

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 03 August 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) 03 August 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-20100803.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

ALAC

Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC
Carlos Aguirre - At Large
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Baudoin Schombe – At Large

GNSO

Avri Doria - NCSG
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison
Andrew Mack – CBUC

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachines

Michele Neylon - RrSG

ICANN staff

Karla Valente
Olof Nordling
Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies:

Alex Gakuru - NCSG
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large
Tony Harris – ISPCP

Coordinator: Your recording has started.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Tuesday the third of August. We have Avri Doria, Rafik Dammak, Baudoin Schombe, Elaine Pruis, Sebastian Bachollet, Alan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Andrew Mack. From staff we have Karla Valente and myself Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologies from Tijani Ben Jemaa, Tony Harris, Alex Gakaru. If I could also please remind everyone to state their names for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Avri and Evan.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Evan should I start?

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. Since I've been messing around with everything it's probably most realistic that I do. First of all, on the agenda. I am suggesting a change from our normal agenda which is basically - (okay) we've done the role call and now we're doing the agenda review. To quickly go through and - some of the milestones and in the slides in front of you Karla did mention some stuff about the milestones that she will show us (kind) of pressure we're under.

Then I would like to walk through - what I did with the comment this morning, and I apologize for my lateness in doing anything. Was, I took the comment that Karla had done the brief extraction for. And tried to sort them in to what was more like a WT1 and what was more like a WT2 and a group of others.

Karla Valente: Yes. And Avri to your comment - the full text of all of the comments is in (Annex E).

Avri Doria: Right. I understand. And I do have a - and it's good to point that out to people. So that helps although you can also still go back to the Web site to find them. I then took the document template, the one that has the Appendix E, that's

being mentioned. And cut in the text from Snapshot 1, Snapshot 2 into the document. I know that's most definitely not going to be the final text.

But as opposed to a place holder that said TBD, I figure some actual texts that we could refer to. What was - was a better place to start. I also put a table in each one of those sections of the comment as I did the cuts and sites and slice on them of the WT1, WT2 and other. And we can walk through those. I am sure I got it partially wrong. I am sure it needs to be modified. But in general, that's the way it looked to me.

So I am suggesting that after we review our milestones and see where we are and see how practical it is that we will actually be finished on time. That we then walk through the WT1. We walk through the WT2 and if we get that far - and I am not sure that we will. We then need to look at how forward on WT1 and WT2 text - I see I forgot to put the two there in the thing. And, and, and, and such.

We also probably need to look at - and we can do this during the milestone discussion. Is whether, you know, we're at a point of one meeting a week being enough to get done? But I will leave that until we talk about the milestones. Is that agenda okay with people with the caveats that I've added? Okay. One other thing I probably should mention, we did have Evan and I with Karla, Olof: and Kurt Pritz did have a conversation last week.

About how to sort of make it to the end game of this group, how to finish it up, what to do. There were various recommendations on things we could do partly rolling up this (document here) was one of things we've discussed. We also discussed an idea that we may want to get to further in WT1 about at some point bringing - in one of the things that we've not discussed much is bringing in aid.

And one of the suggestions we got from Kurt was perhaps bringing in a specialist like someone from the World Bank who is experienced at doing that.

And could possibly even create a parallel function or some other group that would be able to perhaps look at adding some outside grants to the process. To bring someone in to speak to us if this group wanted. So I will put that on the table for now.

We can come back to it later. But if this group would interested in hearing from someone like the World Bank or elsewhere we should, you know, discuss it and decide. So having blurted all of that out, are there any comments before moving on to WT1 comments? Yes (Andrew)?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Oh no the milestones, sorry, sorry, sorry. The milestones, but go on (Andrew).

Andrew Mack: That was just a quick point of clarification. Are we - when you were talking about bringing in someone like a specialist from the bank, are you looking primarily at the structure or are you looking primarily at the financing aspect?

Avri Doria: I don't know. I suppose that would be up to the group to decide what they were interested in. It could well be both. I just don't know. The offer was made to bring in someone. I think it would be up to this group to decide what they needed to hear about in a conversation. And I - and, you know, at this point I don't think there is any concrete idea on the table.

Evan Leibovitch: If I could add something from the call, I think part of the expertise that Kurt was offering to bring in had to do with, you know, the fact that others before us have already been engaged in things like, who are worth recipients of lower pricing and that kind of thing. So perhaps this is an instance where we don't need to reinvent this wheel but perhaps try and find out methods that have been successfully used elsewhere.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else on that before I - we look at the milestone quickly? So we only have an hour for this meeting so we won't get very far.

