

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

### TRANSCRIPT

Friday 03 June 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 03 June 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-jas-20110603-en.mp3>

On page :  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#june>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

#### **Participants on the Call:**

##### **GNSO**

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison – WG chair  
Alex Gakuru – NCSG  
Andrew Mack – CBUC  
Carlos Aguirre – Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

##### **ALAC**

Olivier Crépin-Leblond – ALAC chair  
Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large  
Alan Greenberg – GNSO Liaison – NARALO  
Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) – At Large  
Dave Kissoondoyal - (AFRALO) – At large  
Avri Doria - At-Large Member & NCSG member

Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

Elaine Pruis - Mindandmachines

Eric Brunner-Williams

##### **ICANN staff**

Karla Valente  
Gisella Gruber-White

##### **Apologies:**

John Rahman Kahn - Individual

Cintra Sooknanan – At-Large  
Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO  
Carlton Samuels – LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair  
Dev Anand Teelucksingh – At Large  
Michele Neylon - RrSG  
Baudoin Schombe - At-Large  
Tony Harris –ISPCP

Coordinator: Please go ahead. The call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes thank you very much (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Friday the 3rd of June.

We have Rafik Dammak, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alex Gakuru, Carlos Aguirre, Sebastian Bachollet, Evan Leibovitch, Eric Brunner-Williams, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Elaine Pruis, Avri Doria.

From staff we have Karla Valente and myself Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies today from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Carlton Samuels, Cintra Sooknanan, (John Raman Kahn), Tony Harris, Baudouin Schombe.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Rafik and Evan.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Gisella. Thank you everybody for joining today's call.

So let me start if there is any update in the SOI or DOI?

Okay hearing none so moving just to explain that - the agenda that we have today.

We have two items. And the first is the preparatory for special purpose teleconference with the board members and GAC so which will be on the 7th.

We need to work on that agenda and the message that we want to carry for that teleconference. And then maybe if we have a few minutes we can start discussing about preparatory for the Singapore meeting.

Okay is there any comments because the agenda was posted on Tuesday and I didn't see any I think we didn't see any comments about that?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay I think also - sorry this is Evan. Also I want to also if we can finalize the detailed questions to send to staff to assist us with further working on the Milestone Report on the further report.

The Drafting Team actually came up with this set of questions. Unfortunately it didn't make it out. I'm going to be sending this to Gisella in a moment to put up in the Adobe Connect room.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Evan just, you know, I think the priority is that teleconference for Tuesday. So if we can finish on time we can add that item.

There is if we agree about some point. So and it - we can move - we can discuss about that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Does it make sense for you? Okay. So let's start with discussion about the teleconference with the guide and board members.

I think first we need to discuss about the agenda. I have a draft that will suggest later. And but I want just to speak about some recommendation I think that are important for this to account for us.

So first I think where we are going to speak it's mostly - only speak about GI's recommendation that have concerns with - from the Working Group.

So please if your (unintelligible) please avoid to push forward your opinion or points that don't have full consensus.

And also I urge the Working Group members to make a really short answer (intervention) that need to be direct and going straight to the point because it will be just one hour. And I think for (intervention) we can allocate two minutes.

And three I will be strict about that, about the time.

Also the idea is how to say maybe after we can work on (shipping business) that we want to carry for that call.

And yes, because I think that (although) people to participate so maybe if we can have so many to share the load between peoples during the call. Okay.

So I hope that people understand that it's not to prevent people for - to intervene by just to make this call more smooth and also to allow members from the GAC and to interfere.

We are there for listening more than talking or speaking. So and we hope that we get a lot of questions, feedback and guidance from that.

Okay now I will suggest an agenda for that meeting. Please Karla can you take notes about that?

