

**JAS**  
**TRANSCRIPTION**  
**Tuesday 19 July 2011 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the JAS meeting on Tuesday 19 July 2011 at 1200 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20110719-en.mp3>

On page :

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#> <<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul>  
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

GNSO

Avri Doria - NCSG

Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

Andrew Mack - CBUC

Krista Papac - RrSG

At-Large:

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

Dev Anand Teelucksingh - LACRALO

Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large

Cintra Sooknanan - At-Large

Dave Kissoondoyal - At-Large

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison – NARALO

Elaine Pruis – Minds and Machines

Eric Brunner-Williams - Individual

ICANN staff

Karla Valente

Gisella Gruber-White

Seth Greene

Apologies:

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison - WG chair  
Alain Berranger - Individual  
Alex Gakuru - NCSG  
Michele Neylon - RrSG  
Tony Harris -ISPCP

Coordinator: We're now recording.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much (Ricardo). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's JAS call on Tuesday, 19 July.

We have Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Carlos Aguirre, Krista Papac, Avri Doria, Evan Leibovitch, Alan Greenberg. We are currently trying to connect Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

We have from staff today Karla Valente and myself Gisella Gruber, apologies noted from Alex Gakuru, Alain Berangere, Tony Harris, and Rafik Dammak.

Could I also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes? I'll let people know on Adobe Connect when the additional people join the call. Over to you Carlton. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Hello everybody. Welcome to this call, thank you all for coming. We are still on the quest for finalizing the two major outstanding items for our reports.

First one is the methods (unintelligible) and terms for in-kind services and then secondly funding model funds and process aspects.

They are on the agenda items the bottom left-hand corner of the Adobe Connect room.

We would like to remind all of you that if you have outstanding as SOIs you should or need to update them. Please do so with a copy to the staff and make sure that they are available.

Okay so we're there. The intent of these last few weeks as we have agreed is to get closure on these items.

And so we are focusing on them. The first one up is the in-kind services. We have also received a note from Elaine on the list. We have placed it in the note window on the Adobe Connect.

Did you say Elaine was on?

Gisella Gruber-White: No Elaine is not on the call. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: That's interesting okay. Well Elaine is - placed some additional content in this area. We are expecting to take it up this morning for discussion but she's not on. We have to defer it.

It's there though so you can have a look. And if members have a particular questions please prepare them. And if Elaine comes you can ask her a bit or you might respond to the list or better yet make your comments on the wiki.

We go to the second area which is the funding and process funding models and so on.

Avri is the lead on this one. Avri do you have anything to add to this area, any responses?

Gisella Gruber-White: Avri's just on mute. Staff to un-mute Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes I was on mute. And I was talking up a storm.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri but not to worry.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: But now that I've said it all I don't - no anyway. I took the comments that I got last time about referring to the, you know, giving a reference to the budget where the numbers were coming from and so...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...I added that. I went through - this is in the - this is in the not in the funding model...

Carlton Samuels: Funding yes, funding model.

Avri Doria: No, this is in the other one. This was in the document on how to deal with, you know, how to - where - how to find the funds to cover the reduction in fees and how to make that work. So that's the other document I mentioned Alan.

So I took that one and I updated it. I don't think I had any comment on the other document so I didn't do anything to them.

And kind of just that's where I'm at. So, you know, where I've had comments I've done updates. Where I haven't had comments I've, you know, sometimes read through and done a little bit of cleanup. But so we're talking about three different things that I have out.

I have the funds and foundations I believe is that it?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: No I have the fee reduction program self-funding requirement. Is that one of the ones I have? I have like three things out there for comment.

Yes the fee reduction program self-funding requirement is the one where last time (Dev) had asked for some reference on the budget.

Carlton Samuels: Source of budget.

Avri Doria: Right so I basically went through and, you know, I had copies of them in my - because every time I managed to find something on the ICANN Web site I immediately copy it down to my laptop because I know that it'll take me a couple hours next time I want to find it again.

So I went and I found them. I put the references in the document. So if you, you know, you click on the highlighted blue ICANN budget or the highlighted blue new gTLD budget it will take you to what I believe is the latest version of those.

And then I did a read-through through it both the budget and through them because it had changed since the last time I had written it or something so and collected my figures in a couple of places, cleaned it up and that's that.

I don't think I made any changes on the Funds and Foundations document from last time. I don't think I had any comments last time.

And on the document that's hanging out in subgroup one stuff gaming and review of support applicant, I don't think I made any changes to that one either.

So I think that's pretty much what I've done since Friday -- not too much -- a couple hours but not too much. The hardest part was finding documents on the ICANN Web site.

