

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

**Tuesday 22 February 2011 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 22 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-ias-20110222-en.mp3>

**On page ;**

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

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

Participants on the Call:

GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair

Elaine Pruis - Mindsandmachine

Andrew Mack – CBUC

ALAC

Cintra Sookanan – At-Large

Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair

Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

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

Alan Greenberg – GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At large

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you (Miriam). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening

everyone. This is the JAS call on the 22nd of February, and on the line we have Rafik Dammak, Cintra Sooknanan, Elaine Pruis, Eric Brunner-Williams. And we have apologies from Conny Harris, Carlton Samuels, Alex Gakuru, Avri Doria, and there is someone else - and Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

And is Karla on the line yet? Karla Valente?

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible)...

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay, Rafik...

Woman: Karla's just joined.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you very much.

Okay Tijani, over to you. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: It's Rafik. Okay, thank you, you know. Okay, hello. So hello everybody. Thank you for joining today's call. So we have a few people present on the call.

So - but we have quite important items to cover. I think for first, it's about - in relation to the GAC and Board meeting next week. We discussed that maybe we should write a letter that express the view of the working group. We don't have volunteers yet, but I really encourage some -- how to say -- to encourage you to - that we want to draft something as soon as possible, then we have (Sebastian) that can't - and to be with our document during the GAC and the Board meeting because a topic about - related to developing countries and the initiative - the program is one of the ICANN's - of the meeting agenda.

So any volunteers? Any comments? Any ideas that can foster this report?

Please - I'm not seeing - I'm not in the Adobe Connect though. Please if you want to get the queue (unintelligible) just say so.

Okay. Can you hear me?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Oh, Eric. Thanks. So any comments?

Okay. So, we have (unintelligible).

Okay. Hearing none, I think that I will try to find some people or (unintelligible) the draft by myself and - just to send to the working group for review and comments.

Okay. Elaine, please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: So Rafik, do you have some idea of what you want to write in that letter? Could we hear what your ideas are?

Rafik Dammak: Because we have to - I think that is a good point. There is already GAC working group that we - Cintra, what she did last week. And even she tried to contact (Tracy), who is involved with that working group - GAC working group. So my understanding, which is trying to maybe summarize what we recommended before and maybe what some more additional tasks. I'm not sure what we can add, but just maybe to

summarize or to stress some points that we think are important to highlight.

So like maybe like to - like to draft a kind of Executive Summary or something that can be easy to read and to - in that context, I think that they already have many material to read. But if we can make like a real short letter that - to highlight what we want to advocate, it would be great. So if - what do you think what kind of points that we should highlight or to present?

Is it clear, Elaine? I - did I answer to - please Andrew. Go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes, Rafik. Sorry, I guess I'm not quite clear. Can you help us - and I'm sorry I'm a couple of minutes late. I had a challenge with the metro. I've got a cast on my foot right now.

The - I'm not entirely sure - the audience is - can you help us understand what it is we're hoping to accomplish through this?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think - I guess it's because it's already that issue of - to include developing -- how to say -- developing countries in the initiative - the program, it's one of the topic in the agenda of the GAC and Board meeting.

So it's really a good opportunity for us to advocate or to trace our recommendation, because you know the GAC many times expresses its communiqué - in the - during - a communiqué that is issued after ICANN meetings. They many times they stressed the need to help applicants from developing countries.

So, it's a good opportunity for us because it - this meeting will be before the San Francisco meeting, (unintelligible) so maybe it will help us to advocate some recommendation that I'm not sure they already received - they were received by the ICANN Board, so that's my - that one of - think that ICANN suggest.

Andrew Mack: Okay. That makes sense.

One more quick question for you. Is this something that they have requested of us informally or formally? And if not...

Rafik Dammak: No. No. No. It was more...

Andrew Mack: Okay. No, just trying to get a context, that's all, to help write...

Rafik Dammak: In fact - yes. In fact, it was a suggestion from Sebastian, who will be there in the - for the - in that meeting. So he can distribute the document for us on behalf of us during the meeting. So it's quite - I think is - it's a good opportunity somehow that we can use to - I think that we need to - maybe to pass some message to the GAC and the Board in the meeting - that time.

