

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)  
TRANSCRIPT  
Friday 01 April 2011 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 01 April 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-20110401-en.mp3>

On page ;  
<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar#apr>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:**

**GNSO**

Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council  
Andrew Mack – CBUC Avri Doria – NCSG  
Alex Gakuru – NCSG  
Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

**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  
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO  
Dave Kissoondoyal - (AFRALO) – At large  
Elaine Pruis – MindandMachines  
Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

**ICANN staff**

Karla Valente  
Glen de Saint Géry  
Gisella Gruber-White

**Apologies:**

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair  
Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) – At Large  
Michele Neylon – RrSG  
Fabien Betremieux – Individual  
Tony Harris –ISPCP  
Alice Munyua – GAC  
Tracy Hackshaw – GAC

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS Call on Friday, the 1st of April. We have Baudouin Schombe, Carlos Aguirre, Cintra Sooknanan, Alex Gakuru, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Carlton Samuels, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Dave Kissoondoyal, Karla Valente, Elaine Pruis, Avri Doria, Sebastien Bachollet, Dev Anand Teelucksingh and from staff we have Glen de Saint Gery, Karla Valente, again, sorry, and myself Gisella Gruber-White.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes.

And for apologies, we have from Michele Neylon and Rafik Dammak.

I'm just going to try and see whose line is creating the interference. Over to you. Thank you Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Gisella. Morning everyone, good afternoon, good evening everyone. We're live and online. I'm sure you see the agenda that we are proposing. Is there any objection to running with this agenda as proposed?

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi Carlton, this is Cintra. I would actually would like us to discuss the cost issue and perhaps a request to staff to determine, you know, how the cost can be unbundled and how we can reduce fees that may be applicable.

So I don't know if we want to spend five minutes on that point.

Carlton Samuels: Would that be okay with everyone; the request to have a quick discussion on the cost issue? My understanding of it is that Cintra would like to know whether or not we could unbundle the cost. It's \$185,000 and if we could see the elements that create that, then maybe we can make an argument; cohesive argument for reduction.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Did we already do that? I'm sure we should talk about it but I thought we had already done that.

Carlton Samuels: Avri, I can't answer that question...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: ...because I...

Avri Doria: I don't object to it being on the topic.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Carlton, do you see to be connect? I have my hand raised?

Carlton Samuels: Oh, I don't see your hand. I'm sorry. Oh, now I see it. Tijani, go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, thank you. So two points. First, I'd like to have the agenda posted on the list at least one day before our calls which would be very interesting, very - people will be prepared to know what we are discussing.

Second point, I think that the recommendation of Cintra are already on the agenda, the second point, I think.

That's all.

Carlton Samuels: Okay Tijani. Let me say this Tijani about the agenda. The reason why - it's good to have the agenda one day up, I agree, but recall but really I'm just putting it out just for the timing purposes because we pretty much agreed what we will do on a Tuesday and what we will do on a Friday.

I put one out because I want to have the timing known by all. That's really the gravamen of the agenda.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: So there's no objection to having a discussion. So if we make - I will take five minutes out of - seven minutes out of the reports for the subgroup and talk about the cost. And maybe since Cintra is rearing to go, Avri is up. Avri, you have a...

Avri Doria: Oh, I thought you were going to give it to Cintra first since it was her topic. I just put my hand up to be there when she was done.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. All right, well, Cintra you have the floor. It's your topic. We're going to talk about this for seven minutes, so...

Cintra Sooknanan: All right. Thank you Carlton. This is Cintra. I - what I wanted to raise is two things. The first you have a (TALs) application fee which is \$5000, right? Is that still applicable to needy applicants? And second, you have \$180,000 lump sum fee, which is broken down into different categories from the correspondence that was taken (place on the list) which Avri was also a part of. I don't believe that we actually made a specific request from staff to go into what is specific for those fees.

My area that I was looking at was risk cost. And I guess my presumption was that cost - part of that risk cost would be allocated to litigation fees and that kind of thing. I'm looking at a way to reduce those litigation fees.