Okay first I think Evan can make short introduction for that call to introduce and to make a overview about the Milestone Report. It should be a short presentation, maybe five to ten minutes. Does it work for you Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. Essentially I'm going to make the assumption that people coming into the call will have read the Milestone Report. So the intention will not be to repeat it, simply just to give a small history of how it was made and go to a

couple of very specific salient points. But yes a small summary seems in place.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Thanks Evan.

So the second item it will be question and answer session from the GAC board numbers. We can then get questions maybe if they will ask for clarification and maybe give us some guidance. So it will be really as a main part of our call.

The third is more to talk about meeting in Singapore and especially if we can have a public meeting with the board and GAC members in Singapore meeting.

Okay so we have three people in the queue. Tijani please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay very well. Only I agree with your time reception for the floor but if someone wants to explain to the board or to the GAC something that may take more than two minutes. Please don't be very strict on this (item).

Rafik Dammak: Okay yes. Yes. The problem is we will have 60 minutes and we need it really to be - to manage the time wisely.

I understand that people can be - can want to take time to explain. But that's why I try to go right to the main point. Sometimes you can take time but people cannot get the point easily.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I fully understand but the point is that if that issue needs more than two minutes and it's easy to understand it so in this case don't cut them. Don't let - let them finish their point. That's all. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes but that's why I ask those people to try to - to make their best for that. Otherwise it will be not easy to manage. Okay Elaine please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Good morning. Thank you Rafik. I agree with you about your rules for the call. And I'd like to suggest that before we have the call that an email goes out with the consensus positions listed and specifying that we're to - we've met our time and not grandstand for personal positions.

And I think it would also be useful to list out those items that don't have full consensus and when we're on the call if someone brings up an item that doesn't have consensus that should be noted. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Elaine. Eric go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Rafik. This is Eric Brunner-Williams for the record. The allocation of call time, I'm concerned that any allocation of time to responses before we have a complete set of questions from the nonworking group members such as the GAC and I hope board members who are on the call will limit the number of questions we actually received from them.

And the responses that we provide from - to them should not be the ad hoc responses of the parties on the call within the time constraints that are available which could possibly mean simply Evan responding to each call, question which would not do well for any of us including Evan.

So I encourage you to consider receiving the questions of the first function of the call and the responses only where they are obvious and easy.

But the real issue is to get good questions from external parties and then to provide them with good answers which may take some time. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so and if I understand well I think it's good. So first to take question at the beginning of the second item and then after to try to answer them so to not have a question and answer, question and answer but question session and then answer session. But allow more to get questions from as you said the nonworking group members. Did I get your point correctly?

Eric is - are you still on the call?

Okay. In the meantime Evan, please go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there. This is Evan. I simply wanted to support what Eric was saying. The intention is to collect questions more than to provide answers.

The important part of this is going to be properly documenting and understanding, making sure that we understand the questions from the non-working group, the members of the call that are not usually in the Working Group.

This is as Eric said, this is for us to listen, not to speak.

And I also agree with Elaine in that I don't think this is going to be the position for people to stakeout personal views or whatever.

We have the Milestone Report too which is going to be the document on which most of the comments coming in from GAC and board and other people are going to be made. So that's really our frame of reference as opposed to personal stances.

But I really think that we should even almost as a default position try not to answer things unless they can be answered factually and very quickly.

And for everything else we collect them and prepare them for additional work and additional research.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Evan. That's why I tried in the beginning to make this recommendation.

As I said the idea is to listen. It's really we need to listen what the - what GAC and board members want to ask. But so sometimes it can help. It can be questions not - but also we are waiting for guidance.

Evan, your hand is still up. You want to speak or.

Evan Leibovitch: No. That was just me...

Okay, Olivier please go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much Rafik, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond for the record.

Just to let you know that in the invitation that I have said to (Catim Puray) and that has been forwarded also to the GAC we are asking that they provide us with a list of the participants that they will send over and their suggestions for an agenda, in other words an advanced notice of what sort of questions they might wish to ask.

I'm not sure whether we will get that in such a short length of time. It's only a few days and they sometimes work on a different timescale than we do.