Elaine, please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks, Rafik. I just wanted - I don't know if you're aware, but we did write an Executive Summary for our milestone report, so if we could just go off that. I would certainly suggest that we don't add any new ideas or new material because we won't have time to reach consensus on any new concepts.

Rafik Dammak: No. If the - the last one, of the milestone report you mean?

Okay. I think that makes sense. And you - if we tried to find this - we have that document in the Wiki, and then we can - and then if maybe, just in case - just to share the mailing list to see if there - we think that we can add something or we want to add some points. Because, what - even we - I think we did some progress at least in some points, so maybe if we want to add or - just in case, because we have - as you say, we don't have so much time. Just less than one week to do that.

Okay. So if there is no more comment, we can move to the next item.

Okay. Hearing none, (thanks to the room), so...

Okay. For the next item, last time we discussed about -- how to say -- the - to have in the - a working group meeting for San Francisco. And I think the San Francisco meeting schedule was published, so Karla, can you give more update on that and - so we can I think - now we can select some - the time and date, and then to look to check in the mailing list with the whole members of the working group.

Karla?

Karla Valente: I don't have really Rafik, anything to add to this piece. Any time and date you want, I will just book a room.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I saw that the schedule is now online. So just to check - because you know, for GNSO (side), I think there is no conflict, and I don't know if there would be some session of some joint working group or

something like - for GNSO, but for the ALAC, I'm not sure. That's why...

Karla Valente: Yes. For the agenda - yes, so it's really up to the working group to tell me the time, because these rooms that we are booking are rooms that are not being in use, so any time you want is fine.

Rafik Dammak: So what do you think if we set up - as usual, do a poll just to check, because we can either have Wednesday or Thursday, and just too, about the same time. And then just to check, and we have - you have more clear idea among all the working group's members who are going to attend the San Francisco meeting. So it will be - fix the issue quickly.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Now please let's do that, then we can move so we - at least we are assured to have a working group face-to-face meeting in San Francisco.

So what else? I don't think that we have anything in the other point related to this item for San Francisco meeting. Maybe how to - about our message or some (unintelligible) or something like that. I'm not sure if we can do that.

Any comments?

Wow. That's quite - it's a quiet call today.

Okay. I think now we can move to the work team reports.  
Unfortunately, we don't have Tijani, Avri, and Conny, but we have  
Cintra. Cintra, you are still here on the call?

Cintra Sooknanan: Hello. Yes, I give you the summary of where we are right now.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Yes, please. Yes. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Cintra Sooknanan: In (consulting) Eric, we - I - Tijani called and I might have  
(unintelligible) the eligibility criteria, and we put down somewhat of a  
test with regard to those items (comment) on the milestone report. I  
think the document is ready for review by the rest of the JAS working  
group, so it will be in the shared Google documents.

Right now, it's just a matter of us refining the test of each criteria, and I  
don't know if we want to elaborate on further criteria at this stage, but  
that's where we are at.

Rafik Dammak: All right. Thank you. Am I understanding like to - one of the - like it's  
how to - to have a specific test for each criteria do you mean? Like how  
to assess...

Man: Rafik, can you speak into the mic when you speak into it? It's really  
easy to hear you and a little harder when you're speaking away from it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Sorry. Sorry. Sorry. Sorry. Sorry.

Man: No. No. Thank you. Just want to hear what you say.



Rafik Dammak: Okay. Just my understanding reading the - Cintra made that there may be one thing to elaborate is how to have a specific test for each criteria. So if understand, the work team defined the criteria but we need how to assess that the applicant is matching that criteria, no?

Cintra Sooknanan: Correct. Perhaps at this stage as well, we could all - we can ask (expert or consultant), so to speak - to just review what we have done, and to see if they would prefer to add anything or to clarify anything. I don't know if there is you know, anybody that we know - any who will (unintelligible). I don't know who exactly you want to bring on that's an expert at this stage?

Rafik Dammak: You mean that we need some expertise for that - for this point?