The date reminders and this is the third page. I don't know if my changing the slide changed yours. But on the third slide I ahead of you if you're moving yourself. The date reminders is the public (common period) in English and the 21 of July.

An extended public comment and 23 August. The board retreat deadline for content is September 3. Now we had originally had a final report at - when was it, 13 August on our charter? We are obviously not there. I think that's - is that a realistic statement? Final recommendation posted. Is that - I mean I think we're obviously not - what is it eleven days away from being finished? I think having our final by September 3 for the board retreat deadline is not an unreasonable target.

Of course we would have to take that change in milestone back to the - our chartering organizations to the ALAC and the GNSO just to get their, you know, acceptance of a chain approval - of a change in milestone. But is that something that this group thinks should be done first of all? That - first of all if we're not going to have the final comments, and that says it ends on 23 August. With the comment period that ended on 21 July.

While through the grace of (Carla's) extra work we have something up of it. With translation and everything and that - it's already been a week with translation and everything. We, you know, won't have anything on it assuming that there's comments other than what we can get through Google Translate, you know, until the beginning of September.

So I open up to, you know, whether people agree with. Basically Evan and I taking back our request to move our final recommendation back to at least September 3 and whether that seems reasonable to people. As a date while we're requesting - as a date. I open up - I don't see any hands. Does anybody think it's an unreasonable thing to do, to go to our two chartering organizations and ask for those two weeks? Okay (Andrew) I see your hand.

Andrew Mack: I am - Avri - I think it - the perfectly reasonable thing to do. The question is - and maybe is a question that we should have asked before. But - asked (professionals) before hand, but do we have a clear sense of exactly what constitutes the final product? I - because (is procedures) some of theses are ongoing - as we've seen, some of these are on going processes. They're going to take some time.

They're going to take, you know, just - (some sitting) - sitting down and hashing out with a variety of stakeholders. How far can we get is my question?

Avri Doria: Right. I think we can get - we can get quite far. I think we can get to what recommendations we agree on. And I think we can get - and this is the test that Evan and I have to draft which we've talked about previously. We can get to a - what next (steps) are that the, you know, further work. Whether it's a re-chartering of this group or in different groups.

And we can make those recommendations. So I think we can get to our basic recommendations, all of them will need further work to figure out how to instantiate them. How to make recommendations on them. But we've got to get to a point where when the board retreat comes; they've got as much substance as we can give them. With as strong a statement of what we think needs to be done further as we can get them.

So that they go into the retreat know what we've got to say.

Man: So the answer is as much as possible?

Avri Doria: As much as possible but knowing that the - but knowing that there will be many things that need longer term work. And that we will just look at and say, you know, these are the basics of it but we recommend that certain effort be started to go further. You know, and so we don't need to, you know, type our fingers to the bone with the last minute trying to create things that should take three months.

We should solidify the recommendations we've made. Respond to the comments in terms of changing those recommendations if need be. You know, (spill) some of them out with details that we can develop. But then, you know, say - and further work needs to be done on A through G. (That) would be my take on what would be a good report. Remember at this point the main reason is to tell the board, we took your mandate; this is what we got done in the last several months on it.

These are our recommendations at the moment. And this is the work we still need things to be - we still think needs to be done. And I think if Evan and I within the next week or so can get the first draft of that what work we think is on the longer term list than that - and then review with you all. And you decide that yes - that takes some of the heat off trying to finish those things. That might make it easier to focus on the things that can be finished.

Any other comments on the milestones and such so? I could take it as an agreement on this group and I will put it on the list just to make sure no one who is not here doesn't disagree. But the sense of this group that Evan and I should ask our respective chartering organizations for an extension through at least September 3.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually Avri in the case of ALAC, the actual liaison is not me but (Carlos).

Avri Doria: Okay.

Evan: I can work with him.

Avri Doria: And I guess to me it is, I have to Rafik who actually takes it to the - through the council. So it's us and then liaison? Okay. You are right. Thank you for the correction. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would be putting up my (peak) Avri. It's just that I can't make the room do it. So I may have to mention if...

Avri Doria: Shout out anytime.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. (If) my computer refuses to behave.

Avri Doria: Okay. So what would you like to say?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no. I was saying I'm agreeing with you.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would be giving you a little green (peak) accepting I can neither put up my hand nor do anything else.

