

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 13 July 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) 13 July 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-ias-20100713.mp3>

On page:  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul>  
(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**  
**Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair**

GNSO  
**Avri Doria - NCSG**  
**Alex Gakuru - NCSG**  
**Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison**

**Andrew Mack - CBUC**  
**Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachines**  
**Richard Tindal – Individual**

ICANN staff  
**Olof Nordling**  
**Gisella Gruber-White**

Apologies:  
**Glen de Saint Gery**  
**Baudoin Schombe**

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Avri Doria: Gisella can you do a roll please?

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's (JAS) call on Tuesday the 13th of July we have Evan Leibovitch, Avri Doria, Rafik Dammak, Alex Gakuru, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tujani Ben Jemaa, Carlos Aguirre, Elaine Cruz, Richard Kendall, Andrew Mack, Sebastian Bacholet.

And we have apologies from Boudouin Schombe and Glen Desaintgery. But could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Avri and Evan.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. This is Avri, I guess I'll start us out. First thing we've got is the agenda adoption and in the agenda I wanted to actually offer an amendment and suggest perhaps that we put that up front and that would be I sent out last week a quick outline of what the not only what would be in the final report but who would have first responsibility obviously that the staff has ultimate.

So I'd like to put a discussion of that up front before we get into the two details. Would anybody object to my doing that to the agenda while I see it happening before my eyes? So seeing and hearing no objection we'll do that.

Then we would go into the W2, the W, work team two basically an update on developments and I'll ask whoever is, whoever is leading that or coordinating that for want of a better term to basically give an update, we'll go into discussion as normal and then I'll pass the chair over to Evan who will do the same thing for work team one and update on the developments, discussion and then cover any of the other business.

Am I correct in assuming that we're on for a 90-minute slot? Is that a correct assumption or are we a 60-minute slot?

Man: 60.

Avri Doria: We are 60, is that correct Gisella?

Gisella Gruber-White: Avri we've got another call at 1400 UTC...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: ...depending who's on the (RLTBB) group.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: If you wish to stay on for extra it wouldn't be a problem.

Avri Doria: Okay. But it sounds like...

Gisella Gruber-White: It's now been scheduled for 60 minutes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you very much. We'll go for 60 then, I just was asking because I didn't remember, it was another number thing.

Okay so let me bring, and okay, and last thing I wanted to point out just is that we are coming up on our, we're at 10 July to 10 August so we're in that slot of doing our weekly conference calls on ending, we've got a 13 August as a final recommendation posted and when we have discussions we talked about, you know, the need for at least one or two meetings.

Now they don't need to be two separate weeks, we may decide to cram more meetings into a final week to do the walking through of the document and make sure we're all comfortable with what's going out. So we don't have that much time left.

Let me bring up the, I'm almost acting like I'm competent. Report outline as I say it was a short, quick document. In terms of how the final report would be structured coming out of this, so basically the first part was (front) matter,

which was you know, and I take it people have all seen these reports, an overview of the working group, purpose, objectives, motions that, motion history.

You know the description of the working methods, the summary, perhaps the you know, that sort of information and that that's something that would be staffed on staff. Whenever I say staffed am I talking about you Olof?

Olof Nordling: I suppose you're talking about me, that may change though.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Olof Nordling: It may be helped by (Carl) on this, but that hasn't really been decided yet so, while...

Avri Doria: It's okay for me to call it staff then?

Olof Nordling: Staff is well at least Olof, perhaps somebody else.

Avri Doria: Okay. So maybe like we, a further next one I'll put Olof plus and leave it at that, not to refer to you in an impersonal.

Olof Nordling: Yeah staff is pretty good I think.

Avri Doria: Oh staff is pretty good, fine, I'll leave it at that. I know how busy you are. Then working group responsibility is the recommendations from the two working teams and that's basically I was thinking essentially the snapshot plus any changes, sufficient explanatory material, one of the things we talked about last time is a lot of the comments we got seemed to be as much not quite being sure what we said and disagreeing with something perhaps we had said as actual differences of opinion.

So that needs to be done more explanatory material. And also I guess if there are any changes or whatever that we make based on comments, obviously those would be fed in, last week I guess Andrew suggested that they be broken down by the two, you know, work teams each working on their section in the same method and mode as the snapshot, I think that makes sense.

Then the next section would be something that would be basically suggesting written by Evan and I which is, you know, recommendations for next steps including any possible extension of charter, proposal for the foundation, outreach of funding and helpful organizations, other specific work.

So this would be Evan and I working you know, and presenting it to you all obviously for comments, but basically sitting down the items of further work that come out of the work that you're describing in WT1 and 2, what things won't be done, what things could we possibly get chartered to continue working on.