Carlton Samuels: More than most Avri thank you very much. I mean showing some - this is exactly what we are - all these small details to just fill out so we have a

comprehensive document that people can read from end to end and follow the thread. Thank you very much. Are there any comments for Avri?

No comments for Avri. So can I then ask the question for an affirmative from this group?

Based on what you see in this area from Avri do you now believe that it is exhausted or is close to exhausted the content or the possible issues that we could bring into the final report? And would you say that we have a working consensus on these issues?

I have (Andrew) on the board first and then Cheryl. (Andrew) you have the floor sir.

(Andrew): Thank you Carlton. And my apologies. I got stuck in traffic and just arrived so I guess if you wouldn't mind also (Dev) just arrived to the call.

Could you (unintelligible) a tiny bit my apologies? I know you - I know we're late but before I say that we're in full agreement I just need to know what we're talking about? Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: We were discussing the area where Avri is leading on which is the funding model funds and process aspects.

She has made some based on the last call and suggestions from members she's made some additions to the documents and she's reviewed them for us and pointed out where they are.

And we are asking if this is - if members see that this is complete (Andrew) so you might have a look at them, see what - where she is again. She will - I'm sure she will be able to give us a quick overview later on.

Avri Doria: Can I add something?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: And complete so that I know where there is issues that need to be developed further but also I'm kind of looking for -- and I ask this each time even though we're talking about them, at what point are these contributions ready to start being phased into a draft of the final document?

And, you know, I've got them there in the separate space in their separate little files as, you know, they were personal contributions.

So at what point is this group willing to say yes we're adopting these things, put them in the draft final document?

We still may have things to discuss about them. And I know the model I have is one that I've picked up at the ITF where I learned so much about how - first an individual rights contribution then the group sort of says yes we're willing to take ownership of it, yes you can put it in a, you know, working group document.

And then once it's in a working group document it gets beat up on some more.

But, you know, so I'm really looking for is a possible to take these things now and say they're not Avri's contributions anymore but start importing them into the work and then, you know, we'll beat up on them some more?

Thanks sorry and thank you for allowing me to interrupt.

Carlton Samuels: No that's all right Avri. That's exactly what the processes is and that's a question that I was putting to the member whether or not we think that it was time, it was enough to move?

Anyways Cheryl you have your hand up. You have the floor. She might...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Carlton, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Avri you took the words right out of my mouth.

What I put mine hand up for was to say I think what we're up to is saying that these draft picks spaces have been in the wikis for a little while.

They've been - they've responded and reacted to a couple of changes from the teleconferences. But we're well aware that teleconferencing and wiki is not the only way that we need to socialize these amongst the work group members.

Isn't it time that I call saying that we need to take these words to the next level, goes out to the mailing list and give people a clear deadline where they can do exactly what Avri so far more eloquently suggested, get them to be owned by the wider group and beat up on some more? Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. Tijani your hand is up so you have the floor.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Carlton. I'd like to say that especially for the text about the fee reduction and program self-funding requirement.

I do agree with or everything Avri wrote in this document, especially the rationales that they - that she gave.

I think that with the links that she provided it is now ready to be put in the final document.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Tijani. Any other expressions, any other questions for support? I see Cintra's joined the call. Welcome Cintra.

Okay so Tijani...



Cintra Sookanan: Thank you Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. You wanted to say something here Cintra?

Well can I ask the question again? Tijani has given full - some support for what is on the wiki time enough now to put it in the final document draft.

I - I'm going to ask the question again do you agree as to Tijani does that the time has come to move the content from the wiki into the draft final document?

Cheryl is putting a no to this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perhaps I can...

Carlton Samuels: I was about to ask you Cheryl...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...make my reason for disagreeing?

Carlton Samuels: Clarify, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...a little bit clearer. Thank you Carlton. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Tijani I have also a set of personal opinions that I believe the majority of this text is probably more than acceptable to go straight into the final draft documentation.

I'd just don't think the process is appropriate to just do that on this call. We have all less than normal number of people on this call.

I would suggest that these types of decisions should be socialized through at least two teleconferences and if not more than two teleconferences when we meet twice weekly.

So my proposal would be that we do take it to the next level with the intention of moving the text once given a call for consensus if that's the appropriate terminology.

And I don't really care what terminology we use but what I would suggest we do is say to the complete working group to all those ascribed that those on the - many of those on the most recent teleconference and who's taken the opportunity to review these text since last modified I believe that it is ready or near ready to be put into the - to be created but being created in the near future final reporting.

And as such we would like everybody to look very closely at the text now and see if there is any edits or additions or omissions that they would like to raise.

