

**SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS)
TRANSCRIPT
Friday 10 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 10 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-ias-20110610-en.mp3>

On page :

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

Avri Doria – NCSG & At-Large member

Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Elaine Pruis - MindsandMachines

John Rahman Kahn - Individual

ALAC

Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - ALAC

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

Carlton Samuels - LACRALO - ALAC - WG co-chair

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Dave Kissoondoyal - (AFRALO) - At large

Cintra Sooknanan - At-Large

Alex Gakuru - NCSG

Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

Alain Berranger - Individual

Dev Anand Teelucksingh - At Large

Michele Neylon - RrSG

Baudoin Schombe - At-Large

Tony Harris -ISPCP

Andrew Mack - CBUC

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

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you (Tim). Would you like me to do a roll call, Rafik and Carlton?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, please Glen would you do the roll call as well. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Gery: With pleasure. Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the 10th of June and on this call we have Rafik Dammak, Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Carlos Aguirre, (John Rhamna Kahn, Alan Greenberg, Elaine Pruis, Evan Leibovitch, Avri Doria.

And I see on the Adobe Connect we have Sebastien Bachollet. We have apologies from Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Alex Gakuru, Dave Kissoondoyal and Tijani Ben Jemaa.

For Staff we have Karla Valente and myself, Glen de Saint Gery. Thank you very much. Over to the two of you, Carlton and Rafik. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Karla. I will just start off and then Rafik will pick up. Just for the agenda good morning, good afternoon, good evening members. There was a notation from Elaine that we make a change to the agenda in terms of the amount of time that we make available for an item, Item 4, Preview of the Presentation for Singapore Public Meeting.

It is now listed as one that will take five minutes. I think it's a reasonable request. Can I suggest that we reserve ten minutes for that item, and we will take it from Item 4? Is that okay? Is that suggestion okay with everyone?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: I see Cheryl. Thank you Cheryl. Well Cheryl has led the way and I hear no - Alan is there. Thank you Alan. Evan is there as well. Thank you. I think we can generally say that we have agreed to extend the Preview of Presentation

for Singapore Public Meeting to ten minutes and reduce the meeting time for Number 4 Item, which is the way forward in the chartered items from 20 to 15 minutes. Thanks all.

Might I remind everyone our SOIs and DOIs, if you have outstanding ones, please do make sure they're updated and we will move into the first substantive item, which is the information request from Staff, the detailed questions.

We have placed the letter from Evan who is leading on this in the note window of the Adobe chat, and Evan you have the floor sir.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, thanks Carlton. I - to be honest with you I have posted this on behalf of the Drafting Team. I have actually been one of the minor players on this. This has been a significant piece of work between Andrew, Avri and Cintra.

I've had some contributions to this. I don't know, unless there's a lot of Q&A on this, whether or not this is going to require 20 minutes. Essentially what you have in front of you is a very specific request for more information than we currently ask in response to comments, including from Avri and Elaine in the last meeting.

We wanted to make sure that we were recognizing the existence of existing documentation and that rather than just trying to reinvent the wheel, that we make sure that what we're asking for is not material that's already been published.

So I - there is specific references to three existing Staff documents on cost breakdowns that we are attempting not to repeat, but to in fact expand upon the information that is already presented.

So what you have in front of you is a series of detailed questions, the answers of which I'm hoping will guide further research and

recommendations from this group about potential cost reduction opportunities once we see further details on the breakdown.

I don't have more of an intro than that but I guess we can take questions and answers. Like I say I hope that we've addressed the concerns that were expressed in the last call about recognition of previous publication of information, and that we're not just trying to ask for the same stuff repeated over and over.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Evan. I - yes I wish to emphasize that you were one of the actors, not the only actor. I know of the involvement of Avri and Cintra and definitely I know and Andrew of course.

Avri's on the call. Could I give Avri an opportunity to say anything if she needs to? Avri?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I don't have much to say. I mean, the document is sort of a compromise between the various people that were working on writing it and try and certainly make sure that it was accurate, certainly make sure that it reflects both the information that has been given, and the depths to which it did or didn't go and then to recognize, you know, the questions that various people in the group had mentioned, you know, wanting answers.