So when I say proposal for a foundation I don't mean we would write up a proposal of a foundation but we would write up the metatext of go work on (unintelligible) a, producing one of those is what I meant and that Evan and I would be responsible as the drafting team to produce the first draft of that and then we would put it you know, on the schedule for discussion.

And then the staff responsible for all the important you know, back matter that you find in any of these reports you know, basically you know, as we get the comments or the synopsis of the comments that we get plus one of the practices that's started happening, which I hope we can follow, is for every comment we indicate our answer to it.

One answer is yes, that's already in there, it's in section three, four, you know, we thought about it and decided not to go that way for the following reasons, yes thank you for the comments. We have changed the text in Paragraph (17). So those kinds of answers, they don't need to be long and

detailed but they need to show that we looked at it and we thought about it and what we did.

We don't have to necessarily make the recommended change but we do need to consider it and decide one way or another.

And then there is the charter, then we have to include the explanation of the charter discrepancy, the fact that we're working on a five bullet charter when we only had a four approved bullet, but I think that's already pretty much written it just needs to be done and then like in all these things there's also attendance sheets. And of course everybody reviewing everybody's stuff all the time.

So any comments on that as an outline? There were a few online I didn't see any disagreement but I may have missed it. I'll open up to anyone that wants to comment. I see no hands. I hear.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yes?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yes. I don't see your hand but go ahead.

Man: Okay. Thank you. So I think that the main if you want our, the main part of our work of our report will be bullet point two (presented).

Avri Doria: Oh most definitely.

Man: Okay. So as I see as it is written here it seems to me that it is almost the snapshot plus, minus a minor changes or something like this. But I see that our snapshot is not enough for our report. It gives some points that we

discussed together and from on which we have agreement or not full agreement but it is the situation at this time.

Now we need to give to the board after his, it's resolution (20) we have to give them a way for, to support applicants so we, we didn't describe ways, we didn't describe mechanisms for this support.

So I think that we need a deep work now based on what we did before Brussels and based also on the comments on the questions and answers, etc., to define a certain mechanism to show the board our recommendations. Our recommendation must be more or less mechanisms for support.

Avri Doria: Okay. Open up the queue for others. My first response is actually I think our job is more to indicate the policy and the direction, the actual how a mechanism would be implemented is something that happens more in give and take with staff on the actual details of many mechanisms I would think. But what do others think? And certainly that's deeper work for the work teams is fine but what do others think?

I see two hands and Evan I think I saw yours first and then Andrew.

Evan Leibovitch: I thought that some of the how was sort of explicitly within our work group two, that we would do some of the high level mechanisms, staff would work out the niggling details but the generics of how it gets done I thought is totally within this group.

Avri Doria: Okay so you think there's more work to be done in (WT2) to define those mechanisms?

Evan Leibovitch: That was my gut, I mean...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: ...obviously it's run out of time, some of that will have to go in and to be determined and then it's sort of up to staff. I would prefer that the more we're able to put forward the less is left to discretion.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Yes Avri thanks. And good morning everyone. I think, I like the idea that Tujani is talking about I think that some of it may be a little bit impractical given the amount of time that we have left honestly.

Our, my understanding of our responsibility was to get the, was to get the outline right as much as possible first and then some of the things will take time for us to develop, for example the funding sources and things like that. That may take some time and we all acknowledged that up front.

The other thing is that some of the, my understanding is that some of the mechanism pieces of it we will want to develop in conjunction with staff, right, because they're going, it's a little bit unclear who's got the, who may have the ball and there will certainly be a role for staff, so I was under the impression that we wanted to do this a little bit more collaboratively.

I don't disagree that we should try to get through working group two and generally as far along as we possibly can but I'm a little afraid both, we don't want to put the cart before a horse. We still need to get agreement on what we, what we want to get done. Make sense?

Avri Doria: Yeah thanks. Makes sense to me. I think the other part that we have to consider, and this is one of the reasons why the third bullet is in the document, is that we also need to get a certain amount of general agreement from our chartering organizations in the directions we're talking.

So I think yes, I think as much as work team one and two can get done in terms of explaining the mechanisms in some level of detail is a good thing,



but again we have less than a month to finish the report and get it on. And I think an integral part of this is how we continue on with the work.

Andrew your hand is still up? You want to say more? Yes Tujani.

Tujani Ben Jemaa: Okay Andrew or me?

Avri Doria: Andrew I think, he took his hand down so it's you.

Tujani Ben Jemaa: Okay so I will read reservation 20, the last paragraph. So our work will be to develop a sustainable approach to providing support to applicants requiring assistance and applying for and operating new GTLDs. So we are asked to come up with a sustainable approach.