I don't know if there are any other suggestions. It is obvious our criteria is going (unintelligible) process rather than reduce. So Dev and I have been looking at areas where, for instance, the evaluation criteria, as well as the actual evaluation for completeness of application can be done as a pre-step to the process so that when the needy applicant actually goes through the entire - DAG process, they don't have to go through as much as a test because a lot of those evaluations would have been done at the start when we were deciding whether or not they would be successful or ensuring their success at that point.

Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. So let me see what I'm saying - you say. Let me just summarize it. The issue is if we look at the cost structure and we - and there are certain items of the cost structure that based on the way we define a process for a needy applicants some of that cost might be reduced by virtue of the process we propose.

And therefore we are saying that if this is the case, then we can actually begin to attract applicants who know very well that their cost - coming through this process their cost is going to be reduced; the cost is going to reduce. Is...

Cintra Sooknanan: Correct.

Carlton Samuels: Do I have an understanding of it that way?

Cintra Sooknanan: But I am also saying that some costs may be removed all together for needy applicants, either removed or waived, but the only way we are going to be actually be in a position to assess whether that is possible is if we have a clear understanding of what costs are allocated to what.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. You particularly was concerned about the risk cost because you feel that if you have a system where the litigation risks are reduced, then some are...

Cintra Sooknanan: But the applicant bears a risk rather than anyone else in the community. So the applicant would insure itself rather than ICANN insure itself for the entire process including the applicant. The applicant - we will want to ensure itself of its individual risk.

That is just my suggestion but that was kind of shut down simply because there was a difference in opinion as to what risk cost actually is.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Cintra Sooknanan: Which in my mind is still not clear and will only be clear until and unless we get feedback from...

Carlton Samuels: How do you - so the applicant is a risk and ICANN has a risk. How would we - you're asking for an accounting of ICANN's risk costs, as well?

Cintra Sooknanan: I'm asking for each specific area of the budget that decide where that \$180,000 is partitioned be further reduced so that we see the actual components.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. All right. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, okay. A couple of things. One, in the recommendation we made already that have never been fully acted on by either ALAC or GNSO, we did recommend A, reduction of some of the costs and some of the costs would be taken off the top, so that recommendation is already made, just never acted upon. I've never seen even ALAC send it forward saying yes, this is something that should be done.

Two, we suggested that for applicants that were designated as meeting the requirements of the help program that they would be given a staggered payment, as opposed to a lump sum payment at the front. That, too, is a recommendation that's never been acted on.

So those two are already in the pipe and, you know, I don't know what more we could do other than to say take those off and do a staggered payment.

Now the risk costs are buried in the \$100,000 that was something that both GNSO and ALAC felt we had no business talking about, no business doing anything about. Whether we want to or not, I don't know. That's up to us. I

have no problem since I'm no longer in the role of Chair, I don't care if we talk about stuff that's not on the charter. It's not my job to stop us. So I think that's fine.

I would bring up in terms of the notion of risk and of people getting insurance for it, that does not protect - without - let me step back a second. Without actually saying whether I believe it is appropriate for ICANN to bury risk cost for later lawsuits and other things in its application fee is another issue.

As I think when the GNSO said, you know, this should be a self-funding application process, that did not include, you know, for everything in the future that might be incurred because somebody gets angry or someone makes a mistake.

So - and my notion, those fees were never appropriately bundled into the cost, but they have been. So - but those - but they're bundled in that \$100,000, which as I said we can't break up, but even if we look at risk costs, even if I have insurance as an applicant, that does not mean that some third party is going to come along and sue ICANN because they gave me special consideration because they feel they were treated unfairly in an application.

Carlton Samuels: That's the issue, really.

Avri Doria: Right.

Carlton Samuels: That's why I ask the question.

Avri Doria: Well, that's only one of the issues, but...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: You know, and I had a last issue which just went whisking out of my head, so - that was yet another problem with going further in this. But I lost it and I'll

come back to it if I remember it. Once I stopped to correct my - you know, to answer you Carlton, I lost it, but I'll come back to it if I think of it.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Thank you, Avri. So the issue is - to just sum it up, we have some recommendations that we can look at. I think it's important to look at the recommendations and I think it begins because we have been asked to look at how we might support needy applicants. And one of the big costs is that application cost.

So if - I think it would be appropriate for us to reprise those recommendations and look at them as we make the case for support. I think it would be useful to look at them.

