

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Tuesday 29 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) Tuesday 29 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/gnso/gnso-jas-20110329-en.mp3>

On page ;
<http://gnso.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
Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council
Andrew Mack – CBUC
Avri Doria – NCSG

ALAC

Cintra Sooknanan – At-Large
Carlton Samuels – LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large
Dev Anand Teelucksingh – At Large
Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair Alan Greenberg – GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Elaine Pruis – MindandMachines
Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

ICANN staff

Karla Valente
Glen de Saint Géry
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO
Dave Kissoondoyal - (AFRALO) – At large
Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) – At Large
Michele Neylon – RrSG
Fabien Betremieux – Individual
Tony Harris –ISPCP

Alice Munyua – GAC
Tracy Hackshaw – GAC
Alex Gakuru – NCSG

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you very much, Sabah. Sorry, good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on Tuesday, the 29th of March. And on the call we have Carlton Samuels, Rafik Dammak, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sebastien Bachollet, Alan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch, Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Teelucksingh.

Glen de Saint Gery: Teelucksingh, yes, sorry. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Andrew Mack, and for staff we have Karla Valente, and Gisella Gruber-White and Glen de Saint Gery, myself.

We have apologies from Tony Harris, Alex Gakuru, Baudouin Schombe, Carlos Aguirre, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Michele Neylon and Dave Kissoondoyal.

Have I left anybody off?

Carlton Samuels: I don't think so, excellent.

Glen de Saint Gery: May I ask you please to say your name before you speak for transcription purposes? Thank you very much, and over to you Rafik and Carlton.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Glen, thank you everybody for attending this Tuesday call. So let's just start by - if everybody agree with the agenda which is shown in the Adobe connect. So hearing no objection we can go to the Item 2 which is about - I just want to clarify - to get clarification from GAC in regard to its comment.

I think it's Andrew is on the call, maybe he can give a small report. I am with him in that small team and we started discussion in that - during (this) weekend. Andrew, it's up to you.

Andrew Mack: Rafik, can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Andrew Mack: Okay, I'm sorry, the line isn't very good. What would you like me to say?
What were we talking about here?

Rafik Dammak: Just we try to give a short report to the working group about what we did
(since we can) in regard to the question that we should (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Okay, sure, sure, I will do my best and then please jump in and add if you'd
like, okay?

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Andrew Mack: What we tried to do after our call was to come up with some questions that
would be appropriate to send back to the GAC and to clarify as much as
possible what we were looking for and what we were hoping for their inputs
on potentially, and what we were not hoping for.

And so we made an effort to try to clarify that a little bit and I worked with
(Tetra) on some language to send back. And I think what we all agreed was
that we didn't want to get sidetracked too much because it's an issue that we
had talked about a fair amount in the past about whether or not to involved
governments and some of the complications that were in that.

And we went towards trying to look at, how would you say it, where there
were - what kind of questions were the best ones to ask them and to try to
keep the conversation as precise as possible.

What else, Rafik? What would you like me to say?

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Yes, and if you could summarize to this point, and also I think that it (unintelligible) I think going to open the issue around, I think it's Carlton, you said that just in the last call, but I'm not sure when we should do that.

Andrew Mack: I mean I think the one thing that we agreed was that this conversation shouldn't keep us from moving forward in other areas, and we didn't want anybody - you know, we didn't want the GAC or anyone else to be of the impression that this is an issue that we thought that we needed to solve before the time I reported to. Correct?

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton, correct, Andrew, that was my impression, at least my question was to make sure that the GAC understands that while we are seeking clarification this in no way impede forward movement on the things that we have committed to do.

Rafik Dammak: We have Tijani in the queue, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I am sorry, Andrew, there is a big echo on your room and I didn't understand very well what you said. So can someone tell me very briefly what is the result of this consultation with people from the GAC?