Cintra Sooknanan: No. If it is that we can't decide on a test, then I think it's appropriate for us to ask.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Any comments?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well, I submitted written comments.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. We have Andrew and Eric.

Andrew Mack: Let Eric go first, please.

Rafik Dammak: Eric, please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I already submitted written comments. They were to the list.

Rafik Dammak: Oh, yes. But maybe just to summarize them or just for - to share with the people here on the call (unintelligible). Okay?

Okay. Eric, please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I don't have my previous written comments in front of me.

Rafik Dammak: But - okay.

Eric Brunner-Williams: If they haven't been read, then they haven't been read.

Rafik Dammak: So, it was - tried to - so...

Okay. I tried to (change) them. In the meantime, please Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Well actually, I was going to talk (with respect to) Cintra and ask her if there are - she - are there specific issues that you and Tijani are working on that are - you know, that are really giving you difficulty? I mean, I'm a little behind the loop because I've been working on other stuff. But he and I spoke last week, and he was mentioning that this is a very difficult thing.

I guess the questions in my mind are two-fold. Is one in terms of the criteria, and then the other one is in terms of the mechanism for checking that criteria? And, I wondered where it was you were having the trouble so that we - maybe we could focus in on that for a few minutes?

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. Well the criteria were already defined by in large in the milestone report, right? It was just for us to refine those criteria. The difficult part is really defining the test, how difficult (unintelligible) do we want to create for new applicants and that sort of thing, because our primary criteria will be need - financial need.

All right. With regard to Eric's comment; Eric, I don't know when exactly did you send your comments? I - because we had recently updated the Google doc, so I don't know if Tijani may have incorporated your comments.

Rafik Dammak: I think that Eric sent them in Friday after the call, no?

Eric Brunner-Williams: On the 18th.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. Well, I'll have to speak to Tijani, because I know he did make some revisions, at least on the outcome of the call. But if not, we look at it again, and then I know the aim is to - what I'll do is I'll just resend an email to everybody so they can look at it at that point.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well, I now have it in front of me, so I guess I can...

Man: Go for it.

Eric Brunner-Williams: ...I can bore you all and talk about it. So the first point I raised is that cost and the complexity of asking for money should not be so great that it deters applicants from actually asking. That is, we

want somehow there to be - I'll get back - you'll see where this is up later.

The second point is that because ICANN is - the applicant has to be a corporate entity in order to contract with ICANN, this means that in all likelihood, many of the applicants will be corporations which are formed within a year of the date of application. And therefore, a three year prior horizon for financial reporting will require looking past the applicants to the antecedents of the applicant.

And this will be true both for good applications, you know, deserving applications for which no gaming is present, et cetera, and also for applicants which could be characterized otherwise. It's likely that many applicants will in fact be corporations which are less than a year old, and are special purpose vehicles for just particular investment activity.

So, the three year backwards requirement creates a cost and complexity problem for the applicant, and it also creates a problem for whoever the evaluator is -- let us say it's us at this moment -- in trying to pierce the corporate veil and look into the past and into the - into several other corporations, not just the applicant corporation.

And, feel free to comment any - you know, at any point if either this makes sense or it does not make sense.

Cintra Sooknanan: So Eric, we did incorporate those comments.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay. The...

Cintra Sooknanan: And the three year financial reports, that was actually discussed on the Friday call, and the - in my opinion, it is appropriate simply because you need to have a stable organization that has been around and can prove that you know, it is handling its finances well and that sort of thing.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well, it's nice to have an opinion. The fact is that you're asking for something that goes - you're basically creating a requirement that applicants (that are needy) existed two or more years in the past from the present moment, assuming that the application date occurs within less than a year from now.

So, you're creating through this requirement -- and your belief is this is a legitimate requirement for you to impose on the applicant - and I'm just pointing this out so that you understand what you're actually requiring. You're requiring that the applicant already exists in its corporate form in 2008 in order to be eligible to apply for assistance in 2011 or 2012. Is that your desired goal?

Andrew Mack: Eric, could I jump in here? I'm sorry, Cintra.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Sure.

