

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)  
TRANSCRIPT  
Tuesday 07 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) Tuesday 07 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-20110607-en.mp3>

On page :

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

(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

Cintra Sooknanan – At-Large

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

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

Avri Doria - At-Large Member & NCSG member

Sébastien Bachollet – ICANN Board

Elaine Pruis - Mindandmachines

John Rahman Kahn - Individual

George Sadowsky – Board Member

Katim Touray – Board Member

**ICANN staff**

Karla Valente

Gisella Gruber-White

Glen de Saint Gery

**Apologies:**

Alex Gakuru – NCSG  
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 Thank you very much, good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Tuesday the 7th of June.

We have (Katim Turay), Tijani Ben Jemaa, Carlos Aguirre, John Rahman Kahn, Rafik Dammak, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Carlton Samuels, Elaine Pruis, Sebastien Bachollet, Avri Doria, George Sadowsky, Andrew Mack, Alan Greenberg.

From staff we have Karla Valente, Glen Destaingery and myself Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies today noted from Alex (unintelligible) and possible Evan Leibovitch if he's not able to join and Cheryl Langdon Orr will be a little late on this call.

Can I please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Rafik and Carleton.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Carleton is here.

Gisella Gruber-White: We're just dialing out to (unintelligible) and apologies.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. So thank you for everybody for joining for today's call. Starting with the first item of the agenda, just if there is any SOI or DOI please send an update.

Going to the next item which is about an update of this special purpose call with GAC and board members. Unfortunately we had to delay that for next week so in order to have better attendance from the board and the GAC side.

And I'm really sorry for the short notice, that's why we change it, the agenda and the board today. So maybe Olivier can give us better summary about that. And then we can go later after to the next item. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes thank you Rafik. Well there's not really much to say, it's just that we've had so little time for replies specifically I think from the GAC because the GAC operates in a certain way where it takes a while for the information to reach all members and the members to take action.

It's probably better to delay it for one more week. Now I'm aware that some people will be traveling to Singapore already at that time. And that's why some of those people who are traveling next week I've been told that they can join during this meeting now to gain a feel of what's going on in this group. With that I don't think we should delay any further, as long as they're aware of that.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. I think now people aren't raising hands in Adobe Connect so I guess there is no comment about that. And then we can move to the next item which is about update on staff information request.

So I don't think that Evan is on the call. Evan?

Gisella Gruber-White: He hasn't joined yet. Evan has not joined yet.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so in the last Friday call I think or Tuesday, Friday yeah, we agreed that Evan I think or Avri, Eric and other people we work to continue drafting - nice music - they are continuing to draft the questions that they want to send to ICANN staff.

And they were supposed to send that as soon as possible to the mailing list for review, but we don't have Evan on the call so Avri too is not on the call so we don't have so much updates on that.

Gisella Gruber-White: Evan is on the phone.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so Evan? Give us an update about that issue?

Evan Leibovitch: Which issue?

Rafik Dammak: We are on the item about top information requests so I was speaking about you and with other people volunteering to work on the questions to continue working on the questions.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Hi everybody, sorry I'm late into the call. Essentially where things are at is from previous meetings it was determined that the information that has been provided in documentation to date on cost breakdowns wasn't really sufficient for the JAS group to be able to execute ongoing work related to getting the information we need to advance some of the issues that have been advocated in the milestone report number two.

Specifically methods that would allow for a reduction of the gTLDC for new applicants from eligible applications.

And so right now there is a wiki in place, a number of people essentially the drafting team that had been used for the original milestone report two, together with Avri who's put in some substantial commentary into that.

So right now we have that document is essentially a work in progress, in fact the work in progress, it's getting fairly far along. And it's our intention of bringing it back to this group for approval.

The intention is to ask some specific questions that allow for breakdown of the gTLD fees so we can be in line with the GNSO mandate of cost recovery.

