

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Friday 25 March 2010 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Friday 25 March 2011 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnsso/gnsso-jas-20110325-en.mp3>

On page ;

<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/#mar>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call: GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair

Alex Gakuru – NCSG Andrew Mack – CBUC

ALAC

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

Cintra Sookanan – At-Large

Carlton Samuels – LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

Dev Anan Teelucksingh – At Large

Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair

Elaine Pruis – MindandMachines

Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies:

Avri Doria – NCSG

Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Alan Greenberg – GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Dave Kissoondoyal - (AFRALO) – At large

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) – At Large

Michele Neylon – RrSG

Fabien Betremieux – Individual

Tony Harris –ISPCP

Coordinator: Excuse me. This call is now being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone.

This is the JAS call on the 25 of March. And on the call we have Rafik Dammak, Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alex Gakuru, (Sindra Sukunand), Baudouin Schombe, Eric Brunner-Williams. And we have apologies from Carlos Aguirre and Tony Harris. And for staff we have Karla Valente and myself, Glen de Saint Géry.

Thank you very much. And over to you, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, colleagues. Welcome. I am glad to see you all here.

I can't get onto the chat right now. I'm only going to be on the bridge. So I'm going to ask somebody on the bridge to indicate to me when there is anything happening that requires intervention from the chair. I also will leave a little early because of duties I have to perform this morning.

For the record would anybody object to the draft agenda that was sent to the list?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Carlton, I didn't receive it. Can someone...

Carlton Samuels: Did somebody say something?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. I said -- Tijani speaking -- I said that I didn't receive it.

Carlton Samuels: Oh I'm sorry, Tijani. We sent it to the list, to the list.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yeah.

Carlton Samuels: Perhaps I could just mention it by way of. So we get - we have proposed that the agenda for the call, Tuesday call, which now j- today's call was based to review - adopt the agenda, to review what happened at San Francisco -- you would have seen the notes from the San Francisco meeting -- to focus on criteria and then to look at the process elements and if there was any other business. Is there any exception to acceptance of that agenda?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I agree on it.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you.

Members that have seen the report from the San Francisco meeting -- it was circulated -- are there any matters that you would wish to bring up from the report?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Carlton, this is Eric. Do I understand that someone's going to make a report as to the events that transpired at the San Francisco meeting? Or are you just going through the text that was mailed?

Carlton Samuels: No. There was a report. That focus was made from what occurred in the meeting, Eric. And it was circulated to the list. And I'm trying to see whether or not there was anything anyone saw from that report.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Eric, I have sent you yesterday this notes and attached file. Did you receive it?

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm sorry, Rafik. You sent it as a what?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: As an attached file.

Eric Brunner-Williams: What...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I sent you an email yesterday. You remember? Tijani speaking.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yeah. I see the milestone report update. Oh and there's a Word -
an attached Word - Microsoft Word document. No I hadn't read...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yeah.

Eric Brunner-Williams: The attachment.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: That's it. That's it. Yeah, notes.

Carlton Samuels: It's notes from the meeting, Eric.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Exact.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I've got to tell you guys it really doesn't say that in the subject line.

Man: Sorry. But that's what it is.

Carlton Samuels: Does anybody...

Elaine Pruis: Hello. This is Elaine Pruis. Could you please just put - post that report onto
the Adobe screen so we can look at it while we talk about it?

Carlton Samuels: That would be good. Tijani, can I ask you to do this?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: (Unintelligible).

Karla Valente: I don't think Tijani's able to.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I don't think...

Karla Valente: I think...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I don't have the - yeah. I can only put it on the chat. Okay. We have the agenda now. And the notes do have it, Karla?

Karla Valente: Yeah. I'm going to put it on. Just give me one second. That's the Word document that Carlton said? Is that correct?

Man: Yes.

Karla Valente: Okay. You need to give me a minute here to do that.

Carlton Samuels: Is the report up now?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Not yet.

Carlton Samuels: Is the note...

Karla Valente: Not yet. Let me do the following so I don't delay you while you are doing that.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Karla Valente: It will kind of - so let me put that on the - I just put the first part on the chat.