Rafik Dammak: Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Eric, I completely get where you're coming from, and I think that this is actually a more significant challenge or question than maybe realized at the outset, for a couple of reasons.

First of all is because this process had started up - I mean, this process has been moving forward in greatest earnestness in the last two years, and there may be a number of people who have become interested in this, especially from the markets that we're trying to reach more recently as opposed to longer ago. It's just the nature of things. That's number one.

Number two is I can see very many instances where a special purpose vehicle, a special legal form will have been set up specifically to do this. For example, in a community, or an NGO, or even a company that wants to do this specifically, it makes sense for them legally to set up a separate company to do this. So as - because this is separate activity and for a whole host of reasons. And so it may - that - and we don't want that to necessarily disqualify them.

The other thing is that I can see - in the case of a community, there may be two or three different groups that might be interested, and a nice compromise solution might be that they all come together to offer a similar script or a similar - you know, a - to apply for the new gTLD. In that case, they wouldn't necessarily have had a pre-existing identity, even though the sub-components of that group might actually be fairly well established.

So in all of those cases, I think that there may be - this may actually be a little bit more complicated. And I agree with Eric; we don't want the fact that - we don't want to kick them out for what we would consider to be good behaviors, which might be a compromised behavior, or you know getting set up in a smart way legally. Does that make sense to everybody?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well it does to me of course, but I'm interested in Cintra's answer, because she said that she thought this was a good requirement.

Cintra Sooknanan: What I was saying is that is desired, but it's not required. So certainly, you would desire an applicant to have a certain level of - be established for a certain amount of time, but it's not a requirement to automatically get rid of an applicant.

So, we will have to - you know, based on some other metrics, we will have to be able to really determine you know, the legitimacy of applicants who are you know, established under three years, six months, two months, that sort of thing. So we did agree, (really).

Eric Brunner-Williams: I just want to point out Cintra, that the purpose of ICANN's outreach program is presumably - I mean Karla can correct me if I'm wrong, but the purpose of doing outreach after the Board approves of the new gTLD program -- if they ever do, and when they do if they do -- is to cause parties to apply.

So corporations will be formed the day that ICANN says, "We're going to go ahead," for the purpose of submitting an application some three months subsequent, assuming those - the timeline. So if we - you're - the definition of - I just wanted to point out that we should expect applicants to form within the three month period of the application date itself, not - thank you very much for your time.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you Eric.

Rafik Dammak: Eric? Cintra? Okay we have Andrew. Cintra, you want to comment?

Cintra Sooknanan: No, I agree with him. I - it is the way we have to look out.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes, Rafik if I could I - this actually - I think Eric is very much right to have flagged this, but I think this is an - this may be an easy fix, which is that what we need to do is to say I - the goal which is to have entities involved in this that have some background and have some sustainability as entities I think makes good sense, right.

And so all we need to do is to include in language that says that the entity, if it is a new entity, that we have to have some sort of ability to do look back on, you know, so that they're effectively - the predecessor entities have to have some track record, and we just have to measure that.

The question is when there are multiple predecessor entities and, you know, for example one of them might fit our criteria and others - one of them might not, or where you have predecessor entities, some of which may be financially solvent and solid and others of which may be not so solvent and solid, and I think that may be a challenge.

I can see for example in the case of community groups where you have a broad coalition of people coming together to do this in, you know, dot Housa or whatever, and some of the groups may be big and relatively robust, and others of the groups may be very, very small and only a few people and they decide to bring them all together.



So I get - but I think it's just a question of writing it all down and trying to put that together as a policy. That's it.

Rafik Dammak: So sorry. Eric, you was going to comment?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well I guess I could continue on my laundry list, but I don't want to spend the whole call just doing my laundry list.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Andrew Mack: If there are other things that are relevant, I would say go through it now.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well it occurred to me that looking backwards is one choice that we have. We can also look forwards, that is, what is the - suppose we have an applicant which the backward look is satisfied that the applicant is qualified, but the applicant has actually hidden some assets which the applicant then uses for marketing and achieves a return on investment goal that surprises us, or that is unexpected because there - we had not, we being of course the imaginary us in the role of evaluators of the applicant's need whoever that actually turns out to be, but in the case of a hidden hoard we really don't have any recourse.

