

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 12 October 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) Tuesday 12 October 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/gnsso/gnsso-jas-20101012-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

ALAC

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

GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison
Andrew Mack – CBUC
Avri Doria – NCSG – Co-Chair
Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachine

ICANN staff

Glen de Saint G ry
Karla Valente

Apologies:

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Eric Brunner-Williams – Individual
Alex Gakuru – NCSG
Tony Harris – ISPC

Coordinator: Excuse me. It's the operator. Just need to inform all participants that today's conference call is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. And you may begin.

Man: Okay.

Glenn de Saint Gery: Thank you (Laurie). Shall I go ahead with the roll call Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Please do.

Glenn de Saint Gery: Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the 12th of October. And on the call we have Tinjani Ben Jemaa, Rafik Dammak, Karli Valente, Baudouin Schombe - sorry, he had not joined yet. In fact, he says he will be a bit late - Alan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch, Elaine Pruis, Avri Doria and I - sorry, I was thinking Tony Harris was going to join us but he's not. And we have apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, from Eric Brunner-Williams and Alex Gakuru.

Would you please all say your name before you speak for purposes of the transcription? Thank you very much and on - sorry - first off we have Karla Valente and myself, Glenn de Saint Gery. Thank you very much Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Quick question - for Elaine, is - do we have - is she either on the call or apologies or...

Glenn De Saint Gery: She's on the call.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. All right.

Glenn de Saint Gery: Ela- yes, Elaine's on the call.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay great. Okay. I guess what I wanted to do first was find out what the status is of the (doodle poll) that we were going to take of our working group members to ensure that we've got a fairly complete consensus on these things we've been discussing on the call.

Is there anyone here from staff who can tell me what's going on with the status of the (doodle poll)?

Avri Doria: I don't know if Karla wants to jump in. As far as I know - this is Avri - as far as I understand, Karla sent you and I an initial set of what she thought were the

questions and I think that's as far as it's gotten. I do not think we have actually ever started the (doodle poll).

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Then my apologies. And one thing that I will (submit) to immediately after getting off this call is getting to that as quickly as possible. I've sort of been out of touch for a good chunk of the weekend.

Okay so just to make - just the rest of the members of this call, please be on the lookout hopefully within the next 24 hours for a (doodle poll) that will be asking your opinion on the issues within our discussions that did not meet full consensus that Avri and I want to get a better sense within the group of the extent to which we have either consensus- complete consensus significant consensus with significant difference or significant divergence of opinion.

So please be on the watch for that. And so we will be tackling that. And then discuss the results of that on the next (meeting). It was my understanding that we would be spending today talking about some of the public comments.

Avri Doria: I'm not - this is Avri - I hope I'm not confusing things but I thought we had actually planned to - because we don't have the comments. Karla hasn't been able to sent those out yet - that we were going to be dealing with some of the yet - the changes I made last time. Also we did finally get the email from (Andrew) and Eric on the issue of language which is the - is it the open issue of the price reductions to encourage the build out of IDN.

And so I was wondering - but there're two options in it. And it came too late for me to cut it into the document that I just sent out last night, although I - the one I had sent - basically a version of the one I sent out right after the meeting. Not right after the meeting but a few hours after the meeting. And then I sent out another copy last night.

But this came in after that so I have not cut it in but I was suggesting or I'd like to suggest that we review that here because there're two separate

positions. I have no idea of (them all) and this is basically the - I think the -
and if (Andrew's) on the call...

(Andrew): I am Avri. I just joined. Sorry, (was a little late).

Avri Doria: Okay great. And by the way, anybody - I'm also doing the - letting people into
Adobe stuff so if I was supposed to have let you in, like (Andrew) and I
haven't yet, then just let me know that I should look at my screen for the little
box that says accept.

(Andrew): Just coming up now.

Avri Doria: Right. I just saw you. So anyhow, I'd like to go through that first. What I'd like
to do is, depending on how quickly we get through that topic, basically cut
that into the document. If we have any time, just quickly go through the
changes I did make in the document. Some of them were, you know, from the
past meeting just - and then we cut the poll from that including this issue
because my feeling is just as the co-authors of this have had a divergence of
opinion, so too may the group.

So it'll be good to find out whether there is divergence, whether there's
consensus for one side, you know, so basically this is one of the issues that
probably should be included in any poll we do so it might be a blessing that it
didn't.

In terms of the comment document, Karla at the beginning of the call, says
she has that ready to send out so that should be able to be sent out in
enough time for people to have read it and for it to discuss at the next
meeting assuming we're fine with the, you know, with this document. Out of
breath.

So I don't know if that's okay with people as an agenda, so the agenda at the
moment which I have updated in Note 5 on your screen was the attendance,

the polling for SOI DOI and I'm assuming that since nobody said anything everybody's SOI DOI is perfect with no changes from ever.

And there was review the mail sent by (Andrew). And then there's continue the walk through but this is of 2-15-3. Is that okay? And I'll turn it back over to you on agenda. I'm sorry to be so disagreeable.

Evan Leibovitch: Not disagreeable at all. It's just sort of - okay, well if that's the case then Avri, could you put...

Avri Doria: (Eric's)...