But if we do get them I will of course immediately send them to the Jazz working list. If we don't get them then I guess we'll just have to work - the group will just have to work with the questions being asked on the call. Thank you.



Rafik Dammak: Thank you Olivier.

Karla?

Karla Valente: Yes this is Karla. Just for the record I am following- up with - on what Olivier just said. So Olivier there is no made for staff members to send an invitation.

Rafik Dammak: Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: I'm sorry I didn't hear you there to well. What did you say?

Karla Valente: Yes I want to clarify that there's no need for staff to sell send any invitation at this point. There's no action from for me at this point.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Invitation to whom, to the board and the GAC?

Karla Valente: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Well I - you have been carbon copied on the email that I have sent to (Catim).

Karla Valente: Yes, okay.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: So now what I would hope is that this gets followed through. I'm not quite sure how it will give followed through but I gather that it's - maybe we'll discuss this afterwards because I mean this all falls outside the realm of the Jazz.

But I was - I thought that it was being followed through on the staff side. So we'll discuss this afterwards if you can?

Karla Valente: Yes let's do that. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Okay thanks Karla.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Yes it's - ensure about the logistics side. Okay.

So I think we have agreement about how we will proceed. So just if there is any feedback about the agenda that I suggested which is that first Evan will make a short introduction, then the main part which will be questions from GAC and board members and then to discuss about having meeting in Singapore.

Okay? So if you have any comments about that please speak.

Okay. So yes, that was quick. So please any further comments about (unintelligible)? So because just I think now we agree how we will - with the agenda if we need some discussion about the message that we want to carry for the call.

So, we have some noise in the phone.

Sebastian Bachollet: Rafik it's...

Rafik Dammak: Yes?

Sebastian Bachollet: ...in a very noisy place but - and I'm not (unintelligible). Can you understand me enough to let me speak or it's too bad and I can't?

Rafik Dammak: Oh yes, that's okay. Yes that's okay (unintelligible). Please go ahead.

Sebastian Bachollet: Okay. Sorry to jump in you have to take into consideration one point that it's not on printed on table for (unintelligible) is that we will have GAC board meeting on this Sunday.. And one of the item because it's on the scorecard of the GAC will be the applicant.

I don't know yet how the meeting will be organized in Singapore. But when some board member discussed about Jazz work we suggest to have a prep meeting from - prep meeting from - before sorry, before the GAC board presentation on (unintelligible) or during.

And (unintelligible) we need to prepare this discussion more to and answer to any questions. It's good to have a list of the questions of GAC and all board (unintelligible) out on the table.

But it's also important to really prepare the interaction with those people within the Singapore meeting.

And (unintelligible) my feeling is that you will have to prepare at least two meetings. One will be on Sunday or Monday morning may be and one after the board decide about what we will do with new GTLD problem.

And it's just you organize and you rewrite because there is a process formal process to have involved GAC (concentration) on the final scorecard issue. And one of that is the new applicants. Hope that is clear and I will turn back to mute.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. All right, thanks Sebastian. So it's my understanding so to have - he, suggests that we have two meetings in Singapore.

But maybe I don't think that Sunday is suitable for people from (Arla) in Chile. So I think they have a lot of many session on that day such would be not easy to - for them to participate.

But I think Monday, yes, Monday can works (sic).

Okay and for the second meeting if I understand it should be after so maybe in Friday or maybe I am mistaking. So maybe Oliver can help for that. Oliver, please go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond:       thank you Rafik. It's Olivier here. We already have as far as I understand a meeting on Thursday, the Jazz meeting group working group meeting on Thursday which Karla has been arranging.

And as far as the first meeting is concerned I gather you will probably discussed this on the Tuesday call and tell the board that for some members it is not suitable to have the meeting on a Sunday and it's preferable to have it on a Monday.