Avri Doria: Okay. Well then shout out anytime you need to. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry about that, thanks.

Avri Doria: After years of the GNSO that we did without Adobe. I am quite (used) to people shouting out.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I understand (why) my machine won't behave.

Avri Doria: I had trouble with my Adobe earlier. And then I did something and then it started working again, so I don't know. Evan would you like to...

Evan: I keep getting system error.

Avri Doria: Huh?

Man: I keep getting system error from Adobe for me.

Avri Doria: Oh, so you're not in Adobe? So maybe then, I am going to switch documents that are showing now to the documents that I cobbled together from Olof: - basically had built the template. Then Karla added the - all the comments to Appendix E. So this document that's now up front has all of the comments appended to it if people want to go look. What (Ivan) did was - I didn't touch objectives and backgrounds under the working group recommendations as I said.

(While on) Working Team 2 - 1, I just cut in the recommendations. And then on - and then at the bottom of that you will see for reference only comments received to date related to Work Team 2. To (remove its) later versions of the doc. Just so people don't think this is going to stay there. I proposed that we need a separate document. Perhaps (it is) attached as an appendix, I don't know.

That lists - that take the formal review of comments being done by staff and then appends our response to each of those. But that is something that will have to happen later once we have the full analysis. So anyhow I took these. I cut - I gave each one a number so we can refer to them. So the first one I had for Work Team 1 was, it is not unreasonable to ask the broader registrant community to participate in supporting the expansion of the (name phrase) increase in register fees.

Now that only ten gently related to Work Team 1. It's a (way though) to - it's financial consideration so I stuck it there. I don't know what people think about this. And Karla you and I should probably start taking notes on these responses, so building the response documents later is not quite as difficult.

Karla Valente: Okay. (I am taking).

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. And I will try to jot some down too. But I am terrible at both (chairing) and talking, and writing. So do we have any comments? Is this

something that we want to make a recommendation about? Is it something that we want to say, you know, this is a wider policy call than this group? Is it something we want to say, we think it is a good idea and recommend that it be study by others?

Is it something we want to say we disagree with this (in) principle that registrants, you know, etc cetera? What kind of answer - and I see three hands. And unfortunately I didn't see which came first.

Man: They're listed in the order they were raised Avri.

Avri Doria: Oh really? Okay, so you were first?

Michele Neylon: Yes. What do you mean by increase in registrar fees? What are you referring to exactly?

Avri Doria: I am referring to one of the comments received.

Man: Oh okay.

Avri Doria: And so I don't have a - what I refer to. I basically took this direct cut. We'd have to go back to the...

Karla Valente: I can help with that.

Avri Doria: Okay. Can you please cover that right Karla?

Karla Valente: Yes. So that was from (Danny Younger). And what he was proposing is basically that one of the ways to subsidize the program is by having an increase on registrar fees. He would not mind as registrant paying, you know, a little bit more if some of this money went through - went to this specific issue that we are addressing here.

Man: Okay. So by registrar fees, what he's referring to is the cost of the registry charges the registrar for the domain per year?

Karla Valente: Or the cost that is charged to registrants as well. A few more cents per domain name that would be, you know, given towards, because he mentioned that there was a reduction in fees - in domain name fees. (Prevention) fees over the years, and he would not mind going back to a higher fee. (It just) money went through supporting this work.

Man: Okay. Now just to get - the problem there is that increasing the fee - yes, okay. Is - if - there are two things. We're increasing the fee on the per string basis or you're increasing the ICANN fee. So it's something - I mean I'd love to discuss this further with the group. But it's not very clear which area (Danny) might be referring to.

Avri Doria: In one sense if there are two areas and he's not being specific we probably should look at both.

Man: Well the thing is this Avri. If you increase fee - the ICANN fee then it affects every single domain registration regardless of the strength in the GTLD space. Where as if you're looking at increasing the per domain fee for say (Doss) Community UTLD then that only impacts that particular community. So you're getting the community - theoretically at least you're getting the community to self finance through the registration fees theoretically.

Avri Doria: I - I am sorry I am dead this morning. I missed the differentiator.

Alan Greenberg: Avri, (Alan). I think I know what (Danny) was asking for.

Man: I know too I guess.

Avri Doria: Okay please. So (Alan) if you want to.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. My understanding from talking to (Danny) is he was talking about the nominal 25 cent domain fee. That ICANN charges registrars which I now think is 20 or 18 or whatever. And yes, the intent is that every registrant in the world or GDLS registrant would pay a penny more or whatever towards this good cause. That was the intent.

