

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION**

Friday 27 August 2010 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) 27 August 2010 at 14:00 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-20100827.mp3>

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

Participants on the Call:

ALAC

Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair

Carlos Aguirre - At Large

Alan Greenberg – ALAC

Baudoin Schombe – At Large

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large

GNSO

Avri Doria - NCSG

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison

Andrew Mack – CBUC

Erick Brunner Williams – Individual

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies:

Tony Harris - ISPCP

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair

Elaine Puis - Mindsandmachines

Alex Gakuru – NCSG

Olof Nordling – ICANN Staff

Richard Tindal – Individual

Coordinator: Please go ahead. The call is now being recorded.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Good day everyone. Good evening for those that are stuck with evening. I'm going to - before we start for the roll call, I'm going to follow the process done by Evan last time, even though I'm still waiting for my liaison to get back to me. But since the (AOX) side of the house says they prefer this, and since I have - no one's gotten their hands slapped yet by the GNSO Council, I figure we'll continue to follow what was done last time.

So could you please run the attendance?

Glen de Saint Gery: I'll do that for you Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Glen de Saint Gery: Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the on August 27. And on the call we have Tijani Ben Jemaa. Have you got any Declaration of Interest?

Avri Doria: No, Glen...

Glen de Saint Gery: Oh, sorry. You didn't want me to...

Avri Doria: Yes. I think we're just going to run it straight the way Evan did last time. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Gery: Oh, sorry. Okay.

Rafik Dammak, Carlos Aguirre, Baudouin Schombe, Avri Doria, Alan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch. And for staff we have Karla Valente and Glen de Saint Gery, myself. And we have apologies from Cheryl

Langdon-Orr, from Alex Gakuru, from - I'm not so sure if Michele Neylon hasn't sent his apologies too. I know he couldn't be on a call yesterday. Eric Brunner-Williams has just joined the call. And have I left off anybody?

Thank you, Avri. Over to you.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you Glen. At this point, I'd like to ask on the SOI - on Statements of Interest, which basically describes you know, your work situation and your relation to ICANN and the work group in general. Does anybody have an update or a change they either just made or need to make in the near future?

Okay. Hearing none, I'll move on to the Description of Interest. On the specific issues that we are discussion - for example, applications for aid and such, is there anyone that needs to declare a specific interest relating to the items that we will be talking about today?

Okay. Hearing none, let's move on.

Okay. So for the agenda today, basically I figured we would continue doing the walk through of this version of the final report. As I indicated in the email, the process that I am suggesting is that we finish this one - this walk through without going back right at the moment to verify the previous work done.

For that, I am suggesting that people you know discuss it on the list. Bring up any issues. Karla has done an amazing job in getting the updates to us in this very quick turnaround. Very much appreciate that. And so - and Tijani has -- as I said -- have been the exemplar for

basically taking that work and you know, quite specifically giving his comments based on his understanding of what went forward. But, I'd like to see that happen on the list if possible.

And then when we do get back to it, we will do another walk through of this text, hopefully a quicker one. Hopefully, there'll be fewer things to stop off and discuss. But, just to make sure that what we end up with is what we should end up with.

In terms of what we do next in the group, I would like to - after we've finished this walk through, and I'm hoping that kind of happens today, that the next thing we do is do a walkthrough back to the comment. A, looking at what work we've already done in this pass through to respond to them. Making sure that we've noted correctly the responses Karla is working now on basically integrating the responses that came out on the first walkthrough on comments into the proper comments document. And so a walkthrough that. See what work we still have to do.

And then you know see what work we've already done. That will inform us as to what we may still need to do in terms of other work, and then move on to trying to finalize the document. Does anybody have any problems or issue, or you know comment on following that kind of process to get us to the end? Remembering, that we're still shooting for having something complete, or at least having gotten to our completion point by the 13th, which is not that far from now?

Okay. Seeing no comments - and of course, this is just the rough plan, so if people want to comment on the - on it on the list, that's fine too.

So, getting back to where we were. What line are we at? I don't - Evan, do you remember what line you guys terminated at?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Yes. I don't have scrolling control in the...

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes. I'll give that to you in - every time, I have to remember.

Karla Valente: 186.

Avri Doria: 186. Cool. And, you should have scrolling ability now, because it isn't synchronized. So, it's the one outlined in blue. And, we had not covered that? Or, have we covered that?

Karla Valente: We have not covered that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Karla Valente: Before you move ahead Avri, can I make a clarification?

Avri Doria: Please.

Karla Valente: Well, I incorporated all of Tijani's comments with the exception of two, because my recollection of those was different. So before we move ahead, can you just clarify for me that we are all okay to incorporate those comments?

Avri Doria: No. Sorry. What I prefer to do is - and I saw Tijani's note and I saw your note. Evan and I haven't had a chance to compare notes. And, I'm also wondering whether other people in the group will want to comment on it. So what I'm saying is leave it that way for now.

Perhaps highlight it that the wording is still under discussion. Perhaps, even include you know, Tijani's correction as bracketed text. And then in the next pass, we'll go through.

So, I didn't want to basically go back to any of the old discussions at this point. I'd like to ask those to sort of sit on the list, and then you know we'll get back to it as we do - as I say, I haven't had a chance to look at it. Haven't had a chance to talk to Evan, and the rest of the people in the group have not had a chance to comment.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Avri Doria: So if that's okay with you, I'd prefer to just leave that as bracketed for now and get back there later.

Karla Valente: That's okay with me.

Evan Leibovitch: We had scrolling ability for about a second and then it disappeared again.

Avri Doria: Oh, really? Okay. But, it says that synchronized is off.

Evan Leibovitch: Now it's off.

Avri Doria: Now it's off. Okay. I guess the sign is different. I thought that synching list would mean - well anyway. You've got it. You've got it.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. We're still at 186. So okay. So, it's "Address support for other groups, especially NGOs and (someone will decide a location) at this future point, as the idea of who constitutes a community in this space is less clear and the tests for which groups might need/merit support would be trickier. Moreover, the number of applicants could be very large." Now, this I guess has to be taken in the light of previous conversations. Are there any hands on people that wish to discuss what we do?

And I see Tijani. Please go ahead.

Tijani, are you on mute?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You hear me?

Avri Doria: Yes. I do now.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Very good. So, we spoke about this point last time, and I proposed an alternative text. Because if you read this part it excludes those groups, it says that we will see them at the further time. That means another round. And, we agreed not to speak about other rounds.

And then, they give all the disadvantage of these groups. That means that we don't have to take them. So, I gave an alternative language. If you want to see it, you had it.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay, one thing I'd like to - I'm not quite sure how - I don't know that we had an agreement not to speak of future rounds, also. Because, I - and we had quite a discussion on that, and I don't think

that there was consensus on us declaring that there would be no future rounds because everything in the system tells us there will be.