There were some issues that weren't discussed in those three documents, but for the most part it looks better when it's formatted. But for the most part, you know, this is information based on the documents they put out and trying to use the same language and referring to the sections as were indicated in those documents, so that's about it - nothing to add.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Alan you're up sir. Alan you have the floor.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I question the first item of asking for the breakdown of where the already sunk costs came from and are they reasonable. I thought

one of the principles that we had adopted quite early on is that we were asking for an exemption from that, regardless of where the numbers came from or are they - were they calculated right.

To be honest I think it's a bit late to, you know, tell them - for them to tell us exactly where it came from, then that number has been so far exceeded since then that it's relatively moot whether that number's right or not.

And I thought we were working on the principle that the sunk costs was an accounting not game but an accounting artifice that Staff or Board had decided on, and we were simply asking for an exception on that one.

So I really don't see the merit of trying to go into any depth on those on where that number came from. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Alan. Avri is up. Elaine has just indicated agreement with Alan's point on the Adobe Connect. Avri you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes thanks. I think I - and actually your comment will probably reflect to both 1 and 2 in the original recommendation of the group, certainly both the development cost and the risk cost were costs that we felt should be struck.

But I think the point comes in in terms of including it and asking for more detail is the feedback that has come back so far from the Board and the Staff, is no way that's going to get cut.

So if there's no way that's going to get cut and they're saying it's important and we got to have it because, well then I think the burden, and I think this is what comes in the compromise, that the burden is on them to prove that this is even a reasonable number of, you know, as sort of a had they agreed and said, "Oh you're right," thinking those development costs and for people who weren't even included in the development effort and were paying for all kinds of people to travel to meetings and do this and to do that.

And then, you know, JAS can come up with a counterargument and say, "But excuse me, you know, the populations we're talking about weren't even part of this process." That becomes relevant.

You're right. Had they taken the first report and said, "Yes, development cost does not make sense to apply these to JAS qualified applicants, so yes, okay, we agree," then you're right.

This wouldn't be needed but since it's still an ongoing discussion where they haven't brought into the idea, getting a breakdown, making them show well why these costs and perhaps if you can't get the full thing broken down because they haven't agreed to that, you can at least then make point arguments instead of saying, "Well you're certainly not going to ask development people to pay for budgets that went for big parties they weren't invited to.

And you're certainly not..." and it allows you to get down to the nitty gritty of the argument. That's I think the reason it remains there. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Elaine, you have the floor. You're up next and then Alan.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. So following along what Avri's saying, I think one of the reasons why this just doesn't sit right with me is that if we're going to question that cost and want a breakout of it and see it in places that are unreasonable, why is that specific to our work and not to the entire program?

If we can prove that, you know, one part of this, the estimation is, you know, off by 40% or something, why shouldn't that carry over to every applicant? And I think we, you know, we need to differentiate why the - because then each applicant should have a discount based on a poor assumption but the other applicants shouldn't.

And I can't do that in my mind if we're still going from the frame of cost recovery for the program. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Elaine. Alan you're next sir and then Evan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes a couple of things. First of all I haven't heard a definitive statement back from the Board saying they reject the concept. Maybe it was made and I missed it.

I guess perhaps similar to Elaine but on a philosophical ground, we're essentially saying that the people who develop these numbers are incompetent boobs and we want to be able to verify their arithmetic.

And I just don't - I think the tone is all wrong but that may just be me. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Alan. It's noted. I think - well let me hear Evan. Evan you're on the board.

Evan Leibovitch: I guess to me this is just a matter of, you know, the old Mark Twain time. If I had more time I'd write less. This is a situation which we've had a small amount of time to come up with something.

Alan, I don't think a tone is meant there that implies incompetence. Certainly there's an issue of transparency here. I don't think that we're implying anything by this.

In terms of what Elaine had said earlier it's not the task of this group whether or not to say that these issues should be lowered for all applicants. We're just trying to get some information that is to work within the scope of our group, and what we can try and come up with within lowering prices for qualified applicants.

If somebody wants to extend out of that, that well maybe perhaps these costs shouldn't apply to other applicants, well that's for other people to decide. We've got a very narrow scope in this group.

We're trying to figure out how to lower prices, costs and obstacles to certain kinds of applicants. And if others want to extend that, that's within the absolute legitimate realm of others, but we're just asking for stuff to help us do our very specific work.

