

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

Friday 25 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) Friday 25 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-20110225-en.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Participants on the Call:

GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachine

Andrew Mack – CBUC

ALAC

Cintra Sookanan – At-Large

Alan Greenberg – GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

Dave Kissoondoyal - (AFRALO) – At large

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) – At Large

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Olof Nordling

Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies:

Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large
Carlton Samuels – LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Alex Gakuru – NCSG
Tony Harris –ISPCP
Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon everyone. This is the JAUS call on the 25th of February. And on the call we have Rafik Dammak, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Elaine Pruis, Sebastien Bachollet, Dave Kissoondoyal, and (Kistrant) we have Karla Valente, Olof Nordling, and myself, Glen de Saint Gery.

We have apologies from Alex Gakuru, Avri Doria, Tony Harris, and (unintelligible). And I think probably from Carlton Samuels too because we have not been able to call out to him.

Thank you very much Rafik over to you. And let me just please remind people to say their name before they speak for the transcription purposes. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Glen. Hello everybody. Thank you for joining today's call. We will start because in relation to what will happen Monday and Tuesday, we'll discuss if -- sorry, I think there is an echo, okay, it's okay now -- to discuss about sending letter...

Operator, can you please check, how do you say, what is the source of this echo? Okay. So to discuss about sending letter for the board and the GAAC meeting officially now in regard to the publication of that the

GAAC scorecard is publishing it. And they already include in the promotion about the recommendation of our working group.

So I'm not sure now if because in the last call we discussed and maybe we can just send executive summary with maybe some updates regarding what we did already in our working group.

But now that the GAAC scorecard if already includes our recommendation, I'm not sure what kind of message or letter that we should send especially now we don't have real time to do that.

And also just to, as a reminder, to help already some people who are going to attend as observers even if they cannot, how to say, they cannot intervene. But at least they can talk after the review of some GAAC members or even board members.

So any comments, any suggestions, any feedback, any idea?

Andrew Mack: Rafik, this is Andrew, my apologies I just got on the call. Can you bring me up-to-date, I'm sorry?

Rafik Dammak: Just we started with the first item about how to, as you remember on the last call, we talked about sending an executive summary maybe with some updates to the GAAC and for the GAAC and board meeting.

But now as the GAAC scorecard include already different recommendation from our master report and stress the JAUS working group's work, I said that I'm not sure what kind of message that we should send for that meeting.

Andrew Mack: Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So I hope that we have some comment. Maybe as we have, okay Elaine, you go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Good morning. While just reviewing the GAAC scorecard with Mission and ICANN Board position, it seems like the only real (unintelligible) but you're saying that we need to make sure that everything is putting into (unintelligible). Is that really (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Elaine, sorry, Elaine, I cannot really hear you well.

Elaine Pruis: Okay, I'll repeat that. So looking at the GAAC scorecard -- can I begin?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Elaine Pruis: They are argue that (unintelligible) tracking UN language well beforehand. So the (unintelligible) have an opportunity to participate but they haven't really written a position in this scorecard regarding any of our other suggestions except that the cost distribution is amenable as we mentioned it.

I think maybe we should talk about which or if we want to prioritize any of our recommendations and which ones we should focus on for Monday.

Rafik Dammak: You need to prioritize some recommendations more than others or?

Elaine Pruis: Well yes, we should talk about what the main message we want to go to the GAAC.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Man: You're both fading out. I can hardly hear you.

Rafik Dammak: You mean who, me or Elaine?

Man: Both of you.

Rafik Dammak: Really okay. I didn't talk so much now but maybe, in any case maybe to just summarize what you say because I think I'm not sure that everybody got what you said.

Elaine Pruis: Okay. The GAAC scorecard they do not really take much of the whole stand on any particular topic except consideration should be reasonable and proportionate. And that we want to mention all the translated into UN language is within reasonable time (unintelligible) negotiation.

(Unintelligible) is that we think about (unintelligible). We have a lot more internal than that. So what is it that we want to bring to their attention on Monday and Tuesday?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so any comments? Oh we also just, how you say, we are in touch I think with (Alice Munea) who is in that GAAC working group about, how can I say, including all the stakeholders from developing countries.

So we are in touch with them. There is no response yet from the site. But at least we are in contact with them so maybe if we have some insight from Sebastien or Olof? Olof, please go ahead.