Man: Yeah.

Karla Valente: So we can start the discussion as I, you know, finish posting the report. Is that okay?

Carlton Samuels: Yes. That's fine.

The idea here is that the notes are being put up from San Francisco from the meeting we had there as to ensure that members understand what was said

and if there's anything that's - that is burning anyone that they would like to add or to make amends we are asking you to do it now. We're going to take a very few more minutes to go through this.

Okay. Well I'm presuming that nobody has much to add to what was said at San Francisco. Can we move to the next...

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: Yes?

Rafik Dammak: Yeah. I think let's move to the next item because I think it's the more - the main item of our call today.

Carlton Samuels: That's precisely what I'm doing here, Rafik. I'm...

(Sindra Sukunard): Hi. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Moving to the next item which is a discussion of criteria for applicant qualifications.

Rafik Dammak: (Sindra) is...

Carlton Samuels: Floor is open. (Sindra)?

(Sindra Sukunard): Yes. I...

Man: (Sindra), yeah.

(Sindra Sukunard): Recommended the point that the (unintelligible) that there was consensus overall at least in the beginning of the discussion that we will include developing countries as part of our scope includes our needy applicants. But

there seemed to be some discussion still on that point so that is not a qualified point coming out of the last meeting.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Can we recall who raised the issue in San Francisco? Is there anything else we need to add to this?

Andrew Mack: Carlton, this is Andrew. Is the - what - is the question who raised the issue of countries, country applications?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Andrew Mack: That was...

Carlton Samuels: And...

Andrew Mack: (Tracy).

Carlton Samuels: Whether or not the person we wanted to say something else for the rest - for the benefit of the rest of the members here.

Andrew Mack: I think it was (Tracy) that introduced the idea. And I don't see that (Tracy)'s on the call but I might be wrong.

Carlton Samuels: I don't think (Tracy)'s on the call.

Man: No he's not.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Is that - for people who didn't see it I did send out to the list yesterday a suggestion that -- and this is coming from the GAC side -- that perhaps if they had some good ideas about how this might be approached we'd like to see them because to this point we haven't done any work on criteria for countries and what would constitute a needy country or an appropriate country for an, you know, application support.

And (Tracy) said that sounded like a reasonable request and that they'd get back to us. So for right now I don't think we have criteria. But it's, you know, it's been thrown out to them. Does that sound reasonable to the group?

Rafik Dammak: We have Elaine in the queue. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Say that again, Rafik. I'm not hearing you.

Rafik Dammak: Elaine, Elaine is in the queue if you're asking to...

Carlton Samuels: Yes. Could you go ahead please?

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. This is Elaine Pruis. So I did see the GAC's scorecard item where he basically requested that governments be considered for support for applications. And we spent quite a bit of time talking about this.

So I would - I think if we're going to punch it back to the GAC and ask them for, you know, some clarification we really need to consider exactly what sort of clarification we want from them and, you know, are we asking them - are - do you want national governments to get support, at what level of government, is there a specific area.

And we also should remember that the GAC's a very unique creature. So I don't think we should wait on their response in order to make some decisions ourselves here.

Carlton Samuels: Everybody want to add on the track from that suggestion from Elaine?

Rafik Dammak: We have here Eric and Andrew in the queue.

Carlton Samuels: Eric then (Sindra). Eric, you have a thought?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Carlton. This is Eric Brunner-Williams. Following on Elaine's comment, yes the GAC is a subset of the possible public entities. It's a subset of the ISO 3166 delegation holders.

So I'm not sure that we should just hand the general problem of governmental support back to the GAC because I don't think they represent all kinds of possible public applications. In particular I'm not entirely happy with handing back to Canada and United States the idea that they are going to exclusively speak for tribal entities in North America. Thank you very much.

Carlton Samuels: I have to tell you that I kind of emoted that concern that Eric just discussed. Let's put it to the list.

But let me hear what (Sindra) has to say. (Sindra)?

Rafik Dammak: Andrew. No, Andrew. No.