But also, this doesn't mention other rounds. It just mentions future points. But that be as it may, yes you did have other suggested language for that. And, where do we see that text? That was in your email.

You had that list, correct? Was that - or this was after the list? I'm trying to find...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You want me to read what I said?

Avri Doria: Oh, yes. Please remind us of what you are proposing.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Bullet point B, or the second bullet point. First, we talked about it. The second is NGOs, (unintelligible) society, and not-for-profit organizations. Full stop.

Avri Doria: Oh, that's right. So, you basically - now, had there been an agreement - we'll have to discuss them first, but had there been an agreement with replacing the current bullet? So I guess what you were suggesting was replacing just this bullet, or any other bullet? Were you also suggesting replacement of the next bullet?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: What I read now is the suggestion for this bullet point.

Avri Doria: Just for this.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: So, you were replacing this bullet point with A, B, C, D, E?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. No. I have - I want to replace all the bullet point with A, B, C, D, E that I have proposed. You understand?

Avri Doria: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: And, you also wanted to replace...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So, the...

Avri Doria: Okay. And so with everything, and then you want a series of groups not recommended to replace the third bullet there? Okay.

So, let's talk about - I thought the moment - it looks to me like you want to replace two bullets? This one and the one after...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...with A, B, C, D, E is the first change. Then let's talk second change, of replacing the third bullet with the text you have. Does everybody have that text in front of them? And let me see if I can do anything to put that text in front of them?

(Andrew): Avri, it's (Andrew). I'm pretty...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay. I've just...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): ...confused right now. I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay. That's what I'm trying. First of all, I just put - so, I was working with Tijani to understand. I understand, so let me see if I can make it clear. We have two bullets in front of us. The one that I just read that's outlined in blue, and then the second one, "Overall, the working group recommends giving some preference to applicants geographically located..."

Hold on. I'm trying to do two things at the same time. Delete that.
Okay.

So - and we have two bullets there. Tijani made a recommendation last time that we basically got half way through discussing, and then we got to this point. He's suggesting that 186 to 193 be replaced with a set of bullets that I have just put in the notes screen, although the bullet part didn't show up. So, Bullet 1 was, "Community-based applications such as..." Then Bullet 2 was NGOs. Then Bullet 3 was, "applicants geographically located."

You folks see where I pasted this in, in the note above?

Evan Leibovitch: The top right-hand corner?

Avri Doria: Yes. Thank you. I always have trouble with right and left.

So, I opened discussion on Tijani's proposal to replace. And what I'd like to do is first of all look at the proposal in general of doing this replacement. And then, I'd look to - if there is agreement to do the general replacement, then I'd like to look at any specific wording within that replacement to see if there's adjustments. And, I see Evan's hand up. Evan, please.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi. I like the simplification of - going to fewer words rather than more is always preferable if it expresses the same things. What I would like to suggest is looking at the term emerging markets/(developing countries). If only because if you word it too vaguely, basically it becomes very subjective.

And, I was thinking of actually using like the UN term lesser developed countries or something like that. Would that be - would it be preferable to be specific in such a way that would not allow this to be held to subjective evaluation, but something that has a real concrete definition to it?

Avri Doria: So, this was your comment on the...

Evan Leibovitch: On one of the bullet points...

Avri Doria: On point B? The last one?

Evan Leibovitch: "Applicants geographically located in emerging markets/developing countries." Well I mean to some country - you know to some companies, you know the US is an emerging market, depending on where they've been so far. So, that to me is a very vague definition. I

was going to suggest using something like the UN term such as lesser developed countries, which is actually - has a specific meaning and a specific list of countries that are part of that.

Avri Doria: Okay. So - okay, I've got - two things from this was one, basically that you do - are comfortable with making the substitution, but you want to change some of the language specifically...

Evan Leibovitch: Correct.

Avri Doria: ...in C, but you're fine with the rest of it. Okay.

Next I had (Andrew) and then I had Tijani. (Andrew), please.

(Andrew): Okay. I - since it was my language, I'm okay with that generally speaking. From the experience that I've had, people in emerging markets or developing regions tend to like to think of themselves as emerging markets as opposed to less developed countries. And, that was the reason why we chose to put in that terminology. But if that's not precise enough, I have no problem with it.

I'm still a little bit trying to figure out whether we have walked away from the idea of having a concentration of the first round - in this first instance -- whether it's the first round or whatever -- on trying to narrow the field as opposed to broadening the field? The way that it looks in the note on the top right-hand side, it's still open to a huge, huge number of people.

And, I - that was one of our initial concerns, was to try make this scalable to the broader ICANN community by having the process be

narrow enough so that it doesn't appear chaotic. Have we walked away from that? That's just my question.

Avri Doria: Okay. Tijani, I guess you can address his question and Evan's and stuff. And by the way, I've put myself in the queue with a personal view.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. What - do you hear me?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. We have to bear in mind that the first criteria was the need, so any of those categories are not - if you want applicable if the need is not satisfied - the condition of need is not satisfied. So if you say emerging markets or developing countries, if Evan is more comfortable with the language of the UN I don't mind. But, I want to make it clear that all those categories will not get support if they don't have the need condition first.

Second, (Andrew) said it will be open to a huge, huge number of applicants. I don't think so, since the first factor is the need. So, I don't think that there is a huge, huge number of people in need of support. But, we don't have to restrict our support to one category or two categories. There is no logic - rationale for that.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. I...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Avri, this is Eric. I'd like to get in the queue.

Avri Doria: Okay. What I - and this is going to be partially some comment - so I guess if I do understand, you are saying that yes; you want to move away from restricting to specific categories, which was part of (Andrew)'s message. I tend to agree with you that having need start the sieve will probably limit the resulting set of those who succeed somewhat.

However, it won't necessarily limit those who apply, because you know lots of people will try to prove need, or could try to prove need. And since they fall into the other category, the only thing they feel they'll need to prove is need. So, it still could make for a very large number of people applying, though it may make for a much smaller set of people succeeding.

The other point I wanted to make is I think if there may be a space between the emerging markets and developing countries, and you could have something like a middle phrase that was an emerging market, especially those in less developed regions. And leaving it aside from whether it's country or region would be - and that's a personal preference, not a Chair's preference.

So okay. Going back to Chair role. I had Alan and then I think I had (Andrew).

Eric Brunner-Williams: Avri, this is Eric. (I'd like to jump into the queue)?

Avri Doria: Yes. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Two points. Number one, although I agree with Evan that a well-defined term is better than a vague one, there's a big difference between emerging markets and least developed countries.

The places that I think we're more likely to get applications from are not necessarily the least developed countries but ones that are perhaps a notch above that, because remember this is - we're not offering this for free.