I'm not sure whether it is feasible for it to happen on the Monday but that's something we'll find out next week. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak:    Thank you Olivier. But just maybe if we have some - from the Working Group Side if we can have an idea which is suitable that it's not to have the whole discussion in the - on Tuesday just to make it more easy and smooth. Eric please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams:       Thank you Rafik. I think I heard some discussion of a meeting on Sunday. And I believe I heard you observe, you Rafik observed that some members of the Working Group who were going to be attending the public meeting will not be present as early as Sunday.

And I presume this is an artifact of the travel support making it so that - not covering the Saturday or Sunday.

My point however is that not everyone needs to be present in order to collect the questions or the comments that the participants at a meeting that's prior to Monday might offer to the members of the Working Group or even a proxy for the Working Group to collect.

So again following the notion that it's more important to get questions than answers it's not necessary to generate answers to a meeting on Sunday nor

is it even important to have a member of this Working Group present at a meeting on Sunday.

But it is important that if there is a meeting of parties whose questions we are interested in (unintelligible) at that time that we're in a position to collect those questions. Thank you very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Eric. Yes, really good points, yes. And sorry I think there is an echo. Okay yes. Thank you Eric. Yes, I agree with you.

So okay I think we have some consensus about how we would perceive the agenda and also about some extra steps. So just stop discussing about that.

But now I think it's 25 minutes maybe - I thought that maybe we can have discussed about the message. But as we more are going to listen I don't think that we have a specific message to carry for the board and GAC members.

Then if they don't hear any objection and you don't think that we have any comment that to be added so we can move to the next item that suggested by Evan.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay.

Karla Valente: Rafik, this is Karla. I would like one clarification if we still have time.

Rafik Dammak: Yes?

Karla Valente: Yes. So are we requesting following on Sebastian's comments are you officially requesting a timeslot, any time on Sunday or Monday?

Rafik Dammak: In fact we just...

Karla Valente: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: ...start discussing that we can write that in the Tuesday call.

I think now we - there is no (unintelligible).

Sebastian Bachollet: Sebastian if I can help with that, Sunday will be the official meeting, a discussion between the GAC and the board. It will be on Sunday and if my memory's well and it's scheduled to be the same. It's between 4:00 and 6:00.

And one item will be the new applicants. Then the question is how does that group, the sponsoring organization GNSO ALAC are moving to participate or to be able to get some information during this time.

Because it will be the last time we will have an interaction between GAC on board on that subject also before the votes on yes or no by the new GTLD program. And if it's yes then it will be over.

But I am sure that the Jazz group (unintelligible) to have still have a lot word because we always say that the guidebook is one thing and the Jazz delivery it's a (unintelligible) works. And it's (unintelligible).

But I think you will not have a choice between Sunday and Monday. You will have to be, if you are invited and I hope so to participate to the GAC board meeting who is set up by the board and the GAC.

Karla Valente: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Sebastian for clarification.

Okay is any further comment? So now it's we have 30 minutes okay. Okay just it was that I'm thinking - oh okay. So we have an agenda. (Unintelligible).

Okay I'll say that we don't not have a specific message to carry for that meeting. And tomorrow that we are going to listen - we are going to push for some points.

Okay so let's move to the next item so as suggested by Evan.

Evan sorry, can you just remind us that I think you drafted - that you drafted some questions already for the staff?

Evan Leibovitch: Actually the Drafting Team has over the last little while been doing it. And I have - I've just sent in a chat to Gisella to hopefully put this into the Chat window for Adobe Connect.

My sincere apologies, I had hoped that somebody would've taken it and post it up before now. But that hasn't happened.

So what we've actually done is taken the work from a previous meeting and put this together into the form of a specific letter that would go to ICANN policy staff to try and flush out details that we would need to go forward.