With regard to the - I see you Tijani, and I'll come to you one - in a minute - less than a minute. With regard to the risk cost, I'm not sure - let me just say this. If we can't find a way to clearly show how ICANN risk costs might be mitigated - of the risk to ICANN might be mitigated, then it is difficult for us to say that the cost associated with those risks which are (unintelligible) bundled into the application fee should be. So I think the challenge for us is to say how we would mitigate the risks to ICANN.

Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Carlton. I think that yes, you're right, we should look at the recommendation already done and the Milestone report, but I don't think that we have to come back on them now because we have a special mission. We have - our charter has goals and objectives and we have missions and we have to deal with those missions.

We can add things to what was done in the Milestone report. We can update it according to the comments received including the comments, but I don't think that we have to revise it, to review it, to change it. It is something definite - finished.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I - you're right Tijani. I was not suggesting that we revise it. I was suggesting that we take pieces of it and emphasize it in our report.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, we can.

Carlton Samuels: Because that's what we do.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, we can. Thank you very much. Very good.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: That's all.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Alex, we'll be with you and then we move on to the next topic. Alex, you have the floor.

Alex Gakuru: Thank you very much. I think what I would suggest is that as we deal with all the comments we received since then, we can explain everything, not pieces of it, but we - was received as a comment and added to us. We can explain it as an annex to our report or recommendation so that then it's clear as to where we had recommended before we respond to both comments by stating what we had done before and, for example, what GNSO and ALAC reacted to or maybe (unintelligible) it and certainly be the one (unintelligible).

That which is clear to everybody that we dealt with the comment and we've explained it as to why maybe it's not in our main body of our subsequent recommendations. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Very well. Thank you. Okay. Can we now move to the reports for the subgroups? Anybody here want to start off?

Cintra, would you like to start for the report for your group?

Cintra Sooknanan: Well, if it's okay with Tijani, I don't have a problem reporting on the group's progress.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Go ahead. Go ahead.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. All right. Well we've posted our draft steps and criteria and as pre-evaluation. I believe on the last call you had mentioned, Carlton, that everybody should maybe take a read and post their comments and everything being described we'll incorporate those.

I have been looking at it with Dev in the context of the DAG and the DAG process. And there is need for refinement, particularly with regard to Step 2 and Step 3 in terms of evaluating and in a sense - well I would use it the term frontloading the criteria of the DAG to ensure success to needy applicants because we don't want them to come to a stage and then be rejected in the DAG process.

So I believe our prequalification criteria should be an initial evaluation to gauge their success in the DAG and then at that stage where they are evaluated in the DAG, it would, in my mind, just be an update on our prequalifying step. And perhaps we can look, as mentioned on the last call, at the same evaluators in the DAG performing that step for our group.

The step for - which deals with repayment and partial payment of fees, we also need to have criteria based on the income of applicants who have been successful in the process in order to determine how much they should pay back whether they would be in full or in part.

So in that sense, I am working with Dev to produce for charter and also refine those steps. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. I see hands. Alex, were you - did you want to talk again or is it from the last round?

Alex Gakuru: I'm sorry. I'll lower the hand. It's left over.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Just to say that on last call we emphasized that people - that group members have to comment on what is already done, already written, but I didn't see anything on the list and I didn't see anything on the comments on the Wiki page.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, that is indeed an issue. It would be - we are making appeal always for our folks to put their comments on the Wiki page. It really does help to - in the consolidation of the thinking so we have a position that is probably shared by most of us. And I would, again, urge everyone to make the comments there.

The next hand up was Avri. Avri? Avri? Are you muted?

Avri Doria: Okay, first of all, once again, I want to apologize for not having made any comments on the Wiki or have written anything. I really did get bogged down with paying work and I'm just about out of that now, so should be able to do stuff for this group again.

Though, I do mark myself as totally insane for having volunteered to do anything and it's a disease I have to get over.

But in terms of our process or the process we're recommending or I guess what's being called prequalification, unless something has radically changed, I have always understood this as a separate process. And in fact, calling it prequalification is, indeed, separate; something that goes on during the four months of outreach and probably during the first month or two of the three months of application window.

And I assume that it's still four months and three months. I was looking for that the other day and I'm not quite positive, but I think it's still that.

