

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Tuesday 17 May 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 06 May 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.

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ias-20110517-en.mp3>

On page :

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair

Andrew Mack – CBUC

ALAC

Carlton Samuels – LACRALO - ALAC - WG co-chair

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO – ALAC

Alan Greenberg – GNSO Liaison – NARALO

Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) – ALAC

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

Dave Kissoondoyal – AFRALO - ALAC

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

John Rahman Kahn - Individual

Cintra Sooknanan – At-Large

Dev Anand Teelucksingh – At Large

Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Alex Gakuru – NCSG

Michele Neylon - RrSG

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

Tony Harris –ISPCP

Woman: Thank you. The recordings have started. Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's JAS call on Tuesday, the 17th of May we have Rafik Dammak, Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Baudouin Schombe, Alan Greenberg, Olivia Crepin LeBond, Dave Kissoondoyal, Evan Leibovitch, Andrew Mack.

From staff we have Karla Valente, myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies noted from Cintra Sooknanan, Alex Gukuru, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Carlos Aguirre, Tony Harris, John Raman Kahn and if I could please also remind everyone to states their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella. Thank you - thanks for everybody who joined this - today's call. Starting with the agenda, is there any comment? Okay, hang on. So just I think we will start with an update from (ALAC) and GNSO after that we sent the report last week.

So for GNSO, cancel that, so there was some question and debate in the GNSO council at least about the sending of reports and there arose some issues and we got some questions that I forwarded to the working group and then we re-worked on them in the next item.

But for the update from the ALAC maybe someone - maybe Olivier can volunteer for that, to give us from update from the ALAC?

Olivier Iteanu: Yes, thank you Rafik. Yes, we received the report from the - (Jess) working group and thank you very much. It was well received by the ALAC. It was reviewed and that was forwarded over to the board in time for them to be able to consider the subject during their board retreat which takes place on the 20th and the 21st of May.

Now whether there will be some feedback on that and whether the subject will be on the agenda is something we don't know about. But what I do know is that several board members have already read through - had a first read through of the report.

Some board members actually are a part of the (Jas) working group so they kind of had an advanced look at it but others who were not part of the working group had their first read and I understand that the process is on its way so I just hope - and well look forward to receiving more feedback. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Just - my understanding, there was like a comment period from the (unintelligible) community but is there some question from the (clauch) about the report that we need to answer them in the working group or not or?

Olivier Iteanu: Yes, there was, indeed, a comment period. A few points were made but nothing to (change) so much. There are some questions. Perhaps some of my colleagues would like to bring them forward.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, we have Evan in the queue. Evan, please go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually I just wanted to talk a little bit to the process of this because of the very, very compressed timelines. I mean, there are comments being made but at the same time there's also an ALAC vote going on and as a result the documents on which those votes are happening really can't be changed at this time.

So what I personally see happening is that all the comments that are being received, including some of the ones that have come from the registry constituency and so on, I mean, these are all going to be extremely useful to us going forward but to a certain extent, the need or the desire to have something in front of the board before it meets in Turkey as well as before it in front of the GAAC as it continues its deliberations, the speed with which these things have to be done almost required that there be a very, very bare

minimum of an ability to actually have comments make their way into the report.

So while this is all being taken and this is all absolutely valid and necessary, the effect that it's going to have on the current document called the second milestone report is probably going to be minimal.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. We have Alan and then Tijani Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, to answer the specific question, I don't think there were any ALAC or large issues that require the working group to answer at this point. There were - are some expectations implied in the comments for what happens next.

And in terms of the comments that have been raised largely through the GNSO but there may be others also, I'm not sure, I would say none of them are going to effect the report. The report is issued. You know, for better or worse that report is what it is.

However, in terms of getting any action out of the GNSO, I think the quicker we can have some summary answers to the specific questions, even if they are, yes, this is an area we're working on, I think that would be a good thing if they could be ready by this Thursday when this GNSO meeting, so much the better.