Olof Nordling: Yes thank you Rafik. I'm wondering, you mentioned the contact that you had with (Alice). And I wanted to know what, give us a little bit more input into the nature of that contact.

That might be a good place for us to start. Because if we're making common cause with her and her group, I think our recommendations are going to have a lot more umph. You know, it's going to land on the ears of our audience in a much better way.

Rafik Dammak: I think it's not really needed to contact the trend directly so. I know that at least I think see who contacted (Tracy) or even that working group and also Alex because he know her and also I think Avri. So we have some people contacted her.

But I'm not sure if she really replied to them or not. Because the full line also that she is not in Kenya now but she's at least, she is or she was in Geneva. So I'm not sure if she would really agree to our request. So I believe I cannot say how we can work with them anyway.

Olof Nordling: Well one thing Rafik that makes some sense to me is why don't we take what we have in terms of recommendations and some of the things that have come out of the last couple of months of discussion and ship them to her and get her reactions?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry? Just can you please just repeat that?

Olof Nordling: That's okay. The suggestion is as follows. That we take our recommendations and some of the work that we have been doing in the last couple of months and put it together and either have a discussion with her or at least present it to her to get her reaction.

Rafik Dammak: Oh okay, yes, we can do that, to contact her so.

Olof Nordling: And I think that's a reasonable thing for us to do and it's a reasonable request for her. And that will give us some good feedback from someone who has got the ball on the emerging market side.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. That makes sense. So you think that we should, as we are in touch with Alex so it's better that we at least to, how to say, to inform her about what we already did in this couple of months, okay.

Any...

Olof Nordling: Rafik, I would even go so far as to say that if we could setup a conference call with her, even a brief one, to go through the recommendations that might make some good sense. Answer any questions she might have. Try to get a sense of her priorities.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I think that's one of the problems is if she can attend one of that's here or maybe other members of the working group to attend one of our calls. So but I probably don't any have response but yes, we can.

Maybe we can setup, how to say, an ad hoc call for that reason so to have a discussion with her to have just as an agenda discussion between the working group and the GAAC working group.

Sebastien, please go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, just to be clear about this process. There is a working group with GAAC member, and board member, and staff to work prior to the Brussels meeting. As the Brussels meeting is happening Monday and Tuesday and GAAC and board will meet approximately on Sunday and I don't see how you will be able to have a call prior to that.

And I'm not sure that those groups will still be alive after and between Brussels and then San Francisco then. It's not to say that it will not be a good idea to have at least our other GAAC group's entities to this working group. I think it's always a good thing to have them working with the other part of the community.

But for Brussels, itself, I guess it's something over. But just to be clear, what is the working group? It's (Alice Munea) and (Juan Yanta) and (Fernando) from Sri Lanka and from the board, it's getting too early.

But of course you have two staff members of the group here on the call; I guess it's why Olof joined today as I joined. Olof is on this group and then Karla of course. And you have the - I know that there were others from GAAC and others from board but that's the core group working on the subject, thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Sebastien. Okay, yes, I think, yes it's clearly quite over for this for the Brussels' meeting. But I'm not sure. Maybe we need anyway to continue working with actually with them maybe later, maybe at least until the San Francisco meeting. So it's just maybe ten days, something like this to see what we can do in the meantime.

Olof, maybe you can give us some update or some perspective?

Olof Nordling: Hello, yes, Olof here. Well at any rate, if you want to convey a message, I think well first of all Sebastien will be on the spot obviously. And so will I. So we would be in a position to carry some water directly from you to the action meeting to the extent that the time allows and whatever.

But well for practical perspective, I agree with Sebastien that well there is no real time now to try to have another call with (Alice) or some other from the GAAC subgroup dealing with these matters before the Brussels meeting.

They will be fully occupied Monday and Tuesday. And of course this is one of the topics but there are 11 more. And some of them I can fear will take quite some time. So perhaps email exchanges to her but it's certainly possibly to try to make a short statement if there is anything in particular you want to highlight.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks Olof. That's all we're asking because many points are already in the GAAC scorecard. So I'm not sure what you want to highlight. Sebastien, please go ahead. Sebastien, your light is on.

Sebastien Bachollet: No it was to agree with Olof. But, yes, anything you want to add to what's already public we can carry into the group and see what we can do.

What it will be important maybe to have on next Friday call, to have a feedback on where we are on GAAC board on that issue. If there are

some things to be clear about because it will be useful to the work from this working group.