Now, none of the work that is done by the financial prequalification people will be done with the rigor and process that ICANN plans to use in the application process and I think we have to assume that no matter how we make or the people - it's obviously not us, but the process we create to make a determination on financial aid, no matter how that works, that information will be irrelevant to the actual application process of looking at the technical, of looking at the business plan, of looking at this. We wait...

Carlton Samuels: The DAG process. The DAG process in other words, Avri?

Avri Doria: It's a separate process and so nothing that happens in that financial qualification process has any bearing on ICANN's formal application guide based process. We're separate and parallel. So I just don't see how it lessens anything. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Avri, can I tell you that that was my understanding of it. What I would say, though, is that the persons that are qualified for application support would go into that process with an asterisk beside their names and where they are found wanting, especially in the financial outcome, then you would have some change there.

But let me go to Cintra and then I'll drop the (word).

Avri Doria: Can I respond to that?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: I actually don't understand the asterisk. I thought that the process would therefore - within their financial explanation would be included any of the help

- although I guess you do get asked - if the board were to accept staggered payment, then yes, there would be a mark that says these people pay staggered payment, as opposed to upfront, so yes, you're right. That would be one change on the process itself. Sorry.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, that's what I'm saying. That's essentially what I'm saying. Cintra?  
Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you Carlton. I agree with Avri that there are two separate processes, but I think we also need to assess that it's not only applicants who are applying for financial aid but also technical aid that we need to cater for and maybe I'm wrong, but in my mind, part of that technical aid would fall under the current evaluation process for DAG.

And certainly the stage where they actually check the application for completeness, that is something I believe that our group should do prior to the applicant applying through the DAG train.

So in a sense, I can see that stage moving - jumping ahead into our prequalifying stages.

Carlton Samuels: All right. Let's - can I ask (Andrew) to weigh in here and then we go back to Avri.

(Andrew): Sure...

Cintra Sooknanan: I just have one point that I wanted to raise that actually...

Carlton Samuels: If you do it quickly.

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Quickly.

Cintra Sooknanan: I do think that we need to make special mention of IDN scripts and applicants that have multiple IDN scripts in order to ensure build-out of IDNs and I think (Andrew)'s point is going to be along those lines, as well. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, great. (Andrew)?

(Andrew): Okay, well Cintra, thank you. I do agree, although that wasn't actually the point that I was going to go for. I'm trying to clarify this a little bit. My apologies to all. I also didn't post this week. I was traveling for work and in a different time zone and totally discombobulated with a broken computer, so it's been kind of a crazy week.

Avri, to the extent that it's helpful, I'd be happy to assist with some scribing if you're - you know, if that's possible.

So to - what I'm hearing basically is that there are three stages of this. Tell me if I've got this wrong, but there's a - kind of a prequalification stage where we say is this a group of people that is - is this an applicant or a group of applicants that is appropriate for our process.

And then there's - they would go into the DAG process after we've taken a look at them with this notation, you can call it asterisk or not, that says that they're eligible for certain - you know, for certain advantages.

Then the other question is what do they get? And I don't know. You see what I'm saying? There seem to be three - there seem to almost be three separate things, unless I'm misunderstanding it.

And the - and certainly I do want to put in a flag for the IDN stuff, but we can come back to that in a second if everyone would like.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Can we just take...

(Andrew): Does the question make sense, Carlton? I'm sorry.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, the question makes sense. I mean, I have an understanding of it but I would like to hear first from Cintra - well was Avri was up, no? Yes, okay. Cintra is taken down. Okay. Let me just kind of give a heads-up on what I think the process is.

There is this prequalification process. They're people that we say these people have are qualified through our process to be given some support in their application. And we put that - those person then go in the pool with the asterisk.

And the asterisk beside them says, yes, they are only going to be in your funnel because we recognize and we recommend them for some kind of support, be it technical support or monetary support. Quite frankly, I think they amount to the same thing.

And then they go through that process. And every time they hit a roadblock in that process, it is resolved around the data that we sent along with that asterisk. That's my understanding of it.

If anybody is valiantly opposed and think I'm speaking off the top of my head incorrectly, then it would be good for you to say so, so we have a common understanding of what it is that we're trying to do as part of the process.

All right. There seems to be no objection.

Can we go to the next group then please?