Avri Doria: Okay. So what do people think of that? And Sebastian that's what you understood as well, correct?

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. And I know your hand is still up probably for another comment. I just wanted to get that one in. Okay. Is there - is there initial reaction to this? Perhaps Elaine that's what you wanted to speak to?

Man: Elaine may have dropped off of the call. (She put them to check).

Avri Doria: Oh okay. So Sebastian you had your hand up next.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes. I think we have to look to the broad picture of the money involved in all of that because at the end of the day. As we say, you (repeatedly) the end user who pay the fee. What ever money we are talking about it's always taken the pocket of the end user. (Whether) it - it's (the) business end user or individual end user it's from their pocket. I have no big trouble with what (Danny) is suggesting.

I don't remember how ICANN decide to decrease the pay out domain fee in (one end). But in the other end I think I will be very happy to see people who get a lot of money with the domain names. To put back some of this money; it may be one way to decrease amount given to the people who invest in this (area), to give back to other who needs to increase the market. Then I am not sure that - I have no trouble with that. But I am not sure that the best things to do. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. So I guess in your answer there is really two issues, two questions. One is, whether this idea standing alone is something we want to add as a recommendation. And then two, it seems that you're suggesting that there may be another answer or interpretation we'd want to put on this. To (try) and raise some other money from those who make a lot of profit as opposed (putting on). So I guess we then end up with two questions. One is, do we want to include this as a recommendation?

And two, do we want to come up with yet another recommendation dealing with some other way of gleaning some of the profit for the assistance of others? Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Good morning. I am not sure if anybody addressed this already because I dropped off the call. But my concern with this recommendation is it's not clear if (Danny) is suggesting that we raise the fees on the current GTLDs or if he's saying going forward with GTLDs. The fees would (come back) and that money would not be used for future applications.

Avri Doria: Okay. I assume he meant on the current. But, you know, we can certainly confirm that. And he...

Elaine Pruis: The problem with that in that the new GTLD program is supposed to be self supporting. And we're not supposed to expect current registrants, registrars and registries to pay for this program. So we need to add that to (the question) if we add these to our (paper).

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. And that would be one (comment). Okay. Thanks. Okay, Sebastian you were next with your hand up. Or if you already covered what you wanted to cover?

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes. I covered but I would like to answer what Elaine said. But I will (wait) until the end of the call - at the end of...

Avri Doria: Okay. Great. Okay, (Alan)?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Thank you. Yes, I was going to point out what Elaine said. That the original intent was that this be self financing and the original - old GTLD (owners) not - have to subsidize the new ones. And - but (Danny's) comment was explicitly with the knowledge of that and suggesting that that be changed. We're, you know, he's talking about, you know, if you - as an example a penny a domain.

Whether it comes from - out of the registrars quote profit or whether you increase the cost to registrants because of this. Still we're talking about something in the order of - I don't know it's close to \$1 million I would think a year. I don't know how many domains there are in ICANN's portfolio. But it is something in that order. So we're talking about a fair amount of change even if it's only a fraction of a cent a piece.

That could make a big difference towards this program if that decision was made. It is again - goes against the original GNSO recommendation. Not the first one that would have changed however.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes, that certainly just could be noted if that's something this group wanted to recommend. But thank you. (Andrew)?

Andrew Mack: Yes Avri. The - (Danny) also called me. My understanding of it is the same. I think if there - I actually think that there may be some - that may be worth considering if it's a small enough number. But the question for me is one of sequencing. If this - if the program is supposed to be self financing from the very beginning, then what would we do in the very first round? We've all agreed that we don't want this to be something that has to wait a round - or two rounds or three rounds.

Given that we don't know when that's going to - when those other rounds might happen. And so it would strike me that we're going to still either way

have to find some sort of - some (basket) of financing. And my guess is some portion of that would have to come from ICANN budget if we are going to get this to move forward at the pace that we want. If it's going to be a part of this first next round.

Avri Doria: Yes. I am only assuming that these are all elements of the basket that (Danny) wasn't recommending that this be the only mechanism, but was recommending it as an additional one. And you're right; it's not one that might have a lot to do with the first round. So of course not knowing when (you first found), (unintelligible).

Man: Avri, given the fact of the case though, my question to the group is, is this a political battle because it would be a political battle because some people who are - who have interests jump up and say this is not what we signed up for. Is this - is this the right time to be fighting that battle? This may be a good long term solution whether we do it with new GTLDs or with the entire basket.