But I guess you have both the support of the GAAC and the Resolution 20 of the Narrow B meeting for all these working groups. And what it is important now is to try to deliver us as soon as possible more what you can.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, yes, very good. I agree if we can, even with the timeline to produce maybe a minor tome it will be in the report. It can be agreed and we can really carry our missions to the board.

Okay but Sebastien, you can count on me for to carry our message and maybe to advocate. I don't want to push you to do that. But we really I think many members of our working group will b happy that you can do that because it's agreed importantly for us to advocate our position and share a meeting.

Okay oh, and seeing no further comments maybe I can...

Olof Nordling: Rafik, this is Olof.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Olof Nordling: Maybe one way of scoping the thought here, is there anything in what GAAC, the GAAC advice, what they say that the group fundamentally disagrees with? That may be an important message as well.

Rafik Dammak: You mean if there is a point of disagreement with the GAAC?

Olof Nordling: Yes from the JAIS working group side.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I send the link for the GAAC card. I didn't see any disagreement. I'm not sure it's for the whole working group members. But I think they have more disagreement for the other 11 items but not for the item related to JAUS work.

Okay...

Olof Nordling: That as such is of course a message.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Well you know we can, yes. Okay just if any, if there is anyone here that can work with any day this weekend to prepare a short message and just take it. I would be happy because I'm not really, how do you say, (unintelligible), I'm not a native speaker and so I think we need the count of some organization.

So I would be really glad if there is someone who wants to volunteer to draft a short message. Okay, okay I will (unintelligible) that along.

Okay so I think that maybe I can move because I'm seeing no further comments or feedback. So we can move to the next item.

So just last week we said that we would like to select on the face-to-face meeting we will agree about the time slot. I think Tijani suggested that we have, let me see, that we have that meeting on Thursday from the 14 to 15:30.

So if there is no objection, we can just select that timeslot and so. Okay (unintelligible) go ahead.

Man: Yes thank you. I wanted just to tell you that according to the schedule, the final schedule of the meeting in San Francisco, this slot of time, we don't have any meeting except one specific meeting for our working group.

So I don't think that any one of us is involved in it. That's why I proposed this time.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Yes I agree if I don't hear any objections, I will ask Karla to reserve for us that time slot for the face-to-face meeting on Thursday.

Karla Valente: Okay this is Karla, Thursday, what time and for how long?

Rafik Dammak: No it's from 14 which will take one hour in-house so from 14 to 15:30.

Karla Valente: Fourteen to fifteen thirty, okay, one hour and a half. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thanks. Will fix this one issue for the San Francisco meeting. Elaine, please.

Elaine Pruis: Yes I'm looking at the schedule, you know the public forum is on Thursday afternoon from, I see the public forum jumps from (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Yes before...

Elaine Pruis: (Unintelligible) where that's later and so much shorter than usual?

Rafik Dammak: I think it will be before the public forum so I think we can so just we keep one hour and a half.

Man: It is before the public forum.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Okay.

Man: And if we don't have -- excuse me Rafik -- if we don't have too much things to do, we can make it one hour meeting so that we'll have half an hour before the public forum as a free time.

Rafik Dammak: Yes anyway so just it depends if we need more than one hour...

Man: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: ...or an hour and a half. So we will try to keep it in one hour and half so we allow people to join the public forum in time. So just maybe we should also start on time that day.

Okay so doing that we can move to the next item it is about a report for (Nokie). So we can start with the working A&P lead by Tijani, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Rafik. Since I didn't attend the last call, I don't know what were your comments about what was proposed, what (Sandra) sent as a global dux. But perhaps I will let (Sandra) speak since she knows what was made as comments, (Sandra).

(Sandra): Hi just a summary of the comments made on the last day. There was, well there was some discussion about the three activities, the three

financial reporting being too onerous particularly for companies which are setup for this group to apply.

And I believe Tijani has incorporated that change. As well there was some discussion of the evening and how to disqualify companies or applicants that lie on the onset and provide incorrect financial information.

And that I believe was Alex's wish as well as replenishing the funds of successful applicants. So I think it was just really a full review, the document, by the members of the team.