This is the group - CG.

Avri Doria: Okay, I suppose that would be me.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: As a group, we haven't done anything. As an individual, I keep talking to people and keep trying to find that first big voice that will say "Yes we are on the line to contribute to a fund if one is created or yes we are creating our own fund."

There is at least one national group that is as of yet unannounced, but there is at least one national group that is creating a fund for their own nationals that will be willing to work with us and criteria. But their additional criteria would be - and the person is from within our territory and within our IDN script group. So there is one group that I have been working with that is talking about it, and as soon as I have their (lead) to announce or even preannounce I will. I don't yet.

There are a couple of other groups that I have been talking to, funding agencies, et cetera, trying to get the first one to as I say say, "Yes if a fund were ever created, we would be willing to contribute," or, "We are doing our own thing, but are willing to you know take the leads that you give us."

So but nothing formal has been done in a group. I've just been basically running around talking to be people, and I believe that maybe a couple other people in the group have been doing the same, but we haven't communicated. That's it.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Before we go to Team (DF), is there any questions from members of Avri? (Andrew) has raised his hand. (Andrew) you are on.

(Andrew): First thing, Avri congratulations. That sounds like a lot of work and that's excellent. I'd be interested in knowing if that (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: That's not to say that this group is trying to censor us talking about them.

(Andrew): No, my God. Did that occur on everybody else's line or just mine?

Carlton Samuels: That was on my line.

(Andrew): Okay I guess I'm not going to compliment you anymore Avri. Sorry.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

(Andrew): Take it as it's given, okay. I'd be interested if it's a country that has - if it's a country that shares an IDN with others, it might be for example something in the Middle East. It might be worth discussing some more.

There's one group in the Middle East that I would like (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Ouch.

Carlton Samuels: Jesus.

Avri Doria: You could probably well know that as an Israeli, I'm probably not doing a whole lot of talking with the people in the Middle East.

(Andrew): Fair enough. Okay well that's okay. You know it doesn't necessarily preclude you from doing it nor others. I just think that that may be something that has some appeal. But anyway, I think that that's really great. If it's possible to know who that is at some point that would be useful just so we don't overlap. And also if we have a successful model for what's been done, I think that may be of value.

I question - I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, so going through a government process, which is what makes it not (favorable) at the moment, but I'm sure no one is overlapping with it.

(Andrew): Good.

Carlton Samuels: Can I ask a question here because I'm seeing a thread here about the complementary scripts, about the scripts, which is to say somebody (pays) one script - an IDN TLD, which is a script and it can be used in a lot of places.

Is there a sense also that we might have to bundle scripts in order to effectively support an applicant? And we don't have to answer that question now, but it certainly seems to me that that seems to be an issue. Avri your hand is up.

Avri Doria: Well (Andrew) was still talking, but after.

Carlton Samuels: I thought (Andrew) was complete. (Andrew).

(Andrew): And that's something that our group is working on, so we obviously have done some thinking about that.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

(Andrew): I don't know. Why don't we go with the fundraising issue and complete it now.

Carlton Samuels: I thought it might be connected to the fundraising and that's why I'm raising it here.

(Andrew): Okay it may be. It's a fair question. I just had one more other question related to this, and I wanted to talk about it to Avri, but also the broader group.

Carlton Samuels: Which is please?

(Andrew): Do we have any - I'm familiar for example from the time I spent working at the bank with the idea of having nationally defined trust funds, which is to say like

you know a country says - you know there's a Nigerian trust fund at the African Development Bank where you know it could be used for the purchases of services from Nigerian companies only, but then otherwise it is available to be used on anything.

And so I'm wondering do we have a problem with the idea that the - you know the funding comes only from one country and is only available to the nationals or groups or companies or whatever of that country. Do we have a problem with that? And probably more importantly, would ICANN have a problem with that? I don't know the answer, but I just wonder if there's a (superior) issue to that. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Well Avri can you go?

Avri Doria: Yes, I can address that sort of. First of all, this would be something that would be both judged and given by the foundation within that country itself, so I can't imagine that ICANN could or should have problems with what some other country does within its country to give aid to people in its country for making an application.

They have no intention of relying solely on applicants that would come through any process we may or may not be able to create. What they have said is they are doing their own thing. You know they've seen the work that's being done here. They think it's a good idea. They are doing their own.