So Gisella do you have the message that I just sent? I don't have paste privileges into the Adobe Connect (unintelligible)

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...area?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes I do. Evan sorry it's Gisella. I was on mute. I'm here. I'm just doing a copy, paste as we speak. It's going to be on in a second.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So while Gisella's doing that essentially this is a collection of the issues that have been brought up over the last little while together with other things that have been added since.

And we wanted to stress things that - we wanted to stress requests that were going to be specifically relevant to ongoing work - sorry, ongoing work on flushing out the work in Milestone Report two.

So for instance auction stuff was mentioned in the last call. That is not part of this set of questions because it's introducing new things that were not mentioned.

So as soon as this is in the chat area, what I'm hoping to do is for everybody to have a look at this set of questions, make modifications of necessary.

And hopefully by the end of this call we will have something that can be sent to ICANN policy staff for the purposes of getting us further detail that we need for moving on.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So I just I think that okay the questions are now in the Adobe Connect, okay?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay yes please yes, I had to scroll down to get that so all right so what Karla - sorry what Gisella has just typed in it starts with a preamble.

The Joint Application Support Cross Community Working Group has been chartered by the ALAC and GNSO to research methods to reduce obstacles to potential TLD applicants in less developed economies.

In response to the Milestone Report blah, blah, blah to enable the Jazz to properly respond to the ICANN community we request the following information which we believe should be provided as a matter of transparency and accountability.



And what follows below is a brief but I hope reasonably complete list of the kind of information that people on - in the Working Group have been asking for and believe that will be useful to us going forward.

This is based on the work of previous meetings and previous work on mailing lists as well as some feverish work within the Drafting Team of (Andrew Cinter) and myself to try and turn this into something that could be sent formally to policy staff.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Evan how do you suggest that...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: Due to the lateness of sending this out.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry Evan just I was asking how do you think that we should proceed? I think for first question that we cover that in the last call and it took so much time. But so if you think that we go in the second part?

Evan Leibovitch: Well Rafik it's my hope that this letter is sufficiently non-controversial to be able to go without a lot of discussion and diversion.

In the last phone call we did get diverted with talk of options and things like that that while some of that is relevant to what we're doing it doesn't address the immediate points which is clarification of issues in the second Milestone Report.

So what I'm hoping is that in the time we have left in this particular agenda item that people can look through this and with the indulgence of the rest of the Working Group consider this letter to be both detailed enough, sufficient enough, and concise enough that we're not asking for things that are beyond the scope of what we've been working on yet are still required in order to be

able to give the kind of further refinement and detail of the MR2 that is going to be necessary to go forward into a final report.

So...

Does anyone on the call have any questions regarding this statement?

Rafik Dammak: We have Avri. Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I was un-muting. I have a question about two of them. Didn't they already publish a memo that basically where they basically - where they discussed which costs for the - was there - I mean that they covered on 26K of it that that was the development fund and the other?

So you're only asking about the 100 because it looks like you're kind of repeating some of the questions like cost for history. And they've already presented a different chunk or I don't know. I'm trying to understand that. Thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Avri first of all welcome back. And secondly I think what had been debated previously is that there certainly has been existing documentation coming out from the staff that has detailed some of this.

But there was a general feeling that the level of detail that we required was going to be a little bit better that if for instance we were going to ask for cost reduction in certain areas while still maintaining the policy mandate of cost recovery that we need to find out the kind of interpretation of cost recovery that we need to find out the kind of interpretation of cost recovery.

Is it cost recovery for the entire program, is it cost recovery for the real-time cost of processing a specific application and so on?

And it was believed by members in the group that the existing documentation that exists is insufficient to be able to - for us to be able to do that and justify the kind of cost reduction we're asking for while still maintaining the - while still maintaining the general principle of cost recovery.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: Any other questions? Any other comments? Is there anything missing? There is a line item at the bottom saying any other relevant cost or cost category and if so what category?

Rafik you want to manage the queue or do you want me to answer the questions?