They're still going to have to make substantial investments themselves and so the two aren't the same. Regardless of what we pick we shouldn't capitalize things unless it is a defined term, so emerging markets for instance is not a - typically a defined term and we shouldn't capitalize it.

As I'm going over this it strikes me and I'm not quite sure of the answer. Maybe the answer is addressed in another paragraph, but how much support and the type of support that we're going to - that will be offered is going to control the applications for it?

You know, if we were saying, "We will pay the whole shot for those who make a good enough case," we're going to get a different set of applications than if we say, you know, "At best we're going to be able to reduce the cost 10% and offer some technical aide."

So somehow in this process we're going to have to define what the - what reasonable expectations are from those - for those that we're supporting to be able to set a realistic bar for who applies for it.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you.

Eric Brunner-Williams: (Chris), this is Eric. I'd like to get in the queue.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes I've got you. I saw your hand now up although...

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm not even connected is what the issue is.

Avri Doria: Oh, you're not even connected. Oh, okay sorry, I will get you connected. Sorry. Okay, so I've got - okay, Alan just spoke. I have (Andrew) and then I have Eric. And Eric you are connected now so okay.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, Alan, I mean, (Andrew) please.

(Andrew): Excuse me, a couple of things. Avri, first of all I agreed with your comment. I think the goal is to make this as easy as possible to do. I think that I agree with Alan.

I think that we're likely to get middle level countries as opposed to the real poorest of the poor. That's not something that we should have a trouble finding words for.

But, I mean, I want to get everybody back to the fact that we're really talking about a two-phase evaluation, right. The first phase is we're going to have a bunch of people who are going to apply and we're going to have to sort them out.

And then there's going to be what are we going to offer these people once we've determined which ones are appropriate? And my concern is only that if we have too many people who think they can apply, then we'll lose a lot of the time, the money and the personnel power that we're going to need in that first go-around.

If we get, you know, 1000 applicants how much time will it take just to go through all those applications and to make, you know, to respond to them and to respond to their requests and the queries and, you know, complaints and whatever that is? So that's why the goal was to make it a little bit narrower.

Avri Doria: Okay, so let me stop you for a second. So basically at the moment you're not supporting replacing the current two bullets with the set of A through E, is that a correct interpretation?

(Andrew): At this point what I'm trying to focus on is are we getting the - are we getting to the end that we were looking for, which was to narrow the funnel a tiny bit?

And I - my concern is that the bullet points that we have may not narrow the funnel enough. But I'm open to anything else that will get us there. I'm - I like Tijani's simplification. I just don't know if it's - opens the funnel too wide.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well thank you. I wanted to chime in and agree with Tijani's comments promptly. That's really all I had to say at this point.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Okay so I have the general impression that we should replace the two bullets with the five bullets, but that we may have some more work to do on those bullets.

Does anyone disagree with that particular interpretation of what we've just gone through? Okay, so we will replace bullet one here and bullet two at the moment with A through E, but we still have more discussion on two points.

One is the proper wording for C and one is the - whether some extra wording has to be added for what (Andrew) has been suggesting that the funnel of applicants and I also mentioned, that the funnel of applicants may still be too wide and we have still to deal with Alan's issue of what exactly is - are we talking about - very true, and I see I just got echoed and I see Eric has raised his hand, is we still have the issue of is this for just the financial support?

Is this just for full financial support? Is this for the process of matching people with those that want to donate, you know, equipment as Eric was pointing out in one of his emails?

So we still have that issue to deal with. But we will replace the two bullets with A through E and then we'll continue to discuss those. So if anybody disagrees with that, please show a red X or shout-outs. Okay, hearing no disagreement with that we'll take that move. Yes Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: (Andrew) was making the suggestion that there might be 1000 applicants. ICANN has informed us that 500 is their idea of the top for their ability to process without resorting to cohorts.

So I think (Andrew)'s concern is a little overblown that there will be two times ICANN's estimated maximum before adopting a cohort model of applicants claiming need alone. (Unintelligible). That's all I had to say.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Eric, you're breaking up a little bit. Can you say that again? I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: Basically if I can repeat if you're having trouble with microphones and such.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Please repeat.

Avri Doria: Okay, basically (Andrew) you were mentioning 1000 applicants.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right, that's - let me finish repeating. ICANN has said that, you know, they're expecting at maximum 500, so your estimate's even twice that. And I - and, you know, I don't know whether Eric said this in the cracking up to expect that all of them will be coming for a loan. So the 1000 was a large estimate. Did I get it right Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes, okay thanks. So yes (Andrew), your response.

(Andrew): Actually no, fair enough. I mean, I - and I didn't mean that in any way to be a - an estimate. It was more just that the point was is that I didn't want us to lose all of our energy and our resources in the initial phase

and - but if everybody believes that that's not an issue then, you know, I'm just - I'm trying to make our job as simple as possible, nothing more.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Karla.

Karla Valente: I just want to - that I get through the changes correctly. So the only change that I have is instead of the two bullet points, have ABCDE right now but I have not changed the content of the bullet points to what you had on the notes. Is that correct?

Avri Doria: What is in the note becomes bullet point one and bullet point two for now.

Karla Valente: Okay, so the community based applications which is the same as...

Avri Doria: A through E - the A through E that are up there which I cut out from Tijani's note and then I added some bracketed text on C about least developed and developing and nations and regions, so that there's still an issue for discussion there.

But yes, those A through E would replace the bullet in green and the bullet after it.

Karla Valente: Okay, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: But Karla please replace ABCD by bullet point by - not ABCD, yes? It should be bullet point one, bullet point two. Numbers, not ABC.

Avri Doria: Right, okay sorry, yes. That was also something that had been decided that the last time that A through E indicated organality or some sort of ordering whereas we meant not to include ordering and therefore they were bullets. Thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Exactly.

Avri Doria: So it's yes. There'll be that number of bullets but not A through E. Okay, thanks. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just want to reiterate again we're saying we're not going to be overwhelmed. It presumes we're setting expectations properly. If people think we're really going to pay the whole shot and provide all of their expertise, then we're going to get lots of applications.

Avri Doria: Okay, I would like - okay, thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Avri Doria: I see (Andrew) agree. I would actually like to take the more difficult point that you have meant which is not as a text point and just note it as a point that needs to be discussed further on the list, is basically the point that you and (Andrew) have been making about expectations and about the size of the funnel as it were.

(Andrew): That was fine. That was my intent.

Avri Doria: Right, and so I've just jotted myself a note. I'll try to remember after the meeting to sort of start a thread on that topic so we can get a little bit

more content, and then perhaps when we come back to this text we can look at it again.

And if we need to put some further constraint on it, you know, we can, depending on where we got to on the list. Karla, you still have your hand up.