But regardless, I don't know what our expectation is of expecting action out of the GNSO and I will not be so impolitic as to comment on that. But without answers to the questions that have been raised by GNSO counselors, I think we're not in a strong position. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Alan, about the GNSO (essay), I think the main idea for having this (the course), if we can summarize all our (restaurants) before the GNSO council, so maybe we can move forward in the next call, in the GNSO next

call, otherwise maybe the motion for approving the report from GNSO side to be deferred or we take (more time). Tijani, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Rafik. Don't - so I - there is - I will not make comments. I made comments as soon as the report had been sent to the (charts) and organization. Because Section 3.2 has been modified from the one (pact), very deeply, if you want, and it was modified without any discussion in the group, without any even read of it in the group.

And I understand why because Eric submitted it very late and it was modified like this. But I have a lot of concern about this section especially. Our work, our main work, as per our charter is to give ways to recognize the needy applicants.

And this section treats this point exactly. And in this section we put some under brackets, let's say objective metrics that was changed in subjective metrics at the end. And it's very - I have a big concern. And I don't want to comment on it because it's too late. Nothing can be modified now but in the future, I do hope that we consider this point very, very seriously.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, we're trying to (get) just this (milestone) report and we are going to have the final report. so we are going, I think to I think, to refuse some points and also having more community feedback so we can't change that and continue the task in our charter so it's - this is - you can be - can be fixed.

So we have Carlton, Olivier, (Clu) and Alan. Carlton, please go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you chair. I just wanted to say one thing about the - this - the major point to raise - questions raised seem to be about the metrics and how we qualify.

I am very concerned that if any metric you put up is going to be shot down and so I am not opposed to having a different number there because I don't

think there is any real great basis to determine how you're going to decide who is going to get support based on a number.

I don't think it is something that one can expect. It just seems - and I notice that every time you ask persons who don't like the number you put to suggest a new number, they skirt that issue.

I still believe that it is the numbers, the metrics that's going to be the real issue and that's what they're going to use to shoot this down. I don't believe ever the people who are complaining about it ever have a clue or would even want offer one.

So you know, it's - this to me is - all has been a political thing. It's not going to change. So we can make a good effort to get this metric in but please understand that it will always be attacked by the interests. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Carlton. Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Iteanu: Thank you Rafik. Actually I note in the chat that Alan mentions he has a point of order. I just wonder whether that's not over.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Very quickly, I was going to say that the lesson from Tijani's comment was that we need to remember the time schedule on - last time it wasn't until the last two meetings that we actually started focusing on the report that we knew had a deadline.

And I'm afraid we're doing it again here. We're starting to talk about the substance of the individual me- the merits of the individual things in the report instead of focusing on the particular comments, the questions that were raised that we're trying to answer with a specific time deadline in mind which I

think was the item on the agenda. So let's keep focused on what we have to do not go back and answer the longer term questions. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Thank you Alan. That's - okay, Olivier, you (had something).

Olivier Iteanu: Actually having just heard Alan's point of order I think I'll defer. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Rafik. Cheryl Langdon Orr for the record. I just wanted to come back to the metrics and questions issue so I'm not out of order, Alan. I mean, I don't actually remember the charter specifically requiring metrics through what constitutes and underserved internationalized domain name or language.

It doesn't. I think we need to look at the response to the questions from the GNSO council sent by their chair to the workgroup via our chairs. They have responded. I think they responded perfectly reasonably. And there's been a follow up question at least in the email I've read, that indicated that there was still this metrics issue looming over our heads.

And I'm sure that the metrics issue needs to loom over our heads in terms of the second milestone report. The second milestone report I think is done quite adequately although (passed on far) enough and with enough process and due diligence that some of us would've desired if we had just gone onto our job a little bit earlier.

But that said, it did go to giving substantive information to the board and did the governor advisory committee in terms of criteria and that was the primary time, critical stuff we needed to do on the second milestone report.

There is more work to do. We recognize that. And perhaps if we choose, we could take up this matter of metrics. There's a difference between metrics

and criteria and perhaps in response to the - but what are the metric plea from voices in one of the chartering organizations at least, we could say back to them, could you please define what you think is a difference between criteria and a metric. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cheryl. Okay, so I think we should - if we have 20- 14 minutes left in the call, I think we should foster the question - question (unintelligible) start working on them. We got some response, let's see, from Tijani, Eric, and Rafik and Evan. Yes, I like (unintelligible) of Evan.

So, okay, I'm not sure how to - you don't have to (see) a question and there'll be connected but if you can check them and email it - Gisella, is it (specific) to put them in the Adobe Connect?