There was a bit Tijani and I have been looking. And I think there was a bit of contention which referred to this global business team. So I don't know if our document actually (unintelligible) our scope or if it's limited to lack of committee information and (unintelligible) can be used in the Bay area. Rafik.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes may I speak?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay as for gaming, I proposed at an earlier time that we deal with this point. But I received a lot of comments telling that it is not our work and if we enter inside this area we will not be able to finish the work.

That's why I wrote exactly what was recommended by some of the members of this group telling that this will be done by specific or qualified parties that have skill in proving the truth and verifying the applications. That's why I stopped there.

Rafik Dammak: Okay I'm not sure about the last point. But I think that is, to define how -- sorry, there is an echo -- to define how the GAAC clients, how we will do the work. But not to do the work itself but verification, that's it exactly, yes.

So I'm not sure what - I don't see any reason that to prevent us to define these guidelines. Then how which entity will handle that is I think that's the ICANN should be responsible for that.

Man: Rafik what do you mean by guidelines?

Rafik Dammak: How to say, sorry...

Man: Give an example.

Rafik Dammak: Guidelines, okay. So guidelines will mean that we explain how because we say that we're defining some criteria but how we will define I think the process or the way that to check or to define those criteria.

So when we say that we define, we only need the applicants is eligible. But how we define the process to check this that the applicant is in needy situation or no. So that it's more to give, how to say, guidance for the ICANN staff to implement that.

So we explain the how to but the ICANN staff will implement that.

Man: If I understand you well, if I understand you well, you mean that we have to say who is a needier applicant. That means that what are the criteria of need that we have to use. And this was done.

After that, how to verify if the applicant if those elements are true or not true, people said it's not our work.

Rafik Dammak: Okay we say that we have some criteria but how to verify those criteria, how to differentiate by matrix, and different ways. And so that's what we need as a working group to provide as guidelines.

So we can say that only just criteria should be verified by the applicant in order to receive assistance but we need to define how we can, how to say, in what way to define them. I'm not really not clear but...

So if you remember when we started we talked about matrix so that some (pre-showed) some (unintelligible) that can help us to check...

Man: That was done. The (pre-show) was defined. We have to discuss the amount, the value if you are not okay with the values we can discuss them but the (pre-show) was done, (was put there).

Okay, anyway. So if - even if you can send me an email with examples of the guidelines you mean, it will be good for me to, or for the (working) group to (work on) team to advance.

Man: Okay. So, for example, like Eric stated (unintelligible) expresses some material need and could explain the (complement) means to (verify) application (initiability).

Okay, so please (unintelligible) go ahead and (ask me how) we have Andrew in the queue. Please (state that).

Woman: Hi, I can be wrong but my interpretation of the document was that when we had (the signing) primarily needed as Eric just posted based on financial constraints but also we should also (need) based on technical problems and technical requirements and other (unintelligible) that may be required by applicants which I don't know if we have really covered it or if we really need to assert criteria for other needs that may be required.

If that is in (these capabilities) or not (as that). We've documented - we have initially (drafted) that I (continue) to last week, sorry, earlier this week, also give that an overall process including replenishing of the funds by applicants who are successful.

Again, that is something we need to decide whether or not we want to increase it here or at another area. You know, if it's beyond the scope of this specific (routine).

Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Okay. I think I understood that last bit. I'm not entirely sure but I mean we talked a little bit about, also about, the whole idea of who would be doing the judging and I believe from my notes that, and from my (remembrance), that we were kind of strong on the idea that it shouldn't be ICANN because ICANN is itself an interested party.

Did I remember that correctly? Did everybody seem to agree with that because that's kind of the impression that I had from our earlier conversation.

Woman: I agree.

Andrew Mack: (Unintelligible), that's you saying agree? Yeah, I think that's what we had so we have - effectively we have two or three different things that we're going to have to finalize, right?

One is one of the criteria and whether they are a technical criteria and a financial criteria and then the second thing is who would be doing the evaluating and how we structure that and pay for it.

And on the one hand we want to keep that as simple as possible and on the other hand want to make sure that we make it robust enough so that it's clear and relatively quick so that it doesn't waste a lot of people's money.

Make sense?

Man: Andrew, who are you asking?

Andrew Mack: I was throwing that out to our group in general.

Man: Oh, okay.

Andrew Mack: Sorry.

Man: We have (continued) in the queue. Maybe he can (try to) the question.
Please go ahead.

Man: Yes, thank you. As for the party who will verify ICANN, can be this party but you said before, I wasn't on the call, that it shouldn't because it is a part - it is an interested party because I don't know, we have to pay for it if it's not ICANN we have to pay for it.