If we've been - if we're fooled in the backwards-looking portion of these guys, we're fooled permanently. This - that deals or that's an issue of bad conduct or gaming to address, but there's a similar issue that arises with unexpected success.

Suppose there's an applicant that's - needs qualified and so forth and they strike it rich, truly rich. We want to recover revenues for the sustainability of this program.

Do we have an interest then therefore in looking at the quarterly returns, the profitability of Registries which are qualified and received assistance during the first several years of their operations in order to either discover bad acts which occur after the contract period is entered, or to discover hidden or surprising success and the opportunity to refund the assistance back to - for the purposes of sustainability of the assistance program?

And that was I think the last thing that I wrote in my notes, sort of a conclusion of a critique of just looking backwards, that is, looking some three years, four years into the past. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Okay I - as I recall from our earliest work we talked about the idea that a Registry that makes a fair amount of money would repay any assistance that it would be given, that that was one of our presuppositions to one of our goals.

And I think that that makes sense, but to some extent I think the issue becomes a smaller one. The question is only when do we look back and see if they're making the resource?

In the first - monitoring someone quarterly seems like a lot of work for us and maybe something that they - that a Registry might or might not accept. But if we had originally had - I think we had originally had some

sort of an idea that the support period might be, you know, a time certain of say three years or something like that.

Certainly it would make sense that at the end of three years, if we look back and we say that the - not only is the entity self-supporting but that it is actually taking off, that at that point in time we, you know, you could put into the agreement that they would have the following responsibilities.

I don't know whether it makes sense to look farther into the future than that. If it's earlier than three years I don't know if we have enough data to make the call, but I think if we write it into the contract that says, you know, "As part of the support contract you agree to this kind of look back at the three year mark and maybe at the four year mark and maybe at the five year mark." That would strike me as making a fair amount of sense.

Rafik Dammak: Cintra, please go ahead.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you. I just wanted to highlight - I did copy the TLD Google doc into the chart area as well. These two issues that you're dealing with being - this was being the nondisclosure, is that within Step 3 and repayment and partial payment of - and recycling our funds is dealt with in Step 4.

So I don't know if you can add - copy this - the text that is relevant that - but, you know, if you could both or, you know, the group as a whole could just evaluate that and see if we can refine it.

Maybe there are items that need to be taken out or put in, you know, as well. But it is covered on a basic level in our text.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Cintra. I was unaware of the editorial change.

Cintra Sooknanan: I'm sorry Eric, did you say something? I didn't...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes, I was thanking you. I was unaware that the editorial change had been made in the A-B text.

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes I am. We had included your bit on gaming and that sort of thing, so it's just a matter of...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well I'm sorry I've wasted everyone's time then. Thank you.

Cintra Sooknanan: No, there's no reason. I think Tijani did put it in and we did discuss these three things on Friday. So - but, I mean, we're discussing - these are these items that really need - it's not black or white.

It's something that we really need to try to understand every possible situation and try to key to.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Yes, this is - this looks great Cintra. I'm going to have to take a look a little bit more at - one of the - it does beg the question. If this is - some of this is going to require an actor to do the reviewing and do the evaluating, and it's not just going to be one time evaluating, but it's going to need to be ongoing.

Has your part of the group thought at all about what would be the appropriate entity to do that and the shape and the form of that entity and things like that, because if it does - this does kind of imply that we stand up some sort of a small regulatory team?

Somebody's going to need to do the means testing and someone's going to need to - you know what I mean?

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes I do. I don't think we've defined anything. We haven't defined anybody specifically the areas of - that we have proposed like being especially means test and that kind of thing where we said, you know, we just choose a value, and it really needs to be looked at more carefully.

We actually, I mean, I think there was a suggestion, right Olivier, previously that perhaps we should set up a nonprofit arm of ICANN to do this evaluation.

I don't know if it has to - something that's, you know, being looked at or not, but certainly that is one area that we really need to define who should really be in charge of assessing this and ensuring they come up.

Rafik Dammak: Andrew, you want to comment?

