meeting gives us a feeling of, "Hey you know, we didn't get strong objections to these ideas there. We can start digging down deeper." We don't have lots of time.

Vacation is great but you know, I don't - I'm not actually jumping up and saying, "Yes vacation." I hope you don't mind. Any other hands on the snapshots? So we'll have that. It could be a document. It could be a wiki. If Andrew, you're not comfortable producing it as wiki in the first place, one of us can move it there for you so don't worry about that.

Andrew Mack: Thanks. It's just a question of time.

Avri Doria: Exactly.

Andrew Mack: If you don't mind, I'll shoot that to Olof because I'm quicker on the keyboard and I'm really stressed for time just to (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yes, Yes, I know. As I say and if Olof doesn't have the time to put it up for the wiki, I can certainly do that at some point.

Andrew Mack: Thank you Avri.

Avri Doria: So that's not an issue. The preparation for the Brussels meeting - anything else on the snapshots before I move off to Brussels? Okay. The preparation for the Brussels meeting is - I guess it's coming along. Olof, I don't know if you've got any updates on Board speakers or timings or anything like that?

Olof Nordling: Well the timing is final.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Olof Nordling: It's for 5:30 on Wednesday and we've got the location as well. I can't recall which one, which room it is...

Avri Doria: I think it was (unintelligible)...

Olof Nordling: ...but it's on the agenda. However we had a brief discussion on the title as well, and the title that we actually agreed upon or you and Evan agreed upon, well it turned out to be too long, so we're back to applicant support for gTLD...

Avri Doria: It sounds fine.

Olof Nordling: ...as a title in the program.

Avri Doria: Okay. Any objections to that as a title? Does anyone care?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Can you repeat it Olof?

Olof Nordling: Yes. I have to actually look it up to be really sure what we're - what is the applicant's for new gTLDs.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes good.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible).

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Good.

Avri Doria: Okay great.

Olof Nordling: (Unintelligible) January. January and apparently they couldn't fit it more than that - those lines.

Avri Doria: Yes, we were getting wordy as we tried to be more and more careful and more and more precise. Okay. So have we had any contact and approval from...

Olof Nordling: Here we go. Support for new gTLD applicants. That's the very generic title we have.

Avri Doria: Okay great. So - and from this, I assume we're having a panel, and we've talked about having panelists from each of the teams and trying to make sure that we've got geographical, et cetera, distribution on the panel (unintelligible) as well. But also, have we gotten confirmation from a - from participants for example, from -- I don't know the names (unintelligible) at the moment -- from our Board participants?

Olof Nordling: (Kassim Toure).

Avri Doria: Yes thank you.

Olof Nordling: I haven't seen anything though of the sort and that was on caller cable I think.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Olof Nordling: Kind of.

Avri Doria: So we need (unintelligible) on that.

Olof Nordling: I guess we need to have confirmations on the names suggested in our list of conversations earlier on, that they actually will attend and to be available for the panel discussion.

Avri Doria: Yes okay. We probably...

Andrew Mack: And...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Sorry Avri this is Andrew. Have we determined - are we going to try and do this as one panel or are we going to do it as two panels? Are we going to - you know, how many people do you want to prepare? I'm just thinking in terms of being - having us be ready to go.

Avri Doria: Yes and that's what - I thought we only had three minutes left at the moment but basically yes, we were thinking of it as one panel. I think we have thought of - what was it Olof? And you probably have the list of names in front of you -- I don't -- of asking what, two people from each of the team?

Olof Nordling: Yes. And sort of co-moderation by the co-Chairs, so Avri and Evan being the moderators, and two or three members of each working team for the actual panel list. And together with the one or more Board members and (Kassim Toure) -- as he was the promoter of the Resolution 20 -- is one obvious choice if he is available. But we need to find out.

Avri Doria: And we'd even come up with a first thought of who to ask. Have we reached the (unintelligible)?

Olof Nordling: I think we did and...

Avri Doria: Because are they sales permanent people?

Olof Nordling: ...but I have that just in front of me...

Avri Doria: Right.

Olof Nordling: ...and I don't recall it very well.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Olof Nordling: So I thought I put it - could I put that in the little action points...

Avri Doria: That'd be great.

Olof Nordling: ...with question marks on?

Avri Doria: Yes that'd be great. Elaine I see your hand up.

Elaine Pruis: Yes. I'd like to participate as a panelist if you haven't already...

Avri Doria: I think your name was on the list.

Elaine Pruis: Okay thank you.

Avri Doria: But - thank you. And I think Andrew's name was on the list but I don't remember who else is.

Andrew Mack: I would very much like to participate...

Avri Doria: Right.

Andrew Mack: ...as a panelist as well.

Avri Doria: Right. And basically what we did when we were combing the names of the people who had been vocal and active but also trying (unintelligible), and I think that when Olof fix that up then we can, you know, talk about it on the list.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Avri where can we find the list?

Olof Nordling: Oh, you will find it in...

Avri Doria: On the (unintelligible).

Olof Nordling: ...in a few hours when I turn out the actual points.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: Right. And then you know, we can work it out. We have to make sure everybody is going to be there. We're not even sure of that yet, so...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Another question. Who decided on this list?

Avri Doria: We didn't decide on this list. Basically between Evan, Olof and I as we were trying to put this thing together, we think, "Well who could we ask?" And so it's not a definitive list. It's a first cut at, "Who is it that we could ask?"

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: And it was between the two Chairs and Olof trying to figure out who's been active, who do we know is coming? You know, what about distribution, et cetera.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay good.

Avri Doria: Anything else? It's now 30 minutes after the hour. Our 90 minutes are done. Any other business? I love the way that always seem to be in there and if you've gotten (unintelligible)...

Tony Harris: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Tony Harris: Yes I'm sorry. This is Tony Harris. I...

Avri Doria: Oh you're here. I'm sorry.

Tony Harris: ...was caught in a subway that broke down, and I only joined the call 15 minutes ago but I did want to apologize for being late.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. You probably want to listen to the recording. We definitely talked about stuff you care about, so... and hopefully you know, get back to us on the list on any of the issues.

Tony Harris: Okay fine. Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: And thank you. And I'm glad you got out of the subway.

Tony Harris: Thanks.

Avri Doria: Any other business or issues? If not, I thank you all. I'll talk to you all next week. Make sure you read through the draft that Elaine and Andrew are going to put out for us, so that we can do words missing as necessary next week, and now I'll admit it over, so goodbye.

Man: Goodbye.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks Avri.

Man: Bye.

Avri Doria: Thank you bye-bye.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Bye. Thank you.

END