Rafik Dammak: We didn't contact yet we are working with a small team, we are working on the questions that we should send to the GAC. And so we - anyway I think we will send them to the working groups to ask for feedback. But we didn't contact the GAC yet.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So you are preparing something to send to the GAC, that's it?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, as agreed on the last call.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, very well. So shall we see it before it would be sent?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I think you can.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, thank you very much. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, any other comment about that? Okay...

Andrew Mack: A question, Rafik, if I could?

Rafik Dammak: Andrew, please go ahead. Just I think that we (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Yes, the question that Elaine mentioned, this idea of whether or not we were going to put this to a vote, have we decided about how we're going to handle that?

Rafik Dammak: I think it was an idea of Carlton; maybe he can give more clarification about that.

Carlton Samuels: Thank is Carlton, thank you, Rafik. The idea was that we get the questions together based within the context of what we want - how we want to steer it. We put it to the members, the members will see whether the questions are - I mean, comply with our objective and if they don't we go back to the drawing board or we change them in ways that make the objective very clear.

I tend to shy away from voting on this - these matters. These are procedural matters. It makes sense for us to talk it out as quickly as possible, that is, but even at that point I don't think - I think we should get a sense of what the meeting would - what the working group would like without a formal vote. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Elaine, please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Hi, yes, so it was my understanding that we were going to determine if there was any consensus in the working group to provide support to any sorts of government. We have been working on developing these questions in the

meantime but it doesn't make any sense to me at all to not ask that initial question in the first place. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Elaine. Any response to that?

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton, can I (going there)? Let me say this, I would wish for us to consider whether or not it is not likely and it would not be appropriate for such an entity to attract support. I can think of groups or combinations of groups, in my (unintelligible) they call them public/private partnerships, in which parties that are separate, one could be a government agencies or one could be the government, and a private party, private individuals, get together towards an objective. That objective could be establishing a TLD.

If such a partnership existed in which the government is clearly a partner with a private entity I would not wish for us to close the possibilities of such an entity gaining support through this process. That's the first thing.

The second thing is this, I could envision where such a partnership may, in fact, propose multiple scripts as part of a strategic approach, TLDs. So you could have (in lots of societies) in the world there are two functioning languages. Typically the elites speak one of the top languages, romance languages, and regular people speak another, maybe in combination because that is the way you are going to reach the objective of improving connectivity, improving access to the wider group.

They may, in fact, be able to just propose joint TLDs. It may require a public/private partnership and therefore I think this group will be - should at least extend its mind to the idea that you might have such combinations worthy of support.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thank you, Carlton. Elaine, please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks. So Carlton, did I just hear you say that if it was a government in partnership with another party that that would be a group that you'd be willing to provide support to if they had need? Is that what you just said?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, it's not the parties that I'm concerned about, it's the objective. The objective - my objective is to extend access to disadvantaged groups and the sponsorship - so long as the sponsorship groups shows need, then the combination of the sponsors, to me, is secondary.

It is the objective that I am most concerned about and therefore I would want to - I am suggesting to this group that such combinations may, in fact, happen. And you would not wish to proscribe them, nor would you wish to discriminate against them so long as they show need.

Elaine Pruis: May I respond, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Okay, so I can - I understand that because in many cases we're seeing cities putting out RFPs to registries, service providers, where there will be some sort of partnership where the city itself will actually apply for the top level domain, but the registry service company will do the work. So that would be a partnership.

What - I guess what I am not understanding is if our core principle is need then are you saying that you want the core principle to be whether or not it provides a service to the community rather than need?

Carlton Samuels: The core principle is to - the core principle to determine application support is need, but the strategic objective is access to the underserved and those on the edge that are not. That's the public policy principle, if I can use the term.

That is the reason why ICANN is involved and interested. It's not just about need, that's just one way to get them in the game. The objective of all of this is to extend access to the underserved and those on the edges. That is the objective, as I understand it, and there's a process that costs money that some of them might not be able to do. And if ICANN believes that access would be denied to groups that are inherently in need of access for one reason or other, then they would devise this program to fit in this process. That's my understanding of it.