But perhaps a slightly different interpretation of cost recovery meaning the real time cost of assessing an application and not necessarily the historic.

In order for us to be able to do that we need to be able to get a breakdown of that. Some of this information has been noted, has already been provided by ICANN staff but it's determined that there's some specifics that we're going to need to get into a little bit more detail than that.

That's basically an update, if there's more questions or specific detail from anybody on the call I'm happy to answer to the best of my ability.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Evan, just my question, when do you think that you can finish with this issue for - of questions to ICANN staff so - I saw that some people commented, said some wording, etcetera, but when do you think that we - you will finish?

Evan Leibovitch: It's my hope that for the next meeting of the JAS meeting this Friday there should be something in place.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so we think it should be added to the agenda of the next call.

Evan Leibovitch: That would be my request yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. Any comment about that? Okay, I don't think that we have so much to say about this issue. And seeing no hands up, we can move to the next item and I will be happy to pass the sharing of this call to my colleague Carlton. Carlton?

Carleton Samuels: Thank you Rafik. We are now on this item looking at the agenda going forward for the work group. Members will recall that there were several items that were proposed as a part - the terms of reference for this work group.

And they - we had a situation where there were some attempt because of a different set of needs to unionize the chartered work items. We have a list of them and we then decided that to work them we would join some of these items together.

And we would break the group into subgroups that would specifically concentrate on these items. What you see there and for those of you who are on the Adobe chat room, you will see listed in the notes section the breakdown of the items.

Those letters refer to the set at least how they were designed. Let me tell you what they mean. A was the item to propose criteria financial need and the method for demonstrating that need.

B, proposed mechanisms for determining whether or not the application for special consideration should be granted. C, proposed methods of applicants to seek out assistance.

D, proposed methods for applicants to seek out assistance, E, design mechanisms to encourage the build out of IDNs, and we then added some others in the (unintelligible) which was to investigate options for third parties to facilitate or coordinate assistance identified.

Establish methods for coordinating cooperation among qualified applicants and in collaboration with ICANN staff and experts establish policies and practices for fund raising and establishing links to possible donor agencies.

And then finally it was to see if we could design mechanisms to encourage a build out of international domain names in small or underserved language.

Now subgroup one was looking at A and B, two financial donors, C and D, subgroup three what we call in kind services and reference specifically to items D, E and F, subgroup four which was the breakdown of the costs.

And looking at the chartered interventions and subgroup five was left for IDN support. The subgroup members I don't know if all of them are on the call here. But what we have determined was that we would look at the first item which is the qualifications, the criteria and the qualifications questions.

We were going to concentrate on those as to provide an interim report because members felt that was the most pressing one. And then we would continue on with the others.

So the question for the group is this, first of all do we consider all of the items, all of the chartered work items as still relevant to this work, first question.

And second question, do we continue with the same operational design to address those items? Floor is open. Am I still on? Hello?

Man: I can hear you.

Woman: I can hear you.

Man: Someone actually has to speak.

Cheryl Langdon Orr: Well I missed the question so it won't be me. That was Cheryl for the record.

Carleton Samuels: Hi Cheryl. The question that we had looked at the chartered items in the work group, we had divided them up to be addressed by the subgroups. We have taken a decision earlier on that we were to focus on the first two bits

which was the criteria of qualification question, because we wanted to have that prepared before Singapore.

Now that we are partially through with that, we are going back to the first - the chartered items and asked the question given what we now know do we consider the rest of chartered items as important to complete, first question.

And second question do we still continue with the way we had designed ourselves to address them? And I see Andrew up on the board.

Andrew Mack: Okay, I will try to - I'll be the guinea pig on this, okay? I think that the answer to the two questions that you posed if I understood them correctly is yes. I think that we do want to continue, we are looking at the right issues and we do want to continue moving them forward.

I think my sense is that there's the issue - there are a couple of issues that have - that are real lynchpin to this that we may want to really still focus in on more.