Karla Valente: This is Karla, Rafik. I'm happy to do that as well. I'm just trying to identify the email.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Returning to the - to answer to Carlton, let's see, Carlton's question in the chat. Yes, we should reply to that clearly because we - yes okay. So we should reply to it too. Just in the main time that here that we have, the questions in the Adobe Connect.

How do you think that we should proceed for writing like a summary? Is, for example, this (create) team want to do that or should we - and Carlton do that? So to some - to get all the responses from the working group and then to compile them and then just to check with working group before sending things and to the GNSO council because we don't have so much time.

It should be done I think in - like the council call is in the - Thursday so I think we have just two days to do that. So how do you think that we should proceed? Okay, we have the question now in the...

Karla Valente: Rafik, this is Karla. I posted the question.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Karla. There is still the council asking if the staff can compile the answer in one place for review. Karla, can you please do that?

Karla Valente: I'm sorry. Could you go again?

Rafik Dammak: It's the question in the chat from Carlton that he - he's asking if the staff can compile the answer in one place for review.

Karla Valente: Yes, so I'll take the (note).

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thank you. Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes Rafik, I guess I'm a little bit confused. We're trying to - what I heard you say - just let me make sure I'm understanding correctly. What I heard you say was that we're trying to respond within the next 48 hours to the questions that have been forward by the GNSO that we're going to be pulling together all of those questions and that we're going to need to figure out who, from which part of our working group is going to respond and how we're going to make everyone comfortable with that response before sending it out. Is that the question?

Rafik Dammak: We got some answer from the - some working group's members that I think it will be a reply from the working group so we need to work and...

Andrew Mack: We need to get - we need to create a time certain then by which people need to respond. So something needs to go out, say, today that people have, you know, 24 hours to respond to. Does that make sense? Or put differently - is that what you are proposing?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, so to work - okay just Carlton, maybe he wants to reply to that. Carlton, go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, this is Carlton. Yes, Andrew, the thing is that there are some working group members already replying and there're several replies. They tend to be in the same area but with slight variations.

I think it'll be useful if we just take their questions, compile the questions in one place, take their answers from the different working group members, put them in one place and let us look at them and see if we can prepare a composite answer so that everybody will agree. We can do that by the end of day and have it on the list. That's why I asked staff if they could compile it for us.

Andrew Mack: Okay that's fair. Thank you. I appreciate it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so let's have a (start) maybe the first question from the (unintelligible). It's about point 3.2. So what's - the question is how is this - so about the financial need. Any comment on that from people that they couldn't send their answer to the mailing piece?

I tried to put some - also have - we're trying to (hold) the answer of I think (Eric).

Man: Can you hear me?

Man: Yes. Yes.

Man: I can hear you. There's also some noise in the background.

Carlton Samuels: That's me. I'm trying - there's a helicopter in my area. Let me just put in (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Heavens above Carlton. They finally tracked you down, have they?

Carlton Samuels: Right. Exactly right. It's the famous black helicopters, right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh dear. That's the special team coming to visit. Oh dear.

Rafik Dammak: So please, do you have any comments about the first question?

Man: About the (action) of the amount mentioned in the report?

Rafik Dammak: These - I think it's the second question. The first question's related to the...

Man: Understand the language?

Rafik Dammak: What? I'm sorry?

Man: Understand the language.

Rafik Dammak: No, no. The first question is how - it's about the po- the 3.2. It's about the applicant that's capable to contribute \$45,000 towards ICANN application fee unless it can waive some (unintelligible) and what applicants anticipates (scholar fee) extension (deliberations so far).

So the question how was this determined? Is this the sufficient to demonstrate your ability? Some (expiration) of the working group thinking on these would be helpful. Yes. So if there is no - Cheryl, please go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Rafik. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I think we need to recognize what the purposes of the exercise is here in terms of responding to individual questions.

You're not, as a working group, then called to task by any part of the ICANN community other than your chartering organizations. Therefore, out of courtesy and out of due process and on the basis of good accountability, and indeed, (a little) transparency, we need to respond, reply or in some way,

shape or form, deal with the comments that have come in on the current second milestone report.