Second point, the criteria. Technical criteria, what does that mean? That means that we have to see if the applicant has a need on the technical side. But I think that the need is, if you want, you can test it by the financial need because if you have money you can buy technical platforms. You can build one. There is no problem.

But if you don't have money, you can't do anything. So, our work, I think that our mission, is to - it is clear in the mission is to see how to demonstrate the financial need.

So we are going to see how to demonstrate this need, the financial need, because people who have money can buy a platform or can rent one. It is not a problem.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi Rafik, this is Evan.

Rafik Dammak: Hello Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, sorry I'm not on Adobe Connect. I was just wondering if I could just add something to what (Jenny) said.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Basically in total support, I don't even think we need to concentrate a whole lot on the technical capabilities except when it comes to things like donated services and things like that.

To (Jenny)'s absolutely right. Technical capability can be bought and a trip to any ICANN meeting will show no end of organizations willing to provide technical capability to those registries and would-be registries that can't do it themselves.

So I don't know so much if technical capabilities, even something that we need to worry a lot about, if somebody's got the finances to do it then they can buy the technical capability.

If they don't, either we can show them, you know, lead them to how to do it, or figure out ways of subsidizing the ways of getting a technical capability.

So it just makes our lives a little bit more complex if we're trying to address this on multiple fronts. This is mainly about money.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Evan. We have Eric and then (Tyler). Eric, please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Tijani, or thank you Rafik. This is a response to (Jack) and also to Evan. An observation that the cost of technically is not globally constant and it really isn't globally available.

Secondary name servers for Egypt were operated out of Seattle. It's not the case that you can actually buy a solution by actually putting the solution where it is needed.

You can buy one that's available where it's currently available, yeah, but it's not necessarily true that every applicant is going to be looking, is going to be making, a request (to exist) the providers are able to (provide an) answer for existing infrastructure.

So my real answer is the cost of technically is not a global constant variable and in most cases it actually can't be (bought).

If Burundi approached me in a prior occupation asking for hosting, and of course they did not want hosting in Burundi because there really was not network at all in Burundi.

If we have an applicant who wants hosting in Burundi, answering them with a solution that's located on the west coast of the United States or in Europe is simply not really a solution.

So I don't reduce this to just money and I'll stop there. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Eric.

Karla, please go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Karla Valente: I lowered my hand.

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, you had - it's okay. So you - okay.

Karla Valente: Yeah, I just wanted - I'm sorry Rafik. I take that back. I just wanted to remind people that - so there's the process, if ICANN is to do any of that, which is going to require changes and we need to take a look at conflict of interest and any other kind of issues because we are evaluating the applicants (themselves) at this point. But if ICANN were to implement something like that we need to take into account that we partner with World Bank or any other agency that is providing some kind of financial support to applicants, they will have their own criteria to do so.

So, is that two processes that you envision, one process which ICANN were to do the evaluation and another process in which other organizations would do the evaluation?

My understanding from the board and Sebastien, please correct me if I'm wrong, but my understanding from the (bar resolutions) is that the preference was that this kind of assessment or evaluation was then outside ICANN.

Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Karla.

Okay, (Aaron), please go ahead.

(Aaron): I think worthy evaluation will be done and it's going to depend on essentially who is making the decision then and whose resources or discretion it is. As an example we gave - one of the suggestions that was made early on was that instead of paying the fee in a lump sum, that the applicant, for disadvantage applicants, be allowed to pay in

sections essentially equal to those that ICANN identify as associated with each part of the process.

You know, and those numbers are available based on the refunds that are available if an application is canceled partway through. And that would clearly be ICANN's decision whether to do it so ICANN would have to do that evaluation according to criteria that we're supporting, that we're providing.

If we're talking about money from the World Bank it's obviously World Bank or whatever.

Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you (Aaron).

If there is no further comment for work team (A and B) I think we can move to the next work team. So please let me know if you have any further comment.

Okay, (moving) on. So the next work team should be - because I think Andrew sent some updates in the mailing list. So, the work team related to the (idea).

Please Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Sorry about that. Yes, I put that - I put together the notes and sent them out for everybody to have based on the conversations that we've had and some inputs from Eric and from Tijani.

It's out there. Does anybody have any questions or anything that wasn't clear based on what we sent?