Carlton Samuels: Okay I see a couple of agreements there with that. I don't know if it was what Evan said in the last business but I think philosophically that's where you start. Elaine, you are back up on the board and then Cheryl.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. I'd just like to disagree that we haven't had much time to consider this. It's one of the first items that we talked about when the group formed more than a year ago, and we nubbed it.

It - and there wasn't enough support in the group to pursue it because of the assumption that we're working on cost recovery, so there's that point. And then if in fact we actually need this information to do our work, I still don't see a very strong argument in these questions that show exactly why we need these numbers to continue our work. I'd like to see a stronger argument.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Elaine. Cheryl you have the board.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Following on rather from what Elaine was just saying, actually I was just going to remind the Work Group that of course this is not actually part of the current charter.

It's useful work. It's not the key charter focus though for what we should be doing now and - but it's useful. This needs to be kept in context. We're not actually trying to lower the costs I would have suggested, and doing this

exploration was - may help the Work Group members frame an understanding.

It isn't going to make any difference on those costs as stated. We're not tasked with trying to audit or improve a benefit or cost associated with any particular part.

We're tasked with trying to find a mechanism to ensure applicant support for those who cannot afford it, regardless of what those costs are. So I'd like to get us past if we possibly can at some point, and not do this in the future, the wondering and worrying about the specifics of the anatomy of this, and rather more about what we do with the rapidly decaying corpse because, you know, it's going to be as I think a number of you said before a situation where even when we have these numbers, having them isn't going to change.

And we're not actually tasked with telling them how to change the cost recovery models. We're tasked with finding mechanisms to make it cost capable for those who cannot come up with these cost recovery amounts, and the charges applying based on them whatever they are and however they are generated, but to facilitate those who cannot afford it having an entry point and a reasonably level playing field at this first round, alternative second rounds and everything else is the boogeyman that I would like to try and avoid. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. We have the last intervention on this topic from Avri. Avri you're there and then we summarize and get out. Avri you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Yes, I think in a large sense I agree with Cheryl. The tack of this group could be we don't really care why the expenses are the way they are. We just want them reduced.

And I think that that would be a superb way to be carrying forward. But insofar as the approach, it does seem to be not that but rather for each of the

expenses, why should or should not this expense be applied to a JAS qualified applicant, you need more information.

If you're going to take the approach that I think I was hearing from Cheryl, was it really doesn't matter why the charges are what they are. We stipulate to your charges.

Yes, over a beer we would argue that they're totally unreasonable, but we stipulate to them and we don't think JAS qualified people should pay them period, and then I think we're fine.

But if we're going to start saying, "Well this one is and this one isn't perhaps appropriate," then you need more detail. So either you need a letter at all or you don't need one, and that really depends on the tactic that you're using in the argument. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Let me summarize. We seem to be at a point where we recognize that Cheryl says that the questions of the details of the costs is not a part of the charter that we are working on.

But we also recognize that having more information about those details would in fact help us to zero in on the arguments that says we can reduce the costs because because.

It seems to me it is - it - we're at a reasonable junction here. I would just ask members to go with what Alan indicated - said, "You need to set from a philosophical view and then move forward in it."

I think the item in this letter explores that some. It may be that it needs to be developed but we are out of time for this question, so I would expect that we could probably continue the conversation on the wiki and on the list, and we can refine the letter as we - when we come to some solution of refining the letter as to what we are actually asking.

Thank you. Can we move to Number 3 and I think it's brief. I'll just start it and then I will hand it over to Rafik. If you look at the report it - this starts with selling the summary of the report and it gives you the parts, Parts 1 through 5, and it answers some questions of the why, when, who, what, how questions.

And if you map those back to the chartered items you will see that the report clearly tells you what it covers. And if you go back and look at our group work you will notice that it substantially covers all of Group 1 work, which is what was intended anyway, and to some extent it delves a little bit in the Group 4 work.

That's my interpretation of it. If members have other interpretations then we'd be happy to hear them, but I just throw that into the mix as we begin to discuss this subject. Rafik, could you take over please?

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Carlton. Okay so any comments on that? Well - and because if you have a specific question to the Working Group members too. Elaine, please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. So I'm looking at the notes and I see the part where it says union of chartered work items, common work items. Maybe I'm missing it, but did someone actually like check off which ones are done and which ones aren't? Could we talk about that?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry Elaine, I couldn't hear the last part. I'm not sure who are other people who might - they couldn't hear but you just saying the last part of your sentence.