Avri Doria: Right. And I think perhaps we're arguing over the meaning of sustainable approach, which in one, and when that sustainable approach is delivered and then how much detail it needs to be delivered at each stage.

I think what we're suggesting is a sustainable approach. What we're not necessarily suggesting at the same time is the detailed mechanisms by which that approach works. But let's see how much we can get done as opposed to continuing this.

So I take at your point that we should get as much done as can be done in the next week or two, but be aware that it really is only a week or two we are talking about for each of the work teams to get as deep as they can.

Tujani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: I mean because the other approach would be just to sort of say we're going to take longer and I think that's a bad idea personally, and obviously the group can decide that it's a good idea and then I would go and ask for more time.

But what I would prefer to do is to deliver a report of an approach, and here's how we're approaching the problem, here are the things we say need to be done. Here are the things we say need to be developed further. Here's the further work you would like us to charter to continue working on and you know, what do you say chartering organizations?

So that's kind of the approach I'm taking in this report that we have less than a month to finish.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually Avri it's Evan. I want to back you up on the timing of this, especially since it's my understanding that staff is working on a newly revised (dag) and if we want to have our recommendations implemented in it we really can't, we're really unfortunately bound by some of their timing.

Avri Doria: Okay. And I see, I saw two checks so but I really do encourage each of the work teams to get as much of it as deep as you can in the next two weeks. So I think that's up to the work teams and unless anyone else has anything to add on the outline, we can continue to discuss it online and such, and it'll develop over time, I'd like to move over to the work team two. I see Olof with a hand. Yes Olof.

Olof Nordling: Oh very, very quickly. Thank you Avri. Concerning the staff matter, the front matters and the back matters I see them as communicating vessels. I think the front matter would be exceptionally short really and as much as possible put into the back matter when it counts to those pieces not to tire everybody with the lengthy introductions, so that's just a very quick comment.

Avri Doria: I think that works fine when I've seen that basically you refer to a motion in the front but you quote the motion in the back.

Olof Nordling: Indeed.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah. That sounds good to me. Okay then moving on to WT2 update on what's happened over the last week since our last meeting and who is it, is it Andrew, is it Carlos, who would like to take up the updating? Please one of you or someone else that's in WT2. Even if it's to say not much has happened because we were still recovering.

Andrew Mack: Sorry I was on mute, it's Andrew.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. I was beginning to have a panic attack.

Andrew Mack: No. But my apologies I was, I went ahead talking and I realized I put my phone on mute. Okay quickly we did have, I made an effort to try to draft some revised points based on the conversations that we had specifically to try to address the issues that had come up in our last call and I just sent that out to Olof this morning, Olof I don't know if you got it. It should be in your inbox.

And I'm not sure if we can get that put up or not. What we tried really hard to do was to get rid of some, to punch through some of the points of confusion or unclarity. If we can put it up then that's great and I will, if not what I can do is I can just read it because we, they're not long.

Avri Doria: Okay (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: The goal was to...

Olof Nordling: Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Sure. Yes.

Olof Nordling: This is Olof here. I fear I haven't received that.

Andrew Mack: Let me make sure that it went out but and indicate it's not that long so it shouldn't be that much...

Avri Doria: Why don't you send it out to the group and then read it through and talk us through it please.

Andrew Mack: Okay well I sent it, I sent it to Olof so he should be receiving it. Let me read it through real quickly okay. So I added a, and both Alex and Carlos have had a chance to take a look at this and they seem pretty comfortable with it.

So what I did is I added a little bit to the preamble for our, the who should rehearse, should receive the supports.

It goes, it now goes like this -- the key to making a support program work is the choice of recipients who might receive supports the team agreed that this initial round would serve as a learning experience for the community as a number of issues demand the amount and type of support resources available and other issues become apparent.

However, given the desire to get the program working quickly as part of this next GTLD round which may start soon, working team two recommended that the initial focus in his first round of new applicants should be on finding a relatively limited, easily identifiable, and non-controversial set of potential applicants.

This approach, described as the walk before we try to run approach, is not designed to include policy for every potential applicant but only to help move the community forward as we learn.

I, we changed this text to address the concerns that people had about limiting this group only to ethnic and linguistic applicants. So I have to basically say that it's not only limited to this group but this would be our focus so.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Say it again?

Man: For this round.

Andrew Mack: For this round. Yes sir.

Man: Okay.

Andrew Mack: Pardon my reading, I'll just do as good a job as I can and please tell me if I'm going too fast okay. So based, so then the, there are four points below and I, see if we captured what the group sensed and the questions were.

You turn them into question and answer so A, who should be in the first line for support, who should be first in line for support, that was Q. Q is who should be first in line for support.