But is this the time to fight this battle? I just don't know but I perceive this being - this being maybe a second order thing since won't get money out of it in the first place for this next round.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. And I see Elaine checked. I guess she's agreeing with that comment. (Taylor), hello? Am I still on?

Man: You're there.

Michele Neylon: Sorry.

Man: Yes, yes.

Michele Neylon: I had myself on mute and I forgot to...

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

Michele Neylon: ...(hit the bar). Sorry about that. At present (directly) the problem with this concept while I think I had (just a) skim over (Danny)'s comments and I can understand what he's trying for. The problem is if you start playing around with the per transaction fee that registrars pay ICANN, it's going to cause more problems than it solves.

The transaction fee is one area where ICANN - well there's two problems. One, it's the only thing that ICANN can actually do in terms of throwing us, the registrars, a bone if they want to get us to sign up to a new contract before we need to as happened last year for example.

The other side of it is while it's fine in theory to say X percent or Y cents or whatever from this fee should be earmarked for X, how are you actually going to make sure that that actually happens? Because I mean there's two contributions from registrars per year. There's the annual accreditation fees which are split quarterly and then depending on the registrar size and then there's a per transaction fee.

The other thing as well is you get a lot of pushback from registrars who either A, don't deal - don't have any interest in dealing with new TLDs and just basically focus on dot coms. So I can see - well I can understand where he's - is somebody saying something?

Avri Doria: Please go ahead.

Michele Neylon: So I can see it causing - giving it more pushback than coming - leading to something positive at this juncture.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. I'd like to give Sebastian the last word on this one and then let's move on to the next one. We'll recycle through these at some point. But we've - I've started to collect some comments on where we're at on this. Sebastian.

Sebastian Bachollet: Thank you Avri. Yes. I agree with you. When we take one of this we can go back to the old policy about gTLD some parts we agree or disagree like that it's not paid by income but that's always something that struck me always. But I would like to emphasize what (Alan) say in the chat that if somebody would decide to (have) for next year ICANN will know how much money will come and can put the money on the table today and will get back the money next year. It's not a big deal I guess. Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Moving on to the next one. As I said, none of this is closed, we're just trying to get through these comments and start working on where we're at.

The working group should propose that each additional script proposed by a gTLD applicant would be priced commensurate with the cost calculation for the Fast Track IDN ccTLDs, namely 26700 per script. So I guess if I remember correctly, if one would pay the full cost or the regular cost for the first one but for every incremental there would be just the standard - the 26700.

Interesting idea. What do people think? I don't see any hands. And Karla please add any correction or furthering remarks to what I say about the (unintelligible) statement. Okay. I see (Andrew). I see Sebastian. I guess you're agreeing that this is an interesting idea. (Andrew). Are you on mute?

Andrew Mack: Sorry, sorry. On mute. I think it's a (unintelligible) idea. I don't know if people got the thing that I sent yesterday. I'm sorry I'm a little bit bandwidth limited because we're on vacation. But the - I mean I think one of our goals is to try to get the scripts that won't be built out, built out, right and provide additional access that way.

So I don't know whether it makes sense, I had proposed that we consider something along the lines of a Tier 1 and Tier 2. My guess is that there will be

a lot of scripts that will be built out and then there will be some that will be really left behind.

And so I have no objection to considering a lower price for all new scripts. But if we are limited in what we can offer, I think my suggestion would be that we bundle so that we get the people that wouldn't otherwise be on the Web. It's an access issue. Does that make sense?

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes. Thank you. So basically again we have two recommendations that are similar here. One is this one and then one is the recommendation that you put out earlier that recommends a tiered pricing for, you know, completely absent - of course in this case we do have an evaluation of which one are going to get them in the first round and which one aren't.

But again, there's two similar recommendations. And we should discuss your recommendation but I figured we needed to go through the comments today.

Okay. I see Elaine's hand.

Elaine Pruis: Yeah. So I'm absolutely supportive of the idea of bundling lower prices for additional scripts. I would want to know, and maybe Karla knows, what is pricing for these ccTLD IDNs (unintelligible) purely cost recovery or if there's another way to look at what is the true cost of adding another script that would simply be an evaluation of - I guess that would be contention evaluation more than anything else because the technology would still be the same and the business model might still be the same? Those are questions I'd have about that.

Avri Doria: Right. Karla do you have any information on that?

Karla Valente: No, I don't Avri. What I understand is the whole cost was based on single TLDs.