Elaine Pruis: What did you say Rafik? I couldn't hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I said that I couldn't hear your last part.

Elaine Pruis: Okay, I said - so I'm looking at the notes, the union of chartered work items, common work items. And Carlton said that if you go through the report you can see which ones are done, so I'm wondering if there - do we have like a check off list which ones are done and which ones are not done so we can focus on what we need to do next?

Rafik Dammak: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well no, I'm just - I understand what Elaine's asking for. I thought that was what this discussion was going to be producing and an agreed census of what was or wasn't completed and to what extent.

You know, we all agree that the second Milestone Report focuses predominantly on the activities of Subgroup 1 and to some extent 2, and we all generically sort of thought, "Well, you know, what has to happen in Subgroup 3 and 5 are still out there, and to a greater or lesser extent some of Subgroup 1 and predominantly more of Subgroup 2's work."

But we actually haven't got those listed and I thought what we might be doing is going through the second Milestone Report and seeing how much of those bits can be identified and tabulated, and then allocated as - that whatever priorities each of the subgroups are going to be giving them.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Cheryl. We have Avri in the queue. Avri go ahead please.

Avri Doria: Thank you. This is Avri. I guess I'm sort of confused on where we're going, but in terms of doing that kind of check off and comparison and, you know, this report item is against this charter item, that seems to be the kind of exercise that would be great for the Chairs to sort of do and put forward, as opposed to something that works in a group exercise.

Maybe I'm wrong. And were we already at the - talking about the teams? I thought we were talking about the -- and maybe I just got confused -- the Milestone Report versus chartered items?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mapping out kind of Milestone Report versus chartered items is what we're up to.

Avri Doria: Yes that's - okay I - then I didn't quite understand some of your earlier points. But yes, I was thinking that doing that mapping is kind of a mechanical task that maybe the two Chairs could take a first draft at and then, you know, come back to the group and see where we can, you know, help and add in comments but does that work as a group exercise? Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Avri. Okay. So they did to highlight what is remaining task with comparison between our charts and the (unintelligible) report and then to check the progress for each task. For the subgroups Avri just to answer to your question it would be in the item for...

Avri Doria: Right. Okay. I just thought Cheryl was asking that item already. I got confused.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well no, it's just I though, you know, we needed to have what - would needs to be done vaguely identified before the work teams could actually - dare I say - charter away for it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Maybe...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perhaps I like my horse before my cart, I'm funny like that.

Rafik Dammak: Maybe we can have the weakest pace that we put what is remaining and then to obtain the progress in time for each task. I will work with Katrin on that matter. Katrin? Okay. So it's just for ten minutes. If there any comment -

further comments on that? So I think the co-Chairs have task to do - have action to take on that matter.

But if there are any further comment, otherwise we will move to the fourth item. Avri do you want to comment because I'm seeing - I am -- you think your comment. Okay, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes and no. I guess I got confused again on carts and horses. I thought that there were really three things being spoken of. There's the work that was described in the MR2 and mapping it to the charter items.

And I thought that that was one work item, then there was a work item of given that and given what's done and what's not done how does that reflect on all the other work being done.

But I got really confused when we started talking about carts and horses and saying that this...I'm just confused. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry to confuse you Avri. It was the configuration of putting three and four together, which was certainly not the intent. Let's just stick to the basic netting first which is what the agenda is now.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Okay. Okay. So please if the background noise, put yourself on mute. Okay. I think we have a clear action. So in - the side of the co-Chairs. I think that we can move to the next item which is about more of the (unintelligible) short items team. It's more the updates from the subgroup leaders.

I just want to comment that personally I like how Elaine presented, yes, working in subgroups. How is she presented to work that and what are the next action. I think it makes it more easy to follow the progress, maybe we can follow that model.

And - okay, I was just trying to see the subgroups so we start -- I don't think we have Subgroup 1, but too -- Avri yes? Avri? Yes, Avri?

Avri Doria: I didn't put my hand up.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I was seeing your hand up and down so I thought it was a kind of message. So let's move to the subgroups because I think we focused on them for a long time let's go to Subgroup 2 which is led by Avri which is about the financial donor, funding information donor. Avri yes?