(Sindra Sukunand): Hey Carlton, I don't have anything to say at this point. I don't have a comment.

Andrew Mack: I think it's me next in line, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Andrew, Andrew. Sorry.

Andrew Mack: Thank you. Not a worry, not a worry. Excuse me. What Elaine and Eric say both make sense to me.

My suggestion to send it back to (Tracy) to get some guidance from them was partly a desire to just see what they had in mind because in the absence - since we've not worked on it specifically in the absence of knowing what they had in mind I thought that it would be worthwhile to get that input from them.

I couldn't agree more with you, Eric, that there are some governments that we may not, you know, that certainly aren't very representative of all of their constituents. And it is also true that there are vast differences between governments on a national level and governments on a regional or a sub-regional level.

I have a hard time imagining that a government - that a national government would qualify as needy in any particular way. But the attempt to send it back to (Tracy) was only really to get their information and like that.

Our initial position -- I throw this out to the group -- our initial position was to walk away from the board of governments and government entities in part because of the complexity of this and because of the, you know, the political stickiness of it and things like that.

I'm still comfortable with a step back from that. But if people feel strongly that we should entertain this from the - entertain this from governments maybe the best way to do it is to get some sort - is to go ahead with our other work and to say to the GAC, you know, we're open to this depending on what you come back with, get us something and we'll consider it, kind of something like that.

I don't know what people think. But I think this will be tremendously challenging politically and administratively to figure out which governments are needy and how they represent their people if they do.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Andrew. Can I ask a question? And I'm asking if you could focus on what Andrew said and (Eric) for the next five minutes or so.

If we were to send it back with this kind of framework what would be the key requirements that you think would be relevant for the government or people

interested in supporting the government? What are the key requirements you think for them to come back to us with?

Andrew Mack: Are you asking me?

Carlton Samuels: I'm asking the group because I think it goes beyond just need now. It has to be something a little bit more.

Rafik Dammak: Just for - Carlton, just for information we have two people in the queue. We have Elaine and Eric. So...

Carlton Samuels: Elaine and Eric. Well I'm throwing out that question and I'd like to ask. It goes to what it is that we would go back to the GAC with.

I don't think you should go back to the GAC with - and qualify just tell us some more. But I would want us to say tell us some more and specifically in this area this is where we want to hear the more.

So can I go back to the queue? And Eric is in and then Elaine is it?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Thank.

Man: I think I'll answer the first...

Carlton Samuels: Elaine, do you want to start off?

Elaine Pruis: Yes. Thank you. So I would like to reiterate what Andrew has just said. We did discuss this. We decided it was too messy and we shouldn't provide support to governments.

I'm still in that camp. But if the group decides to go down that path I do feel that we need to - instead of saying okay well what do you think about this or that I think we should go specifically with GAC, would you be satisfied if we allowed tribal governments to get support up to whatever percent.

I think it needs to be very directed. My experience with sitting through every single one of the board, GAC discussions was that they actually had some good ideas but they hadn't actually thought through any of the processes or even outcomes in many cases.

So if we do go down this road which I think we - that should be the first question. Do we really want to consider this? If we do that we need to be very pointed in what we bring to them.

Carlton Samuels: I agree. I agree with that. I just don't want - I would think it would be more useful to go back with a set of criteria that we want answered. Eric?

Rafik Dammak: Can I comment before...

Carlton Samuels: Is Eric in there, Rafik? Do want to give Eric and then you come in?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Yes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Rafik, if you'd like to go ahead to respond please go ahead. I'll wait.

Rafik Dammak: Just I want to ask maybe - so as we want to ask maybe for clarification from the GAC and they like (unintelligible) suggested by Elaine maybe I can volunteer with Andrew to see - to ask them and to - just to - maybe to propose what we think what kind of government that might quality maybe as Eric suggested about maybe local government or some specific case because they say government have support and it's too wide.

So we can - if we can specify some - what kind of ever - what kind of government it fits around then we ask them so we can - may have a better feedback because, you know, it can take more long time - it can take long time to get response from the GAC. And then we can speed up the process.