Man: I'm sorry Andrew, I didn't read yet your email. I am sorry.

Andrew Mack: Not a problem. You have - some of your thoughts, many of your thoughts, have been included in it from earlier conversations.

Man: Thank you.

Andrew Mack: Eric, you want to jump in?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Andrew. I hope I break up less than on the last intervention.

Andrew Mack: It's not just you on this call, for what it's worth. It's been a number of people.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Oh good. I mean, well, bad actually.

I would like to see the (CS) express this not initially as a bundling proposal but as an attempt to find the right solution for needs which take more than one label.

So that's - I know this is difficult to get across but when internationalizing an operating system the first thing to do isn't to add support for script. Actually the real hard part is realizing that the model for a character was the wrong model if the model of the character knew that every character was eight bits long or seven bits long.

So the real hard part of internationalizing ICANN isn't adding a language or translating some document into some new language. It's realizing that the way we conduct ourselves is Anglocentric.

And here we have it in the application model that every label is considered an application and yet we have the variant problem created by, well, I don't want to point fingers unnecessarily, but we have reasonable use cases where the requirement is not for multiple labels expressed as multiple applications all at multiple costs but for one group of labels which meets one applicants needs.

So, I know this is implicit criticism of (Peter) and (Paul) and their successors which is (Peter) and (Rod) and ICANN's model of what an application is up to this point, but if we don't get this point across to them they're really just going to move chairs around and offer modest discounts or nothing on multiple strings as multiple applications.

So that, I think, is the very first point to get across is that the resources required for an application, for a registry, are one or more labels. And an application should be for one or more labels.

Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Eric. I saw that Elaine raised the hand and then lowered. Elaine do you still want to comment?

Elaine Pruis: Yes, thanks. I do agree with Eric that this shouldn't be ordered as a proposal for bundling. I think bundling has a lot of negative connotation attached to it so I do appreciate the statement for the (John) in the

email that what are the other options to enable our facility multiple script applications.

And is there a way to do this without adding to cost besides bundling? So I think we should really focus on those two questions. Thanks.

Andrew Mack: Elaine, this is Andrew. Just to follow-up on that. You know, bundling was the first idea that we came up with and it is a way of doing this that appears to have limited cost which, I know we're focused on because of the limited resource.

Certainly if there are other good ideas, I mean, let's try them.

The key thing is to get past the post and to get not thing out our resource space too much and we were talking earlier about these communities that have multiple script identities and how important, how basically, the idea of having only one script is, you know, isn't going to get them where they need to go.

And so that's why we were trying to see if maybe that's a kind of bundle that makes sense. I don't know, but call it whatever we will. The name bundling, if that's become an issue, we're willing to walk away from that. The key thing is to get the output.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Andrew.

Any comments?

Okay, moving on. So the last (working) we have Elaine, leader of what team, I think, (DEF). Elaine do you have any updates for us?

Elaine Pruis: Thanks Rafik. I've done a little bit of work this week, mostly outreach to providers, and unfortunately haven't received any responses from anyone indicating willingness to provide services.

That is probably just - hopefully that's just a lack of time to consider the idea and I'll be in Brussels at the (Gag Award) consultation and will do whatever I can there to put forward the work that we've done there.

Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Elaine. Just a question, I know that you contacted (Aaron) and Elaine put us in CC but I don't think that he sent any reply yet.

So do you think that maybe we can send him a reminder or something?

Elaine Pruis: Yeah, he actually responded direct to me and he noted that he had actually distributed his mailing list to us but he said he was willing to forward any material that we send to him along to the providers that were at the conference in some newsletter form.

And I haven't seen that go out yet so, yeah, I will send him a note today asking him if he'll still do that.

I did send him basically an outline of what we're doing and saying what we're looking for. I'll CC the group on that email so you can see what I sent.

Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. We have Eric and then Karla, please Eric, go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Rafik, did you say my name?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. You had raised your hand.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I couldn't hear you. This is for Elaine. Elaine, if we have - if we provide a menu of likely needs, things we think the applicants are likely to need then we can get the usual suspects, or provide them anyway, with an opportunity to respond. They're able to provide some or some portion of the menu.

Thank you.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks Eric. I put together a spreadsheet that breaks out the application question in matrix and have sorted out which questions need what sort of work.

So, is it a question that requires some technical expertise? Is it a question that requires legal expertise? Is it just a consulting question? Do you need some financial help here?

