

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Tuesday 15 February 2010 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Tuesday 15 February 2011 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20110215-en.mp3>

On page ;

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page) **Participants on the**

Call: ALAC

Evan Leibovitch – At Large

Alan Greenberg – AL

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ALAC

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large

Cintra Sookanan – At-Large

Dave Kissoondoyal - ALAC

Eric Brunner-Williams - At-Large

GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair

Andrew Mack – CBUC

Avri Doria – NCSG

Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board **ICANN staff** Karla Valente

Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Alex Gakuru – NCSG

Tony Harris – ISCPC

Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair

Carlton Samuels – At Large co-chair

Michele Neylon - RrSG

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to

everyone. On today's JAS call on Tuesday the 15th of February we have Rafik Dammak, Tinjani Ben Jemaa, Sebastien Bachollet, Evan Leibovitch, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Avri Doria, Alan Greenberg, Dave Kissoondoyal, Cintra Sookanan. From staff we have Karla Valente, Glen de Saint G ery and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

And apologies today noted from Michele Neylon, Tony Harris, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond and Alex Gakuru. If I could please remind everyone to state their names for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella. Hello everybody. And thank you again for joining - today call. As first item is there update of you SOI and DOI? Okay hearing none then we move to the next item of our agenda. As usual we will start with the reporting of each work teams and then we start with the Work Team A and B.

Please Tinjani, do you have any updates or something to report...

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes...

Rafik Dammak: ...for work - thank you. Please go ahead.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes okay thank you Rafik. This week I discussed a lot with some of you. And I had communication also by email with Carlton particularly. And because what - I have - the first I have gathered criterias from the World Bank, from a lot of sources.

And when I get in deep and cite what I have gathered it was only criteria that we already did in our milestone report. So it is not - now because our mission now is to find methods of demonstrating the need. And this is - you can't find this anywhere. I didn't - I wasn't able to find this in the sources I found at the first.

So I had a lot of discussion with some of you and with other person here. And for example last night I discussed a lot with Andrew. And we agreed together that it is not - we will not find precise metrics for it. It is not easy to find precise metrics.

I tried to find - to establish, if you want, or to write something about it. And Carlton sent me today what he think about the question. And I think it is

almost the same what I was thinking about. Means that we need to see the incomes of the applicant and how to find it, it is another question.

And the proofs are very important so we can think about the bank statements or about - I don't know about what he called - Carlton at that moment - he called that the qualified statement of account. And the second thing he called it qualified statement of affairs.

So all this are subjective proofs if you want. We need sources - not qualified but secure sources. And this is the main difficulty I thought about going to the central bank of the country and ask about all the - because he can give you a statement from one bank and he has a lot of accounts in other banks. So you - we need to know if he has given all his banks accounts.

So it is still - it is still, if you want, I am thinking I am discussing with people. And again people with whom I didn't discuss please give me what you think about the question so that we will have something that is the point of view of the whole group.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you very much. Just is it possible to share that in the wiki so everybody can check and review the document? Because I...

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: ...understand that there was - a lot of discussions between you and other members but we don't have anything in the mailing list. So maybe...

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: All right...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: You are right, okay I will share it, yes okay.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thank you. I show that Avri and Eric are in the queue. Please Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I guess I have two questions. One is have you set - have you defined what the criteria are at the next level down? And yes we defined financial need is one but have you gotten to the point of actually defining what financial need is in respect to these applications?

And then second I guess I just want to mention a little concern - okay I hear beeping; am I still with the call?

Rafik Dammak: Yes go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay I'm still with the call, okay because I heard some beeping. The second question is, you know, the balance between yes we have to go further than self declaration of that need but, you know, getting to the point of trying to get all banks for information verification seems like we're moving very far on the verification scale.

And I'm wondering if there isn't going to be some sort of intermediate, you know, some sort of - and I hate myself for saying this because I hate these groups - but some sort of group who is professional at asserting the truth - checking the truth of an application.