So that's my suggestion. I can volunteer with Andrew if he agrees. Andrew can work on that.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. That's good, Andrew. But the question is still - would still be - need to be clarified by this group. We are going to ask them and we are going to ask them some specific things.

And so you have - one set is what level of government are you talking about. I would be interested to know what other questions might you both be mandated to ask the GAC. So Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thanks, Carlton. Rafik made the point I was trying to make about - just because I like to hear my own voice I suppose I'll say what I intended to say which is the GAC is competent to speak for its own model of what government is or for public administration. But it may not be competent to speak for other models such as tribal governments in colonized - in North America and South America.

So I don't want us to say government and promote all governments to the status and defects of national governments, that is to the wealth and power of nation states. There are public bodies, public administrations whose needs may not be met by nation states at all, whose needs are of interest to us.

So when we say government is out of scope I think what we're doing is we're saying that everything is China, the United States, Bulgaria. And it's not.

So that's the point I wanted to make. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: I tend to support that observation, Eric. And thanks for the clarification. So...

Alex Gakuru: Put me on the queue, please.

Carlton Samuels: Who is on the queue?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alex Gakuru: Alex. I'm requesting to be put in the queue.

Rafik Dammak: Just Alex, we have Andrew before and then Rafik. You (unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: Andrew, then Alex.

Andrew Mack: Actually, (Alex), I have spoken recently. Let (Alex) go first and then I'll go right after him. Okay?

Alex Gakuru: Okay. Thank you, Andrew, and thank you, everybody.

I'm wondering if we -- thank you first of all, (Rafik), for volunteering to do that; I think it should make us move faster on this issue -- just wondering if as a group we propose to the GAC that we may delete the line where we were saying we are disqualifying entities with government support so that in case the government feels it can support a tribe organization or a regional government or such other entities, whether maybe they could be happy with that or they live with that. Then we'd relieve the complication of having to deal with sub-governments at sub-regional levels.

If that could be incorporated in your inquiry to the GAC I think I'd be very happy to see that we move ahead and don't spend too much time defining government. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. And thank you, Andrew. Is there anybody else on the list that would want to speak on this issue?

Andrew Mack: I think it's just me.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Andrew, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Okay. Quickly first of all I - the more I listen the more I agree with Elaine, the original which was that this - we thought that this was too messy for a reason. It is messy. And I think that it's also politically very challenging for us.

That said, now that they've asked I don't think it's possible for us to walk away completely.

What I'm hearing people say is that there are some subnational groupings that may make some sense with a special focus on tribal and other administrative demarcations which might in our other way of thinking be considered community applications but in some - but they may also have some government support.

I am happy to sit down with Rafik and work up a list of questions that we could go back to the GAC with. I still feel fairly strongly that we shouldn't say that we're willing to do this regardless but rather that we're willing to consider it.

And on the national level I don't see any justification for support. It would have to be on some sort of a smaller level because I think our initial concern was that we don't want something that governments should be paying for to be paid for by our limit - the limited funds that will be available for applicant support. And I think that that still stands.

But I'm happy to work up questions with Rafik after this call and send them out to the list.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Can I just - and I'm...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: Who else is on the list?

(Sebastian): (Sebastian). But I am in very noisy environment. I don't know if you can hear me.

Carlton Samuels: I'm hearing you (Sebastian). Can you go ahead?

(Sebastian): Yeah. Just to say one thing. This group has a very short time to deliver something. The discussion going on, risk -- I would say risk -- that nobody will get anything because you have already a lot on your plate.

I just want to suggest that you need to go very carefully with adding something on your plate. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, (Sebastian). The idea was -- and just let me reiterate -- the idea was not for us to wait. The idea is for us to continue doing the work with the same agenda that we had except, save and except, that we will respond to a GAC concern and do it in a way that allows them to understand that we took it into consideration.

But for my part I will reiterate again -- and I'm fixating -- it is messy to get governments as one of the recipients of support. I however would like for folks to embrace the idea that even in the national space there are groups that are - could be considered governments such as the ones that Eric brought up that might be worthy of support.