And if ICANN's thing includes giving them references for people they should put through their process, great you know. If ICANN were to say, "Sorry. If we don't administer it, then you can't be an applicant," well then I think we have another serious problem with ICANN's control over things going on in you know other countries. So I can't really imagine an issue there.

I had originally raised my hand on the relationship of bundling to this. In this case, I don't think there's a relation to bundling. I personally - and this is no disparagement on the group. I will still be shocked if we get the program to

change where a bundle of names is considered to be a single application since that's been such a definitive part of the program from the GNSO recommendations on out that one name was one application.

But you know is it related? I guess at the highest level everything is, but I don't see it as particularly related other than you know a donor group sort of saying, "Oh gee, you're going to apply for two of them? Well yes we think that's a good idea. We will help support you with both." But beyond that, I don't understand the relationship - the bundling. I never have though, so I admit it's my ignorance.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, can I go to Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I was just going to comment on (Andrew)'s question. And the original ICANN concept was that ICANN publicize a list of external donors who are willing to do something, and I think it's a given that external donors will all have their own qualifications whether it's the African Development Bank or some other organization. Whether it's a national criteria or race or you know industry, they are all going to have some qualifications.

Carlton Samuels: Right. Right.

Alan Greenberg: And that was ICANN's best version at the time, so I can't see any (defection to it).

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Alan. Okay, back to (Andrew) and then (Alex). Folks we need to be very brief in our comments.

(Andrew): I'm trying to. I'm going to. Alan the question I had was when we - I guess the only question is to the extent to which it touches ICANN per se. And if the - if it goes directly into an ICANN - you know into the ICANN DAG system after receiving support, is there something - you know is it preference that ICANN

is perceived as giving. I don't know. I think you're probably right, but that was what I was concerned about.

Alan Greenberg: Or ICANN will set limitations that you can only give money if there are no qualifications you know.

(Andrew): Fair enough.

Alan Greenberg: It either gets in under the terms ICANN allows or it doesn't get in at all.

Carlton Samuels: That is my sense of it too. You know in the end, there's two things. We want to encourage whatever foundation's or country's criteria they use because we need to take the position that it's public infrastructure and they are contributing to public infrastructure. That's the first thing. And they would know they are contributing in the context of a set of rules set by ICANN. And so long as they make the rules, then they are in.

That was my understanding of it, but I move now to (Alex).

(Alex): Thank you very much Carlton. At the June 2010 Brussels meetings, I reported supporting the (unintelligible) from the government of Kenya. It's on the transcripts. And in view of (unintelligible)'s comments at the last meeting we had in regards to support for developing countries and the decision on the new gTLDs and of course close to addressing (my region)'s needs and of course two African countries in the developing regions.

I would be willing to also be a part of fundraising to explore further the support and see if it's possible whether the government - or if it could be extended into some Africa wide initiative that is supported by government. In other words, for them to support rather than just only one country it could be continental.

And so I just wanted to hear the group's views of that. I could - I'm not asking for the government to apply, but if the government could - governments could give their support to this initiative Africa wide whether it's through Africa union or any other (relevant body needs advice). I would be more than willing to explore that further. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, thank you (Alex). We are going to move to the next report and that is the report from the group DEF. Is anyone online that is in that group?

Elaine Pruis: I think that's me Carlton. It's me Elaine.

Carlton Samuels: Hi Elaine. Welcome.

Elaine Pruis: Hi.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks. So we have no progress in BEF. I think (Carla) maybe if she's on the phone - maybe (Carla) if you've done anything more with the Web site or if you have any information there that would be helpful.

Carlton Samuels: (Carla).

(Carla): Yes, I'm here. Could you please repeat the question?

Elaine Pruis: We are talking about workgroup BEF, which is the matching of contributors and (media applicants). And I was just asking if there has been any more work on the Web site that's been proposed.

(Carla): Not more work because now (with legal) reviewing the terms and conditions and the disclaimers that need to be there, so I'm hoping to have some more progress next week.

Carlton Samuels: Okay definitive question. If anybody has anything to offer on this. Alan your hand is up. You have the floor sir.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. That was from before. I will take it down.