Karla Valente: No.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Okay, so can we move on to the next bullet? Okay, the next bullet - as I said we've got two pending actions on those bullets but we're moving.

Okay, the next bullet, a series of groups not recommended for support. Tijani, did you change in yours?

Tijani Ban Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes you did, okay. So Tijani if I put a second set - let me put those up in the play so people can read them if they don't happen to have the mail in front of them. I'm getting it together slowly folks.

Okay, so Tijani is suggesting a different set of language for this bullet. Tijani, would you like to talk through your recommended change and the reason?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, it's only to add that - I will read what was originally and what I want to add. A series of groups are not recommended for support based on our work, specifically our bullet point one, no change.

Bullet point two, applicants that are branch groups that should be self-supporting companies. Between brackets I added, "Except those from countries where markets are not wide enough for reasonable profit making industry."

Avri Doria: Okay, so that's really the only change you've made to these.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: This is the only one.

Avri Doria: Okay, so really we're not talking about any replacement other than possibly the addition of that phrase. Okay, I'd like to get people's comments on the addition of that phrase to bullet two - sub-bullet two. Do people agree with that addition?

I see one agreement with that addition. Does anybody disagree with that addition? And if you disagree I need you to speak out why. Yes (Andrew).

(Andrew): I'm - I don't disagree with it in principal at all. I'm just wondering about the precision of it, whether - if we're talking about - if we're talking - there are some companies that are very successful in markets that are themselves not very successful, you know what I mean?

And one could look at for example the idea that we talked about, about like a large ethnic community in Nigeria. Nigeria has the - dot NG has about 5000 names out of 150 million people.

So it's possible to say that that's not a hugely successful market, and yet dot Housa might be successful economically. Does that fall into conflict? Do you see what I'm saying?

Avri Doria: Yes. No, basically what you're saying is that someone could be profitable and could have market power, even though the rest of the market was problematic.

(Andrew): Right, and I'm not against the idea at all. I think that it's a good idea. I'm just wondering whether we - is there a way that we should be - maybe the trolls within the - doesn't have a need criteria and so it captures that.

But again in the idea of not receiving large numbers of requests that we could kick out, I don't know. I mean, I - that was just something that jumped into my mind. I'm happy to have - throw that out for conversation. Does that not make sense?

Avri Doria: Okay, yes. Comment - was it Tijani asking to speak? Yes, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, I didn't ask to speak.

Avri Doria: Oh okay, sorry.

Rafik Dammak: It's Rafik.

Avri Doria: Who asked to speak? Oh Rafik, sorry. I didn't see - okay, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: I just - I'm wondering why we brand or companies from developing country that there need don't to brand because my understanding such that frankly it's for marketing for promotion.

And then if they think that they need - they should have - they should support such activities and we should help maybe more NGOs, communities or maybe some entrepreneurs, but don't - we don't need to help companies for that.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. So we definitely do have at least one counterview. Anyone else want to speak to it? Okay, at this point I'd recommend that we leave that as bracketed text and discuss that one more on the list, both in terms of wording and in terms of wording and intent.

So in other words because (Andrew)'s issue was a wording issue, is that making it too broad if you happen to be a very rich brand from a - some - a market of one, does that mean you're included.

And Rafik's point that should we actually be giving aide to establishing a brand trademark as a - which is supposed to be mostly a marketing tool and should that be an activity we're engaged in.

And that of course leads into (Andrew)'s larger funnel issue. (Andrew), I see your hand up.

(Andrew): Yes, just really briefly. I think I've thought about this now a little bit more as we've discussed it, and I'm starting to lean toward Tijani's perspective. I think that the likelihood that we will have the example that I came up with is very low.

And I think I'm going to go with the language and withdraw my earlier concern about it. I think it makes sense.

Avri Doria: Okay, so we no longer have an issue of wording, just an issue of appropriateness as brought up by Rafik. Okay, so I'll also start a thread on the mailing list to go further on this point if that's okay with people. Is that okay? Any problem? Karla yes.

Karla Valente: Well, the change that the group wants is everything that I see on the note?

Avri Doria: At the moment I would only put in the bracketed part and that there's still something to discuss there. In other words put it in, in some way. I'd put it in brackets here so that we remember as a placeholder, but whether you put it in colored or italic or footnoted or something that there's still a discussion point here so we don't lose it, but that we understand that this is a point we still have to delve further into.

Karla Valente: I'm going to use your way of identifying that.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. Okay, moving on then any more comments on this bullet point, 194 through 2002? Any more comments or - other than the one open discussion? Are we fine with this text for now? Okay great.

Rafik Dammak: Just when we talked about African that are geographic names, I thought that we strike the - for the snapshot about mentioning Paris and I saw it again in the document.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Rafik, I think you're correct.

Avri Doria: I think you're correct, too. Any objection to striking the examples?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, no objection.

Avri Doria: I see agreement and I see no red Xs saying leave it in, so okay. Karla, you got that one also? I just deleted it from the notes.

Karla Valente: So the example...

Alan Greenberg: That must have come from an earlier version.

Avri Doria: Right, yes. Okay so we're striking the note such as Paris and others.

Karla Valente: Okay, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Okay, now one question we have and I don't remember if this is one whether we needed to - the purely governmental, so applicants with some government support might be eligible.

Where did we end up? Does anybody remember on needing more clarification as to what that means? Is that enough or do we have more words that we need to add to that one, or are we satisfied with what's there?

I do remember there being a discussion about that. Anybody have a comment? Okay, in which case for now I'll assume that it's fine and when we go through the comments, I don't remember whether there were written comments about it or whether it was something that came up in the face-to-face meeting.

But when we get back to reviewing comments we can see whether there's an issue of needing to clarify further. Okay, so now moving on at 203. So we have the paragraph, the explanatory paragraph 203 to 206.

Did anybody have comments on that? Do I need to read it out? Does anybody not have the text in front of them and need a read? Hearing that nobody needs a read, I won't read. So...

(Andrew): Avri, can I make a suggestion?

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Andrew): When I clicked through on the document that Karla sent last time, it didn't have the numbers on the left hand side.

Avri Doria: Okay yes, that was the - that last document she sent I thought was and certainly the one in front. So in other words you don't have the numbers in the one you're looking at.

(Andrew): I do. I was supposed to be on the road today and I stayed here for the morning so that I could see that's on the Adobe Connect because otherwise you don't have the reference numbers. If we could have - if there's a way to put them in future...

Avri Doria: Oh yes. No, they're going to be in all the future drafts and...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): The one that I clicked on this morning did not have them and I didn't see them anyway.

Avri Doria: Okay Karla, could you include them in all the drafts until we get to the end?

Karla Valente: I'm sorry, include what, the...?

Avri Doria: The numbering down the side. I guess somebody didn't see them in the latest ones you sent out.