Perhaps it is within the extent we could say that they are community-circumscribed. So they are specific communities. And that might mean they'll spill across borders.

But it's very important to know that they would be disadvantaged - a disadvantaged group within the context of what we are talking about. And it might be useful to consider them in this way.

Are there any other comments? We are...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Elaine Pruis: So this is Elaine again. And...

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: I'm just checking in to make sure that we actually have made a decision that we would go down this path, is that the case, and if so when was that done and if not, could we actually ask that question as the group...

Carlton Samuels: No actually we have not made such a decision yet. I will give it another two minutes or three minutes towards people to come up with any other thing and then we would ask the group formally for a decision of this.

Elaine Pruis: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Rafik. Just maybe if we ask a little bit, we should defer the remaining piece, I think it's more fair towards those who are not on the call.

Man: Yeah maybe, but can I suggest that I think it - the people who listen to this call are probably going to be the ones who are active on the list anyways, and so I believe that asking directly is probably more efficient.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, but you know, some people like Avri expresses some opinion and so on maybe, just a small...

Carlton Samuels: Okay, maybe we can ask - all right, can we tentatively do this? Can we ask lists and put it out to the lists and wait for there to make it official and move on?

Rafik Dammak: Okay - okay.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Are there any other hands up on the Adobe Connect that we need to acknowledge?

Man: No.

Alex Gakuru: A quick complaint if I may.

Carlton Samuels: Who is this, Alex?

Alex Gakuru: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Go ahead.

Alex Gakuru: What I've seen happen - yeah, thank you. What I've seen happen is (unintelligible) an issue that requires voting of all members. So that the content of the vote was arrived at can clearly be put on record. If certification never presents to ourselves, it doesn't suggest that in addition to posting something on the list, maybe a sort of a survey, a questionnaire can be asked for the members to just vote on their views. Here the questions are pretty

clear. But it's undecided for this question as a general point I wanted to raise.
Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Yes Alex, that's useful. We could pose the question, but for these purposes we could probably do it pretty much in this way. So I pose the question now, is it the consensus of this group that we mandate a small subgroup consisting of Alex and I'm sorry - Andrew and Eric, is it?

Man: Andrew and Rafik.

Carlton Samuels: Andrew and Rafik, sorry - to formulate a set of questions that could be put forward to the GAC for clarification as to their interest in having governments be included as deserving of support - applicant support. Are there any objections to...

Man: No, none.

Carlton Samuels: I'm sorry?

Man: I'm sorry to interrupt but I was just saying that because I (unintelligible) after reading my condition earlier. Thank you.

Coordinator: We have a comment from - Elaine is in the queue.

Carlton Samuels: Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Yes. First of all, I didn't understand what Alex said so maybe you could -- I thought...

Carlton Samuels: No Alex was saying that we could in addition to doing what we do, you send out a survey to members...

Elaine Pruis: Right.

Carlton Samuels: ...to formally capture their feedback. And I was - I did not disagree with that, I just said that we could do it in this way. We could ask the question formally here, which I have just done, and actual members to agree on it, then we put it to the list, the same question, and we would look and see what we get from the members on the list. It's just as efficient as...

Elaine Pruis: Okay. I would like the first question to be, "Should we diverge from our previous consensus position of not giving support to governments?"

Carlton Samuels: Yes, we can ask that question as a part of the scope. Should we change that posture, and if we should change that posture, what would we need to embrace the change of posture?

Elaine Pruis: Okay, thanks.

Carlton Samuels: And we'll allow Rafik and Andrew to develop some more specific questions taking into consideration some comments that were already made this morning.

Man: I agree with the proposal of Elaine. (Unintelligible) speaking.

Man: I agree also.

Andrew Mack: Can I ask a quick question?

Carlton Samuels: Who is this, Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Yes it is.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Okay, you know, I generally speaking agree with Elaine that this is messy. The question is, I think we need to respond to the GAC one way or the other. And so, I'm wondering whether politically the group believes that it is possible for us just to say, "I'm sorry, no, we're not going to do this." If they think that there's a downside to that, then what are our other options?