Avri Doria: Okay, I - this is Avri - I can't possibly imagine myself as a leader of a group seeing that I left the whole group. Being leader of a subgroup is kind of strange to find myself in. I have no idea what that group has been up to over the last couple of months.

Rafik Dammak: I have some good questions. I think for a while we didn't follow the model of subgroups. We focused on second (unintelligible) report and now we are active I think in some groups.

So I don't see any problem that you can't lead it again maybe can you Avri try to let's say to follow up with the other members to see what can be done?

Woman: Hello.

Woman: Yes, some of us, is still here.

Woman: Oh, okay.

Woman: It must be Rafik that lost.

Woman: Yes. (Lynn) I think Rafik dropped off...

Coordinator: I think he dropped off, we'll get him connected back.

Woman: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Hello, I'm sorry.

Woman: There you go.

Rafik Dammak: Well, that happens. Okay, so I guess Avri and so I think you agreed but what so that you are - if you're up and that you set maybe an action of plan or something. And so, okay.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Let's go to the Subgroup 3, Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. So I sent around an email -- I think it was Wednesday -- outlining the work that has been done to meet the charter items and what still needs to be done. I didn't get any response to my email.

So if anybody has any new information about that work perhaps (Karla) maybe you can give an update on, if there's been any more forward movement on that matching website that had been proposed, that would be helpful. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: I have just question Elaine, I think we have changed at least members. Are you in touch with Fabio, Michele and (Eric) about Subgroup 3?

Elaine Pruis: No we haven't ever worked together actually.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Do you need more members some other -- I don't know if you need some...

Elaine Pruis: Yes, Rafik, I think it would really be useful if we maybe just rebuild these subgroups because, I mean from what Avri said she's not in charge of one and I haven't actually talked to Fabio or Michele about these things.

So maybe we can choose who's working on what one and two - the majority of the work on one and two seems to be done, that'd be good, thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thank you. So Avri please go ahead.

Avri Doria: I'm forgetting to unmute myself. I actually very much agree with what Elaine said here. And in fact I mean looking at these working groups and then we'll get late and then we'll find out that one working group is perhaps some of them are.

And so going through the reports is good to see where everything is at, now we know where two of them are at. Is to take the exercise that you're going to do looking at MR2, looking at the charter, looking at what's not covered and then reformulate groups around some of those things that yet need to be done.

So, you know, and if indeed our priorities do get changed over the next couple of days in all these large conversations we're having that can be taken into account too, to make these groups.

You know, on the other hand if there is one other group that's going through and we get to group number x and if it's been dynamic and they all have been working together and they've got proposals and then certainly we should honor those, thanks.

Oh, that's what I keep doing somebody else has already put my hand down. I go to put it down and I put it back up.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Avri. Okay. So you ask that we maybe - we maybe we need to change the subgroups regarding the remaining task and then maybe we can - - how to say this -- reformulate changing to subgroups? Or maybe I am not getting your point.

Avri Doria: What I'm trying to say is and I think this was in agreement with Elaine and certainly she'll correct me if...I certainly think you should, you know, honor the rest of the process you've got going and go through the rest of the group and - and - and, you know, find out where everyone's at.

But then the suggestion too -- once you have figured out what work is done and what work we still must do based on what's in the charter then we may want to form a few. It might not be the same size, it might be whatever groups to focus on those specific chartered work items that we haven't finished yet.

And any other topics that come up during our next week and a half of meetings or two weeks of meetings that, you know, we discover need to be dealt with as opposed to trying to breathe a lot of life back into these existing subgroups. That's kind of what I was saying.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thank you Avri. Okay. It noted, so we have two I think the last two groups but I don't think that the leaders are here. So we just have 15 minutes to, I think we agreed that we need to talk about the presentation for Singapore public session.

As we don't have -- we cannot truly expect any update on the two last subgroups. I guess if there is no objection or other comment we can move to the next item. But I just think that's the comment from Avri and yes, okay.

So Item 5, I'm not sure if I have the correct, yes, description. Karla could you put the description of the - of that Singapore public meeting in (unintelligible).

Karla: It's already there Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: I don't see where it's at.

Karla: Yes, it's right on the board working group meeting it has Singapore session and is just in bullet point. Let me just take it out.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, but I remember you send the email with a slide kind of agenda as well. And also we have I'm not sure if people have the time to check their part of the slides and if they have any comment about that.