I don't wish for us to lose sight of why we're doing this. We're not doing this just because of need; we're doing this because there is a public policy objective, getting people underserved and underrepresented access to the Internet.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, just (unintelligible). Okay, (unintelligible) for this item. Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes, Rafik, can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, it's okay.

Andrew Mack: My apologies to everyone, the line is bad, I tried to do it on Skype and I'm in Paris. Yes, here we go, hold on one second, let me see if this (gets) you better. Hello?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Andrew, we can hear you.

Andrew Mack: Just one second. Okay, I'm just going to go join you on the other line.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: We're running on a timeline there, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes. Anyway, any further comments about this item? (Unintelligible) to - okay, Andrew? Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Okay, first of all my apologies for the echo in the room. I think I've gotten it sorted out. The - what I wanted to say is I agree with Carlton, I think we need to keep our eye on the big picture here. And the application is a part of the big picture but it is not a - it's not all of the big picture, it's not the end in itself.

I don't think it's a choice between one or the other but; in fact, both of them are parts of the same coin. And I just - basically what Carlton was saying I think is spot on correct. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Yes? Yes, you can hear me? Can you hear me? Hello, can you hear me?

Andrew Mack: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Oh, Andrew, okay. Just - okay, just checking.

Andrew Mack: Did you - Rafik, you heard what I just said, yes?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I just have a phone problem, that's why I was checking. Okay, so if I summarize what I heard and what Andrew's (unintelligible), I think that we need to focus to have a comment from the GAC and we need to work with this question and then to check that with working group before sending them.

This is not going to hold the working group from working. But just about the discussion between Elaine and Carlton I think that the main issue was that can we define government (unintelligible) applicant as a needy applicant or not. And then we had some discussion before that we need to work what kind of level of government we can see as needy.

I think there is some (concerns) that a government - a national government applicant cannot really be subject for support. But (we are) working on that.

So maybe we can move to the next item and that small team (run) by Andrew and me will continue to work and to work on the question and then we will send them to the working group.

Any objection to that? Can you hear me enough?

Man: Yes, yes.

Rafik Dammak: Oh, oh, okay, thank you. So if there is no objection, we can move to the next item to discuss about the criteria definition, which is really the main part that we need to work on these days. We had some discussion I think early, a long discussion (unintelligible) but, okay? So Tijani, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you. I see on the agenda, see, for reference, see working group Wiki. I go to the Wiki and nothing is written as the - other than what was there before San Francisco. So there is a problem of language production and I do think that we need to go ahead in this - with this.

The problem I think is that Avri is in the - in Geneva for the (CSTD) meeting and perhaps it's for that that she's not here and she didn't provide the compilation that we spoke about in San Francisco.

It is very important to do this, to produce language discussing, discussing, discussing is - will not give us anything. We have to write something and discuss on what is written that's how we will manage to do the work.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I agree, but as you know, it's the (unintelligible) and maybe you can give Avri more, how to say, you give her your feedback or comments then she can write it to make her work more easy. So...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I have. I did, Rafik, I did, but I think she is busy in Geneva, that's why. That's all.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, this is Carlton. Can I suggest that we agree that Avri would be the main scribe on this and it works because it tends to (unintelligible) language much easier and so on, but a host of good reasons why one main scribe might be the most efficient way of getting this about?

But in the absence of Avri, the Wiki (help) does allow comments and the expectation was that members who add additional refinements or additional criteria to add to the ones that are there would have intervened directly on the Wiki by commenting.

So might I suggest that if we see that there is stuff that we want to say or refine or add, please add them as comments and then when Avri is back in the saddle, she will make the final adjustments to the working page? I quite agree, Tijani, that working from written text is much better than just talking about it.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: And that was my proposal like - about now. What I meant by my intervention is that people comment on the already existing language that Avri can compile.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So just I think we - this was one of the - encourage people to work with the Wiki (unintelligible) and I'm not sure, maybe some people don't feel comfortable to work with the new version of the Wiki, the (comprehensive there).