And that as opposed to we or ICANN getting into the business of verification whether looking into verification bodies who can review the truth of an application isn't an intermediate that might be worth looking at. Thanks.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay. So your first question is the - is our mission exactly is to set what is the - to say what is the financial need. And there is a proposal from - for example from Carlton who says less than \$250,000. And I didn't put figures in

my text but it is not - I don't think it is the main thing, the main, if you want, the main important thing.

The main important thing is to know how to verify this income. We can discuss together, we can say it will be - I don't know if the application is \$185,000 the incomes have to be less than this amount for example or less than \$100,000. I don't know. It is - we can discuss. It is not - the difficulty for me is not this; the difficulty is to prove the need, how to prove the need - how to prove the need.

And second if there is (buddies) that are experts in verifying the income or the application it would be good if we can have someone from them to help us.

Rafik Dammak: So Eric please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you very much. This is Eric Brunner-Williams. Tinjani, I don't often say this but I think you're going the wrong way. There will be gaming. Our problem is not - our problem is to make gaming rational.

So if we create a consequence for fraudulent application, for the fraudulent misrepresentation of need then we have done sufficiently well in - as the designers of a less than easily gamed system.

So I propose rather than chasing the verifications as you're doing which is possibly a unbounded problem that we accept that there will be some misrepresentation which is going to reduce our finite pool of resources assuming we ever have any resources in the first place.

But that the consequences of fraud are the loss of the assets so that the applicant who considers gaming has to consider the risks and the rewards of doing so. The rewards from - the reward of fabricating need is actually quite small as we don't actually have a great deal of resources to hand out.

Yet the cost for the fraud can be quite high such as the complete loss of the delegation immediately. Thank you very much.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: So, Eric, you are proposing that we only define what is the need, what we mean by the - an applicant in need and the verification is not the problem that we ask only for - if you want a declaration from the applicant and that's all?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Tinjani, actually I was saying that we need to state what the threshold is, which was the point of Avri's question and several others in the past and probably in the future as well, that is some potentially quite arbitrary threshold. In addition to that we need to state what the consequences are of misrepresentation.

Now the consequences of misrepresentation are built somewhat into the existing Draft Applicant Guidebook. That is ICANN does at some point say that they will rap someone's knuckles if they do bad things.

Knowing how ICANN conformance has worked in the past that's a fairly hollow threat. A much - a non-hollow threat is what I think we should be making since we have very finite resources, if any, to allocate.

So a very small benefit comes from cheating, a very great cost comes from cheating. We also need to state what the cost is and make sure that it is a credible threat. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Eric. Avri's on the queue.

Avri Doria: Yes...

Rafik Dammak: Yes Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes thanks. I think I'd largely agree with what Eric has said. I do think we need to go a little bit beyond just self statement. I think that - and that's why I

think any number of bodies in the world, you know, who do investigating the truth of an application and we just, you know, and I'm sure staff who has perhaps not done it on an economic basis but has done it on many other basis of basically having a group that investigates the, you know, does the due diligence as it's called on various applications can certainly give us advice on how that's done and perhaps on picking one.

I think in terms of not having many resources, hopefully that changes. But it's not only the resources we have it's the matchmaking we do. And I think that - I think that there's a good chance that we will have other donors, you know, that are willing to match but we somehow have to have some confidence when we're doing that matchmaking that the person is indeed, you know, bona fide in terms of having some evidence that they're representing truly without having gone into deep detail.

So - and I think in terms of a, you know, reaction to lie that that's again one of those things that's easier said than done. Fraud doesn't exist unless, you know, due process tells you there's fraud. And so while I agree that there needs to be a way to, you know, punish fraud and lies we should not assume that that's any easier than getting money. Thanks.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. Andrew is on...