Evan Leibovitch: Could you put...

Avri Doria: (Andrew's) message is up.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So...

Avri Doria: And perhaps somebody should read it for anybody that doesn't have it in front of them. Or does everybody have it in front of them and then I can just ask (Andrew) to talk it through?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And then we have a mail from Eric. Yes, sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: (Andrew), why don't I just give you the..

Woman: I don't have Adobe Connect so - then I'm driving. So if you could read it that would be great.

Avri Doria: Okay, so (Andrew), would you like to read your mail or would you like me to read it, read Eric's response and then you talk?

(Andrew): As you like. I'm...

Avri Doria: Well what do you - what would you prefer?

(Andrew): Why don't you go ahead and read it.

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Andrew): And then I'll talk to it so that I don't have - you don't even have to hear me too much.

Avri Doria: Okay so - yes. Okay, so basically the working off of the following language. The working group work...

(Andrew): Avri, if I could - let me just (refrain) for a second.

Avri Doria: Okay certainly.

(Andrew): At - because I think it's meaningful. At the end of the last few sessions, we were trying very hard to come up with some sort of a position that captured what everybody was looking for. The - effectively that benefits all. And we spent now, I don't know, two or three hours at least trying to run through this.

I think we've gotten some far forward in the sense that we're very much agreed on our end goals. It - the challenge that we can (deface) is that the mechanism for opening this up as much as possible, on the one hand, and avoiding capture on the other hand, is a difficult one. And so this language was an attempt to try and capture where we are right now but this has been - it's starting out to be a very, very - this is no- this is very much a non-confrontational kind of thing.

We put all of our thoughts together - down together and I think we're very much of the same mind. We're just unable to find a mechanism to make the two come together. And we're hoping that the group could help us with that.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. And by the way, my first take on where I would cut this or something that's derived from it into the document would be in Section 25, other types of aid. If that's wrong, please comment on that too as this conversation moves along.

So the working group recommends support for price reductions to encourage the build out IDN in small or underserved languages with the exact amount and timing of the support to be determined.

One way this might be accomplished is through bundling of applications. And the working group recognizes the precedence for this in the cases of multi strings for China to solve the SCTC equivalence problem which of course we would need to spell out (SCT City), multi strings for Saudi Arabia to solve Arabic scripts variant (territory) problems, multi strings for Greece to solve the Greek (tonos) problems.

On the question of who should be eligible for this assistance, there were two opinions within the group - A, that each applicant must be a party associated with or resident in the language community, an organization, NGO or local companies from the script language community. Or, B, that applicants from inside or outside the community seeking to offer service in an underserved script language are eligible for support.

And then - okay, all working group members agree that this support should encourage the advancement of the language community while also encouraging competition to the greatest extent possible.

Okay that's the current state of the text. Obviously on issues like the working group recommends, I would end up putting in the language there was consensus, there was poll, there was strong support, et cetera. Also with the two options, unless we got full consensus on either A or B, which I admit would shock me just from conversations we've had, I would think that we would end up with a different consensus marker on each and that's one of the reasons while maintaining my reservation about polls with this group having agreed that it wants to do a poll for some of these pending issues, that this would be a useful thing to have polls on insofar as polls may be equal.

Should I read Eric's comments or actually let you talk first, (Andrew), and then if there's anything to add I can read in Eric's comments who sent an email with his apologies.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually Avri, can I make a quick suggestion here?

Avri Doria: Of course you can. You're chair of the meeting.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, okay, I wanted to just take off my chair hat for a second to state an opinion on this. I don't think that these are two mutually exclusive options. I think what we have is from the sounds of it that when we say inside or outside that includes inside.

So I think if we want to state it in our traditional way that we've been putting this forward, I'd say we have pretty full consensus on A and we're trying to determine the level of divergence on B because it sounds like B is inclusive of A. So I don't think they're mutually exclusive.

(Andrew): I'm trying to raise my hand but I'm - it doesn't seem to be wanting to make it, so.

Avri Doria: Okay I...

(Andrew): Can I jump in?

Avri Doria: Please go ahead. I mean, sorry. (Unintelligible)

(Andrew): Thank you. Thank you Evan thank you Avri. I agree. There's no question that everyone - I think everyone wants A and the question is - and the issue that we can't - if you see down at the bottom below the - let's see, what I have is - what I have down is the following text in - for those of you who can't read it, it says generally agree that A may be too now.

We're all agreeing that A is a good idea but that it may be too now and that there may be some value in having a (unintelligible) for groups other than those organic groups (springing) from the community. And at the same time that B may be too broad. We don't want it to be, you know, subject to capture.

So I guess my thought is, Evan, is that if we could expand out A a little bit then B would go away entirely and we'd have more or less of a consensus opinion.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...define that even slightly further. C, how broad a consensus we can get on A so that we can narrow the points on which we have divergence. We may not totally bridge that gap but at least lets see how broad a consensus we can get and but still continue to state those things on which we may continue to have disagreement.

I don't know if we're going to be able to wrap everything into one thing that'll have complete consensus because we clearly have some difference of opinion on...

(Andrew): Okay. Fair enough. We were trying to get as much in - as promised, we were trying to get as much of a compromise position as we possibly could.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay keep going.