Rafik Dammak: So we have Eric and Avri. So I think Eric has some points to raise. Eric go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Rafik, Eric Brunner-Williams. The I - raised my hand because I thought that we have an opportunity to meet with staff where we can ask implementation questions in addition to the meetings which are scheduled for our meeting with the board and GAC.

If this is not the correct time on the agenda to raise the issue I'll defer until then. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: I can response to that Eric. The idea is to send - was to send the questions and then to if possible to have some ICANN staff on the call so we can't discuss with them.

So the idea was to send in prior the questions. So maybe if it's possible we may request them to be present in our - one of in our face to face meetings in Singapore. Does it make sense for you?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well the interaction between the Jazz Working Group and the GAC and board is the primary purpose for having questions on a policy issue and presumably our being able to generate answers on policy issues.

The point for a meeting with staff is to ask implementation questions which we aren't - would originate from us rather than questions from external to us that we are going to originate answers to.

So having staff be in the question and answer format at the meeting with the board and GAC may detract from our ability to get questions from the board and GAC. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry Eric, it's not that - I'm sorry that for misunderstanding. It's - I was thinking that we will - we may interact with the ICANN staff in our face to face meeting of the Working Group meeting.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Avri please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes I just typed it while this was going on so I'll just repeat for the record. What I think now it needs to be amplified to include a discussion of the previous documentation and basically a version of explanation that Evan just gave me.

Otherwise I think there's possibly a risk that the answer is we answered that already in our memo such and such.

So I think, you know, acknowledging that and saying yes but that wasn't enough information, et cetera. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Evan so you have the floor.

Sebastian Bachollet: It's Sebastian. I can come into the queue?

Rafik Dammak: Yes please.

Sebastian Bachollet: Yes and it's really on my personal behalf and as participant of the Jazz Working Group that I am saying that, not for with any other (hat).

My feeling is that there were two way to go. It's the way to decrease the - many asked by ICANN to participate to the process.

And there were also the possibility to raise money to help without changing anything on this side of ICANN.

I would like very much that the Working Group spend almost as much time in one on the other. Because if not, if the answer of the board is - so the GNSO and the board say no way, we don't want to reduce any cost so we'll have to (spend) our time on raising money and allowing or finding the process to help with the applicants. And then I would like to be sure that we work on two - on those two issue.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Sebastian. Andrew, please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: Thank you, Andrew Mack for the record. I guess my question Sebastian is a perception question.

I think it's the general consensus of the group from what I understand that we are in favor of pushing on lowering prices.

If we move forward more in the direction of trying to raise money as a kind of a fallback position are we undermining in some way of our focus on lowering

the prices because I think that that's where most people have come down fairly strongly thinking that that's the best approach. What's your thought?

Sebastian Bachollet: Sorry once again my really personal view is that I don't see today how any thought of GNSO or whatever will go in the direction of reducing.

It may be bad. It's just my feeling. And it's important to have this discussion on the seventh and (unintelligible).

And the second point is that I am sure there are some people who went to see the World Bank or others (unintelligible) put some money and that might be one of the subject may be for Singapore but not today.

But it will not undermine something (unintelligible) and we would need to work on both. If not if one is not coming really it will be - you will have (not) time to go back to the second position. I'm sorry I have to mute because it's very noisy now.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Sebastian. I think in relation to that I just noticed a comment from Elaine in the Chat.

So she was asking if we can ask people on the Working Group for to show - for a show of hands on support for further pursuing of I think the cost breakdown. Elaine did I get your point correctly?

Elaine Pruis: Yes. So Rafik my concern with asking those questions again has sort of been discussed between Evan and Avri and that they been answered by the staff a couple of different times. There are memos published.

And so I'm worried that it's a diversion and that we don't know what response we could possibly get that would alter the work that we're doing really.

And the risk in it is if we're pursuing this question because we want to know the true cost of applying I'm concerned that the response to that would be well if you really want to know the true cost let's (go in) the second round when we know.