Now they may continue to raise those and that's fine too as Avri said. But we should say that in the main, the bulk of this text unless significant objections are silent on the list or in comments on the wiki will be then cleared to become part of the draft documentation for final.

So that's my point for disagreement. Not that we should take it from this meeting into final but we should take it through a process which allows a full development of consensus. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Yes Cheryl just can I - before I go to Tijani and then Alan can I just clarify we what we're - what I was asking and what Tijani agreed to is that we move this from the wiki into that document and that document is still going to be subject to another round?

But given that we only have two weeks to go it - this is the mid-step to final.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That document doesn't even exist yet.

Carlton Samuels: Well we were going to start with the MR2 Report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...but it's not in existence at the moment. It's an MR2 report. It needs a new page that copies the MR2 Report and says this is now going to be insert new name and then start moving things across.

Carlton Samuels: Well I think we have a little - anyway let me go to Tijani, Tijani you have the floor sir.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I do agree with Cheryl that the group, the persons who are now on the call are not the majority or the most of the members of the group.

We have to go forward. And I propose that with the agreement today we ask the people on the list to express their views about those texts. We cannot wait forever. We have to go forward.

Woman: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Tijani. I was about to point out that the email that started this last round on Sunday I sent I spent a lot of time last week on the weekend going over this report and listening to comments and sent out an email to say look, this is going to be the final, final call, not the final call but a call to get consensus, make sure we have consensus.

So I think quite frankly there's been more than enough notice. But I will be guided by the group. Alan you have the floor sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. I think we have several problems here. I tend to agree with Cheryl as to the process.

If we are talking about moving things into the draft final report number one, we need a definition of what the draft final report is.

Is this something by which definition things that are in it have already been generally agreed or is it a template in which we're putting things to test - still to test the final sense of the working group because people write final draft final reports in two different ways?

Second of all we need an outline of that report. If that outline is indeed the milestone report with the preamble changed and a few tenses changed then that should be done ahead of time before we move things into it.

So I really don't care whether we send out an email saying, you know, in capital letters last call before we move it out or even if we moved it in with the understanding that this now comprises the last call for substantive comments on it.

But I think we need to be specific so we're not in the mode of continuing going back and doing things again. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Alan. It seems to me that we have a disconnect. So let me tell you what I understand the process to be.

We have an (unintelligible) body about these issues and they're on the wiki. We get to the point we want to reduce the argument ratios on these subjects.

And once we have gotten them to a manageable level we make the decision that it is - that these are fairly thrashed out - I mean content that will come - are ready to become part of final report.

Then we put it in a thing that is called a draft of a final report. That draft of a final report is going to contain some elements that we have already reached consensus on.

Those elements as far as I know are in the MR2 Report. We agreed that that is the case. So we are going to take this creative skeleton that will input the elements from the MR2 and these additional items that we have agreed. That's what the drafters are going to do.

Once that is done we have to agree that they must move. Then when we agree they are moved and once we have them in that comprehensive document that document is then placed on a wiki or put - and put to the mailing list and say here is what they final report draft looks like.

Do we all now have consensus? Because when you have these things put together they might look totally different from what they look like individually. That's what I understand we're trying to achieve.

Now if there's a different - one of the reasons that we sent the email and ask people to look at it again and make comments and so on is to ensure that we have enough basis to say we can now move this content into the draft of the final report.

That is not a closed report once it's moved. It's just permission to move. You will have an opportunity again to look at this thing together, all of the content together that would constitute a final report and even at that point make some suggestions about how it looks, what it says and so on. That is how I envision this thing to work. So I don't think there's any disconnect between what the process is.

What we're asking for is where in the process are we now? And I was supposing that the point in the process we are now is to get consensus that the additional things that we have placed on the wiki for consensus

consultation are close enough that they can be transferred from the wiki on block into a draft final report. That's where I think we are. So if there's any differences in that I'm not seeing it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So...

Carlton Samuels: Yes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I'm getting a little bit reactive this sort of, you know, move from the wiki it's just another spice and slice in the wiki that it clone the MR2 and start creating the final report by some (the acquiring) skeleton I'm 100% supportive it.

Tell people that the text from the following linked pages is going to be moved across at a particular point in time unless people object I'm also for. And getting that done in a timely manner I think is essential.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl. That's exactly what we are proposing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right.

Carlton Samuels: Given the fact that we have two more - this is next - this week and next week.

Any other comment on this area?

Okay so oh Alan you're up sir. You have the floor.

Alan Greenberg: Just a very quick one saying I hope this is the last time that we're going to be spending 15 minutes again on process issues instead of on substance.