Rafik Dammak: Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Sorry, I was on mute. I, you know, Tinjani and I had a nice and long talk yesterday about this and I think that there is a certain amount of arbitrariness in all of this. We have to at some point in time pick a line and say these are some of our qualifications because need is - need has many factors and is to some extent relative like poverty right?

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Andrew Mack: So I think that there's - there is also, as we were discussing yesterday, there's also a bit of a push and a pull. We want to be helping people that need the assistance but we also have the optics - have the public perception of making - wanting to make sure that the applicant is sufficiently strong as to be able to, you know, make it over the long term.

And so I think that while we want to - I'm concerned that we don't send the message that it - that gets a lot of our people disqualified or the perception that they're going to be too small or too poor to make this work. That was one thought that I had.

Another thought that I had was about this idea of trying to - I'm sorry - coffee hasn't kicked in - the idea of trying to have a strong sanction that Eric was talking about. I think that that's a great idea. I'm just concerned about the mechanism for making that happen and the amount of money that it's going to take to have this vetting process.

I'm wondering what is the simplest possible mechanism because I think that that would - that in the end is going to be the one that's going to be the most durable. Thanks.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Andrew. If I understood...

((Crosstalk))

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: ...well Andrew you mean that we need to fix a high threshold and a low threshold because people are not able to operate - to operate the string there is no benefit to help them.

Andrew Mack: Well that's effectively what - Tinjani, yes, that's effectively what we've already described that we're going to do.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Andrew Mack: What I'm suggesting is that within that, you know, the high and the low threshold are a bit arbitrary. Within that high and low threshold we want to make it as easy as possible to identify people and as Eric says have a bright line for anyone who tries to cheat the system.

My only concern about it is that the - is that we can get fairly easily tied up in knots in terms of trying to do the evaluation. And so whatever is the easiest way to say yes this is an imperfect measure but this is the measure we're going to use, let's use and you are either in or out of this basket that's my preference.

That way also it makes it an easier way for us to do what Eric suggested in terms of the, you know, sanctioning people who clearly are trying to cheat.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Any further comments? Eric please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you very much. Tinjani, we haven't considered the possibility of having an accounting moment at some point after launch and yet the registry operators will be going through various accounting moments quarterly and also on an annual basis.

So the point - the moment of discovery of fraudulent application or misrepresentation of need whether intention or unintentional may occur - may best occur a year or so after the point at which assistance is provided. So the - I'm just thinking that accounting later in the life - in the trajectory of startup is where the discovery of misrepresentation may occur. Thank you very much.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: And that's my concern also. Alan please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I think we have to get to the point sometime soon of starting to put down specifics. We're having this real great general discussion on how do we recognize if people are cheating and how do we, you know, how do we set the limits. But I think at some time we have to start drafting things no matter how difficult they are to assess or come up with. I think we have to start putting specifics down so we know what we're talking about.

You know, and I don't know what the measure is of how poor do you have to be or how much cash do you have to be in the bank to be viable. Clearly what we want are organizations that will not likely be able to do this well if we don't help them but are viable enough to be able to keep the domain running and work on an ongoing basis.

And I think either the people on this group or we need to seek outside help and that's part of our charters regardless of which charter you look at to start quantifying this so we have something specific to talk about and either shoot down or agree with. So as much as I think this general conversation is important I think we have to start putting straw men out of something specific.

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: This will happen in the few coming days.

Alan Greenberg: Well I'm hoping so but...

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Yes. You will receive - and I will send you an email specific email to you about it.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Any comments? So if hearing none we can move to the next work team. Okay thank you Tinjani so we will wait for the update in the mail - the mailing list and the document so we can...

Tinjani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: ...continue the discussion. Thank you. Now moving to the work team leaded by Avri about the funding.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Avri.

Avri Doria: Thanks. As Eric put it several times if there are resources and indeed there aren't yet. Ben talking to a lot of people - unfortunately I have not done more on the wiki page. I got those started and no one else has added to them yet.

