

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 09 November 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 09 November 2010 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20101109-en.mp3>

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

ALAC

Evan Leibovitch – Co-Chair
Dave Kissoondoyal - ALAC
Carlos Aguirre - At Large
Alan Greenberg – ALAC (end of call)
Sébastien Bachollet - ALAC
Baudoin Schombe - At-Large
Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison

GNSO

Avri Doria – NCSG – Co-Chair
Fabien Betremieux – Individual
Michele Neylon - RrSG

ICANN staff

Gisella Gruber-White
Karla Valente
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachine
Andrew Mack – CBUC
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large
Alex Gakuru – NCSG
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC chair
Michele Neylon

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. I'll do a quick roll call. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's JAS call on Tuesday the 9th of November we have Avri Doria, Carlos Aguirre, Rafik Dammak, Sébastien Bachollet,

Dave Kissoondoyal. From staff we have Karla Valente, Glen de Saint Géry and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies today noted from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Michele Neylon, Tijani Ben-Jemaa and Alex Gakuru.

If I could please also just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Avri. And everyone will be joining shortly.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you very much. Thank you all for coming at this different but same hour, same UTC, different in many locations. And just to remind people we will be doing a Doodle poll on the thing we talked about last time of sharing the pain with rotating times, etcetera. But we had said that this week was going to be in the old pattern.

And as I say again I apologize up front to anyone who thought that I had cancelled the meeting when I mentioned the possibility of cancelling it because we didn't have an agenda.

One thing I want to check on is the SOI/DOI situation. Does anybody have or need a update to their Statement of Interest? Hearing none does anyone have or need an update to their Declaration of Interest? None. Just so people know an update on the DOI it is being discussed; there are actually motions in front of the council to eliminate the need for it so.

Okay on the agenda we had a few elements, have planning for Cartagena which was something that Karla asked to have on the agenda and so a discussion. I had put on last comments on the press release and opened up another can of confusion.

So while there isn't an update on the announcement/release - and I'll let Karla speak on it when we get there there'll be a slight discussion about what that document is all about etcetera.

Then I'd like to spend some time on the charter extension issue and basically the first question I have is do we want to get a motion filed for the next meetings of the GNSO Council and ALAC? I'm not sure what the schedule is on ALAC but I know that if we want to have this brought up at the next GNSO Council meeting Rafik needs to submit a motion by tomorrow.

And then if the answer to that is yes then I'd like to go through the basic points on that charter extension. If the answer is no let's take our time on it and wait for the Cartagena meeting then we can either go through this now or we can, you know, push it out to Friday.

So I see that Evan has joined and I see that Fabien has joined. Are there any issues - welcome. Are there any issues on the agenda? Any other things that we should add to the agenda? Okay hearing none Karla, Cartagena.

Karla Valente: Yes, so I have made - I have reserved one hour on the agenda right now. I gave I think as a - I gave the actual dates on the email. And it is in the main room with all of the infrastructure that we need with the scribes, translation, remote participation, etcetera.

So the reservation is made. I'm calling this session for now if you agree Developing Countries and the New gTLD Program. I think it's catchy and would call people's attention to it. But is up to you how you want to structure so I leave the floor to you, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay can I ask first a couple questions?

Karla Valente: Sure.

Avri Doria: I can't find the email at the moment that says the when it is but can you say something about the when it is and what other things it might be up against?

Karla Valente: I'm just looking for it just - I'm sorry, I have like...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I know, it's early in the day and the computer hasn't woken up and you probably haven't had coffee.

Karla Valente: No I had coffee but I'm managing several sessions so I want to make sure that I don't get them confused.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Karla Valente: Because of conflict schedules have been just...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes I understand.

Sébastien Bachollet: Can we have two with that because I have in front of me the time you find it you will be able to put it on the Adobe...

Avri Doria: Okay please, please Sébastien, go ahead, you're acknowledged.

Sébastien Bachollet: Okay the title is Developing Countries and new gTLD. It's on Thursday 9 December from 9:30 to 10:30. What is currently a reason as in a review is session member from (this) join SOIC new gTLD applicants support working group would present ALAC of the (unintelligible) reports.

There main objective of the working group is to develop a sustainable approach in providing support to applicants requiring assistance in applying for and operating new gTLD registry.

And the agenda there is nothing, what next, and we should attempt some explanation. But the main thing is that on Thursday the 9 of December from 9:30 to 10:30.