Carlton Samuels: Okay and I'm getting a busy on line. Somebody (fell). Hello. Okay, it's gone now. Hello. Hello.

Man: You are there.

Carlton Samuels: Hello.

Man: You are there. Everybody can hear you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, wonderful. All right, I'm - all right, so that was the report from the group BEF. Elaine is ramrodding that one. Can we move quickly to Team H? Anybody online from Team H. That's the one where they review the basis of (the fee).

Hello. Is anyone hearing me?

Avri Doria: Because it was taken out of...

Carlton Samuels: I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: Isn't that the working group - the team. And because things got mixed up with the letters when ALAC did the charter, but isn't that the team that was looking into the 100,000 that's no longer on our charter?

Carlton Samuels: Okay, yes you are quite right. That's the team that we no longer need that team. That's true.

Avri Doria: Well maybe we do, but it was (disallowed)

Carlton Samuels: It was (disallowed), yes.

(Andrew): I would agree that we probably do need them, but I don't know if we get them.

Avri Doria: Right.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, yes, yes. Thanks for reminding me Avri. That's exactly what happened.

Avri Doria: Even ALAC thought that this was a bad idea. I mean what are we going to do?

Carlton Samuels: Thanks for reminding me. That was in fact what it was. Okay, so we've had the - all the reports and we are ten minutes.

(Andrew): No, wait a second. Wait a second. You left off the IDN Group.

Avri Doria: Yes, if I could make a recommendation, we might want to rename our groups now that these letters don't (associate) with anything so we know.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

(Andrew): And I would like to agree with that. Let's name them on the basis of what they do, because I can't remember which is BEF and H and all that kind of stuff. So one is a funding group and another - you know make it a little bit simpler.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, the IDN Group was the last one. We call it Team I actually.

(Andrew): Right. Yes, that's the one that maybe fits because of the...

Carlton Samuels: Yes, so (my bad). Can we hear what is happening in that group?

(Andrew): Well it's very quick really. We've been having a series of good conversations with different group members and getting some good input and have had

some input from outside the group as well. I am working to put together some text based on some stuff that we've worked on from the earlier report as well as some input and some wordsmithing from Carlton yourself and some others.

And what I'm hoping to do is to have something to circulate no later than close of business on Monday that we could discuss first thing on Tuesday if that's okay with the group. It will be a (unintelligible) to answer all the questions that have come up to this point, all right.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, we hear that (Andrew). Does anybody have a question for (Andrew) on that? No question for (Andrew). Can I take up then the recommendation that we give meaningful labels to these groups? Is that okay?

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Andrew): Sure.

Carlton Samuels: Can we then have proposals for the group AB? Would it be (useful to call this the criteria group)?

Avri Doria: Well criteria is only half of what it's doing, but you know qualifications.

Carlton Samuels: Criteria and qualification group.

Avri Doria: Or just qualification.

Carlton Samuels: Qualification group. Is that okay? Anyone (violently) opposed to calling the group the Qualifications Group? Okay, seeing no objections we will just call it the Qualifications Group.

So now we are to the next group.

Avri Doria: I'd call it Financial Donors and perhaps call the next one Service Donors or something like that.

Carlton Samuels: So Avri's group - we are calling it Financial Donors Group. Is that okay?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: There being no objection, Group CG now becomes Financial Donors Group. The next group.

Avri Doria: It's almost like an in kind - at first I said service donors, but it's more than that. It's technical, it's whatever. It's more like in kind donors as opposed to financial donors.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: I don't know if that makes sense to Elaine.

Carlton Samuels: Elaine this is your baby, so maybe you could say if you agree with Avri's...

Elaine Pruis: (It's not only donors), you know it's also finding those applicants that need (those services) those service donors are providing, so...

Carlton Samuels: So would you - so you are suggesting that it becomes the Service Donors Group or what?

Elaine Pruis: Yes, but that (beams) off of the idea that those donors are (unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: You are fading. I'm sorry. I'm not hearing you at all.

Elaine Pruis: It's more of a matching thing, so I don't know. But I don't really - I don't care.

Avri Doria: In Kind Services then.

Elaine Pruis: In Kind Services is perfect.

Carlton Samuels: In Kind Services. Is there any opposition to the use of the term In Kind Services?