So things such as how is it determined, the discussions that went on in the working group looked at - they established in what was the basis of their experience and opinion, a base level which would indicate sufficient financial viability as to not be a less than start up, blah, blah, blah.

I mean, we don't have to slit our wrists and worry too much over this. Is it sufficient to demonstrate that viability? I believe we had significant discussions about the outcomes and the viability on the amount of money actually spent on, for example, a (deaf cat), GTLD.

And that's all we need to say. In fact, we could say to some of these questions, we considered it and this is what we thought. These are not your masters. These are a group of comments. Answer them, deal with them, respond to them, give them all credit where credit is due, absolutely, all right.

But please don't take so much time responding to whoever's tugged on our choker chain that we don't get on to the next part of our work. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: I really like your (comment). Thank you very much for that. Okay, so I think - okay, Karla, did you take all of that?

Karla Valente: I took a short note saying that answers need to be provided but they should not drive our work. Is that an accurate (unintelligible)?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You're far more politic than they, Karla. And if you'd like to go back at any point - someone wants to go back to the transcript, they can use my quotes in terms of how we determined how 45 was established. We discussed it, we thought it was a fair call. It was based on some experience such as (a dark cat) and of course, the more perhaps reactive way of responding to that was any additional information that may come forward who have better

information on what actually demonstrates financial viability for running a GTLD registry should do come forward and let us know. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you. I think we can move to the next question about the - is the \$45,000 amount an (annual) figure? And it might make (perhaps) more percentage of operational (cross). Any comment on that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think my previous comments were relevant there too. It might make up a small percentage just of annual cost or in the case of (dark cat) for example. It's in excess of it therefore.

Rafik Dammak: Yes thank you. Thank you again Cheryl and okay. I guess maybe we can - let's move to the - it (would be easy) if we can keep doing that. The next question, okay. I think it's about (phases) of \$40,000 amount.

Okay, do we - I think we give some rationale about that or we need to clarify more.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we can probably cluster those - sorry just to jump in - Cheryl for the record just in case the transcriptors think I'm still Rafik. We can cluster the responses to all things to do with the baseline \$45,000 contribution towards the ICANN application fees and I think that would be a reasonable way forward for anything else that comes in in comments. Where we can cluster them together, that would be good.

The essentials are we recognize the commenters. We respect and recognize the comments and we respond to them as a working group to indicate that we have considered them and, indeed, if it's a matter of explaining how we came up with the particular issue in the first place or the recommendation in the first place, we let them know.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cheryl. Okay, so any further comments (guys)? Okay.

Man: I didn't understand that last question.

Rafik Dammak: I said any further comments.

Man: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: On what Cheryl said or if you want to (comment).

Karla Valente: Rafik, this is Karla speaking. I'm trying to draft the questions on the (unintelligible). I don't know if you are able to see.

Rafik Dammak: The questions - did you find the response from Erik, I think, and (Cheryl). Can you put them too?

Karla Valente: Oh yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes, yes. We can see it - the update on Abode Connect. Thank you. Thank you Karla for that. Now, okay, the next question is on 4.1.1.1 on the cost reduction. The question is it's just a (response) actually leave it as (amount to make it) wherefore the deficit can come from.

Andrew Mack: Rafik, can you post that question? It's Andrew. I'm sorry.

Rafik Dammak: The question is in Adobe Connect. Can you see them?

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: I'm in Abode Connect. I'm not seeing it.

Man: Top right side, scroll down to just about the middle.

Rafik Dammak: It's in the 4.4.1.1 cost reduction.

Andrew Mack: Got it. Thank you. My apologies. Appreciate it.

Rafik Dammak: I'm sorry. I thought I can move and then you can see just - so it - okay.

Woman: Sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Let's say, answer to Evan's question. I don't think that (Eric) is here. Okay, I think there is an echo. So I don't think (Eric) is here, right here but we can add his answers to the - add his answer and then - to see how we can - how to say, mix them with the answers from the working group now. That's my - if it's possible to put his answers to so it will make more easy to check.

Okay, did you guys - did you - okay, could you see the question? If this (contingency) (clients) are actually needed - had amount estimated, where would the deficit come from? Any comment on that?

Woman: Sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Cheryl, are you okay?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I'm still breathing.