My biggest concern right now is the issue of money, without it we're not going forward very much and I wonder whether we can marshal our resources to really think a little bit more about that.

We talked about the pricing issues and I think we've moved that forward. I don't know if we're as far along as we want to be.

When we feel like we've finished that, we also talked a little bit earlier on about some possible fund raising. I don't know if we've gone as far as we want with that, but it strikes me that having some more discussion about money may be helpful for us because in the end that's going to be necessary.

Anyway that's my first thought, thanks.

Carleton Samuels: Thank you Andrew. Cheryl you're up next.

Cheryl Langdon Orr: Thank you, Cheryl Langdon Orr for the transcript record. Okay, knee jerk reaction was not required on the first of your two questions because sticking my chartering organization member hat on very firmly, the answer is well, uh, yes.

Of course you need to as a working group deal with what you've been chartered to do. There are processes whereby if the work group believes any change to the charter is required necessary or even desirable for it to go back to its chartering organization, plural in this case.

And outline why that is the case. I see no indication where matters have overtaken us at this point in time where the main topics as outlined in the charters should not or indeed could not be addressed by this work group.

As to the second part of the question that probably is worthwhile a little bit of a thinking and that is the existing sub team approach meet the needs, I think the concept of a sub team approach probably does meet the needs.

But the population and perhaps even the description, the division of those sub teams could benefit perhaps I believe from review. Thank you.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, I'm not in front of the screen but if you could put me in the queue.

Carleton Samuels: Yes Avri, you're next, thanks.

Avri Doria: Oh I'm next already. Okay, thanks. The only thing I wanted to say about that on this process issue is that the sub team only is necessary if we're actually working in parallel.

If we're working in a straight line sequentially as the group seems to have been doing though I'm not positive not having been around, I watch from the outside, you don't need the subgroups.

It's only if you're going to be proceeding on all of the things in parallel that the subgroups make sense. Thanks.

Carleton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Are there any more comments on either parts of the question? Okay, so can we agree that yes, we will continue to look at the chartered items. I would like to pick up on Avri's suggestion and Cheryl's in some way too.

One the sub teams what is generally felt now seeing no opposition is that the teams - the teaming, the process should continue. It should be a parallel process and see do we want to review the breakdown of these teams and the membership of these teams?

Can I have a response? So we don't think a review was necessary as Cheryl is suggestion? I thought maybe that Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Yes, Carleton, I guess I don't remember who said it but it does seem to some meaningful extent that we're operating as a committee of the whole right now and that the people who are doing work on the individual subgroups are doing it when there's additional thought or additional time needing to be spent or in the case of funding, some outreach, whatever it is.

But it strikes me that the role of the subgroups has kind of morphed a little bit from being the people who are coming up with the base ideas to something different where they're basically the people who have now become the people who are kind of keepers of the flame of a particular issue.

Where they're kind of the focal point, but we're really all looking at all of the different issues.

Carleton Samuels: Thank you Andrew. Can I just say that the reason why I asked the question that way is that if you look at the subgroups and the persons who volunteered for it, there were not very many.

I mean most subgroups as far as I know it's one or two persons and we had suspended the subgroup work because we thought we should zero in on the first qualifications and the criteria questions.

If we go back to the idea of the subgroups, you're quite right, I see there is a need to - and this is where Cheryl's point I believe has some legs, if you look at the breakup of the groups and the persons who had volunteered to look at these specific questions, there were very few of them.

And so if we're contending that the subgroup work must go ahead in parallel and we are also going back to the position where the sub teams would report on a Friday call to the work that has gone on, I am wondering if we have enough oomph in the sub teams to move it along.

That's the question. And while I think of it can we have a reaffirmation of the sub team leaders while we are at it?

Avri Doria: Hi, this is Avri if I can ask a question or get in the queue.