I guess my question is only, "Is a straight 'no' an option for us, or is there another option for us if we decide we don't necessarily want to focus on this right now, what do we get back with them for?" Because I'm wondering politically whether it makes sense for us to just say, "Sorry, we're not going to take this up." What do people think, is there a political cost to us not addressing this?

Alex Gakuru: Can I comment quickly?

Carlton Samuels: Is this Alex?

Alex Gakuru: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Go ahead.

Alex Gakuru: I think Elaine's proposal, if I'm getting it correctly, she's saying we say a straight "no" to GAC. We will not do anything on government. But I think the proposal we have put forward is to actually now say, "Okay GAC, we are going to consider your comment but would like some more input into what you are considering should be supported."

And an addition to that is what like a proposal you are saying, if we, for example, say we are going to remove a proposal we had a recommendation we had put forth that groups with government support are - do not qualify, whether you'd be happy to live with another set of framework and the thinking I was having was political (unintelligible). If we say no, then I think we'd have a lot of problems. Thank you.

Elaine Pruis: This is Elaine again. So I absolutely agree we should not just return with a "no." But I think we also need to honor the fact that we have spent a significant amount of time asking ourselves this question, and if we decide to stick with that consensus position, that in a return to the GAC, we should (unintelligible) all of the reasons why, and if you want to leave it open-ended, then ask them, you know, as Andrew has been saying, now offer some specific points on how they would handle it. But I wouldn't hold my breath for an answer before May 17.

Carlton Samuels: My interpretation of what the outcome is and I'm seized of the idea of being politically correct here, is to pose the question but we pose the question for (unintelligible) sake to the political discourse. But I do not believe that we should stop the work.

To me, if the decision is made eventually that governments are - can attract support, then the criteria would be extended and what we are looking for is, if we were to decide this, what that criteria would be. And we are asking a wide audience without the GAC especially, and so I'm suggesting that's how we do it. We just don't - just continue going along what we're doing now. We just kind of ask the question, see what comes back.

And we still have the right to say, "Well no, it's too messy," or if they come back with something that just blows our mind and make it so obvious win-win, then we can simply add it to the set of criteria. Is that a reasonable explanation of process?

Coordinator: Eric is waiting on the queue.

Carlton Samuels: Eric? Eric? Is he hearing me?

Man: Must unmute.

Carlton Samuels: Eric's not hearing me.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Can you hear me now?

Carlton Samuels: Yes I'm hearing you now.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Good. A bar on government will mean that we will have to look into - someone will have to look into applications to see if there is any public component, any public funding component to the corporate entity which is submitting the application. So as a for instance, if a Coquille Indian Nation decides to submit an application through an entity which is formed under Coquille corporate law, and funded in part through the Coquille Indian Nation's resources, we would have to say no because that's an application with government support.

In order to find that out, we would have to actually look inside the application. So, the - I'll leave it at that. Thank you very much.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, that is about process now, so we could do it. Anyway, I'm hearing that there's no valid opposition to chaptering Rafik and Andrew to look closely at this question. So can we agree that we have agreed severally, that this is a step forward - this is the way to move forward? Any objections?

Andrew Mack: So in essence we're saying, we haven't decided finally on this but were we to move forward, we're looking to try to figure out what that would look like? What would you propose based on these criteria, these questions?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Andrew Mack: (Unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: Who was that? I didn't get it.

Andrew Mack: That was Andrew, sorry.

Carlton Samuels: So there are no valid objections to ask I think we can agree we'll put it on a list in the end so they can have another go-around in it for another couple of days, I suppose. It's a quarter of the hour where I am, and I have to run so I can get to my class in time. So can I hand over to Rafik and Rafik can continue with the discussion and move to the process of applicants' qualification.

Thank you all. Rafik? You have the mic.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Okay, we can move I think now to the next item, to discussion of the process to qualify applicants. I don't think that has started yet, the discussion about that (unintelligible) but if someone has any comments, please raise your hand and then we can start with that. Oh, nobody? Can you hear me or not?