Rafik Dammak: Hopefully. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I have two answers to that. I don't have (Eric)'s answers in front of me so I don't - I really can't comment on those. Regarding the \$100,000, that item was explicitly removed from the charter on both - from both organizations so ho- we shouldn't have even put it in the report. That is, we were told that is something we shouldn't be looking at and simply saying ICANN should do it. I think it was a mistake and just ask for that kind of question.

But it's too late to fix that right now. Regarding the second one, the answer is yes, the deficit will have to come from the rest of the - from the overall pool if, indeed we lower the cost for something and if ICANN was correct in its estimation that lowering the cost of to a small number of recipients will increase the cost to others by some smaller amount. That's simple mathematics. I mean, I like that answer but that's the reality. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Any comments on that? Karla, did you get - so - the comment from Alan?

Karla Valente: No, I'm sorry. I was trying to get the comment from (Eric) on the screen so I (bet I) could take a look. I'm sorry for that Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'll repeat it again. In answer to the second one that if we reduce the cost for some applicants, where will the deficit come from? The answer is if ICANN was correct in its estimate of the overall costs, then lowering the cost of some will raise the cost to others. Assuming the number of people we lower to is small, then the cost increase will be a smaller amount for the rest. But that's simple mathematics.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you, Alan.

Cheryl, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: The program (must be cause for recovery) and was, then lowering one raises another. That's - I don't think there's any way out. Thank you.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just to follow on from Alan. Of course, should indeed any windfall from any auctions in the new gTLD process be able to be utilized, it could be from that source that the compensation in inverted commerce for such shortfall be sought.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you, Cheryl, but I saw that we dropped out auction from our charter.

Alan Greenberg: We (unintelligible) the word, not the concept.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We may have dropped it from the charter in terms of exploring how that could be managed, but it was certainly mentioned in the milestone report.

Rafik Dammark: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I'll put it - it still is in the electronic charter. We rewrote it to not use the word foundation.

Rafik Dammark: Oh, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Proceeds from auction is different necessarily from a foundation, because a foundation has a particular legal structure in various areas, including Los Angeles - California.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you, Cheryl.

We have Andrew. Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Yes. Just a question. We're assuming that the cost recovery numbers are correct, right, in this conversation? Because part of the conversations had in - on prior calls our colleagues had some question whether or not they really are correct. And so I'm just trying to make sure we're talking about the same thing.

Alan Greenberg: My answer had a premise in it. Yes. There's an assumption. If that assumption is incorrect, then the result changes also.

Andrew Mack: Sure. Okay. I'm just - I'm not sure - I'm not that - with total respect to what you're saying, and the validity of your math, it may just be - it may not be an assumption we want to make. That's all.

Alan Greenberg: I didn't make the assumption. I stated it as an assumption.

Andrew Mack: Fair enough. Fair enough. Okay. Point...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Point taken. Okay.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. And Andrew, I think the benefit of having audio of course is we hear the tone of course of how we say things. So in our response, I would've had the you know asterisks and inverted commas and anything else that can underline the if as an "if" because...

Rafik Dammark: Okay.

Could you see that only - any questions from the Adobe Connect?

Andrew, do you want - do you have comment?

Andrew Mack: Sorry, I was on mute. No, that was from last - from before. My apologies.

Rafik Dammark: Okay.

Okay, so if we don't have any further comments on that, maybe we can move to the next question.

Karla, did you...

Karla Valente: I have a (unintelligible) the same part is that in the contingency from - (I assume that the amount estimated) - where would the deficit come from? If I (unintelligible) the cost - up front, the cost includes the (unintelligible) for another to other applicants, lowering fees for one applicant (unintelligible) could raise it for others.

Rafik Dammark: Sorry Karla. I couldn't hear you well. Can you please repeat?

Karla Valente: I'm sorry Rafik. I didn't hear you.

Rafik Dammark: That's okay now. Please can you just repeat what you say before?

Karla Valente: Yes. It's on the notes right now in red.

Rafik Dammark: Okay. Yes. Yes. If ICANN is correct in the (unintelligible), then the cost increase would be transferred to other applicants. Lowering fees for a few applicants automatically rises to others.

Should we put about - a motion about auction there? Cheryl, is what you said?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Only as an example. Not as a - more than an example.

Rafik Dammark: Yes. Thank you Cheryl.