We have support staff who can do an awful lot of this stuff and who have experience in getting reports out. Let's make sure we use them and task them appropriately and not...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Yes staff is on standby to help us with that. Karla has actually been supportive of this and she's on standby to lead on this Alan. She knows exactly what...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: ...needs to be done. She just needs to get the word. I see Cheryl agrees so that's a good thing. Thanks.

All right, so I think we are - we can agree that we are going to move in a certain way and we move to the next one. Is Elaine on yet?

Elaine Pruis: I'm here.

Carlton Samuels: Oh hi Elaine, welcome. Just to get you started Elaine I have placed - asked Karla and she's kindly placed your additions into the Adobe Connect workspace where you've identified the additional pieces that you put in there.

And maybe you could take people, take our colleagues through so that we can see if there is any substantive comment? You have the floor.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. I'm not in Adobe Connect yet but I'll just go off the email I sent. So I just drafted a little bit of text that I thought would be useful to have in our considerations for our final report work -- whatever we're calling it at this point.

I went through the transcripts and the emails and looked at e-discussions that we had about in-kind support. And I tried to capture what the thinking that we had around that, what we all agreed upon and any concerns that were raised.

So if you look as you said that's in Adobe, if you look at what I wrote below the types of support that had been identified there's some new text that I put out yesterday.

I just reiterated that (unintelligible) in-kind services (unintelligible) create a list that would match needy applicants with self-identifying providers.

I quoted the (unintelligible) resolution. And I also stated that the (list), both should serve multiple functions like we talked about last week where not only would it match or not match, identify applicants and providers but also could be a place to share information like the proposed IT wiki.

So then there's recommendations from our working group how this list works. And the terms and conditions would be posted on the list and there wouldn't be any certification of these providers.

And that the only concern that was raised several times was that the new gTLD applicants would be, those services might have to come from northern countries or developed - already developed regions where we're trying to build out in underserved regions.

And so there's the suggestion that staff reached out to ccTLD operators and ask them to become involved in the - in providing services so that the needy applicants would be able to have help in their own region.

And then just a note that the staff won't - wouldn't be committing to signing providers for every single new CCR requirement that's stated in the applicant (unintelligible). That's the summary of it and happy to hear any thoughts (please).



Carlton Samuels: Thank you Elaine. Avri you have your hand up. You're the first on the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay yes thanks. I actually think it's a really good list. I'm wondering about one thing that might be added to this.

And I don't have a clearer handle on how much is actually available. But I understand that there are various efforts in creating open source software that helps with various registry services whether it's front end or back end services.

And I'm wondering if one of the bullets can be helping to basically creating a, you know, a set of pointers, not actually getting involved in doing or verifying or confirming but basically dragging these things up, finding out what open source software there is for assisting in registry operations whether front end or backend and just putting a place up in this Web site that the staff's going to build to point to those things. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. Elaine you have a response to that?

Elaine Pruis: Yes I think that should be included as part of the communications side of this wiki where we could definitely go through and name those registry operators that are not only willing to, you know, provide those services in-house but have software that's available as open source such as (Fred) or (Coca) or I think I saw another one recently that yes, we could definitely talk amongst yourself and figure out who those are and help staff with that or staff could do that too.

Carlton Samuels: Okay I see Cheryl has absolutely endorsed what she said a repository of software options which is a little bit more than just having a link but I think that's good.

Eric you are - you have your hand up sir. You have the floor.

Eric you have your hand up. You have the floor. He's probably muted.

Eric you have the floor.

Gisella Gruber-White: Eric you should be un-muted now. Please try and talk. This is Gisella.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Can you hear me?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Yes we are hearing you now.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Questions for - I had the impression that (Coca) had become restricted at some point earlier, perhaps two years ago. Is that no longer the case?

Elaine Pruis: No (Coca) is available.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Without restriction, the gTLD users?

Elaine Pruis: No. No, it's available to needy applicants.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm not sure I understand the difference between - but thank you.

Elaine Pruis: Well, I will send you a note directly.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

Moderator: Any other comments for Elaine? Anything to add to her list from anyone?

Karla Valente: This is Karla, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Karla. Yes, go ahead.

Karla Valente: Yes. I would like to have a better understanding from Elaine what does she mean by this translation? Like the Applicant Guidebook is only published in English. This is not the case. The Applicant Guidebook is published in six United Nations languages.

I think the issue you often see is that the translated versions are posted after the English version is made available for public comment. And that sometimes confuses people to think that there's no other versions.

So what exactly is needed here?