(Andrew): Oh no. So the general idea was that - is that certainly (four) groups within the - that grow organically from the community, groups of whatever sort - so it could be a business or it could be a community group or any other form of organization. I think there was general agreement about that.

And the question really was in the case of a non-community actor that expressed an interest where there wasn't an early mover from the community, would be - would the non-community actor offering service to the community still be eligible? And there we saw pros and cons to that. The pros being that we were concerned that if there was nothing in the language for around or an extended period of time, but that could be a real deleterious effect to the language script on the Web further digital divide issues. And at that same time there was that risk of capture from an outside entity.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

(Andrew): Does that make sense for everyone?

Evan Leibovitch: It does. I'll comment in a second but both Tinjani and Avri have their hands up. (Dejonny), you've been in the queue longer. Avri, is your point procedural or an opinion.

Avri Doria: No, if it was procedural I'd probably just cut in. That's why I raised my hand.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, well then Tinjani was first and then you and then Alan. Tinjani, go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jamaa: Yes thank you. I will ask for your understanding here because I know how dear is this idea for (Andrew) - my friend (Andrew) and I tried to - I try - that's right. I tried to be supportive to the - to what I can support from this idea but

after the decision of the board and it's (retreat) in (Oland), I become to be more (skeptic), more - it is difficult.

They are rejecting everything so if we put inside at the second level, first level of the kind of support was the fee reduction. The second level is this point. So if we put it like this we - there is a big risk that we will - we'll all lose because they will say us we asked you to (sway) - to see how we can help the needy applicants, not the underserved languages.

So I would like to put this point not in this position, in another position, a position after all these kinds of supports because if we put it here, that means that it is of very high importance for us and I think we will have a problem with that.

We can put it as a remark as something that we can add but it is not the ma- it's not our mission, if you want. It's not our mandate they gave us. They gave us the mandate to see how we can help the needy applicants not how to help the underserved languages.

And I understand very, very well that the underserved languages have to be helped but it's not inside this report. I want to remind you that I did this remark outside this group. The remark that the (bandlet), the strengths have to be treated as the fast track (certificate) - the idea. It's exactly the same. Why they were paying nothing - something very low.

Why now they have to pay \$185,000? So I am aware of the problem. I feel it but it is not here. It's not in this working group. It's not in this, if you want, (circumference). Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: So Tinjani, if I read you write, just to keep going, this goes to some of our original discussions. It said as valid and important as this point is, it is not completely a scope and probably should be going into an appendix as

opposed to the core document itself. Is that - did - do I read you as still supporting that point of view?

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: You are right. That's what I mean.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. (Andrew), do you have a response to that?

(Andrew): Well obviously we've just talked about this on a number of occasions. Given the amount of time we've spent on this and I think the importance of the issue I would recommend against it. I understand Tinjani's point. We've discussed it before.

I recognize that there is a possibility that they're going to reject every single thing that we say. In fact, to some extent they've already done it. I think that leads me to suggest that we should ask for everything that we would like because if they're going to listen to any of it, they may more likely listen to all of it.

I don't think that any one piece is going to lead to a rejection of all of it by the board since they're already expressed their skepticism about discussing any of it, but that's my opinion.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Avri and then Alan. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. First of all, one of my questions was when (Andrew) was speaking of it, he talked of there being, you know, full consensus on it. And I was just going to sort of dispute that but of course Tinjani has done that very well before me. So this is not something that we have full consensus on in the first place.

The second place, I'm seeing two issues sort of convoluted here and then there's a prior condition. Let me go to the prior condition. First of all we said for any aid there is a primary issue of meeting the financial need barrier.

Now I don't understand this to be saying this is a type of aid we're suggesting for people who don't meet the financial need. And if I'm wrong about that understanding, I need to be corrected. I'm assuming like everything else in the report that financial need comes first and then this becomes one possible remedy for those who meet that and the wording would need to be changed to say that if that is indeed correct.

The second here is by using - it's not a whereas clause but it kind of acts as a whereas clause, that the wheth- the variance examples, the - that were given - China, Saudi Arabia and Greece - that were examples of scripts where it was absolutely necessary for political or cultural reasons to support both kinds of Chinese characters, the simple or the traditional.

It was necessary to support the variances in Saudi Arabia, not specifically because they were underserved languages but because the population used both interchangeably therefore the issue needed to be dealt with in order to reasonably do a domain name in those language/scripts.

And then we're sort of saying these are examples from the CTLD - CC - IDN CCTLD land of why we are suggesting some kind of bundling here. So the bundling here, if those really are our precedence is not simply because it's an underserved language but because it's an underserved language - an IDN underserved language.

And, in fact, all IDNs are underserved at this point so that's sort of an interesting issue in itself. But that these are languages, and if I am offering a new TLD in Arabic or in Chinese or in Greek, it may be necessary for me to do this kind of bundling to reach my entire community because they interchangeably use these. So that could call for different wording.

If we're arguing it, it's simply because it's an underserved language, then we need a different set of whereases in the clause. And the third thing, just to

respond to Tinjani, the unfairness between, you know, IDN CCLDs and their fast track, you know, is the sovereignty issue and that ICANN, you know, as an American corporation can't charge them, that is a completely separate issue and I understand the feeling of, you know, well why them and not us.