A, for the initial/pilot phase the working team recommends targeting support to ethnic and linguistic communities. For example the house community, the (catch) speakers, (panel) speakers.

These potential applicants have the benefits of being relatively well defined as groups and passed the test of being generally non-controversial. Such communities already have a history of recognition in ICANN and facilitating community on the Web is one of ICANN's core values.

And then in italics -- however this does not mean that only ethnic and linguistic groups would be eligible but rather that these groups should be considered first if there's adequate interest given that they are considered a positive good for the Internet community and most closely fit the criteria above, limited in scope, easily identifiable, generally non-controversial.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Andrew Mack: B, okay sorry?

Avri Doria: I see now three hands up so when's a good point for us to take a break and let some of the questions come in?

Andrew Mack: Please anytime.

Avri Doria: Okay so that's why I stopped you before B. Great. Okay I had Richard and then Tujani and then Elaine I believe. Or did I just say it backwards? Anyway.

Richard Kendall: Yeah right. Actually I wanted to hold my question until Andrew had finished, so let me wait.

Avri Doria: Okay sorry. Tujani or Elaine did you want to make your comment mid-stream or would you prefer to wait also?

Tujani Ben Jemaa: Yes. It's only to say that I would like Andrew to send it on the list because he is speaking to fast and I understand half of what he says so when, if I have something written I will understand.

Avri Doria: Okay so yeah, if you could send it out to the list, I think Olof hasn't gotten either so.

Andrew Mack: No problem.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Andrew Mack: I will send it, I can send it just now if you'd like.

Avri Doria: Yes please. And Elaine did you want to comment now or wait until the end?

Man: Avri can I just add something now? If it's small enough, you said it's not very long why not just cut and paste it into Adobe?

Andrew Mack: Okay let me try. Just one second I'm...

Avri Doria: Trying to do three things at the same time.

Andrew Mack: Yeah. Sorry guys. How do I, pardon my being thick, how does one do this?

Olof Nordling: Oh this is Olof. I need to promote, which I will do now.

Andrew Mack: Okay. It's been a wonderful morning already.

Olof Nordling: And then you go down to the left hand corner of the big pod and you see share, you click on that and you see select from, document from my computer and then you upload it from there.

Or you could perhaps more easily just go for this, the notepad, note pod up in the right hand corner, clean that one, just make a copy or paste into that one and you don't need to convert (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Chief I don't see a notepad?

Avri Doria: It's chat, it's called chat.

Olof Nordling: No. But (unintelligible) in the upper right hand corner...

Avri Doria: Oh upper right hand corner.

Olof Nordling: ...which says ICANN Brussels reducing barrier to new GTLD creation and so on, that one. You should be able to access that and actually manipulate it as you please.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Just one second and I will, I'm going to try and cut just the pieces that have been changed in this document okay?

Olof Nordling: Okay.

Andrew Mack: Bear with me.

Olof Nordling: I cleaned the notepad in the meantime, the...

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Olof Nordling: ...something useful.

Andrew Mack: Let's try this, hold on.

Olof Nordling: Okay here it goes, now it's all yours.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Man: Good.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Olof Nordling: Yeah.

Tujani Ben Jemaa: Oh okay.

Andrew Mack: Did it work?

Avri Doria: Yes it did.

Tujani Ben Jemaa: Yes.



Andrew Mack: Okay. Apologies everyone for the form. Like I said everybody is as you know is very, very busy and so we're trying to, we're just trying to get this stuff out. If it needs a little bit of wordsmithing or chopping then feel free, I have no problem with that at all.

Avri Doria: Okay just before we go on, Elaine your hand was still up, did you want to comment now or wait until the end?

Elaine Cruz: Yes I'll comment now.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Elaine Cruz: In discussing this (unintelligible) I keep hearing how do you define ethnic and linguistic community, so I think we need to fix that, are we going to define that or are we leaving it open to interpretation to all (unintelligible) do they belong to a ethnic community or are we going to be a little more narrow in that?

And the second thing is I don't see anything on the list in the last week and so the development of all of (unintelligible) where is this happening and can I be a part of it please? Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Yeah the list is supposed to be used in common for everyone but I understand that sometimes two people get together and work on something, which is great, but then it should be floated on the list.

So I turn it back over to you Andrew to talk about, you don't need to read it all but to talk us through the points.

Andrew Mack: Sure. Okay first of all to Elaine, two good points. In terms of defining ethnic and linguistic community I think that that's hard and to some extent I'm not sure that it should be our role to tell people how they define themselves. I think that the, creating a test for that will be difficult but I understand the desire to do so.