Karla Valente: The line numbering?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Karla Valente: So I see the line numbering on the document that I sent out. I wonder if you're looking at an older version. So the version that we are reviewing is Version 2.7 August 24.

(Andrew): I think I did because I just clicked on what you had. It - we don't need to go into detail. It's just if it is there I'll take a look again. The one I pulled up from your email, I didn't see it in it. I didn't see the line numbers. It's just very helpful, that's all. Nothing more.

Avri Doria: Yes, the intent is to include the line numbers until we're at the last clean draft for delivery would be my recommendation, is that we keep line numbers in because they make life so much easier.

But anyhow, if anybody doesn't have line numbers and needs me to be more precise or give a different reference, please let me know. So 203

to 206 which is what kinds of support might be offered, the lead paragraph. Any comments?

Okay, moving on. Point A, logistical outreach and fee support, 207, you know, through - 207 which was Point A. Any comments to it? So that's 207 through 220. Any comments on any of that? Yes Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, I want to raise the caution about translating the DAG. It's - the DAG should be - should have been constructed so that it was not difficult to translate, yet it has been.

I don't know that we should - I don't think that we should take precious resources and fix the problem that was created through - by others. It's not the case that - I don't think it's the case that applicants need the DAG translated so much as they need the DAG rewritten in much more compliance form.

So that's where I look at the document translation and the work in English and I think we should approach that critically rather than uncritically. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. A quick question. Karla, is there going to be translation of the DAG by ICANN Staff or not?

Karla Valente: Always. The applicant guidebook and all of the supporting documents, explanatory memos, we have made a policy to always publish those things in six United Nations languages.

Now going back to I think it was Eric's point, we do have to improve in the quality control of the translations. Now my understanding is that

what he is saying is that the quality of the translation - is that the issue or the issue is actually the style in which the applicant guidebook was written in English to start with?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Karla. Yes, it is the style with which the applicant guidebook is - has been since, oh gosh, since Rome - even before Rome. This guidebook - the RFC has always been in a particular kind of English which is a barrier in itself.

So what applicants need isn't the literal translation of the guidebook, some that's tilted to American English dialect. What they need is the clear statement of what is needed, not necessarily in American legalese, because that's the system that they - a document that doesn't exist to the best of my knowledge and I think that's the shorter from the DAG and that is what I believe applicants actually should be able to count what they need, not the translation and work processes.

Karla Valente: Eric, this is Karla again. I agree with you. The - if we could have simplified the languages further because it's a lot of relying on the American style. I really do - have made that argument before.

But I think it's going to be hard to change the applicant guidebook and I wonder if maybe the solution would be in addition to that, create an FAQ that is more accessible or some type of reference material that is more accessible.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, I think Karla that is the right approach, to produce a standalone document which has been intended for the readers other than let us say Jeff Newman in the amount of the half - a very competent American law speaking person.

We're trying to help other people than that so this little document should be addressed to those needs.

Avri Doria: Eric, can I ask you a question? I have two people with their hands up but I wanted to ask you a clarifying question. Are you suggesting that this is a task that we should do, or is it something you believe that ICANN should be doing? Is it something you think we should be adding to our list of things to do?

Eric Brunner-Williams: It is not the case. Everyone...

Avri Doria: Not we, but the group.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, I understand. Need is not an aspect of language, so I think it's a general problem that ICANN should undertake to produce a simpler, what you need to know kind of document.

The elements of necessity, whatever it is we are addressing, should be written carefully in a - in English that is aware of the translation issue. So I propose not that we create the standalone document but rather that ICANN should.

But if there was a document that is addressed to those who are qualifying or who seek to qualify, then I believe it is in our interest to do it. And it should be prepared in a translation aware English.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I have Alan and then Evan. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, in the past when we've asked for clarification what did you mean by the answer's always been sort of you tell us and then we'll decide if you're right or wrong?

But the words are the words. I think we need - I think it's definitely ICANN, not us and I think there needs to be an awareness and Karla says she's aware but hasn't sufficient - hasn't successfully made the case that if we do want this to be accessible by people who aren't already in the business and aren't already established, and I think - am I still here?

Avri Doria: You're still here.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, yes and, you know, I suspect or I know that Jeff Newman has had problems with the language. So, you know, he's not the - I don't think there's anyone we can aim at who will understand at all, and certainly not the target audience that we're looking at.

So I think there needs to be FAQs or whatever that try to explain, give examples to simplify the process. I agree with everyone. We're not going to get the DAG rewritten at this point, but it needs to be made more accessible.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. One thing I'd say is if we have language we have problems in the language for someone who is too legal and those who are not legal enough. Evan.

Evan Liebovitz: I think we're getting way, way off base here. We got enough problems doing the task that we have, let alone rewriting the DAG. I mean, can

we please get back on topic? I understand the necessity of having good wording but it's not the place to be debating that.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. The one question I...

Alan Greenberg: I don't think we debate - we're debating. I think we're saying there's a note to ICANN that it needs to be done and that's it.

Avri Doria: That's what I was wondering and we can - I've put it in my list of notes and we can take it to list, do we want to as part of our recommendation make a recommendation related to there being such a task?

And I'll put that one on the list so we can have more discussion on it, because it doesn't relate to the wording. Alan, your hand is still up. Do you want to say something more or...?

Alan Greenberg: No, it's going down.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Okay, so understood that that was the one comment that came out of - through 220. Any other comments through 220? If not, moving on to B, technical support for applicants, 221 through 227. Any comments on that wording and those issues?

(Andrew): Again I think we've got an old version that we're working off of because I recall that we decided to take out reference to (Coca).

Avri Doria: Okay, so basically...

(Andrew): I'm not strong on it but I think someone made the argument that it was a brand reference and as a result we didn't want to use it.

Avri Doria: That is correct, thank you. So 227 should read grouping and/or lower cost registry service/back end service or back end service.

(Andrew): Avri, I seem to recall that our final language in Brussels had - we had already addressed this so we have language that we already agreed about.

Avri Doria: Okay, so we should just go reference that to make sure we have it. I'm not quite sure what version picks up this language. Karla, please let - make a note to check our snapshot, but basically (Coca) type should be removed.

I'm not sure what the sentence needs to look like but we already had a sentence.

Karla Valente: I'm sorry Avri, can you further clarify it?

Avri Doria: Line 227.

Karla Valente: Okay, hold on. Yes.

Avri Doria: Right, okay. At the very least (Coca) type should be removed, but what (Andrew) has said is that we had already corrected this in one of the earlier versions, the version that went out as a snapshot.

So he's recommending going back to that version to take the language that was in that line, but at the very least we know (Coca) type should be struck.

Karla Valente: Okay.