Carleton Samuels: Yes Avri, you're up.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. The question I have is if you went back to the subgroups and people got themselves working and you did reporting on Fridays, does that mean that you could actually save the Tuesday meeting to talk about substantive issues and make the Friday meeting the one that has the process group?

But at least there would be one whole meeting devoted to actually discussing the substantive issues? Thank you.

Carleton Samuels: Yes Avri, that what I mean back to the process. The original process we had determined was this. WE would take the Tuesday meeting to talk about substantive issues.

And then we would - and that's the whole group - and it would come mainly from the postings of the sub teams on the wiki or to the list.

And then on Fridays we would have all sub team leaders reporting. That was what - how it was determined to go forward, that was the process. So the question was do we continue with that process, identifying the weaknesses and seeing what we can do to support or to backfill the teams.

Elaine you're up. Elaine you have the floor. You might be on mute.

Elaine Pruis: Sorry, I was on mute. I think it would be very useful if we set out the charter and compared our reports to see which parts we still need to really work on before we decide which subgroups need to continue to exist. That's all.

Avri Doria: This is Avri if I can.

Carleton Samuels: Yes Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: I actually think what Elaine said is actually a really good idea. It might be a good thing at the moment to create a list of that topics, the issues, the sections, the whatever that need to be completed so that we actually had a more detailed list of all the things that yet need to be done.

And then start working through them.

Carleton Samuels: I will ask Karla to cut the data and put that in the note page, Karla would you do that for me please.

Avri Doria: Is that a Karla issue cutting that list or is that an ops issue?

Carleton Samuels: I'm sorry? I didn't get that, it broke up.

Avri Doria: Sorry, I was breaking up and I know I said I shouldn't talk in train stations. I thought I heard you asking Karla to come up with the list.

Carleton Samuels: No the data is there, it's on the list. The point is that when I started I read through them so just to get persons with the same eyes looking at the same thing I'm asking Karla if you could put them in the note area of the Adobe chat.

Things I heard earlier on, we would finish working, we would continue to work on the chartered items. There were only two chartered items that had got any kind of close support in the last little while.

And those were the ones for criteria and qualifications. All the other chartered items are - remain to be worked on. The consensus as I heard it was that yes we would continue to work on them.

The question was do we rejigger the groups, in other words we had completed the subgroups by breaking up the chartered items and putting a couple of them together and so on.

And that is how the subgroups were formed, they were looking at more than one - usually more than one off the chartered items. The question was if we continue on them is there a need to change the subgroup focus?

And what I heard was well, we might need to tighten it up and that's where the conversation is. So that we wall have a sense of what they are again, I

have asked Karla to - if she could just copy them and put them in the note section of the Adobe chat.

Rafik you're up.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so just about the remaining points, I think I'm not sure about the date but maybe two weeks ago, we have discussion in the call and I am recording that Evan proposed that we have a red line version of the milestone report to highlight the remained points or parts to need to be extended or to have more details.

And it was the idea to follow that so we have in the wiki space red lined version of our milestone report. And to continue working on that, so I guess I'm not sure how we can proceed.

So the sub teams to work on that, and we have that drafting team or the scribing team to which - have answered before to get the comments and to work on - to compiling them, etcetera.

So I wanted really to have Evan sit back about that and to see how we can manage to mix the two process.

Evan Leibovitch: There's not a lot of feedback I can offer at this point. I mean what I want to do is basically take a look at the contributions that have been made and bring things together,.

When we finish doing milestone report two, we knew that that was a work in progress, we knew it had rough edges when it went out. The timing was related to getting something into the board's hands before its meeting in Istanbul to get it to the chartering body so that it could then be sent to the board, be sent to the GAC and other interested parties.

Moving forward having a red line version was meant to identify components of the milestone report that needed further work, that needed either more detail, that needed clarification and so on.

I really don't have a whole lot more to add beyond that except just you know repeating that's the intent of what was meant to happen. The heavy lifting now is going to be determined I guess partly from what we hear back from stakeholders.