Andrew Mack: Oh no, I'm sorry. I - that was my question. I - one of the concerns that I have is that we're going to have to find in addition to finding money to actual cover - actually cover program, we're going to have to find money to cover this little apex group, right, this evaluation group and support group.

And I don't think that the - that it will be difficult to find people who have relatively good experience in this space. I think that the challenge is going to be able to find - but it may be challenging to find the money to cover the group.

And I'm wondering is this - in everybody's conception is this a group that exists with a connection, a specific connection to ICANN or is this a group that is independent of ICANN?

And, you know, for example if they - if the funds come from outside of ICANN does this group exist outside of ICANN as well? What's everybody's preference?

Rafik Dammak: Someone want to answer?

Cintra Sooknanan: I think there are too few people on this call to really stand to that. I think it's something that perhaps we will have to decide on the mailing list and flesh out there or perhaps on another call when there are more, and more people and more members.

Rafik Dammak: Okay no, if everyone seems to have more comments I think we'll try, or maybe that if we want to update the current with all comments that we have in this call. Can you hear me?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: So just anyway how I think a quite interesting discussion, so we - maybe the Work Team members need to update the document with

the comment that we hear - we heard now and then to share that again with - in the mailing list.

So if there is no more comments we can move to the next Work Team. Okay, hang on. Evan is still here on the call? Evan? No? Okay, I think he's not anymore on the call.

Okay, so not sure how to handle if we don't have leaders of others' Work Teams. So the option if maybe you want to continue the discussion about Work Team A and B, but otherwise we can adjourn this call for today so...

Andrew Mack: I think we're - right now I'm - I've been putting together the kind of where we are for our group, but the truth is that we have so few people on the call right now, maybe it would be better to post things up online and move on from there.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, that's why I'm asking that if it's possible Cintra can update the document that we - and share again on the mailing list. I'm not sure that people will listen to the mp3, so it's better to share the document and then to have other comment and to see if people can review the document and then to discuss about it through the next call.

Andrew Mack: That sounds fine. I've got a - some stuff that I'm going to share with Eric and then we could post once I speak with Eric and to (Johnny) from our group, so that's fine.

Rafik Dammak: Oh yes. No, so yes, it's - say if it's the work to be done in the Work Team in A and B. So - but Andrew, do you have any updates in your Work Team? So...

Andrew Mack: Well, as I was saying I've - I'm going to - let me be brief. What I've tried to do is to basically go back through the different things where we are, and what the conversations we've had with people outside of our Working Group have told us, and to try then to get the group's advice on how we can fit this in.

In terms of where we are, it seems very clear that IDN should be a part of our pitch to potential funders, to the international donors, foundations. This seems to fit their target markets a lot.

They're very much focused on issues of digital divide and of fairness, and this addresses a lot of their concerns about if you will northern domination of the Web.

On the community side this seems to be pretty important to the way that they actually see themselves and express themselves, especially communities outside of North America, excuse me, in Asia and as Eric has mentioned in North America and in other places that - including communities that use - that express themselves in multiple scripts, and in terms of companies that are trying to reach out to regional companies, especially who are trying to reach out to people in their own space in their own language.

One of the things that we have found is just how much more this idea of a multi-script identity is a part of our - it should be a part of our thinking. A number of people have mentioned it.



There are a number of cases. There are, you know, the cases that Eric mentioned about the North American groups. There are different cases around Africa and Latin America where different multi-scripts are used.

Certainly India is a perfect example where you might wish to have a number of different scripts. One of the things that has come up in conversations I've had since then has been about the increasing mobility and the rise of this sense of the connected Diaspora, and the idea that you have people who are from a particular community who exist in - if you will in one language, in one country and another language in another country, and one script in one country and another script in another country.

And I think that that's increasingly going to be the case as people become more mobile and more connected in their mobility. And also the rise of a lot of communities, NGOs, companies in the south who are wanting to reach multiple IDN communities.

So it's a lot of our - a lot of the work historically has been focused on the idea that it would be northern groups trying to reach out to underserved southern communities.