Karla: Oh, I see. Hold on just a second I'm trying to retrieve the email that I send with. That was with the PowerPoint and the proposed structure for the meeting right?

Woman: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Karla: I'm trying to locate that. I just posted it. I don't know if you already can see.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Woman: Yes, thank you.

Rafik Dammak: So I guess can discuss about the kind of agenda that proposed. If we have agreement of that, if we need some change any comment is really welcome, it's just a draft to have for discussion. And also if you have any comment about slide piece and I think maybe we don't have a lot of time (unintelligible) please send them to the main.

So let's focus on that, okay, agenda. Any questions any comments? Okay.
So just -- Elaine please go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. So I'm just looking what in the note section. So maybe there's some more details in the part of the presentation but I just like to suggest that I think the audience that would benefit most from our meeting will be, you know, possible applicants that would benefit from our work.

And so I would like to make sure we highlight how they can participate or what they could expect or what's going to happen next for them.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, but how you think that we - how we should proceed for that?

Elaine Pruis: Well, there's a couple of things I can think of. I mean I know the program hasn't been built so perhaps we could outline, you know, where the board has already been in agreement with things we suggested or, you know, what's still being discussed?

Basically, what people can expect what to come out of this? And also I think we'll also have that public commentary will be open at that time so we could ask people to comment and request, you know, a decision on a certain part or maybe it's to propose some additional information.

I'd just like to see, you know, more of - more useful to the audience than us just saying what we've been doing.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I guess that the focus will be what kind of support will be provided etc. that it will interest prospective and immediate applicant. And it will describe like will qualify for etc, etc.

And then we draw up like parts like statements just to focus on the part itself. And maybe also to think how we - how long we - we think times that we think to allocate for people to comment.

I guess - I think it's one hour and half so if we make it less than 30 minutes for the - present the report etc., and then to have one hour to listen to the people and to top their comment and to reply to them. Does this make sense? Okay.

I'm not sure how to give these, as agreement or just...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rafik I think it makes sense that we probably need to also establish in the current plan you've got Cheryl for the record by the way and you've got your member one, member two, member three perhaps asking for people to sit forward and own those roles.

And that might also be a good next step. I - it is very unlikely that if I'm in the room at all, I will be there for very long because I've got a number of competing meetings in that time - same time slot.

But if whatever we have presenting is in a - a highly graphical and usually understood form, it will be all the assistance I would have thought to people may be in the room as perspective applicants who could benefit from the support.

Because it is also likely that they might be relatively new to the nuances of the wonderful world of ICANN. So if we do less gobbledygook and more, you know, flow charts and simple approaches I think that would be a good approach as well. Thank you.

Elaine Pruis: So on Tuesday...

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cheryl. I agree, I'm not sure if it's wonderful world of ICANN but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That was firmly tongue and cheeks, believe me.

Rafik Dammak: But we are now thinking about perspective applicant but we may also take people from the ICANN community who may have a comment. I don't think the same comments or questions like new applicants or maybe we need to balance between that.

Okay. Carlton do you have any thoughts about that?

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton, Rafik well, I really expect some rebalancing but I will just hold until I hear what others have to say.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: And by the way just to follow-up on Cheryl's point about trying to make this a little more ICANN, less ICANNese and more public friendly. My collectively and think has been working on a flow chart, we were hoping to preview it this morning but it's not quite ready so we'll put it to list in a little while which we hope graphic item might be more useful in terms addressing the outcome that Cheryl has proposed here. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I saw a question from Karla. So if we have lesser slides. Yes I guess we need to highlight the main points not the - I don't think that we can cover really all the reports content. We need to focus the main parts that really interest the many applicants.

Okay. We have three minutes left through the call and I guess we have some comments. I think Katrin we work on that (unintelligible) and send it again to the (unintelligible). I know that we're not easy this week because people will be more busy to prepare to go to Singapore.

We will have just the next call on Tuesday which is with the Board and the GAC. So we will try to fix that as soon as possible. Okay. Is there any - there is any further comment on that? Too much silence in here today.

Okay. Any other business? So I hope that all the working group members can make it for the next call with the Board and the GAC. I hope that we can have - we can have enough questions from them which is a part of the committee review on our work and that's all.

Thank you for attending today's call and this call is adjourned. Thank you.

Woman: Thank you Rafik.

Man: Thank you Rafik.

END