(Andrew): And specifically I think that we had actually - Karla, I think we had language that we had all agreed on prior to Brussels, so just go back and take a look at that because I think that's something we had already discussed.

Karla Valente: Okay, I'll do that. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, so I'll just make a note up here. Okay, so now any other issues up to 227? Okay, the next section is support for build out and underserved languages in IDNs for new gTLDs, ranging from 228 to 238.

There's been some discussion on the list and Tijani has his hand up.
Yes Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, you hear me?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, as I - perhaps I don't understand very well the language, but I still find that if our group recommend that we give support for an applicant that applies for two things, one in ASCII and the other in IDN. I find it not very fair.

I perhaps don't understand it, but I find it not fair. Because, we don't have enough - we don't have the duty to promote IDNs. We have the duty to help applicants who are in the most need.

So if we help one applicant for this thing, we cannot help him for another thing. And this is sad. I am absolutely okay with the giving a low price for the IDN streams. It's normal.

As we did for the ccTLD IDNs fast track, but in our group, we have not - we don't have anything to do with that, I think.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. (Andrew)?

(Andrew): Okay. We talked about this a little bit before and we've talked about this with Evan and others. I think it really does fall within our mandate, if that's what your question is, in terms of trying to get more strings in the route from underserved communities and preferably in their own languages and that was the purpose of this.

What I like about this and why we're so strong on it, is that the - is that it's relatively no cost. We're not really talking about - all we're trying to do is to capture what are effectively the positive externalities of the lower cost.

If you're already applying for one, than ICANN has already gone and done the due diligence on you as a viable entity and a lot of the things that are actually costing money as part of the application.

And the idea was, to capture that and effectively to encourage companies and NGOs and groups to say, "Okay, if we couldn't make a - if we couldn't afford it at the full price, let's - but we could afford it at a reduced price, let's go ahead and build out in say, English and other languages that don't have the presence."

That was the purpose, and you know, but what I like about this, is it really should be at no additional cost, because all we're trying to do is to capture the lower costs that ICANN should themselves be - should be seeing.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. I wonder if there's other comments on it. I do hear two cross purposes. One is, the notion of building out scripts with limited presence and one is, the notion of a (LBS) ASCII and a IDN.

So, those are slightly different topics. Also, I want to point out, that just in reading this, I've made a note up there that Line 234 in any case needs rework, 'cause agree with the idea of Working Team 2, is not necessarily language we want in the final draft.

So, I guess I get two points here. One, I hear, that we don't have full agreement on this bundling idea. And two, the language needs to be reworked.

So it strikes me that there's something in this set of lines that needs more online - on list work.

(Andrew): Avri this is (Andrew) again.

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Andrew): Can I make a suggestion?

Avri Doria: Please.

(Andrew): I think that, since everybody seems to be - seems to like the idea that there would be more build out in under served scripts...

Avri Doria: Can I stop you there? Yes. Okay, go on. Sorry.

(Andrew): I'm sorry, what I was going to suggest is, I am happy to work on the language, as I said earlier. What I am looking for is, some positive suggestions from others as to, you know, how they might like to see this.

I would like to keep it in as an option for our recommendations, not you know, something that we can throw forward that people - that the ICANN community may pick up on.

And, so if there's - if for example, Tijani, if you can get over the idea of, whether or not, this is - this folds in our mandate, whether you write the mandate more narrowly or more widely, let's try and think of some language that would be cut - that would work for you and then, I'll write it up for everybody for next time.

Avri Doria: Tijani I want to ask Tijani, if A, you agree to work with (Andrew) to try and find language that works for you both? I also might suggest that Eric get involved in that exercise, 'cause if I remember reading the list, I think Eric made a sort of detailed argument for, at least, some set - subset of cases within this category. Correct me if I'm wrong.

But, so if the three of you could agree with languages and perhaps anyone else that was interested in participating, that might be good.

(Andrew): Alex has also got a comment about this one a bunch.

Avri Doria: Okay. So what do people think?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I am okay with the proposition, but I will try, no I will ask you very kindly, that the language that you write would be very easy to understand, because sometimes what you say (Andrew) I don't understand it very well.

So try to write it in very simple English.

(Andrew): I will be happy to and to Tijani I will do you one better, if you - if it would be helpful, I would be happy to sit down with you and we can talk fresh and work it out and I will do my best to translate.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. No problem.

(Andrew): Okay. We need to find a time for that.

Avri Doria: Eric I volunteered you to participate in this. Do you accept that volunteering?

Eric are you still online? Perhaps not. We'll have to get back and ask whether Eric agrees to be volunteered.

Okay. Anything else on this set of lines or at this point, should we wait until we've seen the rewrite?

Anyone else want to contribute a notion that the people doing the rewrite have to pay attention to?

Okay, then hopefully seeing something on the list will be good.
Hopefully, if it can get there at least by Monday, so people have had a chance to look, we can put that - looking at that language if Evan's agreeable at the top of the agenda, before getting into the comments on Tuesday.

(Andrew): It works for me.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay then. Moving on, we are now at other recommendations. So, I guess we'll go through these one set at a time.

First of all, 241, 242, yes Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, we have spoken about that, this 50%, do you remember?

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah let's - get there in a second. First of all, any comments on the first two lines that we have agreed on a set of principles in quotes, so we're fine with that remaining the case?

First, on 240, we probably don't want to question mark after other recommendations.

So I would strike the question mark in 240. Karla?

Karla Valente: Done.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Okay, so 241, 242. Okay Tijani 243, 245.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. This 50% we - I think we decided, we discussed that and that was - I don't say that was in agreement, but there was a lot of support

to - for not putting 50%, because I don't know why - why 50%. Why not 60? Why not 20?

Do you remember the discussion?

Avri Doria: Yes, I remember a discussion and I don't remember it actually landing anywhere specific yet. I think normally people say that if you're getting support, it shouldn't be for the majority, you know, it should be, but I do remember a discussion. Would others like to weigh in on this, because I don't remember it having terminated with a conclusion?

(Andrew)?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: May I?

Avri Doria: Yes Tijani, yeah you still want to go on?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, please. May I give an example? Suppose you have, for example, (Amharic) community that wants to apply for (unintelligible). And that - they don't have half of the cost.

And they have everything to be helped, everything. They have the need. They have everything, everything. All our criterias are well for them. Shall we prevent them from having support, because they can't have 50% of the support?

Suppose they can have 40% of the support they need. Support - suppose they don't have even the 40%? I don't say that they don't have to put some money, but they - some applicants really are in need and they don't - they can't have half of the cost.

Avri Doria: Understood. Okay. I think the question is understood. I've got (Andrew) and Alan and Rafik. Okay, (Andrew), Alan and Rafik. Go ahead (Andrew).