Man: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Rafik, we can hear you. Can you explain, maybe it's just not clear for us, what it is this is about? If this is the process, like, how people would come into the system and get evaluated, as opposed to who would be evaluated - it's the process. Is that what you're saying?

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, the process. Because we - the former item was - the previous item was about the criteria, but now the process how we can qualify the applicants. So it's how the criteria of the metrics to see just to qualify an applicant but how - what kind of process we should follow for that? I'm not sure if it's in the notes already but - Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Okay, let me give a try to see if I'm understanding. In our meeting in San Francisco, we talked a little bit about the need to have some sort of a qualifications review standing committee.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Andrew Mack: We also talked about the idea of having a standing committee that would evaluate the process itself. So there are two separate functions. The - we didn't make a decision as to whether or not either of them needed to be connected to or run through ICANN.

But they could be conceivably delivered outside - by an outsider, and there was - in my mind there may be some value in having at least some outside voices so that it's not too much captured inside. But is that what you're talking about? So that's one stage is, who's going to do the evaluating and we talked about having a committee and we haven't gotten as far as who should be on that committee or what kind of skills they have.

Rafik Dammak: In fact in the notes in the ICANN tool, there was what we called process discussion and why it's not saying - it says we have - that the group (A&T) - we defined the criteria to access for the support is really to define which process by which this will be determined. So how will we - what kind of process we should follow to determine the criteria - I think the applicant is qualified eligible for those criteria. Does it make sense? Andrew? No comment?

Andrew Mack: Yeah, no, no. It makes sense, I mean, if we were designing this thing what we'd want to have is - we'd have to answer a series of questions. And I'll throw out a few of them and then maybe other people can jump in. I mean, one is, who constitutes the review committee? Who is on the review committee? The second thing is...

Rafik Dammak: I think...

Andrew Mack: Am I asking the questions that you're looking for?

Rafik Dammak: I don't think the review team is in the process but the review team maybe will manage the process itself, but maybe...

Andrew Mack: Well someone has to evaluate the applications, right? We have to determine who that would be.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, so - maybe the question...

Andrew Mack: Go ahead, I'm sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, sorry. Yes, maybe the question is what kind of process does the review team follow to check if an applicant is qualified or not. So, I think it's two topics interrelated but you're making the focus on the process itself. Maybe they are doing a quick start to check for, I don't know, criteria A and B and C and then to see if sometimes it's either a sequential process or just some rough ideas that we can start with. But yeah, I understand about the review team. And to have the site discussion - it should be inside or outside ICANN, if I am recalling correctly. Any comments? I'm not sure that we need really to foster this discussion, and...

So Andrew what you were saying about the review team I think it was the item for discussion on selection process clarification that early in the review refers to selection process, not to interview ((Crosstalk)).

Andrew Mack: Okay, we've got two different -- if I remember from San Francisco, we have two different reviews. One is a review of the process itself, right? Is the process working, all of that kind of thing, what changes need to be made, and we talked about that as something that as a team that would look at this perhaps on an annual basis to make changes in it so that it continues to improve.

The other piece of it that I thought you were trying to get at was a piece around -- so we have this criteria, we've agreed on the criteria for who is

possible, so then someone has to make the - someone has to make the determination of whether applicant X fulfills those criteria or not.

Or if applicant X doesn't fulfill the criteria but fulfills most of the criteria, what would they need to do in order to fulfill the criteria, or things along those lines. And to have a process around that review. And that's what I thought you were talking about, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Andrew Mack: So there are two separate processes and there's two separate teams, yes. But someone has to determine whether a candidate is qualified - qualifies or not.

Rafik Dammak: If this is the work of the - that - what should we call it, the standing committee -- Elaine, please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks. So this someone who would have to determine qualifications, could we talk to ICANN about using the evaluators they are already hiring for the general application review? And I think that would only work if we had very strict criteria that they basically just had to check boxes.