Anyway, maybe (you try), we have this discussion, the many (of these) if we can at some level to summarize them and to put them as a comment in the Wiki then I can make the work more easy and we can foster good discussions.

So because sometimes we have a threat of many - many (unintelligible) it's not easy to follow in the track. Anyway, maybe we can, if we have some question about criteria definition we can work on them now and just after that

if maybe, Karla, can you take some notes and then we can put them as a comment in the Wiki. Does that make sense?

Karla Valente: Sure.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so, okay, as we have seen to our end, the day in the court maybe if they have some specific question for the work team, we can try to discuss them and we get the feedback that Karla would take as notes and then put in the Wiki. (Jenny) or Cintra, someone who wants to volunteer for that?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I think that this - this question of criteria have been discussed a lot of times and also in San Francisco, we discussed it, so now I don't know if someone has something to add, something to - because there is a proposal here and nobody object to the - those proposal, except some refinement, some changes, but if there is addition it would be very good.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Okay, Cintra. So if there is - maybe if there is really any specific question and I understand that we discussed a lot of things, but a specific question about specific requirements, maybe we can (answer to it) now.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: The question I have in mind have been - have been answered by some people, but if the whole working group can answer it, it would be good for the body who will - would check the criteria. The consensus with the people who discussed with me about it is that this body having to be inside ICANN. Is it the opinion of the whole work team member or working group member?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, (unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton. Does everyone understand the question that Tijani is asking? It is a very important question to process.

Andrew Mack: So the question is whether or not it's within ICANN? Maybe I'm not understanding the question.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I'll repeat the question. Do the - does the body that will check the criteria we are setting have to be inside - a part of ICANN or outside ICANN?

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, Tijani, this is Evan.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, Evan, go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Who does the mechanics of the evaluation is one thing and I imagine there's certain business processes that can be outsourced, but the overall management of the criteria and the management of the program, like, is there any reason to even consider that not being an ICANN role?

Rafik Dammak: You are asking a question, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, to anyone who wants to answer.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, just...

Cintra Sookanan: My hand up.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, okay just to organize. We have a question from Evan who is I think to the whole working group but also we have in the queue Dave and Evan. So if someone wants to replay - to answer the question of...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton. And the question and to Evan this is exactly how I see it Evan and I don't see any rational reason why it has to be outside of ICANN. And I can't conceive of it being outside of ICANN.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay we have Dave and then Alan. Dave please go ahead. Dave? Is Dave on the call?

Okay waiting for Dave we can go to Elaine and then to Alan. Elaine please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: (Thanks). So I think maybe we need to narrow down the question in little bit in that the - yes the entire program is developed by ICANN.

The actual processes has been developed by ICANN staff. The evaluation of relevant criteria will be done by outside evaluators, not by ICANN staff.

So are you asking our - will we have ICANN staff looking at our criteria and affirming our applicants or are you asking is the process itself to be developed by ICANN?

Rafik Dammak: Okay we have Alan. Alan please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I'm getting a little confused here. To the extent that we're talking about programs that ICANN is going to administer, you know, lowering the fees or, you know, changing the terms then ICANN is going to be doing it whether ICANN outsources it or not is mute as far as I'm concerned.

We have also been talking about parts of our overall recommendations which suggests we get outside funders involved.

And both the evaluation with respect to those to the extent that use any criteria we define obviously is going to be done by them.

So I think the answer depends on what part of the program we're talking about. But I don't think there's any question in my mind anyway that to the extent that ICANN is going to be administering parts of this program itself

should it choose to that ICANN is responsible. It's not, you know, ICANN will almost surely outsource parts of it if it goes ahead and does that. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Is Dave un-muted now?

Dave Kissoondoyal: This is Dave are you hearing me?

Rafik Dammak: Please go ahead.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Oh okay thank you. Sorry about that. This is Dave. On Page 79 of the Applicant Guidebook it says that ICANN will be selecting qualified third party providers to perform the various reviews and for all the different that'll do the stability review contention string et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

So it seems to me that this is how ICANN is going to approach it. And apparently they're ready - they sent out an expressions of interest to such providers in late 2009 and already have gotten several responses to that. And I've just posted a link there to that - to which - a link to that document.