But that's just a reality that's far beyond this group. I mean, it's one that, you know, many of us have argued about in other spaces but that's far beyond this group.

And the last thing - I know I said the last before the last thing - but the last, last thing is that we cannot with certainty say that the board has rejected everything. I know that that was my first reading. I know that that was most of our first readings.

And now as we listen to the interpretations that come out from the board of what they've said and we hear that the budget may actually have some money for setting up some fundraising or for providing some kinds of support based on some of the things that we're suggesting, I don't know what the case is anymore in terms of having been accepting or having been rejected.

So I am taking the assumption that we finish our work real soon now. We present it to them. We present it to the world. We have no idea what's going to get accepted and what's not. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay Alan, you've been very patient.

Alan Greenberg: All right, I've got a whole laundry list like (Andrew) - Avri did covering some of them but just to re- to, you know, with my twist to them. Regarding the CCTLD, I think Avri's right on. It may be completely unfair. That's life. We can't do anything about it. There's no point in using that argument at this point.

Going back to - Evan, going back to what you were saying about the A and B options, I think you're correct. I think we have consensus on A and I think B should be worded of add to that mix people who are outside the community and that's the one that we're uncertain of.

So I think if we phrase it - if we change B to just add...

Avri Doria: There was a minority (view).

Alan Greenberg: Add those outside. We have a minority view that says add those. And think it would make it a little - it would make it clearer instead of having A or B as a pick one.

On the issue Tinjani raised of needy versus underserved, I think again Avri was right on. Needy is a prerequisite so these are needy who also have the - be wanting to use an underserved or unserved IDN language community. I think - so I don't see a conflict there.

In all of our examples I believe are variance. At least some of them are ones where the variance will be deployed with multiple TLDs which are synchronized with each other. The board very explicitly in the (tran) time motion said they will - we will not at this point delegate variance which requires synchronization.

So I think we need to give some examples that do not include variance because as stated right now it sounds like we're only talking about variance and variance which will be synchronized. And I think it's going to get rejected on because of the examples instead of because of what we're saying. So I think we need to look at that.

And lastly on the issue of the board said no, Avri I don't think you're right. I don't think we interpreted the words. The words very clearly said no. However,

what (Kurt) said is what the board meant was they will not allocate anything at this time pending criteria but they are - would be receptive to the criteria.

Now in general we're not looking for a criteria. We're saying that's the next group that does that, however, serving an underserved IDN language is, in fact, a criteria. And from that perspective we may, in fact, be identifying a group who are eligible and this is the one we don't want to leave out because it may be one of the easier criteria to identify. It's not a criteria for how needy are you but it's another measure of saying that the relatively easy white/black decision on whether to - we want to help this group along or not.

Long laundry list. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay (Andrew), go ahead.

(Andrew): Well Alan thank you actually for that laundry list because I think there's - I think we're pretty much aligned. In terms of adding the language as A and then that there was a minority of people that wanted to expand A to B, I'm very comfortable with that. I think that that accurately reflects where we are.

In terms of the bundling examples, those as you can probably tell from the text were Eric's additions. I think his hope there was to show that, in fact, there was precedence for some sort of a bundled approach because he was focused on trying to get the different scripts that were part - that were related to a community to provide the opportunity for an operator to get those different scripts together such that one could offer if a community uses two different scripts, that one might be able to offer to both language - well, both script versions of that community. And I think that's where he's going with...

Evan Leibovitch: Just to cut in, that's true but because their variants, they are being eliminated from the whole pool of app- of eligible applicants for delegation never mind support in this round.

(Andrew): Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: And therefore I think we're doing them a service by...

Alan Grennberg: ...by using them as the sole example.

(Andrew): No. No. No. In which case - I take your point, and it sounds as if it would be probably better to leave out this issue entirely, if in fact we've already gone past it, right, and - or if it's not on the table for this round. And then in terms of the focus on served - underserved language, that's where we were going - that's what we were going for, and I agree completely.

And you know, I think that you know with all due respect to my good friend Tinjani - or with respect to my good friend Tinjani, part of the goal is to get these underserved languages in, and that the community has effectively become disadvantaged by not having something - you know, a presence on the Web, and that's what we're trying to address. I understand what you're saying, but I wouldn't draw the underserved - the ring around who is underserved, so now only because I think in fact it's what we've got more correctly reflects where things are.

I mean, that's it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Tinjani, do you have any response to this?

Avri Doria: Can I ask (Andrew) a quick question?

Evan Leibovitch: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: That's the person that's trying to write - this is Avri. So, you're saying that this should not be subject to the financial need requirements, or did I misunderstand?

(Andrew): The way that we have it now, and Eric and I have talked about it, and Richard and I have talked about it, and others, is that the - obviously the goal is to put as many people who are underserved in, so they would be in for sure, right. And then, were there no - the idea is that if there aren't underserved candidates that are ready to step forward, and there are other candidates that are ready to step forward, that some sort of intent - the idea that some sort of intent - if that helps them to move forward, then that's what we're looking for.

So, B would've - could apply to people who are not themselves - wouldn't normally fit into categories A through E above in the document.