Hopefully people who are volunteers in that group will start looking at some of those spaces and do - I've unfortunately been busy actually making a living which only happens intermittenly in my life these days so I haven't gotten any writing done. And I don't have that much more to report other than we need to start (writing) those donor cases and start framing the appeals letters that we'd send out.

One thing that has become apparent to me is another thing we have to include in all of this and we could possibly take some of it out of the milestone. But when I was at the .next meeting last week - now granted these are all entrepreneurs with pockets full of money talking - but it was also people talking about, you know, what you need to apply.

And there really seems to be a mindset that says if you don't have bags full of money you don't belong in this game. And I think that to some extent that attitude may have, you know, been accepted by some of those who actually have money to donate. But they're looking at it and sort of saying why would we?

You know, and it's not so much the competition that we're worried about but we just don't believe this can be done without having a war chest of at

minimum \$500,000. And that was basically the information that was put out in that conference was if you've got a TLD that no one will object to and will not have to answer any objections and will not have any string contention that's \$500,000 at minimum and it can go up to millions.

So what do you mean when you say helping people financially? Are we talking about helping people to the tune of \$500,000? And what business do they have in this if they don't have that. And so that is a mindset that we have to deal with.

And we'll have to find a way to discuss and to answer the questions of because any donor is going to have heard that or will hear that and sort of said, you know, how do we get them to that? How do we get a package together, you know.

Because that's - I was once a donor for, you know, something else and basically the person that was putting together the fund had to get like 12 or 13 of us together to show that she had met a particular threshold that was considered the minimum threshold she had to meet in order to be qualified to move forward in order to have a prayer of succeeding with what she was doing.

And are we in that same kind of concept where we have to work with an applicant and show them, you know, and basically show that you've got a package now of equivalents, of support in kind and monies that get you to that \$500,000 equivalent below which people don't believe you have a chance.

So that's just a new problem that I've sort of really picked up on in the last week being in California at .next. And it's something I think we need to add to things we discuss in any materials we put out. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Avri, I just have question about this \$500,000. It's just about - for - about the application itself or...

Avri Doria: No it's - basically it's an assumption, a calculation the various of these companies that are helping people do things and that are - or doing it themselves or what have you.

But it's a figure that came out of consultants sort of saying when you look at the money it takes to put together the basic staff, to put together, you know, the application fee, to write the application, to, you know, have the basic agreements in place, etcetera, it'll take that as a minimum even if you - or especially if you're already working with a backend provider let alone if you're trying to prevent your own.

Now as I say there's a lot of discussion we can make that shows yes but those are at LA prices; those are at LA salaries and those are at leases and rentals, etcetera. But what I'm saying is the argument needs to be put together. And we've already don't a lot of it once but it's still the prevailing vision.

Rafik Dammak: So it's mean like the expenses for the application if you...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: ...have some service - legal service, etcetera?

Avri Doria: And just the, you know, the time...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Running the...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...and get it running, etcetera, all of it put together.

Rafik Dammak: Can we have those figures etcetera maybe it will be helpful so we can check them.

Avri Doria: I haven't gotten a breakdown I've just heard people talking the figure. But I can look and see if I can get that breakdown. If I had it I would certainly have posted it.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Okay thank you Avri. So, Eric, please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you very much. Avri and others, the cost for .cat was the \$45,000 to submit the application. There was some cost for developing the application but was not borne by the applicant to the best of my knowledge. And it went to market with a \$2000 marketing budget.

So it is a counter-example or a counter, you know, yes so counter example to the claim that mid six figure capitalization is necessary for a successful operation. Now the itemization is something that we really should be doing in the D, E, F group to get numbers on and choices and the numbers associated with the choices, for instance the choice between lease and rent, the choice between backend and non-backend.