So I imagine whatever our review team panel that will evaluate an applicant whether it's a - requires support would either be one of these third party providers or would most likely be a third party provider given how ICANN has chosen to implement the providers, the evaluators I say.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Any comment to that? Evan does this - does it answer your question?

Evan Leibovitch: I guess. I mean essentially, you know, the question of what to what extent ICANN does things? I mean here we are doing policy.

Once the policy - well not even policy. We're doing implementation criteria policies done by GNSO where you're just sort of trying to nail that down into

something that will, you know, provide a set of guidelines and criteria and things like that.

Once that's done, you know, if ICANN is going to subcontract out some of the actual, you know, look at the paperwork and see if they made the criteria I don't think that's going to be a huge problem or it - you know, is that the point of this question or what I'm answering?

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton. This is precisely what I'm saying. It's the agency agreement. I mean as far as I'm concerned that people are acting as agents for ICANN anyway if they've paid for them or whatever.

But the point is that the process itself and the ways, the mechanics of it is handled and maintained by ICANN that they have people bring in under their sponsorship auspices to do the work that to me is a detail. They are still going to be accountable and responsible for it.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes I agree. Anyway I'm sorry. I have to leave for a doctor's appointment but I'll try and monitor otherwise.

Carlton Samuels: Safe travels.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Evan.

Okay any further comments on that? Okay I think that we have some ideas about the question that will be put as a comment in the wiki.

And Avri is in the call so she is late - later use those comments to update, et cetera.

Okay Tijani or Cintra do you have any other questions that we need clarification?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No it's okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Tijani?

Rafik Dammak: Yes?

Carlton Samuels: Sorry, Rafik. My - what I - might I suggest that you - now that Avri has joined the call might I suggest that you repeat your...

Avri Doria: I can go back and listen to the recording.

Carlton Samuels: Oh okay that - you could do that too yes. Thanks. Not to worry.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think as we have Avri now on the call maybe we can move to the next item about the process. Okay hearing no objection so we can move...

Carlton Samuels: Well can I - before we do that can I ask a question? I am still very much would like to know whether or not that we have a set of criteria and we expect that each criterion will - is subject to refinement and so on.

But the general question do we believe that this set of criteria is all that is needed to make a qualification? This is to the group.

Woman: Which set of criteria is that?

Carlton Samuels: There's a set of criteria on about qualification, the selection criteria. We already have some.

Woman: Is that - can I get posted on the Adobe please?

Carlton Samuels: They are on the wiki page. I don't - I'm not where I can - but at least my systems don't allow me to do it quickly.

Woman: Can you - would you put a link into the Chat to the wiki for me then?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I will put the link.

Carlton Samuels: I think it's there already.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: The point Tijani was making is appropriate to emphasize here. We have a wiki page in which we are working.

There's lots of discussions back and forth about refinement of the list and so on. The idea was that we - we've have (really) agreed to be kind of the scribe that pulls it all together and keeps a clean copy as it were.

But we are also recommending that those of you who have refinements to existing criteria or want to add you add them as notes on the wiki where Avri will see them and through her good offices try to sort them out in some semblance of fashion that we all can follow.

And my question is again I am keen to see set of criteria settled. And the question is do we have further refinements to what exists now and do we have additional ones that we would wish to propose? Back to you, Rafik sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Okay that's (unintelligible). We have (Derek) in the queue. Hello?

(Derek): This is (Derek). Thank you. Sorry I was un-muting myself. Thank you. I do have a question though because I was reviewing the initial process of looking at how applications are submitted and so forth.

And my question is this. Can applicants - well just to step back a bit. The way the system works, the applicant becomes a registered user of the application system or the TAS.

And then at the time when they register they can indicate how many slots or how many GTLD slots this user's applying for.