Karla Valente: Yeah, that's the only change that I had since yesterday, since last night, I'm sorry. It's from 9:00 to 10:30 so it's one hour and a half, it's not one hour, if you want. So Thursday one hour and a half on the main room from 9:00 to 10:30.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. So I guess first of all the first question is do we know - does anybody know what's against it? For example I know that there's some sort of IDN meeting also on Thursday and I'm just wondering whether we're in conflict with that. If we are there may be an issue or not because of very often the same people would be interested in both issues.

But the conflict is one thing I'm curious about. Are people comfortable with the title of it? Developing Countries and - I mean, that isn't our...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes, go ahead Sébastien.

Sébastien Bachollet: I have two points. The first is that once again we target country and we wanted to target project from. And I know the title must be short but I really think we need to say something - it's not the country will apply and that's a little bit confusing as a title.

And as - I don't know if there are any conflict; I will check with the At-Large agenda. But I think there was some discussion on the list with Eric and others that that's for a public meeting, let's put it like that to discuss what we've done and maybe what we will do.

But don't we have the need to have a face to face meeting with the participants from this working group who will be in Cartagena to advance some of the issue and to discuss it not just on the telephone but face to face? I think this two meetings could be very useful for the work of these working groups especially if we have to discuss evolution of the charter and it's done - it's not done prior to Cartagena we really need to get together at least to discuss that but I guess for other purposes. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Karla put up her hand so Karla.

Karla Valente: Yes you asked what we had at the same time. So there is a geographic regions review workshop. There is a Q&A about the wiki. The only - there's one that is ALAC regional leadership policy directing and reporting. There's the first half an hour conflict with that, that might be a problem right?

Evan Leibovitch: I would have to be at that.

Karla Valente: Yeah so if we do from 9:30 to 10:30 there is no conflict. If we do from 9:00 to 10:30 there is.

Avri Doria: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry. It's Gisella. I just wanted to say that Cheryl is on the geographic regions as well.

Karla Valente: Yeah. And then there's an IDNA protocol transition and experience, inter-registrar transfer policy, I think that's it.

Avri Doria: Okay so...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...it's really the geographic and ALAC session that conflicts with it.

Karla Valente: Yeah.

Avri Doria: I think an hour and a half is actually good but it really also depends on what we're doing. I think Sébastien brought up a good point about developing countries not wanting to, A, make it sound like countries can apply, B, that we're restricting it just to developing countries though that is a strong focus. So I think the title may need tweaking even though, yes, that is a good and sexy title.

And then, C, the question of a face to face meeting. I think it's probably a good idea; fitting it into the schedule may be a challenge but I think it's a good idea.

Karla Valente: I'm sorry, could you repeat that face to face - is a face to face with...

Avri Doria: That in addition to the public meeting that we're discussing now Sébastien also brought up of getting a meeting slot for the working group itself. Now I also want to bring up that I did ask GAC Chair for the possibility of us having a discussion with them because we had discussed that months ago.

And actually haven't gotten - I realized today that I hadn't gotten an answer on it yet. So if it's something we want to do I'll have to send that again though I don't know how much chance we have of actually getting it to their schedule.

But we had discussed at one point, you know, the importance of meeting with the GAC and discussing this issue since our solution, I mean, our whole process was in part initiated by their concerns. So meeting with them and getting their viewpoint on how we have dealt with their concerns was something that earlier we had seen as possibly a good thing.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Avri Doria: So there's basically two extra meetings...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...that we're talking about.

Karla Valente: Yes. So for the meeting slot you just want a room that fits actually members from this working group for how long and what date?

Avri Doria: Good questions. For how long I would think it would be an hour to an hour and a half; that would be sufficient. I would think that that it would it have to be a room with remote capability because I'm sure not all of our participants will be at the meeting.

And I have no idea of the schedule. Is actually a sample schedule out, a basic schedule?

Karla Valente: I don't think so.

Avri Doria: Right so I have not idea to say, you know, obviously it can't be against any of the big ALAC stuff; it can't be against any of the big GNSO stuff like, you know, their open meetings. And so - but I have no idea what the schedule looks like. So I can't say when.

Karla Valente: So it has to be - so it has to be probably before Wednesday because if you're meeting with the GAC and they're putting out there any kind of communiqué it has to be before Wednesday and before the session on Thursday so it has to be either Monday or Tuesday; Tuesday is constituency day which is...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...impossible.

Karla Valente: Yeah. And then Monday we have a lot of new gTLD sessions because what we're trying to do is to have a Monday for all of the status reporting including potentially the reporting of the overarching issues so Monday is like a packed agenda.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I'm not sure that it necessarily has to be before the GAC or before the public meeting. Because if it's about how we continue to work and how we take the input we've gotten from the two meetings as opposed to prep for either of the two meetings I personally don't think that before is an absolute requirement; I think if we can find a slot on Thursday that works - that would probably be okay.