(Andrew): Okay. First of all, Tijani I understand your concern and I think it's a very legitimate one. I think that the - we should make some sort of a vision for exceptions to the rule.

The reason we had - and the 50%, I remember from our conversations earlier, that we all agreed that the 50% was an arbitrary thing. I think that it makes sense to have some sort of number down though, because, number one, with limited resources we don't want to be on the hook. We don't want to be obligated to have people, you know, to offer support on an ongoing basis if it should be needed to too many applicants.

And we think here - remember also, that the 50% can be 50% that you have or that you raise. The other - so for example, if you had 20% yourself and you had 30% that you could bring in from another source, that would be fine. That would get you to your 50%, as long as, you had - which is the other piece, some sort of a sustainability plan.

My big concern would be that a group that could only find 13%, might not be very sustainable over the long term and that's we would put good effort to something that wouldn't last and then wouldn't help the (Amharic) community.

But I have no objection whatsoever to the idea of having the ability to waive that rule on a case by case basis.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I've got Alan and then Rafik.

Alan Greenburg: Okay. (Andrew) just brought up two of the things that I wanted to mention. Number one, we talk about - ICANN support is easy to understand. You know, we're saying reduce the 50000 or whatever.

The term community support, in terms of dollars, is too vague here, because I think we're talking about community support that ICANN or somebody is going to match together after the application is submitted and that's different than an applicant coming in and saying, "The World Bank is putting up 100% of our money."

That's, you know, if the World Bank puts up the full fee, that's not asking for 50% or that's not asking for 100% community support. They're walking into it with it. And I think we need to differentiate between those two.

And to be honest, I haven't heard an awful lot of discussion about where we're going to get community support with actual dollars, as opposed to technical aide or things like or discounts.

Avri Doria: No we haven't gotten that.

Alan Greenburg: So I'm not even sure we've talked about community support in the form of actual dollars contributed. I think that....

(Andrew): Alan let me ask you a question of you, just to clarify that, if you don't mind?

Alan Greenburg: Yeah.

(Andrew): Let's say that if we were to sit down, let's say - you know, let's say that we want to do (Amharic) as an excellent example, okay. And we could go to the (Amharic) community and find either an entrepreneur or a community group, right.

Let's say that we - let's say that it was not 100% self financing, but that individual, individuals or that group were then to go to the African Unity, the World Bank, the Government of Sweden, somebody who might want to contribute in additional money.

I guess my feeling is, is as long as it not - as long as they come to the table having mobilized the resources themselves, so that with not the obligation of this community, as long as they mobilized, you know, 50% or more, they can do - you know, if someone gives them a grant or they win the lottery, I am...

Alan Greenburg: (Andrew) we're violently agreeing with each other.

(Andrew): Okay. Good enough. I just wanted to make sure I understood you. That's all.

Alan Greenburg: I just want to make sure we're using the term we, when they say, "We go", when you said at the beginning of your intervention, "We go some outside support groups", that doesn't mean they. That's the applicant.

(Andrew): That's the applicant.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenburg: We're not...

Avri Doria: Excuse me.

Alan Greenburg: Okay. All agreed.

Avri Doria: Excuse me. Okay, yeah we've gotten people talking over each other.

Alan Greenburg: Okay, can I finish? I'm almost done.

Avri Doria: Okay, please.

Alan Greenburg: Okay. Okay. We may identify the World Bank, the X, the Y, the Zed, a potential sources, but I don't think we have any intent, we being ICANN of trying to match up the applicants with the donors for finance. I hope we don't.

That's not a business we want to be in, I don't think.

So I'm not sure where this 50% comes from. Who are we thinking other than ICANN itself in subsidization or reduction of fees is going to support this process?

So I think the 50 is probably too high, too low a number and certainly it doesn't have to be any higher.

Avri Doria: Well, if I'm understanding what you've said and I'm only bringing this up as a question and then I go to Rafik and I guess Tijani has his hand back up, is that I'm not even sure that we have agreement on A being

there, because what you guys sounded like you were saying, is if somebody can go around and they can raise charitable funding from Group A, Group B and Group C that matches it all, you know, who is anybody to say, "Well, you can't do that?"

That strikes me. And so even if ICANN were giving some aide or helping to put somebody together with some aide, getting involved in that, how many percent you get from where and how you build up your funding, whether charitable or not, so I'm not even sure that we're agreeing that A should be there.

But anyhow.

Alan Greenburg: Well, at most I would say, that there - you know, there's going to be, I won't use the word marginal, but there's going to be minimal financial support. It may be \$50000 or something, but it - whatever it is, is going to be well defined at the beginning of the process.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay. Thank you. Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. First I think when we talk about, of course we are talking about the fees and then it can be maybe after the reduction, etc., then it would be 50% of the cost of fees after subsidization or reduction.

But, the main point about self financing possibility, if I take the example of start up companies, it's more how much, if - especially in the case of entrepreneur how much the entrepreneur invests with his own money or - so like for example, he should at least 5 or 10%.

Then we don't need to talk how much the ICANN or the community will support. So we should just focus in self financing possibility specifically and particular for the case of entrepreneur and then how much he should invest, then we are sure that he is not just trying to help support but also to make him more responsible.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. I've got two more hands up on this, but I'd like to recommend and then I'll get to the two hands, that we bracket A for the moment and think of what the wording needs to be there, because it's not a simple wordsmithing that we're looking at, I think.

Yes, okay Tijani put his down. I've got (Andrew).

(Andrew): Okay. I will be brief and hopefully, this will be helpful. Rafik makes a good point. We're not talking about the full price, we're talking about the discounted price. Fair enough, right.

So let's say that the discounted price is 100 and what we're looking to do is to have some sort of accountability such that the applicant contributes some portion of, and it may be 50% of what is remaining.

If it is, the way that I have it, at least, in my own head, and the way that I think I'm understanding it from our group, is whether they have it from their own resources or they raise it themselves from other sources, we're indifferent.

It - the idea is only that any actual funding that needs to take place, isn't mostly from this mechanism. And I don't know if that's clear, but that's the general - that was the idea that I thought we had.

Avri Doria: Right. Thank you. I think that that's largely what a lot of people are saying. Tijani and then I'd like to close this one, because I think this one needs some list time.

But Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, just to say that I am okay with 50% of the remaining cost. That's all.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. So yeah, so I'll put this one out on the list also for some on list rework and wordsmithing, 'cause it's not something we're going to get done here.

Moving on,...

Karla Valente: So what I'm doing is, just bracket it.

Avri Doria: Yeah, just bracket A and that will remind us that A needs work.

Two forty six through 249 Sunset Period, were there any comments?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: One moment.

Avri Doria: No comment on B? Okay. Two fifty to 251, transparency? Any comment?

No comment. Okay. Two fifty two through 255, application form is not limited.