Avri Doria: So in other words, the answer was yes.

(Andrew): Yes. I think that's correct.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. I was just trying to get...

(Andrew): Sorry guys. I'm just trying to be as exact as I can.

Avri Doria: Fine.

Evan Leibovitch: Alan, is your hand still up, or did you - do you have something new to say, or did you just not lower it?

Alan Grennberg: No. It's a new one, but it's in response to what (Andrew) just said. Or not in response, but I'm a little bit - I thought I understood, and now I'm not sure I do. It's really a question. At one point, we were talking about saying that people would be eligible not so much because they are poor in their own right, but this is a gTLD, which may not be self sufficient initially and need some help because of the size of the community or something. Did we end up including that? I vaguely remember we did not.

(Andrew): I think that that was the gist of our conversation, to respond, and that was - those are the kinds of people that we're trying to get to. But, we won't - as with anything, we won't necessarily know whether it becomes a self-sustaining entity or not until it gets going. What we do have is the same obligation to repay if it becomes self-sustaining as with any other.

Alan Grennberg: Okay. I thought we had eliminated that category because if it wasn't likely to be self-sustaining, it's not clear we want to create communities that we then have a problem with. But, okay. I'll...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): What about (unintelligible)?

Alan Grennberg: Let's just go back...

(Andrew): Sorry.

Alan Grennberg: Let's go back to Tinjani. I'm introducing red herrings perhaps. Go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay. I am really embarrassed because I feel what (Andrew) is feeling now, but I have a big problem with my conscience. I am sorry. Because, I am - if you want, very convinced that anything we have to recommend here must be for people who need assistance, as it is written in the Recommendation 20 and the (Revision 20). So, if - before people who need assistance, we would recommend for them to reduce the price of the IDN scripts for underserved languages, but not for the others.

(Andrew): So Tinjani, you're objectively saying you support A and not B?

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: I support everything which is with - for the people who need assistance, yes. Yes.

(Andrew): Okay.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: I have just - just so people know, I have been listening and trying to recross the language, and I want to see if I'm getting anywhere close. I see Alan has his hand up (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Grennberg: No, sorry. I just didn't put it down.

Avri Doria: Okay. I've put in the note - I've put it in as 263, which on the current numbering means it's on other types of aid, so it's already in that other basket that has vertical integration and stuff like that in it. And basically, it - as we worded it, I included the subject - the requirements of meeting the support, well I have to fix the wording. "The working group recommends (work) for price reductions to encourage build out of IDNs (explore) on the shared languages, with the exact amount and timing of the support to be determined. One way this might be accomplished, this (unintelligible) of applications."

So in that first paragraph, I have repegged it as I think Tinjani is arguing, and then perhaps others have been presuming, including myself, to do that. Then, I have, "There was consensus/strong support for requiring that each applicant must be (part of the) associated with the resident in language community," et cetera. I left that one pretty much alone, other than changing it to consensus from support, depending on what comes out.

Then, I added, "There was a minority view that applicants from," oh, that should be outside this community. Sorry. "From outside," actually, it could be inside or out, but, "seeking - including those," let's phrase it, "including those who may not meet the need requirement for support, could also be able to

offer service in an underserved script language are eligible for support.” Need to fix the sentence. Obviously, reading it out loud, always a good edit.

But what I’m trying to do there is sort of divide the issue into one side that is basically accepting it with a binary set of conditions. One, that they meet the requirement for support. And two; that they are from within the community.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Good.

Avri Doria: And then, a minority view that sort of says, and perhaps I need two minority views. One that yes, it’s okay, even if they’re from outside the community but meets the financial condition. And then perhaps if a third one that says - and if some - there’s a minority view also that it’s okay even if they’re from outside - inside or outside, and do not meet the financial, and there’s probably different sized minorities on that.

But basically to cut the issue up so that if -- and please Tinjani, correct me if I’m putting words in your mouth -- that you would accept this idea for those who meet the conditions of need, but that you’re uncomfortable with it for those who don’t need to dip into that. So, they can basically - that can be indicated that those who need it - for those with need and community, but not for needy but not community. And then finally, for those that say anybody who wants to help build out one of these should get a pat on the back and should get a hand up in doing it.

And so, this - all three views can be expressed and we go on. Obviously I have words missing to do, but that’s what I am trying to get to. And I’m finished, and thank you for listening to me.

Evan Leibovitch: Avri, I’ve got one question, and it’s actually I guess addressing (Andrew). (Andrew), is a possibility that maybe we can find some common ground between the A and B with maybe just a little bit of a change in wording? (Unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): Actually, we're trying.

Evan Leibovitch: Having an outside organization try and serve an underserved community without the support of the community itself seems like something that might have grounds for opposition. But what about just saying if an out - you know if an outside organization comes in, but it has the full support of the community it's trying to serve, doesn't that make a - you know, doesn't that sort of cross that boundary?

If an outside organization, you know let's say a VeriSign wants to serve a tiny little community, if they do it without the support of the community, well then that's - you know, that could be...

(Andrew): That wouldn't work.

Evan Leibovitch: (Agree).

(Andrew): And, that's certainly not the intent, right?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry?