So I've got that all done. I still haven't posted it to the wiki because I still don't know how to access that.

Rafik Dammak: Karla, please go ahead.

Karla Valente: Thank you Rafik, this is Karla.

Just a quick update. I started putting together a mock-up for the Webpage that the board requested on a resolution in which we would have a list of organizations that are offering help and applicants that are seeking help.

And this mock-up started, I'm working on disclaimers, terms and conditions and things like that, so it's not ready for primetime yet. But this is something already in the works.

In this list we would have the names of the organizations and also where they are located geographically and what type of help. They offer a link to the Web site and contact information.

And we would have also from the applicant side the name of the applicant, the location, the country or the region and also what type of help this applicant is seeking.

The purpose of the Webpage, or this space, is to really match or make it easy for the organizations that are willing to offer help find the applicants that are seeking help and vice versa.

So this is one of the things that I wanted the group to be aware of. This work is already on the way.

The second thing is some concern that the group might be reaching out to third-parties at this point on behalf of ICANN. And once we have all of this criteria and everything put together and the Web site, my recommendation is that we post an announcement and ICANN which is out to the group, but we do all at once and we do all in a very public and transparent way so we give an opportunity for all organizations

and everyone to know at once that this is being worked on and available.

Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Karla. Any comments?

Elaine do you want to comment on what Karla just said about the page?

Elaine Pruis: No, that's clear to me. It's fine for me to wait to do any outreach until that's ready. I think that makes the most sense as far as being efficient.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Anyway, just (for comment), I think, that what you are doing (is outrageous) and not. I don't think that there is anybody who says we are doing things on behalf of the ICANN (suggest this) with our - it's done with our personal capacity. We're trying just to not to wait for really (at the end) to do that so to see if we can have an organization that can help later.

Karla, your hand is still raised. Do you want to comment?

Karla Valente: Yeah, how is the (value) personal (capacity)...

Rafik Dammak: I think it's like what Elaine...

Karla Valente: My concern is the fact that we should be using a standardized messaging, a standardized kind of material and I just don't understand the personal capacity in this context.

Elaine Pruis: Karla, what I (need) is the later that we wrote and approved as a group back in June called for interest from providers and potential applicants I just forwarded that to (Kieran) so that's something that's already been published. It's already put on the ICANN blog.

There wasn't (any material) that I just forwarded to (Kieran) and asked him if he'd distribute that to the providers that had gone to the (Dot Net) conference ten days ago.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So just (covered what type meant by) personal capacity is not that - so we are trying to not wait really that's just (an answer) that we do an official announcement for ICANN.

So just to explain what (Jeff)'s working group - what you are doing in (Jeff)'s working group and to see, I think, the reaction of some like providers, etc., but you are not talking on the behalf of ICANN.

So, I'm not really seeing any problem for transparency at this level. Just we try to see, maybe, the reaction of those people who may, as I say, I'm saying, who may help later.

So, it's - anyway, if we have a page and (efficient) and (unintelligible) it will (helpful) but also it should be done as soon as possible not to wait really at the end and then to make it complicated for possible (needy) applicant.

So, thanks.

Anyway, is there are any further comments?

Okay, I think that we ran out of time. We can adjourn this call for today.
Thank you everybody for joining.

Oh, Tijani, you have a comment?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, last question it is about (the) other thing.

Karla, I sent you an email about the page. Did you - I asked you, did you already create pages for each work team because I didn't find pages? Or shall I create a (chart) page for my work team?

Karla Valente: Hi Tijani, this is Karla. I'm sorry I didn't see your email. Anyone from this group should be able to create a trial page.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Karla Valente: You, for whatever reason, cannot do that please let me know and I'll create one for you just let me know exactly what you want.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, I will do. But I thought you said in a call that there is pages for each work team. That's why I was wondering perhaps they are put in another place that's why I was asking.

Karla Valente: Yeah, I'm sorry if I wasn't clear. I was not creating the page for each sub group. That was not my intent but I will be happy to do so if you have some issues in doing it.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, thank you Karla.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so (heading) (unintelligible) and then I can now we adjourn the call for today. Thank you everybody for joining this call.

I think we don't have a call in Tuesday so (see you) in Friday.

Man: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: Thanks everyone.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Rafik Dammak: Operator? Operator...

Okay, you cannot hear me.

END