I would be very happy to receive some guidance on that if there are from my experience there are, you know, traditional organizations, there are individuals that wish to try to speak on behalf, you know try and organize communities, you know there are a lot of different ways that communities organize themselves and at the risk of being to vague I also didn't want to prescribe how people should define themselves or how they should self organize. That was item number one.

Item number two, in terms of the work on the text Elaine, the three of us, Alex, Carlos and I had been kind of working on this since the early days of working team two, certainly happy to have more input to it it's just we got going on it and to be totally honest we just, I just got comments back this morning so that's why it hasn't made it to the list. There's no desire to keep anybody in the dark, quite the contrary.

Avri Doria: Is there any, the is Avri again, is there any possibility of putting the text in a Wiki form so that many people could see and work on it as it changes or is that just a model that's not comfortable to the people that are leading this effort?

Andrew Mack: I'm not so much a Wiki person but if you need us to do that I may just need a little bit of an explanation on how best to make that work with our work flow that's all.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Andrew Mack: I'm happy to take a lesson offline if that, if that's easier for the rest of the group.

Man: Well the..

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: We'll take this one to the list and we can, and we can first do send it out to the whole list and then if multiple people, I don't know, how many people think editing on a Wiki is a good thing?

I see no one raising their hand. Okay. So, okay I see one. I'm just trying to encourage the use of these methods if we can but I understand that the time it takes to learn and sometimes if more than three people doing it.

Okay why don't you, okay I see Evan and others and Olof. Okay. Certainly we can, it's easy for one of us that's comfortable on the Wiki to put it there to tell people it's there and to give you the off line training. Now I see Olof's got a terminal with a pointer, I understand that at all.

Olof Nordling: I'm just trying it.

Avri Doria: Okay. Would you continue talking us through and then we'll get to Richard's comments?

Andrew Mack: Okay sure. So if you look at point A, which is the question who should be first in line for support.

And for those of you who are not English speakers please tell me if I'm going to fast, my apology, not native speakers.

The - as you'll see the goal was to try and square both sides to give some preference for these groups that we've identified as good initial targets while not excluding anyone else.

I agree with the point that Avri made earlier on which it is let's try to get somebody past the post.

My biggest concern if we open it too much is that there will be an infinite amount of discussion on who is eligible and not any money actually or not any resources actually getting to needy applicants.

So that was the whole - that was the whole (ethos) behind the desire to focus on ethnic and linguistic communities.

If Elaine or others have some good ideas on how we can put some bounds on that that aren't onerous or that don't feel too limiting I'm more than happy to add more precision to that.

Any particular questions?

Richard Kendall: Yes I have one.

Avri Doria: Yes. Go ahead Richard.

Richard Kendall: Can you guys, can you hear me okay?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Richard Kendall: Yes right. Yes so I think a little bit along the lines of what Elaine was getting at and I guess Avri was talking about earlier, but let's hypothesize that ICANN does in fact decide to wave development costs for applicants in our category. I think - or reduce the actual (unintelligible) thousand dollar fee.

So in that event clearly there's going to have to be some fairly bright line rules as to who gets that sort of reduction in the application fee.

So it's your intention I suggest that some of these fairly broad terms like, you know, what is an ethnic and linguistic, you know, community, who is in need and who is sustainable?

Are we assuming then that there would be a sort of - another round of staff work to really define what these terms mean? That's my first point.

And then my second point is I don't see mutual (unintelligible) before or at least I raised it before and perhaps we thought it was a bad idea. But I don't see the notion of the string of the applicant being sort of reflective of their identity at all.

So my question for Andrew and for the group is are we okay with an applicant who meets all of the criteria that we spelled out here? Are we okay with an applicant of that type getting support if they're applying for say .sport?

Avri Doria: Okay.

(David): I don't think I understand the question. Are you saying should they get support regardless of what the actual string is the organization is deserving?

Richard Kendall: You're talking about my second point (David)?

(David): Yes.

Richard Kendall: Yes. Yes that's my question. My question is would we be okay with an applicant met all of our criteria getting a subsidized fee if they applied for something like .sport?

Andrew Mack: Richard this is Andrew.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Andrew Mack: Can I make an effort to address that?

Avri Doria: Go ahead. And just so people know I have - then I have Tujani and Carlos.

Man: My hand was still up.

Avri Doria: Oh your hand - oh that's okay. Yes, you get lost in the tracking because you're promoting. Okay sorry.

Man: I'll wait until people have their comments how about that?

Avri Doria: Okay. So Evan I don't know where you were in the order of Tujani and Carlos because I've been going off of the little boxes on my screen.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay they were very quick things. And one was technical in saying that doing a wiki doesn't really - it's not usually exclusive with the way that the working group is operating until now. It's just essentially a window into the rest of the community.