(Andrew): I said that I agree that that wouldn't work, and that's certainly not the intent.

Evan Leibovitch: Then, can we not put in wording into A that says that it - that something that is either by a community or with its full support would be okay, and then we wouldn't need B.

(Andrew): Okay. I like the idea a lot. My only question - we tried to go there and I think you're closer than we were. I ran into two challenges, and maybe we just leave it a little bit mushy and go on. The challenges are in instances where

for example you have a divided language community, or where you have government trying to expropriate the language community space. And we were thinking about language scripts like Amharic, where the government currently is pretty weak in terms of its ICT policy and may not necessarily be in alignment with the kinds of people who might be interested in building out the script, such as members of the (unintelligible) community who themselves are divided.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. I agree (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): And, I happen to know this one a little bit, because there's a big Amharic community in Washington.

So, I'm - I think what you're going for is much better than what I have, and I'm happy to go there, I'm just wondering if there's a...

Evan Leibovitch: No, the thing is all those issues about fragmentation of community or whatever are already attempted to be dealt with in the guide book through you know, the whole community procedure.

(Andrew): Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: It already acknowledges the fact you may have multiple communities that either are competing for or at odds over a string. And so, there's already mechanisms within the Applicant Guide Book to try and deal with that kind of thing, you know the point system and all that stuff.

So, I'm not too worried...

(Andrew): So, the question is - let's say there's a desire to do like a .org or something like that, right? Then, PIR would need to go to get approval from the community, depending on - and then - and (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Well, .org is a bad example, because there's no well defined community that way, okay.

(Andrew): Okay. But...

Evan Leibovitch: Let's just say - let's go back to your example, okay, the Amharic. Okay, that there is - if there is a defined community that uses the culture and language, or even if there's one of many communities that has significant grass root support, even if it's not the only one, at least an outside organization with their backing is a lot more important than an outside organization trying to do this without any community backing.

(Andrew): I mean, as long as we can make it so that a potential applicant who is trying to support these communities can actually get the - you know, the backing, whatever mechanism that is, I just want to make it so that it's...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: (Unintelligible).

(Andrew): ...operational.

Evan Leibovitch: Then, how do you know they're in good faith trying to support the community? If they can't get the backing of the community, then to me, that's almost...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): (Unintelligible), I'm sorry. Perhaps I misspoke. What I meant to say is all I think a potential applicant would need to know is, "What's the process for me to go through so that I can get this?" so that it's a knowable thing, that's all.

Evan Leibovitch: The vague answer is get community buy in and what defines a community is shown elsewhere in the Applicant Guide Book. Anyway, that's my piece. I think we can actually bridge this. I see Alan and Tinjani's hand up, so go ahead Alan.

Alan Grennberg: Okay, Evan. I like what you're saying of putting into A a statement - another or, and that or I think should be something like with the explicit support of that language community.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Alan Grennberg: I think B is a loser right now because of the phrase in it that says they don't need financial support. This whole thing is tenuous as people pointed out. We don't have Board support yet, and we might get Board support if we can come up with solid enough criteria which should not open the barn door too wide. Adding in that we might do this for VeriSign or PIR, both of which are making profits, I think is going to damage our overall case.

And, I guess I feel that we're not coming up with the perfect long-term package here. We're trying to get something that will be accepted by the Board to help some people. And, if it leaves out a few people who maybe really should've been helped but we can't make the criteria solid enough or the work solid enough, then so be it. It's not perfect.

So, I would definitely leave out the criteria of not needing support in this case. I think with the inclusion of the explicit community support in A, we no longer have a B and there's no two options.

So, I think we can come to closure on this quickly, but we're - recognize, we're not trying to find something perfect that covers every possible case. We're trying to get something solid enough that so we can get some support from the Board on it.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I'd like to get (Andrew)'s comment on that, but I've got Tinjani's hand up and Avri's hand up. So, Tinjani are you following up on this?

Avri Doria: And, mine is to offer a wording change that I have (up there). I just want to make sure people notice it. I've tried to capture what was said, and I - so...

Evan Leibovitch: We'll go to - I'm trying to - where is this? At the bottom of...

Avri Doria: No. It's in the note at the top there.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: And, the note at the top there just says 263, subject to the requirements.

Man: I just - I don't have that up.

Avri Doria: It's been there...

Evan Leibovitch: I've got a note window, but it's extremely small, so I can only - (unintelligible)...

Avri Doria: Okay. If you - oh, okay. So, it's - I can read it to people.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Well, hold on. I'd like to hear from...

Avri Doria: ...(unintelligible) put in the document.

Evan Leibovitch: ...and then (Andrew) again before going through that wording.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Tinjani go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: It's me?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Thank you. Evan, the condition of the support of the community is already in the DAG. If they don't have the support of the community, they will not have the string. So, we don't have to put it I think. And, I prefer what Avri said at the beginning, three levels, and we have to see who will support which level. And, I think that it's much better than include everything in one paragraph, and then we will not have consensus at all.

Evan Leibovitch: So, you're saying we should not even - we should not put into A that an outside body with the explicit support of a community should - is still outside the scope of what we have agreement on in A. Is that what...