(Andrew): Just a question. Does that imply that those services are offered gratis or does that - it doesn't really matter. Never mind. I take it back.

Carlton Samuels: Okay and then we have the last one, which is the IDN Group. Everybody would agree (with just) the IDN Group. That's the one with (Andrew). Would there be no...

Avri Doria: Well actually it might just be IDN Support as opposed to just IDN because there are so many IDN groups.

Carlton Samuels: Fine.

(Andrew): That's fine - IDN Support. I mean to call each of the subgroups some sort of support makes sense anyway.

Carlton Samuels: That's fine. So all of the groups are renamed now, so here forward we will refer to them by these new labels. Are there any other objections? Okay, we have four minutes until the top of the hour and we will take the next four minutes to - I think we are going to skip the criteria recommendations this time. I had hoped that we could get back to it for this brief time here on this call but we are out of time as it were. Cintra has raised her hand. Cintra do you have, Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you. This is Cintra. I just want to make one quick point with regard to the GAC developing country criteria. Was there any progress? Are we in the process of writing them? I've had no contact with Rafik, but I don't suspect that they have done much in terms of - well I'm not sure that they are aware that we do want them to help us with this aspect of it or if they know

that we are actually still determining whether or not we will incorporate it or not. So I just wanted to get a (unintelligible) on that. If I do have any meetings with him, I will be able to speak (appropriately).

Carlton Samuels: Well let me just say this quick response. Rafik and (Andrew) took on the task of putting together a set of questions. The questions should be ready any time now. We would hope that the questions are put to the list and we will look at the questions and see whether they are an appropriate fit for purpose.

The purpose again to repeat is we wish to hear from the GAC, but we are not going to stop the train for the GAC to catch up. If they come back with anything that is important, we will incorporate it as we go along, but that I believe is what we agreed.

To the extent that we solicit their input and it comes back to us, I think it would be appropriate for us to discuss it, but we are waiting for that set of questions to come on the list. Rafik isn't here, (Andrew) is on, and (Andrew)'s hand is up anyway. So (Andrew) you have the floor.

(Andrew): First of all, I think everybody agrees with your approach. The questions we put together -- and Elaine contributed into them as well - were designed to solicit exactly that response. We worked to try to come up with a clarifying framing for it so that they got clear language that we were not planning to stop what we are doing nor were we asking them to give us an okay on everything, but rather specifically to the issue that they had brought to the table.

That - from what I remember, that was on Rafik's table and I'm not sure whether he sent that forward or not. So it might be worthwhile for you to check in with him. You know it obviously should have come from the chairs of the group, so I honestly don't know what actual follow on communications we've had with them. But I do know there's language that's already been

prepared and I think it's pretty clear. I think everybody who saw it is pretty comfortable with it, so it's more (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: All right, (unintelligible) Rafik comes back.

Avri Doria: Is this language on the wiki?

(Andrew): Rafik and I worked on it and I sent it back to him and I think Carlton. So no it was - it's not (all that) Avri. It's mostly just paraphrasing the conversation we had had about what our - what we were looking for, for their help with and clarifying that we were not asking them to review or to you know - basically we weren't asking them to bless every aspect of it nor were we looking for the help in every aspect, but specifically to the aspects that they had brought to the table.

Avri Doria: Right, but I understand. If I understand correctly, you are talking about sending them a missive of some sort.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: And I'm wondering if that is text that has been drafted somewhere and is on the wiki. That's all.

Carlton Samuels: It should have been placed on the wiki and that is what I'm suggesting Avri. Rafik is working on it. I'm suggesting that it be placed on the wiki so we can (convey) on it. And then once we have a general consensus, we can send it forward.

(Andrew): Got it. Okay, well I sent it back to at least Rafik and I don't know if you got it or not, but...

Carlton Samuels: I haven't seen anything. It must have (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): Okay, then I will resend it to the chairs. If you are comfortable with it, please let's put it on the wiki. That's fine.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, Avri. You still have your hand up. We still have a (couple minutes).

Avri Doria: I already spoke.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, we are a minute past 9:00. I really thank you all for this call.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: See you all next Tuesday all being well. Thank you all. Good morning, good evening, goodnight.

(Andrew): Cheers.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

END