Because I know in some - the GNSO Council (unintelligible) option.

Okay. So I think we can move to the next question, which is about I think IDNs. It is does the working group believe that costs will be less for IDNs in small or underserved languages? If not, what is being suggested here?

So I think what - Cheryl, please go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't think the working group was making any assertions that there would be a cost differential between an IDN gTLD and a non-IDN gTLD. I think what we were clearly making recommendations is that the need for proactive applicants support for a needy applicant who is going to meet an underrepresented and underserved language or need was very high. And they're not mutually exclusive I admit, but they are very different. Thank you.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you Cheryl.

Andrew (unintelligible).

Andrew Mack: Right. I agree with everything that Cheryl said. I think that inherent in our work and our responses is that this isn't really a level playing field, and that people who are coming from underserved language groups are inherently at a disadvantaged based on the way that things are structure, and also the particular needs of their communities.

That was one of the reasons why we included some discussion of the possibility of packaged pricing, because in the end, it is - it doesn't cost a whole 185 extra if you've got the - the evaluations are being done by you know, a - two or three different scripts as part of - it just takes the additional amount specific for those scripts.

But anyway, that's what - I just wanted to add that in.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you, Andrew.

Karla, did you - could you take a note of Cheryl and Andrew comments?

Karla Valente: I took very short notes. I'm going to go back to the transcript Rafik. Not the best note taker in the world, but I just will do the very high level and then go back to the transcript and take the more detailed one.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. Karla, did you mean will not be - will be more for IDNs or less in your short note?

Karla Valente: The short note is on the screen.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Karla Valente: It says the working group is not making any assumption that the cost will be more for IDNs. This is on the last - not the level field.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. But didn't he say we're not assuming it will be less, which is what the question asked?

Karla Valente: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I think I said different rather than more or less.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you.

Karla Valente: So should I just have it as different?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Different's probably a good baseline to run from.

Karla Valente: Your idea is this is this is (nonetheless) not a level field. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rafik Dammark: So Karla, anyway (unintelligible) okay that put all (unintelligible) in Wiki space and then send a link to the working group so we can - after - other working group members can check (unintelligible) answer, and make comments and then you can send later to the GNSO.

Thank you very much.

Okay. Moving to the next question. It's saying assuming the fees are reasonable with regard to services provided to registries, would other registries be expected to make up the deficit? Or, does the working group believe the fees are too high if the (unintelligible) - or if anything done to support that position?

Karla Valente: Yes Rafik, this is Karla. Isn't that the same that we already answered? That if ICANN is correct in the cost estimates, then the cost increase will be transferred to other applicants?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The answer is yes to me from my point of view Karla. The same question asked a different way. We need to bundle these responses.

Rafik Dammark: Well, maybe we can issue with (unintelligible). Anyway...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, Rafik. Indeed we can, and we need to bundle these responses.

Oh, and that's Cheryl for the record, because I'll only say what you can print.

Rafik Dammark: Okay. So you know, we can I think move to the next question. Yes. We are doing great. We just have I think eight minutes, maybe we can extend some few minutes trying to finish all the questions.

Sorry for that guys, but if we finish in time, it would be more (unintelligible). It would be more - it will be better.

So moving to the next question. Could this put the registry at a competitive disadvantage compared to the registry that (unintelligible)?

Karla Valente: Yes. Rafik, this is Karla speaking. I started putting here - or I copied and pasted Eric's answer to that. I don't know if this is acceptable for the working group. It's right now on the notes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here for the - for - as a card carrying of supporter of (basics), usage, and transition for (these sorts) - to the (unintelligible), I think that's just here an accurate comment. I think most of us out here at the edges are trying very hard to convince the end-user to recognize that - to go with people who are offering basics, even if it is slightly more expensive for whatever service you're deploying with them, even if it's you know end-user and customer equipment is a smart move.

And yes, there may indeed be a lot business to those who only have a (V4) option.

Olivier, do you have a reaction to the wonderful issues of basics on this?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes. Sorry Cheryl. My mind was just taken up by something else at the moment, so I certainly missed your question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I know. It's probably a film festival thingy. I was just saying that I think that what Karla's put in there from - distilled from Eric's comments, which states as follows, "In our opinion, no DNS provider who does not keep up with the market which means our IPV 6 and DNS-6 in this context will lose business to those who do. However, this will not in our opinion be relevant to new registries during the initial years of operation, while IPV 6 requirement is deferred."