I have Sébastien with his hand - and I also say I don't know that we're going to get a GAC slot.

Karla Valente: Okay sure.

Sébastien Bachollet: To (unintelligible) wikis and the - going maintenance and I can't have a look to the current At-Large schedule. But I have the feeling that - I don't understand why if the Monday it's a full day about new gTLD why we didn't fit inside this Monday because we are part of the solution and not just one problem to be put away from.

If Monday new gTLD and agenda of the day you need to have a broad picture of what will happen; we need to be there. Even I will say if it's just half an hour of our two chair giving the summary of what we do and where we are going I would like very much that we fit into that.

And then if it's the case maybe we can use this one or one and a half hour as committee meeting. It would have been better but I know that for travel

purposes ICANN is not willing to help at all with that to have this type of meeting when the GNSO working group met on Saturday but the At-Large and ALAC people are not allowed to be on the Saturday.

Some will be for travelling time reason but I don't think all will be able to be on Saturday. But it could have been a good idea to have that on Saturday.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Sébastien Bachollet: That's my two cents. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. You bring up a good point, Sébastien. And actually, Karla, at one point wasn't there also a report by us during the new gTLD separate from this meeting? And I see you already have your hand up so perhaps you were going to speak to that.

Karla Valente: Yeah, so I would like to clarify the Monday one. The Monday sessions are - have to do with new gTLD status reports and overarching issues. The only slot available that we have with Monday right now is against an ATRT interaction with the community.

And what that specifically means is that board members would not be able to attend our session which I thought it would probably be important for them to attend. You know, and so that's the only slot I have available on Monday is against this ATRT session that really, you know, gives away the board members away.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: What about if ICANN - I see Sébastien put his hand up again. But what about Sébastien's idea that just Evan and/or I got half an hour, 15 minutes even, during your whole presentation to basically give a quick overview of what we had done and get it into that whole session? So...

Karla Valente: Yeah let me double check with...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Sure, not a whole meeting, not a whole hour and a half but just a chance for us to stand up and say listen this is what we've been doing, this is where we're going. You want to talk more, join us.

Karla Valente: Okay so can I get back to you on that?

Avri Doria: Please.

Karla Valente: Kurt has one hour and a half and I'm going to ask him if we can include, you know, 15 minutes to half an hour to his agenda. Can we do that and I'll get...

Avri Doria: Sure.

Karla Valente: ...these to you today.

Avri Doria: And as I say if he's only got an hour and a half getting a whole half hour would be ridiculous but getting some part of it would be appreciated.

Karla Valente: Okay I'll talk to him today.

Avri Doria: Okay I have Sébastien and I have Rafik. Sébastien are you muted?

Sébastien Bachollet: Excuse me, yes. Thank you. Yeah, I will just say it crudely but board member are not in the room doesn't matter. Yes it would be good but we want to address all communities. And the one who are in the room will be in the room. And we need to give them even if it's just 10 minutes with Avri and - then just Avri or just Evan I am fine with that. But then I think it's important to show that.

There are many reasons for me to ask you to do that and not at the end of the day to have the answer, Kurt will do it. I - we as volunteer we do a bunch of work. And we need some reward on that. And the way to get reward on that is to have you, the co-chair or the chair of this working group on stage when we're at the wrap-up of what's happened during the - since the last few months about (unintelligible).

And I'm support to - even if we have just 10 minutes to get these 10 minutes to you, Avri and Evan. And yeah, some people like me maybe will be in the ATRT meeting but once again it's not a big deal. It needs - things needs to go in different meeting room and that's okay.

But once again if we can - that's 10 minutes, I don't know if we need to say more to people except telling them that their working group will meet in another meeting room somewhere and some time and they are welcome to come. And we will talk with them too and allow us for one or one and a half hour working group meeting open to everybody. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Just to summarize, I think that as working group we will have somebody for GNSO in the (weekend) and maybe to have a short time in Monday and why not have a full session for Tuesday. I think it's not the same audience and (unintelligible) we can in every opportunity to change or to adapt the presentation for the audience because I think if there is for the GNSO decision I think Kurt will present again - sorry?