I'm hoping that we'll get some really good feedback in the meeting next week. I'm hoping we'll get some good feedback from the community in Singapore.

And the intention really is to move forward from the second milestone report to flesh out what's there rather than do a lot of surgery on the document itself, to essentially bring out the details, bring out the clarifications, show justification, show specifics of things like reducing the cost while at the same time maintaining the cost over recovery principles and so on.

Really don't have much to add beyond that at this point.

Carleton Samuels: Does anyone else have an issue? I have sent the document that I'm talking about because as I understand it and following this workgroup, the milestone report we produced essentially looked at two issues, the criteria for financial need and the mechanisms for determining whether or not the application meets those needs.

There are other elements of work elements in the charter. And what we're trying to do is to focus on getting those resurrected and probably seeing how we can get the work teams that were supposed to address them moving again.

That's what my understanding is and that's what I'm asking. I'm not hearing much from the teams about that. Would it be useful to ask the team

members, the members who had actually volunteered to be team leaders in these subgroups, would it be useful to ask their opinions at this stage?

Andrew you're up sir.

Andrew Mack: Yeah, that - Carleton maybe I'm misunderstanding this, this seems - I think I understand what you're trying to do, but it seems to me we can be very focused on the process of it, and I want to just make sure we don't lose track of where we are.

Have we - is everyone comfortable that we've done everything that we needed to do or want to do related to those first two issues that we have defined as priorities?

If we are I think that's the first thing. If there's some outstanding issues related to those initial two items that we've identified already as priorities, before we go further I think it makes sense to really hone in on those.

I also throughout earlier in the call this idea of focusing on money, I personally think that that's important and as I hear more about the politics of all this going on, the impression that I get is we are likely to have more success if we have some good information about that as well as to balance out or to enhance the good information that we have around the arguments for cost reduction.

So I'm throwing that out as a further, I'm not suggesting that we don't do work on the subgroups. I'm just wondering in terms of priority and resources when it comes down to it, the people who are leading up the various subgroups, just keep the same dozen or less than dozen people who are on these calls.

So in point of fact we really are a committee of the whole even if we're divided you know notionally into subgroups or not. Does that make sense?

Carleton Samuels: Well it makes sense to me sir, I'm not sure - I would love to hear from others who think it is, with respect to the financial issues, that was subgroup two.

And more details of that, I believe the person as I recall as having volunteered to do something in that area was I think Avri and if your suggestion is embraced by the group, what you're actually asking for is kind of heightened sensitivity to the issue of finance which is where the subgroup too would come in.

Is Avri still on the call? Would - I don't see Avri on the list, is she still on the call?

Cheryl Langdon Orr: I thought she was on (unintelligible), not the AC.

Carleton Samuels: Okay, maybe she'll come in. Cheryl your hand is up?

Cheryl Langdon Orr: Yeah, thank you. I just want us to - we've got the listing of the subgroups in view at the top part of the Adobe Connect group and just for those who may not be on the Adobe Connect room they refer specifically subgroup one, refers to parts A and B of the charters.

Subgroup two which is financial donors refers to Parts C, G, subgroup three, in kind services report or maps to Parts D, E, F of the charter.

Subgroup four which is the financial issues, \$100K breakdown etcetera a considerable amount of what we've spent a considerable amount of time ruminating over and requesting information on is not chartered.

And subgroup five is the IDN support which was J and got rolled in one of the versions of the charter that we're working on.

Now if we were to look at the master in report one and the master in report two, put it in chat, make it in some sort and say completed partially completed majority, small amount of work to be done or this really needs to be our focus for each of those A, B which are probably relatively well detailed but with a little tidying required.

C, G definite work needing to be done, D, E, F, extremely definitely work needed to be done and J I think somewhere midpoint. Then I might be slightly more patient about getting into the process of how that's approached, but I would really like to see it as an action item out of this meeting that we get that mapping done so we all know and we can all agree in a very clear and concise way how much work on each of the sections of the charter that is what we're working under needs to be given resources, human or otherwise to be devoted to it. Thank you.