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Evan, the support of the community is one condition.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: So, we don't have to put it at - people who doesn't have the agreement will not - the support will not the string anyway, so...

Evan Leibovitch: No Tinjani, I understand that, but I'm just trying to say if we've got this clause in A that says you know, that a community - you know, what entitles a community to support? If it is - if it has demonstrated the need and it is either proposed by the community or proposed by an outside body with explicit support of the community, then it can go on.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay, like this it's not a problem.

Evan Leibovitch: That's all I'm asking for in A, is to make it explicit. Maybe it is indeed said elsewhere that if - you know, if it doesn't have community support then it's a non-starter. I'm just saying that if we're adding in a small bit of wording to allow B to go away and put together an A on which we can have consensus. It makes it clearer to support I think for some people if we say an outside body with explicit community support, even though that may be stated elsewhere, we can emphasize it here as to make sure we're not trying to enable somebody to come in from the outside and capture a community without its support.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay. With the need - the criteria of the need at the top.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

Okay, Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. So, I'll quickly read what I'm proposing put in, and then it's something that can go into your poll.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. And by the way, since we're only three minutes from the hour, I think we've basically you know, swallowed up the time.

Avri Doria: Right.

Evan Leibovitch: So I mean, let's at least resolve what we've got here, get some new wording that we can put into the doodle in time, and then get that out.

Avri Doria: Yes. And people, we'll just see. Okay. And, this is what I'm proposing cutting in 263, "Subject to the requirements of receiving support, the working group recommends support for price reductions to encourage the build out of IDNs in smaller underserved languages. The exact amount and timing of the support to be determined. One way this might be accomplished is through bundling of applications."

"There was consensus/strong support for requiring that each applicant can have explicit support of the language community from an organization, NGO, or a local community from the language script community. There was a minority view that applicants who may not meet the need requirement for support should also be able to receive some form of support in order to offer services in an underserved risk/language with the explicit support of the language community to be served." I still need to fix wording.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: So basically, what I've tried to do is sort of define the support for the A as you tried to couch it, which is if you have need, if you meet the - you know, the other requirements, then this is something that should get specific kind of support, perhaps bundling. However, there was a minority view, because I don't think we can suppress the minority view, that sort of said this should also be enabled for - as long as they've got explicit support from a community - a needing community. So, I suggest that I'll put something - I'll still fix more wording.

Evan Leibovitch: So, this will end up showing up in the doodle as two separate issues to vote on is the way I'd like to put this forward. And, I think we'll get wide support on one, and significant divergence on the other is my gut right now. Or maybe, even significant opposition to the second one, but let's put that up on the

doodle and see how it happens. I think we can put this in the form of two separate statements for the doodle poll, and we can then poll our community.

Is everybody okay with that?

Avri Doria: (I'm okay).

(Andrew): I'm wondering. You made this together as one proposal slightly shorter than Avri's version earlier, and the slightly shorter version seems to me to be pretty dead on. And I don't know - I'm not sure if this is valuable to separate them out if we can put them all in A.

Evan Leibovitch: No. But, Avri's saying that there's a significant community - there is a significant but possibly not majority view point that's saying that even a group that does not meet the needs requirement if they're serving an underdeveloped script should be entitled to ask for support.

(Andrew): As long as they have the demonstrated support of that community, right?

Evan Leibovitch: Right. So, there's...

(Andrew): Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: So, there's - so the issue is does an outside group with the support of the community that doesn't have a demonstrated need - a financial need itself. So, a rich company like VeriSign is going after an unserved community, VeriSign itself is not a poor - is not a have not organization, but the community is underserved.

(Andrew): Right.

Evan Leibovitch: I believe there's a divergence in this group with a company like VeriSign should be able to go after support funding. The group may be underserved, but VeriSign itself is not. And so, I think there's divergence on that.

(Andrew): I understand. Obviously, this wouldn't be an issue if the group itself wanted to go for their own thing.

Evan Leibovitch: Exactly.

(Andrew): This is only to...(unintelligible)

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: I guess, (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): ...(unintelligible) a local group.

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...(unintelligible) think we have consensus on that. We have consensus...

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: On what?

Evan Leibovitch: ...that the group should be able to get it, but we don't - I don't think we have consensus that a larger outside organization, even with community support, should be able to get aid. So, I'd like to separate that out. If we get agreement on both, that's great. If not, let's find out.

Alan Grennberg: I need a clarification on the wording.

Avri Doria: I am in the process of clarifying the wording, but please go ahead.

Alan Grennberg: It's not clear whether the from the - in A, it's not clear whether -- from the script language -- community modifies local company or modifies all three.

Avri Doria: Okay. I'll clear up the reference.

Alan Grennberg: Well, just tell us so I can make my comment if necessary. What was the intent?

Avri Doria: The intent is that the applicant - wait a second. That the application have the explicit support of the language community.

Alan Grennberg: Okay. In that case, the A and B omit applicants who do need support, but outside the community?

Avri Doria: That's in the first sentence. Subject to the requirements. "Subject to the requirements for receiving support from the program, the working group had full consensus/consensus on price reductions to encourage..."