For the GNSO (weekend) if Kurt will present again the status about new gTLD program maybe you and Evan, you can intervene there somehow. And also you have presentation for the - of the working group status for the GNSO Council. And the Monday it's more for a large audience and for - and

Thursday it's more for people who got - get interested by the issue and they want to know more.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Okay I still see a bunch of hands up but I want to try and sum up on this and see if I understand correctly. We have several types of meeting and encounter being discussed.

First we have the traveling Evan and Avri show to GNSO Council to ALAC possibly even to the GAC if I get them to fit us in, where of course other group members are welcome but basically we give a quick status view and get feedback. And then, you know, other conversations, so that's one thing.

We have a request in for a speaking slot on the Monday all about new gTLDs because we just basically want to get a quick statement of what we've done and where we're going and basically point to our longer meeting on Thursday.

On Thursday we have a full session hopefully it can be shifted so that we can get a full hour and a half but if we can only get a whole hour so be it. And that will be a session where I would just suggest calling it Support for new gTLD Applicants and - which is a short title which is the name of our group which is what we're all about. And it doesn't get into any of the specifics so in terms of Karla's asking for a short title my recommendation is Support for new gTLD Applicants.

And then we can get into what we mean by that, etcetera. But I know if I was a new gTLD applicant, you know, it was something that I might find a (unintelligible) title - but certainly other suggestions - and finally that we're also asking for a slot probably on Thursday if we can find one where we could have a face to face meeting.

Did I cover all the meeting stuff? I see Evan with his hand up and I see Karla with her hand up. So I don't know which of you had your hand up first but go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Karla was.

Avri Doria: Okay Karla.

Karla Valente: Okay so just to clarify you want (unintelligible) Sunday (unintelligible) then you want a short meeting or room for the team to meet. And then you also want the one hour session that was scheduled for Thursday?

Avri Doria: Yeah. Does that make sense?

Karla Valente: It does.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay...

Carlos Aguirre: So Avri a question, Carlos Aguirre here.

Avri Doria: Okay, Evan, do you defer to Carlos?

Evan Leibovitch: Actually...

Carlos Aguirre: Yes, my question is have we available translation for the session on Thursday because having an account but we have in the middle developing countries region Spanish speakers I think it's needed to have translations for the meeting session on Thursday.

Avri Doria: Okay. On Thursday, Karla, you said that was in a large room; is that the room with translation?

Karla Valente: Yes. We have...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Karla Valente: ...five translations and (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay so the Thursday - the Thursday main meeting is a full-blown meeting with translation and whatever. We wouldn't have translation on our shorter group meetings but on that main Thursday meeting we would and on the new gTLD session on Monday I assume we would.

Carlos Aguirre: Excellent.

Avri Doria: Okay. Evan, you've been patient.

Evan Leibovitch: I wanted to speak up in support of what Sébastien said. I think having even just a couple of minutes to stand up during shall we say gTLD Day on Monday is very important I think considering the audience that we have.

I also don't think we need an hour and a half; we're essentially presenting a milestone report and preparing - giving an overview of it and giving Q&A. So I just want to put my two cents in for really pushing to be on that table sometime through the day when they talk about the gTLD program.

And in terms of the title Support for gTLD Applicants, that's - on first glance that means anything; that means somebody applying from Europe or the US or whatever. So, I mean, my preference is to stick with the first one in support and developing countries or I'd say developing economies. I think that's far more clear in what it is we bring in our little corner of the process.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Any other comments on the title or anything? I put up in the notes the four meeting types that we're asking for. So, Karla, in terms of getting the title...

Sébastien Bachollet: And I put some idea about the title in the...

Avri Doria: Oh okay so Sébastien put in new gTLD project support, new gTLD project support for developing countries. Karla, you wanted to...

Karla Valente: Yeah so far from developing countries I think the second one is reasonable. The word support by itself many people interpret that as being customer support that's why I try to avoid that word because I had, you know, several people come into me and say are we talking about the customer support? And I had to explain not. And...

Avri Doria: Well how about something that was aid because we're talking about various kinds of aide. It's help of one sort or another. So, you know, a grabbing title is aide for, you know, new gTLD applicants from developing regions, from developing economies. Leaving out the countries, also there was the notion of leaving out the countries notion.

Sébastien Bachollet: Why not help and not aide.

Avri Doria: Help is fine too. Help for new gTLD applicants from developing economies.

Evan Leibovitch: So you're trying to get away from the word support?

Avri Doria: Yeah, Karla was mentioning getting away from support simply because it immediately makes people think of customer support.

Carlos Aguirre: Avri, I think one of the - maybe assisting we use it a lot?

Avri Doria: Assisting, that's a good word.