Carleton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. Are there any responses to Cheryl? Olivier? Olivier your hand is up.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you Carleton. Olivier for the record, it took a little while for my phone to unmute. Just going to say yes I totally agree with Cheryl, a dashboard is what's required to keep exact track of this and I think that some of the questions that will be asked in Singapore from the group will be to give an exact idea of how far they've gone and how much more is due to be done.

Certainly a presentation is partly something that you should be thinking about, at least the chairs should be thinking about with Karla so as to be able to give an exact snapshot of what's going on at the moment. Thank you.

Carleton Samuels: Thank you Olivier that is exactly why these questions were asked on the team. If you notice that last week we had the breakdown for two meetings, the Singapore meeting and as well as for the special purpose call.

And the purpose of having these conversations is to go into the preparation for the Singapore meeting.

In my opinion if you look at the report there is clearly a lot of work that has been done on subgroup one, on subgroup one which is A and B chartered items, which I have said so many times what they are.

And I forward them to Karla, just all the verbiage so we can actually put them just below the breakdown of the subgroups, so Karla if you get it by now you should be able to put it up for me.

It seems to me that if you go further which is what Cheryl is supposing and do a mapping in the report itself you will find that the substantive work in - that is reflected in that report is in subgroup one.

And somewhat of subgroup two, subgroup four as you see the one hundred - the breakdown in the figures which has been the focus of a lot of tough questions is not a chartered item as is noted here.

But it is certainly important to looking at the subgroup two issues. If you look at those you will see where they - the holes are and definitely subgroups three and five to my mind are the ones that require work.

I would ask the question then, we had folks who had actually volunteered to lead these groups and the question to them is this, is it still reasonable to expect them to turn in the kind of work we are expecting?

And if so when, secondly do they need augmented teams to make this possible? For those of you who are on the Adobe chat, the actual verbiage is now in the notes page so you can see exactly what the subgroups and the mappings for A, B, C, D, E, F are supposed to be.

They're now 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 unfortunately but we can still see the mappings. Is Avri back on? Avri's not on? Can I ask the question again that Andrew raised, because I would be interested to hear if there's any further thoughts on it.

It seems to me that the financial issues dominate, especially those are the ones that seem to raise the most questions and that is natural I suppose. Andrew is proposing that we actually bear down on the financial issues and ensure that we fill those out to the best extent possible. Is - what would that mean in real terms, that's the question I would ask the group.

Does anybody have a question or an issue? Andrew I see your hand up again.

Andrew Mack: Yes, let me (unintelligible). The - thinking about it to some extent politically, my take on it is, is that the if we get the kind of support that we're looking for, there's going to be something that's necessary, right?

Some combination of this, we're going to almost certainly end up with some combination of price cuts and some unmet need for whether it's for consulting, whether it's for help with legal stuff, maybe in a number of different areas that we discussed early on like nine months ago early on, right?

We have a big long list of things that may require some cash infusion. I think we strengthen our position with the powers that be and strengthen the likelihood that they're going to help to give us favorable hearing if we've shown that we've got some good ideas in the fundraising space, if only because it will seem more real.

And because ultimately we're going to need it at some point in time. I know Avri had done some good work reaching out to governments and we had

done some good work here trying to get an idea about other sources, WorldBank and other people like that.

And then like a lot of the other subgroups we kind of let that go because we were all focused on the two pieces that you mentioned before.

All I was suggesting is that at this stage this might be a very good place for us to go. IT will make our efforts - it has the possibility of making our efforts seem much more real to the people who are going to be reviewing them and give us a little bit more leeway to continue on.

So that's what I had in mind. In terms of the other steps, certainly happy to continue to do work and to accelerate that work, but like people from the other subgroups I have been focused on describing and the things that we had identified as priorities.