So I'm worried that we get - our applicants could get pushed off in the second round if this is a line we choose to draw in the sand. Thanks.

Thank you Elaine. Okay we have Alan in the queue I think also Evan. Maybe you can comment too. Alan please go ahead.

Alan Gakuru: Yes with regard to what Elaine just raised my position and I've taken it a number of times is I don't think we're going to get cost breakdowns more than we have right now.

I do believe it is valid to ask for the parameters that were used in establishing what the costs are and that - there's a big difference between the two.

There was a lot of statistical analysis done and they've made - there were assumptions that went into that. And knowing what those assumptions are would be useful to us. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Evan do want to comment that?

Evan Leibovitch: Not really. I think I would just totally agree with what Alan said is there's more work that needs to be done.

Elaine I totally absolutely disagree with you that we have no right to ask things from staff that should be public information already.

This is not a matter of asking for information that does not exist. We're simply asking for the documentation upon which ICANN has calculated the sums it has asked for to date.

Somehow they have come up with a figure of 185,000. They have not given sufficient detail on how they got to that number.

That is - the detail on that is not something that needs to wait for a second round because that already exists right now.

So all we are asking for is the set of assumptions and calculations that were used to generate the sum of 185,000.

Why do we need that so badly? Because as has been mentioned and as exists in consensus form in Milestone Report two we are recommending cost reductions.

And in order to maintain cost reductions while keeping consistent with the point of cost recovery we need to find out what are the real-time costs, what are the deferred costs, what are the historic costs and what are the calculations behind those costs that perhaps could be worked - reworked for the benefit of applicants from developing economies? Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Elaine Pruis: I'd like to...

Rafik Dammak: Thank you.

Elaine Pruis: ...(unintelligible) please Rafik. So Evan you've really misquoted me. I didn't say we didn't have any right to ask staff for these things.

What I said was that we've already asked and they've responded. And I feel like spending a lot of time on this one takes away from our efforts to find other ways to support our applicants.



Rafik Dammak: Alan please go ahead.

Alan Gakuru: Yes just a comment on there's a subtle difference between asking for the calculations and asking for the parameters.

They've already stated in their documents the calculations were done using some relatively complex simulation processes which we're not going to be able to be given all the details of.

But the parameters into that simulation I believe are very relevant. So I think there's a subtle difference calculations and the parameters and we need to be conscious - cognizant about. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Am I muted?

Rafik Dammak: No. Yes?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay I just put it in the Chat that my preference is that we get a significant fee reduction. I'm relatively ambivalent on the information that we obtain from staff or from the board on how they arrived at their general fee. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Eric. So I think we need to hold on about this point. Evan asked for to make (unintelligible) Adobe Connect. So if people agree with Alan just how do you say, yes use Adobe Connect to say that you agree, otherwise just disagree.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Agree or disagree with what?

Rafik Dammak: Alan what Elaine said just because she asked for that people show hands in Adobe Connect? Avri you raise your hand and lowered. You want to speak? Yes Avri please go ahead.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay sorry I was on mute. I think for raise of hands we need like a statement, you know, specific statement like Elaine if I understand correctly and I don't want to put words in her mouth, if Elaine was to make a recommendation it would be that we don't proceed with sending a letter.

Is that sort of a clear statement of the kind of thing you want hands-on or just are we in general agree with what she's saying but that doesn't change anything? What - so I don't understand what we're raising our hand on. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Thanks. So what I guess my question is this is a letter that's going to staff. We're asking questions for further clarification.

And when I posted that question for a show of hands on pursuing this was before we talked about altering those questions to include or recognize what's already been answered and to clarify that - the reasons why we would ask these questions.

So I'm hearing that people want to know the assumptions, what if we pursue this and send this list of questions to staff. I would like there to be a very clear statement of why we need those assumptions and how it's going to affect our work. Then I'd be fine with it.