How do you feel as a - you know, I'm comfortable with that. I think that's an accurate observation. Sort of a buyer - or not seller beware. But, I did wonder as a (unintelligible), what you thought?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well thank you Cheryl. Olivier here for the record. Yes, it is a questionable thing actually, because of course if you want a new applicant to be 100% up to par with the latest technology it seems to be very costly. But there are two sides to the coin. One being that you want them to be using the latest. At the same time, you don't want them to be stuck on (the off) technology.

But the gist of the matter is it is costly and it might not be something that's required from day one. Certainly, the cost of implementing V6 will go down. And certainly in some countries, IPV 6 - the infrastructure is not there for IPV 6 yet. So, you would be basically precluding those communities from being able to run their own DNS service.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you, Olivier.

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you.

Rafik Dammark: Okay.

Alan. Please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think the - Eric's answer is applicable, but there needs to be following that a nevertheless, the working group is advocating that IPV 6 gateways be provided at advantageous terms to these new registries. That's Section something-something - I don't remember, but it's the one sentence I wrote about the IPV 6 gateway.

So, reference that bigger section saying, "No. We don't think they'd be at a disadvantage. But nevertheless, we are suggesting that they be given IPV 6 capability at advantageous terms." (Just provided with) - thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We - Alan, Cheryl here for the record. We might even encourage ICANN to try and find an angle or two who could indeed provide such tunneling technology.

Alan Greenberg: That is exactly what our other recommendation says.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I know.

Rafik Dammark: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Karla, I - we should point to that particular point. I don't remember what the numbers are, but in the final answer we should.

Karla Valente: Yes. I just wrote the - I just wrote something that Olivier and you said. Can you take a look at the notes?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. No. No. I'm agreeing with you. I'm just saying in our final answer, we should make reference to the specific numbered item in our report that said that. I just don't have the report in front of me. It was something - 3.4 or something - something 3.4 I think. Thank you.

Karla Valente: Okay. Thank you.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you, Alan.

Okay. Yes. I think we can move to the next question. What (unintelligible) of working group actually is the higher tolerance for failure and (make sense) for the smaller continued operation obligation?

Karla Valente: And again, I just copied and pasted some of the things that Eric answered in our mailing list.

Rafik Dammark: Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. With - I'm sorry, the whole thing just jumped. Where is it?

I'm not disputing what Eric says, but isn't the short answer that we are not suggesting higher tolerance for failure; we're suggesting that the cost of handling failure is significantly lower than what ICANN has suggested. I think we make that point somewhere in the report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Karla Valente: So can you repeat that? Not higher tolerance for failure; however...

Alan Greenberg: However, we believe - the working group believes that the cost of managing...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Failure.

Alan Greenberg: ...handling the failure - the continued operations following a failure - sorry. The minimal - continuing minimal operation following a failure will be significantly less than the current ICANN estimates.

Rafik Dammark: Okay. Any further comment?

So we can move to the next question. It's about the staggered fees, staggered over the period of time what happens of the - if progress payment are not met - made on time.

Any comment on that?

Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think the answer is yes; those details must be specified. We haven't yet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Next stage, thank you.

Alan Greenberg: The - our intent in the staggered fees was that they be paid in line with the work being done during the evaluation process. And what if they're not paid on time? That's a decision ICANN must make. Cancel the application, charge them interest.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Business decision.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: 1%? 3%? 15%? You know, work it out.

Karla Valente: Yes. So I kind of tried to combine what you just - with Eric's note to the working group. Can you take a look and see if this is it?

Alan Greenberg: I would leave out that last sentence which is - I think is a bit belligerent.

Karla Valente: Agreed.

Alan Greenberg: Which is how we feel right now, but I don't think it's appropriate.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Rafik Dammark: So - okay I think that we have the last question, which is about variation process, (unintelligible).

Karla Valente: So we are on Part 5, evaluation of process and relationship to the new gTLD applicant group. And what the working group is asking is there enough time for the - I don't see any answer...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: We hope so.

Karla Valente: So the answer is we hope?