Alan Grennberg: Okay. But your wording now, if the - it's only an example I understand, but it's an example which will try to illuminate for anyone reading it what we mean. Your example says from the community - from the script language community. So, A seems to exclude those who are not from the community but want to serve it.

Avri Doria: Oh, so you're - right. You're...

Alan Grennberg: Between A and B, there's still a group that isn't covered, and that...

Avri Doria: And, you're saying that a group that's excluded is those who have need but aren't from the community.

Alan Grennberg: Correct.

Avri Doria: Right. So, the local do-gooder's association. Okay.

Alan Grennberg: Exactly.

Avri Doria: Got it.

(Andrew): Or a regional do-gooder's association.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Grennberg: (Andrew) who has decided that Amharic hasn't been supported.

Avri Doria: I understand completely.

Alan Grennberg: Yes. Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. I will fix this...

(Andrew): I don't have the cash to do it. I promise.

Alan Grennberg: Well, that's why you need support.

Avri Doria: I have it - all right. I will fix that before I...

Alan Grennberg: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...put out this...

Alan Grennberg: Is there any real support for B at that point, once that's fixed?

Avri Doria: Well, let's see. I mean, is there a...

Alan Grennberg: Okay, fine. Got it. Okay.

Avri Doria: ...minority view that says if VeriSign wants to do it, should they be allowed?
That's B still. That's (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): I thought we had replaced B with the version that includes with community support?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I will...

Avri Doria: Yes. (Unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Grennberg: We had, but not in Avri's mind.

Evan Leibovitch: Are we of the opinion that there is no support for B if that change to A is made?

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: No. I - may I speak?

Evan Leibovitch: Sure. Go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: I think that (Andrew) now said that we have to get rid of B since we include it in A, people outside the community that have the need.

Evan Leibovitch: That's what I'm asking Tinjani. Do we have consensus on this call that there is no need for B?

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Avri Doria: So, that means that (Andrew) is no longer saying...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: So...

Avri Doria: I'm sorry. I am totally - so, no one is arguing that people that have no need should get bundling assistance?

(Andrew): Now hold on. Let's go back. What we were talking about was the - what our goal was was to avoid capture, right? And so, what we - what I thought we were proposing as a changed version of B that would potentially make it part of A is that there are two groups that could receive assistance. One group would be a group that derives organically from the community, and the other one would be a group that is outside the community that is working with the community to address their need.

Avri Doria: I still think there was a division in the group between...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Avri Doria: Does that outside group have the bucks on their own or not?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay guys, we are five minutes over the call, so here's what I'm going to suggest, okay. Avri and I and (staff) will go offline and put together the doodle poll. The doodle poll will have the current modified provision for A.

We will also have wording about whether or not to allow groups that are supporting underserved strings, but do not have the need, it will be a question, and I invite and encourage, and implore anyone who disagrees with that to vote No in the doodle poll. And if it gets roundly defeated, it get's roundly defeated. That's one of the things the poll can help show us. So rather than debating that here, let's put it up. And if nobody wants it, then it gets no votes.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So, can we not just do it that way rather than drag out this call in figuring that out?

(Andrew): All right.

Evan Leibovitch: Is there anyone against that way of doing this?

Avri Doria: I always have my reservations against solving anything with a poll.

Alan Grennberg: I have reservations in that I haven't hear anyone on this call saying we still need to include people who don't need financial support. If there's anyone on this call who believes that, then I agree with what you're proposing. If no one here agrees it, then I think we scrap it and not give it - and clean up the language we have today.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So last (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Grennberg: Is there anyone who supports it?

Evan Leibovitch: (Unintelligible) Alan said, is there anybody on this call who believes that we need to put in or even poll the community whether or not we should include a statement requesting support for outside bodies that do not have need but might have community support? Is there anybody here on this call who thinks we ought to ask about including that?

(Andrew): Hold on. (Unintelligible) - I'm sorry to (unintelligible), but I'm not sure I'm understanding Alan. So if (CORE) decides that they want to support a - the Amharic guys, and they are an outside group which may or may not have

need - okay, if we make the decision that they don't have need, or VeriSign or PIR, or whomever affiliate, and they go in and - but they're providing this service to the community which itself does not have the resources or the ICANN awareness to do this themselves?

Avri Doria: No help.

(Andrew): You're suggesting that there's no help, even though it makes it - the idea behind offering the assistance was that it would make it more (likely). (Unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: As is say...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): (Unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Hold on. Hold on. Stop. Stop. Stop.

Alan Grennberg: Okay. Fine. (Unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...(unintelligible) thinks that the option ought to be put forward?

Avri Doria: That's...

Alan Grennberg: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...what I've been saying. I've been saying listening to (Andrew) that there is support for the B.

Alan Grennberg: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Even if it's one person Alan, you now have some - you now have evidence...

Alan Grennberg: I'm agreeing. Let's not discuss it more.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So, we're now eight minutes over the call. I think Avri, I, and (staff) have our walking orders of what we need to do to put forward the poll. Hopefully, we can put it out and get answers before Friday, and then deal with that as well as the community comments, and get a start on that on Friday. Is that okay with everyone?

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Alan Grennberg: Yes.

(Andrew): Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay?

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: All right.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks everybody. See you on Friday.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: See you Friday. Bye-bye.

END