Anyway I'll just leave it at that that we do have an example that shows that for \$50,000 with - actually \$47,000 for - well \$2000 of those were in euros - with the costs for the application and the cost for operations forwarded against future revenues, which is a common form of factoring of receivables, the total cost came in at 1/10th of what the glitterati are bantering about (Karen)'s little love fest. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes I can't get over glitterati at a love fest but thank you for the image.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I was there and I'm definitely not a glitterati. But anyway I think - I think, Eric, you're absolutely right. And that's what I mean we've got to build the case. And I think examples like, you know, the one you've given are indeed what we're talking about.

I wasn't trying to argue that that is a correct figure but just trying to argue that that is a mindset that exists and it...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...exists upon the glitterati and those are the ones we have to get money from. So, yes, thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Avri. Okay any further comments?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Avri, post the links please to the wiki.

Avri Doria: Sure. As I say they didn't actually lay out the breakup of the expense but I'll find any information I can post. I - it was mostly talk.

Eric Brunner-Williams: No, no, I mean, the wiki that we are working on...

Avri Doria: Oh it's in the confluence one that was already sent out but I'll send it out again. It's the confluence one that was set up by Karla and within that as soon as you go in you'll see team C, G there and that's where I started creating the pages. But it's in the JAS's wiki page that we've all got.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thanks.

Avri Doria: But I'll send it out again certainly.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Avri so don't have any further reports for this?

Avri Doria: Me? No.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, okay. We also had some discussion - I'm sorry we also had some discussion the last conference call hope that you could listening to the MP3 and enjoying that.

Avri Doria: Yes, no I haven't yet, I'm sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. We had a lot of discussion about this - funding issues. Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes I wanted to throw out we talked a little bit last time about diversifying funding sources and about trying to find companies or corporate foundations that might be interested in this. And I wanted to know if anybody had any further thoughts on that.

It would strike me that this is an obvious place to go as a co-financer. And I wanted to know who we as a group thought might be obvious people to look to not just for technical support but also for a small amount of seed money to get this process going. I take it from radio silence no thoughts on that. Are there any people - are there any obvious candidates?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Andrew, I didn't actually understand the question. I'm early in my coffee cycle.

Andrew Mack: No it's okay. As you could tell from my first comment I was - I am too. I guess what I was wondering is is that trying to get a little bit of money in the door as an indicator because I think Avri is right it's important to try to, you know, prime the pump a little bit.

And I was just trying to think of who in - who in our world that is already familiar with this process might be a good candidate whether there's a corporate foundation or something that's relatively close to us.

We talked about donors a lot in the first few calls and I'm wondering - trying to think in terms of - in terms of other groups. You know, Avri mentioned the fact that there were a lot of people at .next that were well capitalized. I'm wondering if there are any of those well capitalized sources that might be leaned upon to, you know, if there's anybody who's expressed - who we think has expressed any kind of a social purpose that might - that might be a good fit.

Avri Doria: If I can respond quickly I'm putting sort of pressure on a lot of those. You know, and you can figure out how the suspects are that have lots of money. And I've also been, you know, talking to people about, you know, contributions in kind which is more the D, E, F cycle than the C, G one.

And unfortunately I'm still waiting for that first one that says yes and you can put out my name and say I'm going to do this. And I've been pushing on a fair number but I don't have one that says that yet.

And it's both among the normal, you know, people in the gTLD space that have money but I've also been talking to the various ccTLDs that either have foundations or are looking at foundations.

As I think I've mentioned before their interest tends to be restricted to helping people probably within their own national area which is not a problem but then again it becomes more in the setting up of relationships and not actually bringing in money.

They have their own foundations, they're possibly willing to talk about helping, you know, possibly as part of putting together a package but their focus will be on their own geography.

Andrew Mack: Okay. So we have the same issues...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And as soon as I do I will shout it.