Alan Greenberg: We hope so, and a smiley face.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The (deity)'s willing perhaps.

Alan Greenberg: No. We hope so, not also.

Karla Valente: We hope so.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. We're getting slap happy here.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Rafik Dammark: I think we did have - my understanding that Eric sent his answer to the (unintelligible) and for us - forwarded them to the Council. So I'm not sure if we should answer to them or not.

And we have that question -- I think that Cheryl answer to it or Carlton -- that question from Stefan about the (IED) and think - so...

Okay, I think we are done.

Karla Valente: Yes. So Rafik, I have a suggestion.

Rafik Dammark: Yes?

Karla Valente: I'm going to copy and paste this and send it to the working group, incorporating some of Eric's answers as well in addition to what we commented today, and then you can take it from there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good.

Rafik Dammark: Yes. Please. Just to please check our emails maybe and I think the - maybe Tinjani and Cintra and even (unintelligible), so just to check and to put other answer just to - in one place that will be more easy to review them.

Okay.

Karla Valente: (Unintelligible) mailing list today.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you very much.

Okay. Ending with this item, is there any other business that you want to rise?

Okay. No any other business. So...

Karla Valente: I'm sorry, Rafik. This is Karla. I have a question. The Singapore meeting is coming up, and the meetings team is already scheduling the agenda, and I want to know from this working group if you want to have any kind of public session that we have to book for right now.

And this has nothing to do if we want to meet and reserve a room to meet like we did in San Francisco, that's fine. We can do that at the last minute. But if we want to have a public session, we need to schedule a slot as soon as possible.

Rafik Dammark: Okay. Actually I was - just for information, I'd like to (comment about that). We've gotten and we agreed that we need - we may need a public session, but the - what is - if we have any comments for the working group to (unintelligible). So Karla can proceed and book a room or (unintelligible) - the public session for us in Singapore meeting.

Any comment?

Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Well, I mean - this is not about whether or not we're going to have a public session in Singapore. But I wanted to bring up another issue. You want to finish with yours?

Rafik Dammark: There is nothing to read any comment on that, so yes. We can move to your - if you want - what you want to talk about. Yes. It's okay.

Andrew Mack: Sure. Now just briefly, I know that where - we have talked about this IDN issue a number of times over the course of many, many months. And I wanted to bring to everybody's attention the - a letter that I worked on with input from a few JAS members and also from people on the BC talking about IDNs and urging the Board to take this issue much more seriously.

And I can post that to you. We've gotten a lot of support, including from some of the JAS's leaders and I think that the notes very much follow the general tone of the conversations that we've had with the working group.

And so, just - we're still looking for more support and for more people to take this seriously so that they include a serious discussion of IDNs as part of this process before it goes too far down the line.

I have a - I do have a link to the letter, and just ping me. I don't have it with me right now, but I could post it to the list right after this call, okay?

Rafik Dammark: Thank you. Yes. Please.

Andrew Mack: Terrific.

And for those members of the working group, (talking to Tinjani, Evan, and others who have already signed on and support for this idea, thanks very much; I do appreciate the support.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you.

I think - okay. Thank you Andrew again. So please be - please send your letter.

Okay. So if there is no - any other business or any other further comment...

Karla Valente: Sorry. Are we holding a call this Friday?

Rafik Dammark: Yes. I think so.

Karla Valente: Okay. For one hour. Gisella, is that all you needed to know?

Gisella Gruber-White: Fine. I'll send out the notification.

Karla Valente: Okay. Thank you.

Rafik Dammark: Okay. Thank you Karla.

Okay, we extend just ten minutes. I thank you everybody for today call. I hope that our answer will please the GNSO Council. And the last word...

Alan Greenberg: Rafik, you're not really serious about that are you?

Rafik Dammark: What?

Alan Greenberg: That you hope these answers will please them.

Now that's something on which we have consensus. Come on.

Rafik Dammark: Alan, I am just - how to say? I just have some hopes (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. I couldn't resist.

Rafik Dammark: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: We end on the nice and happy wishful thinking note.

Rafik Dammark: Thank you.

Okay. So I will - I adjourn this call. Thank you again. It was really a pleasant call today.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Rafik. Bye all.

Rafik Dammark: Bye-bye.

Karla Valente: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Bye.

END