So if they're - if you guys basically are uncomfortable with doing things on a wiki or more comfortable with having done things in a certain way that's okay. And Avri, Olof and I can be your interface.

But essentially the wiki is simply good way to be a window into the world for this. So I don't think the two are - I don't think the wiki is mutually exclusive with the way you've been doing things so far.

And the other thing is regarding the definition, I mean I'm going under the assumption and maybe this should be very explicit that we are already talking about organizations that are identifying themselves as community applications under the existing community component of the DAG.

Is that a good or a bad assumption? Because that may deal with the - that may deal with some of other questions?

Avri Doria: Okay Tujani?

Tujani Ben Jemaa: Yes I have a big concern about Paragraph A of the text of Andrew.  
Andrew has put the ethnic and linguistic applicants in the first line and the first priority.

And I don't think it is the spirit of the Resolution 20. The Resolution 20 spoke about inclusive educated program and spoke about developing countries.

So it is not - I don't think that our duty or our right is to prioritize some kind of applicant than others.

We need to find who can be eligible for this support but what kind of applicant can be eligible if you want. But we can't say this is the most important and this is the last important.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Actually so I think the group can recommend what it wants and then the board will decide whether it meets their needs.

I have Carlos and then I have Olof and then I'm going to cut the discussion on WT2 so that we have some time left for WT1.

Man: Avri you were right, the group can recommend what she wants. But the group is directed by Resolution 20 please.

Avri Doria: Yes but as we've often talked about there is a lot of space for interpretation within Resolution 20.

Man: It is wide. It is not specific Resolution 20. That's the important.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you.

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: So Carlos.

Carlos Aquirre: Thank you Avri. I want to make a comment, a quickly comment about the question of Elaine some moments ago.

There were during Brussels meetings some questions and comments asking about the concept of ethnic and linguistic groups.

This people's saying that in the questions, communities around the world are all (unintelligible). But ethnic and linguistic groups are constituted by people who won't belong to these groups.

And in some cases it's not needed to have purebloods to belong this group. It's our - it's our idea. The - we need to have an account that there are many interests difference in relation with this and are people not interested in that our work have will finish or end.

So it's necessary to define but not answer in discussions, not necessary. It's my quickly comment.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Olof?

Olof Nordling: Olof here. I want just wanted to respond to Evan's proposal that this community would be as we have it in the DAG well for the community applicants.

We should keep in mind though that the DAG opens the possibility really to self-select your community denomination. You actually decide for yourself without it being checked that you're a community applicant.

The only thing and the only point when comes into play is in the contention situation where somebody else would like to have a string that's identical or confusingly similar.



That's when you have the community priority evaluations step. And that's pretty far down the line.

So it's only there where the community denomination or community application denomination plays a role.

So I don't think relevant to just say that okay this self defined as community and so be it. So we've - that calls for some kind of measure to gauge whether it is a community that is worthy of getting the support in that's intended. Just a few comments so...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Olof Nordling: ...maybe a bit difficult.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I'd like to actually halt this discussion now. I think we've opened up a lot of issues for people to take to the list. And I'd like to give Work Team 1 a chance to update us on what's happening and bring up issues.

I have mentioned it in the discussion. I have put this text in the wiki and I have a blank wiki page ready to put anything that WT1 tells me belongs there.

Andrew Mack: Avri...

Avri Doria: At some point - yes?

Andrew Mack: Avri it's Andrew. Can I just respond to a couple of the quick points very, very briefly?

Avri Doria: Can you do it on the list please and let's continue the discussion on the list. Because as soon as you respond people will - are going to respond to you.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Avri Doria: So please take it to the list and let's continue to work on the list. Evan I pass it off to you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay well there hasn't been a whole lot of mailing list discussion to update from the snapshot which essentially is there is sort of our last point of reference.

So what I was hoping to do right now was go back to that snapshot. I take it we don't have (Tony) with us on the call? Is (Tony) here?

Avri Doria: No.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So would...

Woman: He's not on the call Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry?

Woman: He's not on the call, not able to be contacted.

Evan Leibovitch: Would any of the other members of WT1 like to sort of pick up on where we left off on the snapshot and see if we can maybe do a little bit of extension and refinement of that given the fact that we have to start to solidify this is into something we can turn from suggestions into recommendations?

I see Andrew's hand up. Is that about the last question or is that now something new into WT1?

Andrew Mack: All right.

Evan Leibovitch: Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Mack: No, no, no I'm - I'm sorry, I lowered my hand.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So does anybody at all from WT1 who's on this call want to start?  
Okay Elaine go ahead.