That's our whole - is that one still needed, since we've gotten explicit about not excluding them or is that still useful to have?

And I understand that various people were confused by the wording. What do people think? Does that stay in, just because it's good clarification?

I see no comments, so we'll leave it in. Alan the X means you don't think we should leave it in or you do think we should leave it in?

Alan Greenburg: Okay, I think it's confusing and doesn't really add anything given the rest of our changes.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Does anyone object to re - I mean, does anyone object to removing D? I see no one objecting, so I would remove it for now. I would remove it, not for now, unless there's future objections of removing it, but I would delete it.

No objections to deleting it? Karla can you mark it for deletion?

Karla Valente: Okay. I was only deleting D completely.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Thank you. Obviously, it'll still be there as deleted, so if someone not on this call has a, you know, a problem with it, they can speak up.

Okay, we only have ten minutes left folks. Two fifty six through 258, limited government support.

Okay, any objections to that the way it's worded now? I think that one got lots of discussion in the past and this should express what was covered.

Okay. Two fifty nine through 262, repayment in success cases. Any comment or issues with that wording?

Okay. Good. That one leave.

Now, 263 to 269, we had additional questions. Certainly, I think 263 through 269 has additional questions needs to come out of the document. However, we have the two questions and we need to make sure that they've been covered or not covered.

Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, before going to that additional questions, I wanted to mention that we discussed a plan - the issue of the financial contingency instruments and I don't find any mention of this in this - in our recommendations.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: They was a very long discussion, very - a lot of people had - was in support to put it in the report, so I don't why it is not here.

Avri Doria: I guess because nobody produced any text and gave it. So...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I can...

(Andrew): Can you say again? Can you say again what you're talking about? I'm sorry Tijani, I didn't understand it.

Avri Doria: That's right. Good point.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, I can. We discussed at length the issue of the financial contingency instruments, in case of a (unintelligible).

And there is no mention on this issue in this report. So, I will produce text for that. I will send it on the list and perhaps we will discuss it the next time.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yeah. Please do. And the - also the question does it belong in this section or does it perhaps belong in a different section would be a question to be dealt with.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes, yes.

Avri Doria: I think it might not belong in this other recommendation, but might belong in financial recommendations or somewhere else.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Perhaps. Perhaps. I...okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. So back to 263 to 269 and thank you Tijani for bringing that up and for volunteering to write some text. We have eight minutes left.

Additional questions and possible responses. So as I say, the section has to disappear. Does anybody disagree with the section disappearing?

I don't see any...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I am in favor.

Avri Doria: Okay. Then we have - can we offer subsidized plans of support? And there's the question - this will become clearer over time, but standardizing packages of support should help reduce support costs.

So, did we ever include anything in the financial instruments that had that? I don't believe we have yet, but there have been discussions on it, so perhaps we need some text contributed for that in another section and then question, is there is a minimum number of people in a community needed to create critical mass for viability?

And there was extensive document discussion around this, but no consensus. I think we're a little less community bound, because the difficulty of defining community, so that's one of the places where we've broadened the discussion, but of course, now we're talking about you know, the funnel constricting.

So if anything, this consideration needs to go into some of the discussion that we've had about you know, expectations and the size of the funnel which I was going to put as a issue to the list.

So perhaps I will include this question when I'm writing this up later, and it won't be until this evening that I can get to it.

Basically saying, that this is one of the considerations in the size of a funnel. Is that an acceptable way to go with it? (Andrew) I see your hand up.

(Andrew): Yes. Avri this is one that came up in, I think, it was February or whenever, excuse me, but not February but in April or something. So I think we've gone past it at this stage.

If we look at the need - the combination of the need test, the viable business, you know, viable sustainability plan test, we probably don't need this any longer in my opinion.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. I think you're probably right. I may include it in what I send on the list, just to make sure that everyone feels that way too, but I think you're probably right on it.

So, Karla in terms of 263 through 269, that gets deleted. And then we'll cover the questions elsewhere if there's more content to be added.
Okay?

Karla Valente: Done.

Avri Doria: Okay. Then there's the next steps piece that I've put in 274 through 290 that I believe still needs discussion and we haven't gotten to that yet, and I think that we have to finish our first steps to know what exactly our next steps are, but I'd like to ask at this point, if there are any issues that should be fixed for the next version of the draft?

Okay.

(Andrew): What was your last question? I didn't follow it Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, basically what I'm saying is, this section next steps is one that I've contributed that hasn't gotten much editing or much discussion yet, which I think is fine, because we have to finish the current steps we're on to know exactly what the next steps should be, but I wanted to get a placeholder in place.

So I'm not suggesting we dive into this deeply at this moment, but if anyone has any comments as to what should be fixed, changed, or added, now to this placeholder, you know, comment please.

Otherwise, we'll come back to this again later. Okay.

In which case, I think then we get to the part that we have nothing to talk about, the charter, which is the charter. And we've got the milestones which are the milestones.

Then we've got the Annex B, the relevant resolution, which there's nothing to say about. And then we've got the Annex C, which we still have more discussion to have at another point on the structure of the document, but it's including a description of what would be as a companion document and then the other documents that are in the Web page that describe all these pieces.

And I'd like to leave that discussion alone for the moment, acknowledging that there's an open discussion there based on a point Tijani brought through about exactly how we present this, but I'd like to get that for another point.

So, we made it to 11:27. I think we've made it through the document. We've...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Hello. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Now we're okay.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I fell off for a second, but we've made it through the end to the document. We've made it to the end of meeting.

I've got a couple of things that I'm going to send out discussions on the list, including expectation size of funnel. There's the issue of brands and groups, self supporting where we have some bracketed language and some work to be done.

There's the question of whether we want to recommend the facts, looking at the facts sheet is that enough? There's the whole rewording of the 243 through 244 on financial rewording and then there's the issue of financial contingency instruments that Tijani said he would offer some text for.

I see Tijani with his hand up. Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Thank you. I'd like to draw your attention that (Elaine) has prepared the problematic. She sent it on the list and I want to thank her first and we have to look at this text. I think (Andrew) said that we need only one text and I think he's right.

So, this is a point that you have to look at for the next meeting also.

Avri Doria: Okay. Great. So as long as Evan is fine with putting that on the agenda, I think that makes sense to put that on the agenda.

(Andrew): Actually Karla are - could - would it be possible just to make sure that this gets on agenda that gets put out for Monday or for Tuesday?

Karla Valente: Sure.

Avri Doria: Right. Yeah. If the agenda gets out for Monday, I think that yeah, and I think the three of us need to make sure that we've got all the things right for the agenda.

(Andrew): Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. Any other issues at this point? In which case, with one minute to go, I close the meeting. I thank you all for a very productive meeting and good weekends all.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Avri.

Avri Doria: Bye, bye.

END