Carleton Samuels: Thank you Andrew. Andrew, you're complete? I see your hand is still up.

Andrew Mack: Yeah, sorry, I'm done.

Carleton Samuels: Any other comment? Okay, so can I suggest then that if we - there are two things that seem to be needed here. The first one is as Cheryl suggested, maybe we go back to the milestone report and we map the milestone report in more specificity against the chartered work items.

And we will see very clearly where the milestone report is deficient. We already know that the milestone report actually was intended to look - focus mostly on criteria for determining financial needs and the mechanism to assess the application.

If we agree on that there might have been some overflow in other areas but all of the other bits of the work items would need work. Since we agree that we are going to continue with the team approach to focus on the other

outstanding work items, then those teams remain committed to working on those.

We go back to the original of having those teams report on a Friday and the substantive issues that come out on the wiki and on the list be brought to the entire group on a Tuesday.

That is where we are with this question. If there are any other questions, any additions, then please say so. Andrew.

Andrew Mack: Yeah, Carleton I guess my only concern is that it's work back and forth and up and down a little bit and I'm - you know I'm happy to have reports on Friday if there's something to report.

But if there's not something to report and you know everybody's putting a lot of time and effort into this, some of the challenges with this particular call today have been that we've got a lot of things that we're still waiting on or that we're still digesting.

And I think in terms of using our time effectively, sure we can reserve Fridays for those reports but you know people shouldn't feel obliged to report unless there's something that's new.

And if it's a work in progress, then it's a work in progress, you know what I mean?

Carleton Samuels: I agree with you Andrew, that seems to be the sensible way to approach it. You report what you have, if you don't we just move along. Do we need to reiterate the team leaders on the list? Would that be necessary, would that be useful?

That's my question. We haven't got an answer.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi Carleton, I'm having some difficulty with my browser, this is Cintra. I think that we should reiterate the leaders just for everybody's refresher in their memory but in addition to Andrew's point, I just want to say that if we know that our team is going to take up more time than is typically allotted that they also mention it to the group so that we can reschedule, reallocate time on the Friday call.

Because in the past basically the teams come in along to the end have no time to really update the group as to what's happening. Thank you.

Carleton Samuels: Thank you Cintra, we were hoping that the members of the work teams who are on this would actually come in and volunteer some information. But the only one I recall for sure that had done some substantive work to move along was Avri.

I'm not sure of anyone else. So I would think the thing then is to simply put out the teams again, those who volunteered and we will ask them to indicate whether or not they continue to work on the items.

And the expectations, what we can expect from them in the near term. That's all we can do. Elaine you're up.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. So I was in charge of subgroup three, in kind services. Basically left that discussion behind over the last month at least to focus on these other issues.

What I'm doing right now is typing out the charter requirements or requests and then comparing it to what we've done over the time since we decided that it was something we wanted to pursue.

And I'm going to put that on the mailing list and ask if there's any further input as far as that work and how we want to proceed with that. So hopefully we can continue the conversation that way.

I think it's difficult for work team members to - on this particular call to answer your questions just off the cuff. So I'm going to do it on the mailing list.  
Thanks.

Carleton Samuels: Thank you Elaine, that will be very useful if we use the list or the wiki to do that. It's almost the top of the hour, it seems to me that what - there are two issues that - from this call that seem to be top of mind.

One that we can look at the report, the milestone report and do the mapping just to satisfy everyone that the other work items are not sufficiently addressed in that report.

And two, we can reprise the team that have agreed to be leaders in the various other work items that we have. And that should be ready for Friday hopefully with the help of staff.

And the third item which would be on the agenda is the questions, the detail questions for staff, they should be ready by then and that will - to the group, it's top of the hour. I see no hands up.

The agenda is complete and therefore I'm going to thank everyone for coming on this call and we will declare the call ended. Thank you all, good day.

END