Elaine Cruz: Sorry. I was just going to ask for the snapshot to be posted but I see it's there now.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I mean we need to sort of kick up the activity in the mailing list. But I guess the intention right now is to take this significant list of suggestions and start to turn them from suggestions into recommendations.

Is there anybody in WT1 or on this call that has any comments about moving forward with the snapshot?

I'm not seeing a lot of raised hands. Does this mean that everybody likes what's in the snapshot that we could just wordsmith it a bit, refine it and submit it or does anyone have concerns?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. We may need to wait until we have some feedback from (Tony).

Evan Leibovitch: Oh I mean that's understood. But I'm just trying to get it just from the people that are on this call. Are people generally happy with the comments that are in there? Does anyone take issue with any of the suggestions?

Because if that's the case, I mean we can take it offline to mailing list. We can make sure that we've got (Tony)'s comments. But if that's the case I think maybe the next step is just doing the wordsmithing necessary to turning this from suggestions into recommendations.

Tujani could you comment a little bit on the African submission and to how that may affect some of the work that we've been doing in WT1?

Tujani Ben Jemaa: Yes sure. As you have scheduled the (read it), the statement of the African community was little bit synchronized with our snapshot.

It's not contrarily it's not absolutely different but it is a little bit different in this self that African people African community feel that they are - that the (unintelligible) divide make them away from this industry of GLDs.

And they think that we need, the African community need a specific support for to enter into this industry.

They are speaking about community based applications but also about the commercial, not commercial, let's say about normal application from African region because they think that the market is not wide enough as I said last time.

So for the other for the Working Team 1 issues it is almost the same but there is more emphasis on the waiting of the development and the risk cost.

It is a clear understatement that the waving of those two costs is essential because even the 100 kilo is not easy for the African applicants. So at least we have to weigh those two costs.

What else? For the ongoing cost African community thinks that only the transaction cost have to be paid at least at its minimum level.

Now they said in the - in Brussels that it is now at 18 cents. So it is - that's more or less the content of the African statement.

Tujani Ben Jemaa: Okay. One of the comments here relating to the - what Tujani said in regarding to statements in these - in the document that is suggesting that a specific and exclusive reference be made to giving priority on this to applications from organizations based in Africa. Any comments?

Tujani Ben Jemaa: I think it will be a good thing.

Avri Doria: We've got Alex Gakuru: and Elaine and Richard...

Evan Leibovitch: Avri excuse me, my screen went away for a second.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Wonderful experiences with Adobe Connect. Okay...

Avri Doria: Right. You have Alex Gakuru:, Elaine, and Richard, and Andrew.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Andrew you - your - okay, Alex Gakuru: go ahead.

Alex Gakuru:: Okay. I want to echo what Tujani has said in the sense of the statement that was written. I got involved with it the eve of our presentation.

And yes the group that drafted it actually are calling for more priority of Africa but we must also be sensitive and I support that.

But we must also be sensitive that our agenda and the resolution that was passed in Nairobi also cover the other developing region.

So we do not want to be seen that we are given priority of one and excluding - I mean excluding others. We must also make a decision because we are participants in the work team that we are from Africa we don't exclude other regions.

But indeed yes, Africa suffers the most. They are the bulk of the developing regions if you like. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Alex Gakuru: just to follow up on this, are you saying that we should mention Africa in the documents but also make sure that it's not limiting or that we should just not put in geographic (preference)?

Alex Gakuru:: I'm saying we could give priority to Africa. Yes, we could mention that Africa because of its weighted impact of the region but we make sure also that we are not limiting like the (unintelligible) Andrew had written that we are not limiting this to only Africa, other developing regions.

I mean it's well qualify and Work Team 2 and their - basically the entire Resolution 20 that they also qualify.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Alex Gakuru:: Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: I have Elaine next. Go ahead.

Elaine Cruz: My comment is more about the process of allocation of support. So maybe I'll save that till the end of (unintelligible) session about (unintelligible) nations.

But Tujani if you wouldn't mind sending me any reference you have about this (18 cent) for domain name C I'd appreciate that. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Okay Richard you're next.

Richard Kendall: Yes thanks. So again I think it's very important that we - whoever's going to formulate the actual rules they're based on our recommendations. Who's going to formulate the rules?

I think we need to get them better guidance as to who's going to qualify. So at the moment we're saying that it's ethnic and linguistic groups. We're saying that it's needy groups and now we're discussing it a geographic factor.

So I've got again, two quick questions. What's the rationale for why applicants from a particular geography would supersede other applicants?

Are we saying that it's because they're more needy? And if that's the case I think we really need to define what needy means.

If we're saying it's a different reason then I think we need to articulate that reason in our list of qualifications for applicants.