My question is this can an applicant be - ask for support for one GTLD application and at the same time submit a another GTLD application not requiring support? And I hope my question is clear on that.

In other words is the needed support evaluated in the application for the GTLD or is the needed support at - the support I should say applied solely on the applicant itself?

Carlton Samuels: Good question.

Rafik Dammak: Okay...

Karla Valente: Hi. This is Karla is speaking. So the system and evaluation, the way we are designing it right now looks at every single TLD application.

So are making an assumption that probably, you know, as the application is entered into the system it's going to be evaluated individually for string.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Okay this is Dave. Just to quickly follow-up with that, then the criteria here, you know, speaks of how we evaluate the applicant as - in as well as the entity by itself unless on the application process.

So there's I guess a decision to be made as how we - either we find the criteria or, you know, because I was - I will stop on ask if - see if anybody else has other comments on it?

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Okay.

Cintra Sookanan: Can I - this is Cintra.

Man: Can we be back to the list?

Rafik Dammak: Okay yes we have Dave and then Cintra yes. So...

Cintra Sookanan: Right I have two comments with regard to the criteria. Can you hear me?

Man: Yes.

Cintra Sookanan: Okay with regard to the criteria I think we do need to include something specific for IDN so that where an applicant may be applying for support but is also applying in different IDN languages that we can maybe give more (read) to that application, right?

My second point with regards to (Dan)'s query I think in a sense he's mixing both processes. Our criteria is almost a pre-step to the draft application guidebook process.

So first we will evaluate we are (going with) this applicant is needy or not right before they even get to the (DAG) stage or before GTLD application stage.

So why we need leverage on some of the (unintelligible) tuner processes and those staff members or whatever carrying all those functions it is two separate (trees).

So for instance and (unintelligible) will come out when we do this (recheck), so if an applicant wishes to apply as a needy applicant they will first go through our criteria process and then jump into the (DAG) (train). Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Cintra we have Sebastien (unintelligible). Please Sebastien go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. It's Sebastien, just to say one additional point to what Cintra just said. We don't want to have the evaluation for needy application.

We need to have evaluation for needy applicants. And it's completely another process and the one we will be taken during the application itself process.

And one of the reason from my point of view it's very clear that we didn't takes - we don't want to have a process where some project are put into public if they don't want some risks there and they - we need to just have the applicants and not the application. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Sebastien. Okay I lost the access to the Adobe Connect...

Man: Avri is next on the list.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Avri please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes I obviously haven't followed some of the earlier conversation. And I apologize for being late.

It would occur to me though any sort of criteria we had for an applicant which looked at their capability, if they told us they had the capability to do a another application then that should be able - I mean there should be a capability in that process to disqualify them.

Because if they can afford another one then they obviously, you know, are not as needy as somebody that can't afford any.

Now the - that does bring up the problem of understanding and knowing that this applicant that you are reviewing for aid is not somebody who's showing up somewhere else under a different name or under a different corporate structure.

And I'm not quite sure exactly how one handles that other than, you know, swearing it's not the case and then having them arrested by fraud for fraud if it is.

But, you know, it would strike me that if you could afford to apply for a full application then you aren't needy. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Cintra please go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: I think her hand is up from the last time. I don't think she has any.

Rafik Dammak: Oh okay. So any further comments?

Dave Kissoondoyal: Well this is Dave. Okay...

Rafik Dammak: Dave yes please go ahead.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Okay well okay, and the reason why I was trying to ask this question when - is because the way these - the flowcharts for how to do the evaluation, it's published in the Applicant Guidebook.

And I was trying to figure out how this - how it would work. Again how the system is drafted is that the applicant registers as a T - as under the TLD application system and then pays when the application period is opened for, you know, new submissions. Then they pay a fee for each application slot.

So that's why that question came up to - in my mind about whether an applicant can do both, you know, an application that requires need that is requires I should say support not need require support and one that does not.