Andrew Mack: Okay yes. Just for what it's worth if you find that there is some interest but some reticence to be the first one in the pool let's talk about that because maybe we can come up with the mechanisms to either get other people in the pool with them or lower their risk in some way because I know it is very difficult to be the first one to take on such a responsibility.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Andrew. Eric please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. Avri, the - you were careful not to indicate whether or not you were speaking to ISOC or Afilia just to pick one example. That is the distinction between a party that has no profound interest in capturing new applicants and a party that is a backend provider or VeriSign for that matter being in the same boat as Afilia.

So to avoid the linkage of - or the complication of in kind of direct benefit - direct donation from a backend provider my suggestion is to approach ISOC separately as a foundation possibility distinct from the registry operators that currently operate either Gs or Cs which have their own interests; some Cs of course are interested in becoming G operators as well as their existing operations. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes, no definitely. And in fact part of the breakdown that I started working on in the wiki is that one needs a different approach for all of these. So it's safe

to say that I've talked to many different varieties of possible donor from one with a vested interest in policy to the one with a vested interest in using their services to the vested interest of seeing their country grow.

You know, my assumption is everyone's got a vested interest otherwise they're not doing it, they just (bury). You know, vested interests of begin seen as a good guy might be, you know, one if I can find it. But I've been talking to people in all the categories obviously separately.

And in fact the way I was looking at coming up with cases for donors and with funding models is that they are different based upon, you know, exactly what you said.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Avri. Any further comments? Okay I'm not sure I think - Elaine is not here in this - for this call. And I think only Avri and Eric from the - let's say technical support for the applicants are present here. Do you have any updates from your work team or there was any discussion?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well I'm drawing a blank at the moment. Who else did you say?

Rafik Dammak: Okay just because we - for the next work team which is about the technical support that should be provided the applicant. We don't have Elaine who is the leader of that work team. But we only have you and Avri now on this call. So I'm not sure if you had already some discussion that...

Avri Doria: No.

Rafik Dammak: ...or something to report.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I have nothing. There's been no contact with Elaine. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: No I haven't. I saw Elaine at the glitterati festival but I haven't spoken to her about this much.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you. So I don't think we don't have so much report for this work team. So we can move to the next one. But I think that Tony is not here too. And I think he's the only member of that work team.

Okay so we have the last work team - oh Eric, please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes could we take down the unionized charter and put up the agenda of the call? Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That'd be nice.

Rafik Dammak: So the next work team leaded by Andrew about the IDN.

Andrew Mack: Right. Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Can you hear me? I'm sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: ...I wasn't sure if I was muted or not.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Okay thanks Eric. So I made an effort to reach out to some different people in the IDN space based on the conversations that we have had to this point trying to put some more specifics around the way that we think this is likely to play out; the kind of models that we think - actual use models that we think people are likely to go for, right?

And so a couple of things I found very interesting, not surprising I guess but just confirmation from the user perspective that there was a fair amount of - more demand based on what the conversations that I had people seem to think that there was a lot of demand for IDN.

And one of the questions was whether we are assuming that in this new gTLD world that everything that comes forward is going to be a Latin script new gTLD or whether there will be some things that are either - that are just IDNs that are pushed forward in this round.

And I wasn't sure what the answer was and I'd be - just didn't know what the community thought. And given that a good piece of the world that is - so that's Question Number 1 for the group.

Question Number 2 is given that the world is in no small measure not Latin script using as a primary means of communication do we wish to have some sort of a cutout or reserve for people who wish to do IDNs as part of our work given that we're really trying to reach those underserved markets, communities, people, applicants? So that was the second question.

And I'd love to get everybody's thoughts and then I have a couple more observations. Is that clear?

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Andrew. Eric, please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Andrew if you could restate that as simple questions that would be good. Thank you.

Andrew Mack: Okay sure. The - okay the - one question - the first question is - the first question was - was whether through this process that we're assuming that most of the new gTLDs that are coming forward are going to be Latin script.