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: I'm sorry?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Single (unintelligible) TLDs.

Karla Valente: Yes, I understand what Elaine is asking, I'm just - I don't have the answer to that.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Is that an answer that you think could be gotten?

Karla Valente: I think we need to look into it how the costing model would have to be modified to accommodate additional (unintelligible) lowering the price because some of the costs are fixed regardless of how many TLDs a specific applicant applies.

Avri Doria: Yeah. As far as I know on the ccTLD, that was based upon the cost recovery model for what it took a ccTLD but they had a much simpler evaluation model than the gTLDs have or at least that's - as I've understood the argument.

Yes, (Alan).

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. This is another case where it goes against I'm not sure if it's the GNSO principle but certainly goes against the initial cost modeling that ICANN did that says every TLD will cost the same thing. What we don't know, maybe Karla does or may - I'm not sure, is to what extent that calculation presumes that some TLD operators would be applying for multiple scripts simultaneously.

If they factored that in and said, "Yes, we expect ten applications which will be each done in ten scripts," which is like 100 fees, then it would raise the

prices. If they didn't make that assumption that adding on scripts for a reasonable, you know, marginal cost doesn't - isn't (perdition) of the model itself.

So more understanding of how the model - how the cost modeling was done would tell us whether this is asking for money back or is in fact just a good idea that we've come up with now separate from the original price modeling.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. So basically was there - and I see (Sheryl) agreeing? Did the cost model take into account things that may or may not be called variants in different scripts?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I'm not sure variants is the right word...

Avri Doria: Right. Well...

Alan Greenberg: ...(unintelligible) different scripts but, yes, versions...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: ...it's not variants.

Avri Doria: Versions of the same TLD in a different script, which normally takes us into that other bear trap that sits waiting for us all when we talk about new gTLDs and IDNs and multiple scripts which is the variant problem which was the subject of a previous call I was on.

Elaine is your hand still up from before?

Elaine Pruis: No. I had one more question. And that would be...

Avri Doria: Okay. Please.

Elaine Pruis: ...I'm pretty sure I saw a similar comment on this topic in the DAG4 comment postings. And so I'm wondering if it makes sense for us to try to delve into this specifically for our working group or if, Karla, if you can let us know if that's being considered or recommended to the board just for the DAG in general.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Come back to this one again. I've written down some points. I'm sure Karla has written down some. We'll combine what we've done and, you know, ask people to think about it some more. We'll come back through these.

Karla Valente: Avri, can I just make one comment?

Avri Doria: Sure.

Karla Valente: So if we have an application process in which we allow bundling, so for example I apply for .carla for a certain price and automatically I get .carla in Chinese and other scripts at the lower price, we will automatically assume that every applicant that has one string has the right to the strings in other languages, right? So it's not only a change in cost, it is also a change in the overall approach.

Avri Doria: Yeah, that's a good point.

Karla Valente: (Unintelligible), right, who has the right to...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Karla Valente: You know, and we chose to imply that, you know, for the current TLDs like .asia has the right to have .asia in all of the other script.

Avri Doria: You're right and that is a very open and contentious discussion at the moment.

Karla Valente: Yes.

Avri Doria: (Andrew).

Andrew Mack: Yes. Karla, I'm not sure that we're going as far as you're saying. I think that we don't need to answer the question about whether or not people will have a presumed right to the scripted part because I don't know if we can offer that at this stage given the politics of things. It may be a good thing from the perspective of the user but I just think that if there is - this is one of the reasons why I think if we focus a little bit on some of the other (service) scripts it will help us.

If there is the incentive to do it, then at least that means that more people are going to look at it, there will be more competition for it. I don't know if we need to answer the question yet whether or not there's any presumed rights that if you get .carla in Latin script that you would get .carla in any other script at all, just that you would have the ability if there was - if you wanted to apply for them and you applied for a bundle of them that you could get the - a bundled price for some of the smaller scripts or some of the IDN scripts.

Avri Doria: I believe that this one and I think this may have been in the contents of so many people's (others), this one would be very politically controversial partly because those who are not at a financial disadvantage plan - or perhaps have the thought of doing multiple applications but then the question is a disadvantaged community needs, you know, how many? And do they have a need for the multiple languages earlier than others?

And so this one would run into - the first time (since we) had a bundling was one where several different scripts working together with a common, you know, technical support and backend perhaps and such were applying for several different scripts in either the same script or different - different TLDs either in the same script or different script. But the notion that we're opening

up and easing of the way to get the same script in multiples falls into a very politically contentious area at the moment.