So in a nutshell I don't understand the rationale for why applicants from one particular geography would supersede others.

And just to emphasize the word supersede. I think it's important for us all to recognize that there will be limited funds for whatever it is we come up with. Not every person who wants to receive this subsidy is going to be able to receive it.

The staff is absolutely going to have to pick and choose based on some bright line rules who gets access to the limited funds.

So I think we need to give them (nearer) guidance. And my question is what is the rationale for why applicants from one geography would supersede others? I'm not saying that there isn't a rationale I just haven't heard what it is yet.

Evan Leibovitch: I would just personally take issue with the - with your reference to limited funds. Based on some of the work from WT1 there's been identification of ways that would be able to drop the cost associated while still maintaining the principle of cost recovery.

So I'm not sure if this is a matter of saying well there's only a specific small pool that will limit the number of applications.

Richard Kendall: They may or may not be. But I mean my experience in life is that funds are not unlimited. So I - my expectation is that there's a likelihood that there's not going to be an unlimited ability to subsidize.

But I mean let's not quibble on that. It's certainly possible I think you might concede that ICANN's going to have to pick and choose between applicants who want a discount.

Anyway, that doesn't change my question. My question is what - what's the articulated rationale for why applicants from one geography would have precedence over others?

Man: I could respond to that and I think my hand is up next Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Man: Okay there are a few things. First of all I - in terms of why one - why some geographies over others and why we'd initially determined that we wanted to favor emerging markets or historically the challenged regions is because of the historical challenge.

There are issues of bandwidth. There are issues of access to professional services. There are just issues of market penetration.

And one of the things that we had determined in our earliest conversations was that one of the goals of this group is to help provide access to help provide footprint.

So in areas where there isn't footprint I think that there is - that that makes sense Richard.



Second of all I think we identified early on that there are some very specific linguistic and technical disadvantages that a lot of these regions space.

So it's not like we're talking about a level playing field. We're really not. And Africa is probably the region that is the most affected by that.

That's said I think that we have to be very realistic in saying that if - just declaring a blanket reference for one region over another I think is dangerous in terms of our building the political support that we want. And I think that doesn't fit the reality.

There are places that have similar characteristics. And not all places in Africa are equally disadvantaged.

In terms of your point Richard about the idea that there won't be an unlimited amount of funds I encourage everybody to hear that point because I agree with Richard very much.

Even if we're only talking about this first round in this very first round, if we can come up with some applicants that seem logical, that seem noncontroversial that get everyone excited about this I think that there will be more resources.

But if in the first instance it's unclear why we're choosing who we're choosing and there is a choice that's going to be necessary then I think it's going to negatively affect the likelihood of getting support in the future which is one of the reasons why we were trying with all respect to (Johnny)'s point, why we were trying to narrow the field of applicants in the initial phase not because we don't believe that there's needs but because we have to make some choices.

And if we can make some choices that are noncontroversial in the first instance we are likely to build support. Anyways that - those are my points.  
Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I want to remind everybody that we're into our hour into the call. And I think Olof says that we have a hard stop from some people?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: So I guess we've got to wrap this up. There's a lot more work needs to be done on WT1 but we need to take that to the mailing list.

Avri do you want - do you have any wrapping up stuff that you want?

Avri Doria: Only to say that continue the discussions please on the mailing lists. We have a very lowly used and we've got infinite time between now and the next meeting for people to have (unintelligible) and definitely large for people to have active discussions.

So please a lot of the issues have been brought up today. Let's take them, let's work them out on the list and thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri, Cheryl here, just if everyone can check that they do have access to the wiki's. Interestingly enough, I - when I followed the links you set up even though I'm logged in to Social Text can get access to those pages.

Now...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...staff will look into that and I will be given access I can assure you. But it would be good if everyone else double-checked their ability to do the same because...

Avri Doria: And yes I'll check the membership to make sure people are on it...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: ..I could check the other way also.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay. So thank you all. See you...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...next week. Oh Elaine you had your hand up on a point of work. Is that correct?

Elaine Cruz: Yes. Yes.

Avri Doria: So you get the last word.

Elaine Cruz: Thank you. So of course if you go to the mailing list, but the idea of - that you see here in the chat Avri, who makes the decision and how are - how is - how are the funds allocated and how is the technical support distributed, I've heard from multiple parties that some registry providers are more willing to support an African linguistic committee, others are more willing to support an entrepreneur from Africa.

So I think we need to discuss sort of a clearinghouse of support that's available and allow the providers, some say and who they will work with or who they will support. And I'll bring that to (another list). Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you and talk to you all next week. But please make it an active mailing list this week. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: All righty thanks.

Avri Doria: Thanks.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Avri Doria: Bye.

END