Rafik Dammak: Elaine, you want to comment again? We have Andrew in the queue. Please, Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yeah, Elaine I like your idea a lot. Let's keep it simple, that's great. Perhaps what we would end up needing then is really only one person with some specific knowledge of the differences that we're looking at to advise the evaluators or something like that, maybe we wouldn't need an entire committee, but I do think that we would probably want - put it this way, I'm not sure that it's going to be easy to just create a series of boxes.

There may be - it may be a little more organic than that, and so having one person who understands our process and our goals really well, I see that as possibly being helpful. But I like the idea of working with the existing process as much as possible.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, I think with boxes it will depend also how we we'll define the criteria. Maybe some criteria can be easy to check and other needs more, how do you say, not that easy, maybe need more exploration or something like that to check if the applicant is eligible for that criteria or not. Any further comments?

Alex Gakuru: Yes, maybe I could throw in a quick comment - Alex?

Rafik Dammak: Alex, please go ahead.

Alex Gakuru: Yes, I'm finding that discussing both eligibility and the criteria and the process entwined. We are going - mentioning them interchangeably. Perhaps what we could ask ourselves, is when even the questions we are posing in terms of eligibility and criteria and mostly in terms of the process, we have a sort of a chat where we say when we raise this particular point what will it be as a contribution to the process?

And therefore every question or every point we raise, we have a box -- a big table -- where we take for this particular one, we are going to ask A, B, C, D and this is contribution to the process, et cetera, so that we don't -- we try and sort of simplify the two because I have - I don't know why it's only me who feels that we are discussing the two interchangeably.

And so maybe I don't know if your group - your team - with Andrew Mack can help us to tell us what this question contributes towards maybe the evaluation, et cetera -- something of that sort. We have done it on monitoring and evaluation, maybe that is a possibility? Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Alex. Any comments? So please any further comments on that, so otherwise - because I think we just have maybe two minutes on this call.

Man: I guess a question for the group. Would a flow chart of all this help?

Woman: Yes.

Man: Isn't that effectively what we're trying to build right now, is the process, a flow chart?

Rafik Dammak: I think a flow chart, this works, yeah, that's a good idea.

Man: That'll be good.

Man: Yeah, okay. Is there somebody who has a clear enough sense of where we are that wants to make a draft of this? Because I think part of the problem is we're trying to do this in the abstract too much.

Rafik Dammak: I think for the flow chart - I think that as we - I think, if I remember what (unintelligible) for such thing, something like a map of all the criteria. So maybe we shouldn't care about the -- I agree for the idea of flow charts.

Man: Uh-huh, okay. So even if it's not a visual chart, just step 1, step 2, step 3, would be terrific. That would really help a lot, I think.

Man: Absolutely.

Man: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Any further comments guys?

Alex Gakuru: Maybe just to ask would Karla be in a position to assist in the chat room with all the activities we have had so far?

Rafik Dammak: What was your question, Alex?

Alex Gakuru: Would Karla be (unintelligible) in that regard of the flow chart and everything so that (unintelligible)? Just a question.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Karla?

Karla Valente: Yes. I'm not sure I know enough of what you're trying to accomplish to be able to chart. I'll be happy to help, I'll be happy to bring that internally and run against our existing charts to see how the process would work. I see in the chat room that (Bev Anound) had volunteered also to draw a chart.

Man: (Gavin Centric) can help. Why don't we take...

Man: Oh yeah.

Man: Karla, why don't you get - see if we can't pull together what we think we might already have and shoot it to them and then have them put something together?

Karla Valente: You mean the existing charts for the new (unintelligible)?

Man: That existing chart so that we could clip into that as much as possible plus anything else from our past history that you think we should have, you know, any other - if there are any other discussions of it. I don't really recall anything in any detail. But - and then let them have a go at it.

Karla Valente: Okay I will find the first chart, I think it's in Visio I think the first one I did was in Visio and I'll send it to you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Any further comment? I think so Karla we will wait for your proposal and we'll check also with (unintelligible) about her idea and then I will also

work with Andrew on that question for the GAC. So if there is no any further comments, I will adjourn the call for today. Okay, thank you everybody for joining our call today and see you on Tuesday. Thank you.

Man: Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

Rafik Dammak: Bye.

END