(Alan), I see your hand up.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I was just going to follow on in that. The implications as Karla implies are even stronger in that not only might people think they have the right but for the marginal type of cost that has been talked about in this suggestion, why would someone not add another half a dozen scripts on if they think there's going to be a market for them?

And then we also have a situation where scripts are going to end up being dominated by wealthy western countries and - which again is politically charged. So this one is a nice idea which probably is not going to survive our scrutiny unless we can figure out a way just to do it for disadvantaged applications and I'm not convinced that that's really worth a lot.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. I'd like to move on to the next one. As I said, we'll circle back to all of these. We've only got 12 minutes left so this might be the last one we handle in this call.

So is three - maybe there's not a lot to do on this one. Supportive of a staggered fee approach recommended by the working group and the use of some portion of any auction proceeds to provide a partial refund for application fees to qualified applicants. (It's in the) minimum annual fee of 25,000 would likely be very challenging for some disadvantaged applicants (unintelligible) supports the elimination or reduction of fees to disadvantaged applicants but only in circumstances where registration volumes do not support payment of the annual minimum.

So I guess this one is basically a support of our idea but the addition of a constraint as to under what conditions the reduction would occur.

(Alan) is your hand up anew or is that a remainder?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. No, this is new one.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I strongly support this one. It was part of the original package that I put forward at the very beginning of this work group. And I think I also suggested that this reduction or elimination of this fee could also be put together with a deferring of 185 application fee that is to be spread out over a number of years, you know, going along with this one. So I think this one has a fair amount of potential benefit at minimal costs.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else want to comment on this one or should I move forward to get one more in at this point? Okay. Let me take one more then.

And this one - okay, the whole thing is there but there were two important points that need to be taken into account prior to issuance of any final report. Then their first point I have down as a WT2 issue so I'll skip it here. Second, while fully supportive of a need to ensure the protection of registrants in the event of registry failure, the primary reliance on ICANN on a financial instrument is misguided. There are other mechanisms besides mere financial instruments that exist to safeguard registrants' interests in the case of registry failure.

While ICANN's application fee may represent a barrier to entry from a potential applicant, the potential postings of a financial instrument prior to the launch of a gTLD represents a much more substantial barrier to entry. This working group should address what other support mechanisms exist in the potential case of a registry failure and how they can be made available.

So I guess the solution to this (unintelligible) a solution to this could fall both in Working Team 1 and 2 space but listing the issue definitely falls in 1.

Yes Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks. Yes, this is another point I fully agree with that financial instrument requirements are beyond what I think is reasonable or necessary to keep a registry running. But again I wonder, this - in my mind this goes beyond disadvantaged applicants. I think this should apply to all new gTLDs and so I think we should make a note of this in our report that we support the idea but I don't think it should just be exclusive to disadvantaged applicants.

Avri Doria: Okay. And certainly we can - I mean our charter is of course to pay attention to the disadvantaged applicants but we could certainly include something as a footnote sort of saying, you know, that this should be considered for all applicants. But that would be sort of outside our mandate a little. And - but if we do want to support it for, you know, the financially-challenged applicants, we should specifically say so I think. We need to specifically say so.

Any other comments on this one? So on two of these - on several of these we've already marked that there is some support for it which means some change to the WT1.

Okay. I want to stop going through these now because we're almost at the end of our hour and we'll start from where we left off at the next call. What I'd like to move for a second is the way forward on our two bits of text and the rest of the report.

One question I have, is one meeting a week enough for us to finish even with asking for an extra two weeks? And if not, then we need to figure out when and how or do we want to go back to lengthened meetings if we can? So that's another question I have.

And then two, I'm not sure that being divided into WT1 and WT2 makes that much sense anymore because again we're all trying to finish it together. So it

does make sense for there to be one or two people on each of these topics sort of holding the pen perhaps in terms of updating the document hopefully each week to sort of keep up with the discussions.

I wonder what people think about that and whether that makes sense to the penholders. Because this document even - okay, 11 days was too short, even a month seems really short at this point. So comments? No comments. Is there agreement to lengthening this meeting to a 90-minute meeting? Oh, now I see hands. Okay. Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: I think we need more time. I think it would be very useful if we had an outline of what exactly we want to add to this document so we can work through that. I think saying that we have more work to do is true but it's not very helpful in adding that work to get done.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. Well I think part of the outline of what we need to add is coming out of response to the comments. So that's partly developing. But you're right. Michele.