The reason why I ask this is because at what point do we evaluate the applicant? And in my mind it seems to me that you have to - from a process point of view you have to make the evaluation at - when they become a registered user of the TLD application system because what - because during that application system they could say I am an applicant requiring support.

And then we start applying the criteria or - and ensure that question is asked that, you know do you meet this following criteria A, B, C, D, E, whatever and so forth rather than when you have the evaluation later on in the application process. That - so that's my comment question.

Carlton Samuels: Hello? Hello?

Dave Kissoondoyal: Yes?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Dave Kissoondoyal: Oh he said his line has dropped. This is Dave.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Woman: He's dialing back.

Rafik Dammak: Okay yes, he said that yes. And Dave you want to comment or your hand is still up?

Dave Kissoondoyal: Oh I'm sorry yes. I'll put my hand down sorry...

Rafik Dammak: Because...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Kissoondoyal: ...hear any comments.

Rafik Dammak: ...we have Cintra and Alan. So Cintra, Elaine, and Alan. Cintra?

Cintra Sookanan: Hi I just wanted to respond to Dave's query.

Rafik Dammak: Just a comment Cintra please? Please everybody keep short because we are running out of time. So with that please go ahead.

Cintra Sookanan: I'm sorry Rafik, I didn't hear you clearly.

Rafik Dammak: Just please go ahead, yes. Cintra?

Cintra Sookanan: All right, so there will be some areas that will be processed by the (DAG) process. The materials we do need to evaluate so that we do (unintelligible) right? And I will be happy to go through that with Dave and you - we'll come up with our (page) together right? They'll be and (unintelligible) can evaluate.

The other two points I wanted to make is I do notice everybody got a chance to look at my proposal for insurance.

I don't know if the group thinks it makes sense given the (responses anyway). I don't know if we have time to spend maybe two minutes talking about that? Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Thanks. So just in response to Dave's comment about when we would look at it I think when they actually should be (named into) the (pass) system should be the very last point.

To me if I were a needy applicants I would want to know if I was going to qualify for any support before I even went through that process, committed any initial money or resources at all.

So if there's any way at all that we can decouple that, the actual identification of an applicant and qualification from the (pass) system I think that would be best.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks and Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I think Elaine's point she has made is a relevant one. Back to the original question that Dave raised, I don't think we care to a large extent how the process runs.

If we're specifying that certain issues are applicant criteria as opposed to application criteria then we need to specify that.

With the exception of Elaine's comment exactly how these processes are handled and what the overall flow is I don't think is our concern.

If however as Elaine mentioned it is we believe it's important that the overall applicant be evaluated based on certain criteria and that that be done before they committed any money then we should say so to be honest.

I don't think ICANN will accept that. There's going to have to be some money committed to this at some point.

But I think we need to specify what our criteria is, what our criteria are and what the overall requirements are for what we believe is necessary for the evaluation and not agonize over the exact order it's done or where on the flow chart it fits. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Alan. I think that Cintra is proposed to work with this and to produce a flowchart to present to the group.

I'm not sure maybe Avri is also working on that. So are we going to have...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I'm (actually not) working on anything at the moment.

Rafik Dammak: Oh nothing? Okay.

Avri Doria: No...

Rafik Dammak: So we have just one.

Avri Doria: Right. Just to fill in since I was late on that and since the time is up I, you know, have a lot to catch up on. I was insane when I said I would do this.

I'm unfortunately under a lot of work that's actually paying me at the moment. So I will get to it but I figure you guys have to make all the decisions first before I write it down anyhow but I haven't done anything.

Rafik Dammak: Some - no problem Avri even if we have one or two probably it should be okay. So we will wait for Cintra and that problem and we can catch up later if we can.

Okay is there any further comments? And because we are running out of time and so if I don't hear any objections then I think we can adjourn this call for today. And thanks for everybody for attending.

And I think we need to update the wiki anyway so we had a lot of discussions and maybe it's better to update the wiki to have more substantive content okay? Hearing none so we can adjourn this call for today. Thank you everybody.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you all.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks.

Man: Take care all.

Man: Bye.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

END