Karla Valente: What was (unintelligible) it was assisting what?

Avri Doria: Let me see, assisting...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...gTLD applicants from developing economies? Does that work?

Karla Valente: And then we need some help to make a reference to the new gTLD program so people link the two.

Avri Doria: Well I would think a new gTLD applicant would be linked to the...

Karla Valente: Oh.

Avri Doria: ...new gTLD program.

Karla Valente: Assist and developing - assisting new gTLD applicants from developing economies?

Avri Doria: That's one possibility that I typed while people were talking; how does that work?

Rafik Dammak: Avri I think when we say applicants people will understand that we are talking about new gTLD. I think it's the most (unintelligible) we talk about in every ICANN meeting so...

Avri Doria: So you don't think we need new gTLD you just think assisting applicants?

Rafik Dammak: Assisting applicants, yeah, if it would make it as short as possible.

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: Let me explain why is because yes if you are an ICANN-er you know what this is about; if you are not you don't. And it make very hard later to reference

a session or something because, you know, you have to educate people about the use of the word applicant.

Avri Doria: So do people - is that assisting new gTLD applicants - with an S - from developing economies okay with people? Is it short enough? Is it too long? Does it work? Is it acceptable for now?

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: It's too much ICANN-ese in the title. New gTLD applicant (unintelligible) so if it depends if we want to target newbie or newcomer so we should really to change all the title and to say maybe assisting applicants for new - let's say domain or something because new gTLDs is really ICANN jargon.

Avri Doria: Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: First of all the word new is redundant. I don't think anybody is applying for an existing one.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: So gTLD - so go back to what you just said? The last one you said, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay I have - it's up there in the notes it's Assisting gTLD Applicants from Developing Economies but Rafik just indicated that gTLD applicants was too jargon-y.

Evan Leibovitch: To me TLD applicants is - personally I got no problem with it I just thought the word new was redundant.

Avri Doria: Okay. I personally think that anybody, even a newbie at a ICANN meeting is going to know about the gTLD application process, Rafik. And I'm not sure

that that would be unclear. But perhaps, you know, we have a title and then in the description of the session we can go a little further if that would help.

I worry about just saying applicants - if we just say applicant for domain names then we need to distinguish that we're talking about Gs and not Cs. And so the gTLD is kind of like the shorthand that I think most people at an ICANN even the newest participants will have seen all over the place and see as they're walking through the lobby and see everywhere so I have a feeling that that wouldn't be that strange even to the newest of the new.

Any other comment or issue on that? Rafik could you accept the name that's up there now, Assisting gTLD Applicants from Developing Economies?

Rafik Dammak: Yes it's okay. I just understand that I thought that Karla was talking really about new audience that's why I said that.

Avri Doria: Right.

Rafik Dammak: We are talking many times about new - yeah - no new gTLD (unintelligible) program and in every ICANN meeting (better).

Avri Doria: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Rafik, we won't be the first ones speaking. There's going to be a whole bunch of introduction to the concept before we get there.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Yeah we'll be at the end of the day. We'll have mentioned it though hopefully in the Monday. Okay are we pretty much - we know what we're asking for, we've got a session. Perhaps, you know, we can - if Karla wants we can do a couple iterations of the wording of this thing on the list if we need to get back to more wordsmithing on this we can come back to it on Friday. I'm not even suggesting we cancel that meeting at the moment.

And so have we covered this or, Evan, actually your hand is still up; you want to comment more?

Evan Leibovitch: I'm going to put in another plug for a 60-minute meeting in preference to a 90-minute one. An hour and a half meeting in that big room tend to be really, really tiring by the end of it. I think if we plan to an hour, if we do an agenda to an hour I think we're going to be okay. Usually what happens between the half hour and the hour - the 90 minutes and the hour are people asking questions for the sake of asking questions.

The key stuff is going to be people at the beginning of the queue. And I think we're going to be able to cover off everything we need in an hour. I think - personally I think it's overkill to make this 90 minutes.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I wanted to, if I could, and I see Karla's hand up. My one reason is I guess I saw one other thing happening during this meeting that others haven't mentioned which is getting initial comment on some of our new working group chartered items whether the charter has been approved by then or not.

But actually opening up the discussion on those chartered items and getting people to think about those and possibly wanting to get involved in that public session. So that was my reason for pushing for the hour and a half but I'm not stuck to it in any religious sense, that was just what I had in mind. Karla.

Karla Valente: Yes in relation to the title I am under pressure by the (unintelligible) to finish that by tomorrow.