And in fact this - there are an awful - there's an awful lot of push from the south now. I - we've identified three different kinds of cases and Eric, I'd like - love it if you'd jump in real quickly to make sure that I get this right.

One in which there are IDNs alone. A second one, groups with identities in multiple scripts and Cree, Cherokee, but many others. And then groups that wish to work across platforms, so that use IDNs.

So for example NGOs that wish to go regional, professional associations. Eric mentioned the possibility of doing like a dot medicine or something like that, and that makes good sense.

I think that four IDNs, especially the issue of pricing, will be an issue and it will be an issue because when you're talking about an underserved community that needs one script to be real, to really truly represent itself as it sees itself, that may be a challenge.

But certainly if it's a community that really truly exists in two scripts, that makes it even more of a challenge and so something about pricing needs to be done.

We've talked a little bit about bundling. That is an option for getting at the pricing issue. If there are other options then we're - I'm very interested in knowing what there is.

The key thing for - from our perspective is that we recognize that there is a limited amount of funds going to be available, and so to the extent that we are not asking - we were not asking for a, you know, a second poll if you will on the finance of whatever foundation gets set up, we think that's probably a benefit.

And then the last piece that I had is, is that there was some agreement that we had come to from our call a couple of times ago that there is no preference for IDNs in our application process on the one hand.

On the other hand that it was important not to ignore IDNs in the process, and that we all agreed that providing some level of a diversity

through this process, at the very minimum to not have IDNs be a - an afterthought or to have it be hard or more difficult to get into a - the IDNs, but that that was a value that we wanted to pursue.

So that's kind of where we - that's kind of from the notes that I have where we are and Eric, if you'd please jump in and fill in anything that I got wrong or that should have been added to that.

Eric Brunner-Williams: No, you've done quite well. I mean, the - I'm tempted to editorialize. We're struggling with the - really the lack of internationalization of ICANN itself. We're trying to localize applications without actually having the means to do so.

So we're stuck with this notion of an application as a string, not an application as the resources necessary to get a job done, which may include maybe as simple as one string or it might be several strings.

But I don't see that Peter and (Rod) are going to be any more flexible on this than Peter and (Paul) were on this and - for over the past three years.

Andrew Mack: Well I certainly agree with you. I think as with a lot of other parts of this, we might as well ask for what we think makes sense. The - certainly I think it's been made abundantly clear to us through our conversations and through conversations with people outside of our Working Group, that there are a tremendous number of groups that would be interested in applying who are, you know, kind of a multi - have a multi-script identity.

And that that's an important part of who they are, whether it's reaching their community members or reaching the, you know, the association or client members that they're trying to reach out to, that that is really on a deep level who they are.

And so if there's some way that we can make that easier, I certainly think that that's going to be important. You know, in point of fact because of the way that the Web has developed, an awful lot of people who other - who in their regular life has an IDN identity, have a - at least partly Latin script identity on the Web.

And so I think that that's something that we have to come to grips with because it - we're effectively - if we don't make a move in the direction of IDNs we're effectively asking them all to, you know, to have this dual identity and it's asking a lot.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, any further comments? Andrew, can you please summarize all these points and document something that can be helpful to people to review and to comment?

Andrew Mack: I would be happy to. I actually have it written down and so I will send it out to the group. If there are any comments I'll add them in, and then if not I'll send them out this afternoon or tomorrow. Sure, no problem.

Rafik Dammak: Just document and then we can share it and the idea is to have the trial call of these points because I think we have very interesting discussion in our calls, but we need also to write down all these points that it - after we can draft our report.

Andrew Mack: Sure. I just want to get everybody's thoughts before I put it out by the wiki, that's all.

Rafik Dammak: Oh yes. Thanks. Okay, any further comment? Okay guys, thank you for attending this call we have if you attended it, but we could have very great discussion and to probably some different point, so what I can advise it's that for the different Work Team that we discuss their reports that you update your documents and to share with the Working Group members.

And also to put them in the wiki so we can then to talk the progress done there. So thank you again and we adjourn this call for today.  
Thank you everybody.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

Andrew Mack: Okay, thank you. Thank you.

END