And if we are given that we are trying to reach out to underserved communities and applicants should we, as a matter of our efforts, think about reserving some part of our support specifically for the IDN community? Make sense? The concern with one of the people that I spoke with was that we would end up supporting everybody but IDNs.

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: ...call on people.

Rafik Dammak: Avri and (Cheryl) and Eric please. Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay yes, I think, you know, when we get funding I think the funding can and will be targeted for specific purposes. I don't think that this group should make any decisions on ASCII versus IDN. I think if we get a donor that says I'm only willing to give for IDNs and then we'll probably actually get them specific - I'm only giving - willing to give for IDNs in script/language X I think that we have to deal with that.

But I don't think that, you know, we should say should we get a bucket of funds from, you know, World Bank, ISOC or whatever we should decide to reserve some of them for IDNs because that was part of the family of characteristics. It certainly wasn't something that we necessarily decided nope this has more support than any of the others and therefore it gets a quotient.

And I'd be - even though I definitely do want to see IDNs I still think they can be very worthy causes that are not IDNs so I would not differentiate among any undifferentiated help we get. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Just following up from what you said, Avri, I was - it struck me that there may be opportunity to leverage support either in kind or cold hard cash donations. If we were to say that there is an ability to put a sense

around some of this input so that it is specifically purposed. So I think we might have a marketing opportunity for the concept if we can say that people are able to make the differentiation preference themselves rather than us do it for them.

Andrew Mack: Okay. So, Cheryl, if I'm understanding you correctly what you're saying is is that this may be something that we use in our pitch.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Andrew Mack: But that...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I'd be pitching it because for example there's particular types of funding that you'll find that is focused by definition of the group that we may or may not, you know, successfully approach that would have to be targeted in, you know (unintelligible) or Asia Pacific or whatever.

I think this is a good thing and I think pitching IDNs as one of these opportunities for growth in the new space for both gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs is a very good thing.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Eric I think...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Andrew. Andrew, I think whoever provided you with this responsive question was not contributing to our work. The issue of allocation or pre-allocation presumes, A, that we have resources which presently we don't yet have.

But it also doesn't actually advance us in any specific directions. That is we didn't get any response from the question which is illuminating to us. So I

don't actually think the question is mature enough - is ripe to be asked. Thank you.

Andrew Mack: Okay fair enough. I hear all of you; that's all very helpful. And certainly take it under advisement. I agree with you, Cheryl, based on what I've heard so far that this is a selling point. But I understand where you're coming from, Eric and Avri, and I think that those are all fairly - they all seem rational points to me.

The other piece just to finish up my little report the other piece that has come through fairly clearly and it builds off of something that Eric mentioned is that there's an awful lot of people who say for me I am not a one-script - I'm not interested - I can't do what I need to do in one script only.

And so IDNs would be part of something. It would be - if part of a multiple script kind of thing if we're trying to reach out to a community or to an NGO company, anything like that.

And one of the questions that we talked about yesterday - that Tinjani and I talked about yesterday was this idea of at what point do you become needy? For example if you could conceivably do in one but your target audience is many - is multiple scripts do you not qualify then as needy for - in terms of achieving what your aims are?

But the big takeaway for me was I was surprised to the extent to which people said that they were really multiple script identifiers. And I think that's partly because a lot of the groups that people seem to think might apply are people who already have some Web presence and that some Web presence is largely in Latin scripts and so they'd want to keep that and move to whatever their local or their regional. So that - because people actually have these two or sometimes three different identities. Anyway that's what I got.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Andrew. Eric, please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you. This is to the group not simply directed to Andrew. I sent several notes to the group mailing list on the issue of use cases and received no feedback. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay any further comments? Okay hearing none I think that we covered all work teams. And then I think we can adjourn this call for today. Okay thank you everybody for joining today call. And so see you on the next call in Friday.

Avri Doria: And on the wiki. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, working on the wiki and the mailing list. Thank you Avri.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye. Thanks a lot.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Bye.

END