Avri Doria: Okay, I think we've got a title. I think no one is objecting to Assisting gTLD Applicants from Developing Economies.

Karla Valente: Okay. And do I change that meeting Thursday to one hour?

Avri Doria: That - what do people think? Evan has made a strong case for 90 minutes being overkill for us to explain what we've done and take questions. I agree with him that, yes, an hour is enough for that. I was hoping for the extra half hour to basically get people invested in where we were going and try to generate some discussion somehow.

He may be right, we could just end up with dead silence but I see Sébastien. I made an or statement and so I'm not sure what you're agreeing with.

Sébastien Bachollet: I was agreeing with the 60 minutes, it's okay especially...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Sébastien Bachollet: ...because I guess that Evan will be in the Secretariat At-Large meeting and will not be able to be for one and a half hour. But not just I think if we need to go straight to the point it's - we need to be efficient and to get that done in one hour.

Avri Doria: Okay so I seem to be alone on this particular topic. So Karla I think we're at 60 minutes. Anybody disagree...

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...other than me? I see no disagreement other than me, so.

Evan Leibovitch: You see to me it even sends a message to the world that it takes 90 minutes to explain which to me even sends a message I don't want.

Avri Doria: Okay we're at 60 minutes, Karla. And that may help you miss the two conflicts we've got to some extent.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Avri Doria: Do we want our face to face meeting to be a 60 or a 90? Anyone care? We're looking for another 60?

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: It depends on how much we have to do.

Sébastien Bachollet: I guess for an ICANN meeting if we already get 60 minutes will be great. I would have preferred to have 90 minutes but...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Sébastien Bachollet: ...it will really depend when it can be fitted in there and just let that happen. If we can again end up with 90 great but...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Sébastien Bachollet: ...let's target for 60.

Avri Doria: Oh well why don't we target for 90 and if we get 60 we're fine?

Sébastien Bachollet: That's okay with me too.

Avri Doria: So ask for 90 but 60 - okay. Okay so are we clear on all of this now? Karla, you've got your hand up again? Please.

Karla Valente: No I don't, sorry.

Avri Doria: Oh okay sorry, I wasn't sure whether it was new or old. Okay so can I call this topic closed for the moment? I'm sure we'll be back to it. I see everyone said Karla, Dave, all said 60 is okay. Well great.

Okay the next thing was can you quickly set us right, Karla, press release/announcement? What is it that we reviewed last time? What are we trying to do with it? And when can we see if we're going to see an updated version?

Karla Valente: Yeah so that announcement is what is posted on ICANN's Website on the right corner. And usually they are (unintelligible) statuses and other kind of activities that happen, for example, posting things for public comment. The middle section of the Website is really controlled by the communications team, Barbara Clay, and her team.

And this is where usually press releases go and then you have a very different structure with quotes and information about ICANN and so forth. So what I sent to you was a proposal announcement - a little bit different for that ICANN does, you know, in a Q&A file because I think it just makes it easier for people to read.

And I received feedback from some people and I incorporated Sébastien's changes, some of Tijani's changes, some of Eric's changes. But I did not incorporate changes in which, you know, I think people confused that with a press release.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So we're not talking about a press release. And anybody like me that said press release and again confused people, was wrong. We're only speaking about an announcement. Will you be sending out another copy of this announcement that people can just look at and comment to?

And also I would like to ask since Michele asked the question of me and I obviously, you know, boggled it, could you also respond on the list sort of saying what this is and hopefully giving an updated copy of the announcement so that people will see what it turned into?

Karla Valente: I can send a revised copy today.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. And maybe you can combine it with the answer to Michele's question so it's all in a nice little package.

Karla Valente: Okay I will...

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. And I know I'm asking you to clean up a mess that I perhaps helped make so I appreciate your help. Thanks. Okay brings us to the last topic. Or first let me check, any more issue on the announcement? And I will not use that other word.

Okay, charter extensions, there is - we have two chartering organizations, the GNSO Council I think - and please correct me if I'm wrong - it has far more strictness in how they go about doing the chartering stuff. Part of it requires a motion, part of a motion is it has to be in a week before it is to be discussed.

It can be changed during that week but it needs to be in place. And...

Rafik Dammak: Avri, sorry it's eight days, it's not even a week.

Avri Doria: Oh okay, sorry, you're right. I keep thinking of a week but it's eight days that's why it's Wednesday for Thursday's meeting - for next Thursday's meeting.