But I don't want to just throw out the same six questions we've asked a couple of different times over the years.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Elaine. Okay are there any comment on that? Andrew please go ahead.

Andrew Mack: I guess I just posted in the Chat I'm - what it sounds to me is that we're basically agreed then.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Andrew Mack: That we want to go ahead and push forward, get some more of that data. But in - to respect the work that's already been done explain the context of why we're looking for more?

If that's the case I think we're all on the same page.

Rafik Dammak: Yes I think there is no real issue just I think we can go with sending the letter. So let's agree if the content is okay and then to move forward.

So it's more if there is any real disagreement or comment about some points otherwise I think, yes Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay all I'm going - I'm just making a request right now to both Avri and Alan to contact me afterwards and see if we can come up with some wording.

Elaine, Avri, Alan about the things that have been brought up on this call, Alan you made some extremely good points about the nature of what we should be asking for and I think we'll make our statement more clear and definitely less ambiguous what's already been received.

That together with what Avri and Elaine have been suggesting that we make sure that the letter is seen in the context of already having received information and not trying to just duplicate that.

If any of you that have commented on this can suggest some specific wording to modify to the set of questions that would be appreciated.

I'm certainly prepared to commit to by the weekend sending out a revision of what I've - what is on the Chat window right now that reflects that.

And hopefully we can get some consensus on the email list or in the Tuesday - well no the Tuesday call is going to be too important to talk about the, you know, set of questions.

So if we can resolve this on the email list I can put this in the hands of the chairs for the purpose of sending off to policy staff.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so you are going with other two of them to, how to say to wordsmith this. I am borrowing the word from Evan, wordsmith the letter.

And then when you think that it can be put on the table for the Working Group to agree about it?

I hope our timing is within 24 hours. But it will - obviously it'll go faster if there is multiple people working on this as opposed to it just going on the shoulders of the existing working and Drafting Team.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Evan. There's because my point is here if the question are important but also we need to move forward and to work on the Milestone Report itself. So hopefully we can get a response quickly hopefully.

Okay so I think we have now some consensus how we will proceed. So we have a team which we work in the letter so to - for wording it et cetera. And then we'll send it to the working group for review. And then we will send it to the policy ICANN (unintelligible).

Okay. I will take the silence as agreement. Okay we have five minutes left in and agenda if there is no any further comment about the current item?

Okay so there was an item in this agenda about preparing for Singapore meeting which is more about that we start discussing about the many - the meetings that we will have in Singapore.

Now I think we have a face to face meeting for the Working Group in Thursday. We have also public session and now maybe we'll have a meeting with the board and GAC members.

So we need to work on that. I don't think that we have time to discuss that in three minutes. So I think we should start this discussion in the mailing to start to threads to get the comments from Working Group members.

I think a few days ago Karla sent a description of the public session and asked some questions. So maybe Karla will - can you send again that you made and then we can start discussing about the preparation for the Singapore meeting?

Okay so I think now we can move to any other business. Is there any other business that you want to raise or to comment? Eric please go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well thank you Rafik, Eric Brunner-Williams for the record. The - Sebastian's call, part of it is something that I don't want to overlook. I put this in the Chat already.

And that is the issue of how resources are accumulated for later dispersal to applicants who are (needs) qualified. That's been a subject that we really haven't spent a great deal of time on.

I know that there are other issues as well that we also have to consider in future calls. So I just suggest this is something for a future call agenda. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Eric thank you for your comment. Can you please write a note and send this to the mailing list so maybe it's - it will be more easy to follow-up on that?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Of course.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Okay is any other business, any further comment?

Karla Valente: Hi Rafik, this is Karla. I believe you and me and Olivier and Evan are staying after the call to hash out some details about (unintelligible) 7...

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Yes. Okay so hearing none and yes we have one hour call today. Thank you everybody for this call.

We hope that we did enough things today to moving forward. Thank you everybody and this call is adjourned. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Thanks a lot Rafik.

END