Michele Neylon: The only thing I would - just in relation to longer calls. If you're going to be doing - planning to do longer calls, could we look at when - at the times? The only reason - I know I haven't been making a lot of these calls but I just realized the other day that I'm the only registrar in this group so I have to vow to make a bigger effort.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. So (unintelligible) longer calls or other calls we'll have to go through then a...

Michele Neylon: Yes, because I'm chairing a meeting normally at 3 - straightaway after...

Avri Doria: That starts right after this.

Michele Neylon: ...this one.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Okay.

Michele Neylon: Yeah. So I can't miss it obviously.

Avri Doria: That's how I feel about this call based on the call I had before. (Andrew).

Andrew Mack: I am happy to spend more time whether that's two calls a week or whether that's a longer call each week if that's what's necessary. What I think I asked about earlier in this call was try to give us a sense of what our goal line is. And I know that it's a little bit fuzzy and I know that it was perhaps unfair to pin you down but I think that will help us an awful lot.

A lot of these issues are interconnected and a lot of things, you know, realistically we have to start pushing things to the side and say, "We're going to include this. We're not going to include this. What does the finish line look like?" And so that would really help. I think it would make the calls more productive, you know. That's just my suggestion.

Avri Doria: Okay. Sorry this call was unproductive.

Andrew Mack: No, no, no. That's not what I meant. What I meant was...

Avri Doria: But...

Andrew Mack: ...in terms of...

Avri Doria: ...I mean we are moving through things very slowly which is true.

Andrew Mack: Yeah. I'm just trying to give us (which) we'll be able to work more and we've got an outline. I'm just trying to see if there's a way that we can do it so that we can check things off so that the document takes shape, you know, at the

end of the call the document has more shape. Not that the calls aren't productive. I didn't want to give you that impression.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah, we weren't actually try - okay. So it sounds to me like more time would be good. Adding time to this call is not practical. What about the notion of trying to find time (unintelligible) extra hour or a second hour and a half and taking to heart the fact that you basically would like a bit more structure to be done on the document. I promise to put some time on the document between every call to try and bring out those questions and get those answered.
Michele.

Michele Neylon: I'd be in favor of a second call at some other point during the week even if it's - whether it's an hour long or a 90 minutes or whatever. I think also as well bearing in mind the location of the various participants I think having it earlier than this time of the day is probably going to cause issues for people.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah. Okay. Gisella, can I ask you to put out a Doodle poll for that. At this point our next meeting is still next Monday but to try and come up with a second call starting next week following through to at least the end of this month? Can I ask you to and perhaps you can work with (unintelligible) and you know best when there might be open spaces for the participants of this call.

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. Avri, second call starting next week I'll send a Doodle poll out.
Will this be a 60-minute or a 90-minute call?

Avri Doria: I would look for a 90.

Gisella Gruber-White: Ninety-minute call (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: If we can't find a 90, then we'll drop back to a 60, but, yeah.

Gisella Gruber-White: And we're maintaining Tuesday 1300 UTC which is the current time?

Avri Doria: Yes. I would - yeah, this one seems to work for many of the people so I would not want to get rid of it but I understand that we can't lengthen it.

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay. Fine.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. So Evan, Karla and I will probably talk about the document some more, see what we can do to structure it. I'll start to - I'll commit to by next week having built at least an outline of the future work section so that is something that people can look at.

I also ask people to continue - start or continue working online so please respond to (Andrew)'s suggestion online but please also respond to the document that I sent out with comments, with text changes, with proposed blocks of text to add into various places, anything that occurs to you to contribute that will take this even baby steps forward would be helpful.

And as I said, I'll work with Karla and Evan to make sure that whichever one of us has the bandwidth to update the document does so, so that we keep the document moving forward.

Karla Valente: Avri, this is Karla.

Avri Doria: Yes, Karla.

Karla Valente: For the applicant guidebook public comments we have a structure that we use to address comments. I'll be happy to share that with you if you think it's beneficial just to structure how people give feedback.

Avri Doria: Certainly, yeah. Why don't we - why don't you and I and Evan talk about that...

Karla Valente: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...and then we can present it to the group, you know, once we understand what we're presenting.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Man: And I'm still here. It's just this doesn't seem to be the kind of meeting where two chairs would've really helped.

Avri Doria: And I apologize for being such a microphone hog.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: But anyhow I thank you all for participating and let's just keep working towards it.

Man: Thanks everyone.

END