So I had the feeling that we wanted to get this on the table at this meeting, partly because what often happens in the GNSO is the first time they see a motion even though you need to have an eight day lead because you're going to vote on it ostensibly at the next meeting, there's almost a 100% tradition of at least one of the stakeholder groups saying we need more time, and there is a practice of allowing people to push it off one meeting.

So given that that would mean that that charter, you know, that basically we would present a motion and, you know, Rafik would present a motion and I

would help him with the writing for tomorrow's meeting - I mean, for tomorrow's deadline.

And then, you know, they would discuss it. Because we can announce the release of our document; we'll be able to do that by then. One of them has already been, you know, called final and the other one will probably have been called final by the middle of tomorrow.

And then we can list our - so the whereases are - whereas there was a group, whereas there was this, whereas the new board resolution and, you know, gets into the details, the numbers, etcetera, resolve we ask it to be changed. So my question is do we want to try and get something in by tomorrow so that it is on the GNSO's docket and the ALAC's docket as well?

But as I understand from Karla and from Evan basically it's a - it's not quite as strict a process within ALAC in terms of how it gets on the agenda, when it gets discussed, how it gets pushed off to other meetings although I could be totally wrong. So...

Evan Leibovitch: You're pretty close, I mean, Avri, when we get to Cartagena you essentially have all 15 members of ALAC sitting in the room. And so it doesn't take quite as much notice to get stuff on the agenda.

Avri Doria: Okay so - and if we follow the pattern.

Sébastien Bachollet: And if I can say it's...

Avri Doria: Please.

Sébastien Bachollet: ...already on the agenda for the Cartagena meeting then everything come before will be (unintelligible) for the work of ALAC during this meeting then it's a question - it's better to have advance notice to allow the members to read it and to - but as an item it's already on.

Avri Doria: Right. So basically what's driving the schedule then is the GNSO process. And what we have is of course we need to get ALAC and GNSO to agree to the same wording.

So as I say I'd be amazed if we got the GNSO wording approved at next week's meeting. If we did that's great because then that could go to the ALAC, the ALAC could review it, the ALAC could come back with any necessary changes etcetera because while we may agree together in this joint group on wording once it goes to the council there is - there is obviously the ability for them to edit the wording.

And if they edit the wording then there's the back and forth, you know, conciliation process between ALAC and GNSO that Evan and I would have to manage. So that being said is there any objection? Is there support for us getting the initial motion in front of the council tomorrow and getting this process started as opposed to waiting another couple weeks?

And that's why I put out a - the initial view of the charter statement but what do people think? Is there objection to us trying to get a charter revision in front of the council tomorrow? No objection.

Sébastien Bachollet: If it can be done it's great.

Avri Doria: Okay, okay. Now I have put - we obviously only have 10 minutes until the end of the meeting, actually 9. I did put a set of resolves in front of the group. I sent it to the list I guess last Thursday. Haven't seen any comment on it yet.

What that resolve list is is our next steps view from the document but with the wording shifted to being a motion and with removal of some of the extra wording about why we didn't do this before but we're doing this now, etcetera.

So I've had that in front, as I say, the wording on a motion is really just the starting place. The GNSO will then work over the wording. I would expect that ALAC would work over the wording.

So I'd like to ask if people have read what I've put out last Thursday are there any objections to that as initial wording barring any of my normal, you know, fractured sentences and bad grammar and typos and stuff that Rafik and I would need to go over.

And we would roll the - and I guess I have to ask Rafik do you have any objection to trying to get a motion before the council tomorrow which means you and I have to work on wording and we have to put it before the group to make sure we haven't done anything that offends anyone?

Rafik Dammak: No problem.

Avri Doria: No problem so you're fine with that? So at this point is there any objection with - okay I see Sébastien. I'll finish my statement. Is there any objection with taking this initial wording and Rafik, I and review by the group, crafting an initial motion for tomorrow? And Sébastien.

Sébastien Bachollet: Yeah, two or three points. The first is that in any event even if we didn't review as a working group your document it's from my point of view better that you and Rafik go ahead with this one. It will be refined by the council and we will have time at the ALAC level to discuss it.

Then if we can give you inputs before tomorrow great but even if we don't just go ahead and we will have the next day to give you some feedback to be incorporated to (strengthen) the GNSO discussion and at the (bell) we will have the ALAC to discuss it. That's for the process.

My point I just really - really quickly and badly but I have a little concern about the Point H about begin the word of fund raising and establishing link to

possible donor agency. I am not sure it's a role of a working group of ICANN volunteers to start to fund raise.

We need to establish the process, to establish - to push to have the organization in place to do that but I don't see myself by taking my little bag and going to Microsoft, Google and World Bank even if I discussed that yesterday night with them and of this just to do fund raising.

If we do that's good but it must not be our target. If not one day our electorate, that being the GNSO and the ALAC, we'll say - you say that you will do that and you do nothing and that you are not a good guy. And that's many different reason I would like to avoid that we begin the work. We could begin the work on how we will, that's okay or...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Sébastien Bachollet: ...but not fund raising itself, thank you.

Avri Doria: So thank you. So it's H we're saying to change to establish initial processes for or work with staff to...

Sébastien Bachollet: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...establish processes for...

Sébastien Bachollet: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Sébastien Bachollet: I support that, yes.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Any other initial comments? And thank you very much for the process approach you suggested. Anyone - any other comment? We

have four minutes left before the hour again assuming we don't have any participants on the half hour clock. If not...

Karla Valente: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes please, Karla.

Karla Valente: It's Karla, can I just repeat back to make sure that I got all my item?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right.

Karla Valente: Yes I need to find a meeting slot which is one hour and a half with remote participation and it can be after Thursday. I need to change the title of the main session to Assist gTLD Applicants from Developed Economies and have that as one hour.

A 10 minute update from the chair to the session that Kurt conducts on the new gTLD (unintelligible). And (unintelligible) the announcement and send to the working group today. Can I assume that all of the coordination with update to the GAC, update to the GNSO, ALAC and everything that happens you and Evan will take care of?

Avri Doria: I believe so. The only thing I would comment on is I don't know that it can be after Thursday; I don't know that anybody has permission to stay much beyond Friday afternoon. It's okay with me, I'm there, but it's basically can be Thursday.

Sébastien Bachollet: And maybe I was - I am not sure I get it but, Karla, we - if it's a working group meeting we don't need translation even if it's always better to have but we don't need. We need it for the 60 minute meeting slot in the large room. But the face to face working group meeting could be like today English only.

Avri Doria: Right, yeah. And I think all she said is with...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...remote participation.

Karla Valente: Yeah.

Sébastien Bachollet: I was not sure.

Avri Doria: We do want - right, we do want the option for any of our group members who can't attend Cartagena to be able to attend that meeting even if it is in the middle of the night for them.

Sébastien Bachollet: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay anything else? We will be getting out the Doodle poll with three questions on it that we discussed last time. It's my fault it didn't get out. I didn't respond to a request in time on what was - basically it's, 1, are we willing to go into pain sharing of a rotating schedule?

And then, B, two questions are, B, is is one permanent session enough, the Tuesday one? Is one permanent session enough the Friday one? And get people's views on that going forward.

Anything else at this point?

Sébastien Bachollet: Just to say that if anything must happen it must be before Thursday because today I know that as a Friday for ALAC Ex-Comm people and ALAC in general will be quite full and...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Sébastien Bachollet: ...it's already very difficult.

Avri Doria: Then one other question I have should we at this point - I don't have an agenda for Friday since we're going to try and get the motion in tomorrow - I don't have an agenda for Friday. Are we canceling? And here I said I wouldn't use that word again. But is there anyone that objects to cancelling the Friday meeting at this point now? And if we cancel it now I will not put it back on the schedule, I promise.

Sébastien Bachollet: My only question is that even if you already send to the GNSO the document we are just talking now could it be a good idea to have it refined by the working group before the GNSO met officially so that...

Avri Doria: Sure thing.

Sébastien Bachollet: ...will allow Rafik to give some changes we may have - we may want to make. It's just an idea.

Avri Doria: We could do that Friday or we could do that at the next Tuesday meeting. That would still be before the GNSO meeting.

Sébastien Bachollet: Let's do - consider Friday and go ahead with the Tuesday next week.

Avri Doria: Okay anybody - any other questions or objections? So anybody agree with my statement Friday meeting is canceled? Boy...

Sébastien Bachollet: Yes.

Avri Doria: Oh thank you. And I hear no objections so Friday meeting is canceled. We'll talk next Tuesday. And at the moment it's at the same time but we will do the polling on times and see where we're at. Evan, I see your hand up.

Evan Leibovitch: No, that was meant to be a check not a hand.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. And I see Dave's hand. We're a minute after our allotted time. I thank you all for attending and for contributing. Thank you Fabien for your green check. Thank you Dave for your green check. And talk to you all in a week - well I'll probably talk to some of you sooner but anyway.

Sébastien Bachollet: Thank you Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Sébastien Bachollet: Have a good day. Thank you Karla. Take care, bye.

Avri Doria: Good evening to you all. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you everyone.

END