Woman: Karla, yes. This list I just cut and paste from over in the chat room so that does need to be edited. We can just take that one out.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Karla. Any other comments?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Can I just ask a question of Karla, as sort of you know the most likely person in staff on the call to know the answer to? Do you accept all the applications in only the six UN languages, or do all applications need to be in English only, or what?

Karla Valente: Hi, this is Karla for the record. So the question - the test system is in English. The questions are in English and people will be answering that in English, but we do accept documentation like supporting documents in other languages. The evaluation services include translating and looking into those.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Karla Valente: And we looking to applicant support in multiple languages as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Karla Valente: But, the test system and the answering of the questions as well as the - most importantly the contract - the base agreement that the applicant will have to sign...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Karla Valente: ...those are all in English.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is in English.

So there are...

Karla Valente: There's a translation, but you know the official legal binding document is in English.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. And I think that's important that everyone understands and recognizes that at the beginning.

I guess there's an opportunity for us to (tease) out those details in even more (unintelligible) for the needy applicants then, because there may be some opportunities or points, more to the point, of a potential confusion. For example, if you put things out in six UN languages, I'm wondering even in your (unintelligible), you said a number of documentation can come back to ICANN in other languages. Now is that only the six UN languages, or can I send it to you in Uzbekistani?

And if that's the case, then we'd need to make sure that Uzbekistani is going to translate appropriately into something that's going to be robust enough to you know, get my application through the right hoops? So to some extent, there might be a benefit for it to not come to you in Uzbekistani, but in fact

come to you in previously and properly checked translated language into English.

I guess there's just an opportunity (unintelligible) not want to - perhaps not work to death, but just make sure the appropriate attention is given to. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Are there any other comments?

I think that intervention by Cheryl is very important for us to understand, because it might have an impact on the kind of service that we required up front.

Karla Valente: Yes. This is Karla again Carlton for the record. So I'm thinking through the process now. So if you apply - when you apply to the new gTLD program in test, then you'll have the kind of services and language approach that I mentioned before.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Karla Valente: Because, there is an understanding that applicants come from all over the world and you know, corporate documents for example - incorporation documents and things like that will be in (lots of) languages. Yes. So that is one thing.

The second issue is about the applicant support itself. So when and if - or when people apply to have the applicant support evaluation - the piece that says, "Okay. Will this applicant qualify for support?" We need to be careful that that piece is also supportive of other languages.

Is this a correct assumption? Because this applicant would apply before the new gTLD program. This applicant - that needy applicant also will need to

have a kind of guidebook for this you know grant, on when to call grant or in-kind you know, application in other languages.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And in fact, the likelihood - Cheryl here for the record. I'm sorry Carlton, but I'm...

Carlton Samuels: No, go ahead Cheryl. Go ahead. Don't worry. Go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm in interaction mode here.

The likelihood of that happening in one of the six UN languages is extraordinarily small. The six UN languages in (the main) not really going to be overlapping to what we would probably predict should be the local languages of the prices and places that we would assume the needy applicants would be coming from.

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Cheryl, that's precisely...

Karla Valente: Yes. So I'm sorry Cheryl.

Carlton Samuels: ...that is precisely why I thought that issue is important, because it depends on where you start. Thank you.

Karla, could - you go ahead. I'm sorry.

Karla Valente: Yes. So this is Karla for the record. Yes, so you said that the likelihood of the support in other languages is very small. So I think that having the documents like some kind of a guidebook for the applicants - for the needy applicants is something that is going to be done. So, this is not an issue to be done in six United Nations languages.

Now we can question whether the six United Nations languages are exactly the languages that are needed for the - for this type of applicants, depending on the countries that were selected. And also, that's a separate issue, whether or not this is the right selection of languages is something that we need to look into carefully.

But then the other issue is that if we have an evaluation panel - I'm calling evaluation panel, but you know just making up a word here. Or you know a group of community evaluators. Somebody that is going to look into this needy applicant to see whether or not they qualify for this program - for the support program. Then, it's a separate issue whether or not this group has the capability to handle languages and what language they have the capability to handle.

So maybe one of the criteria for an evaluation panel could be languages.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. Are there any other comments on this issue?

Okay. There be no comments. Might I ask the same question that we asked refunding and funding? Do members on this call now feel that this content that is there - that is led by Elaine is good and sufficient to be moved into the draft final report document?

Alan, you're on the board sir.

Alan, probably you're on mute? You have the floor.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, I was - you must have said I could speak while the mute off message was coming through.

As with the previous one, I don't I personally don't care if it is moved now or moved next week. I want a definitive email to go out with something in capital letters saying last call type thing, or semi-last call, just to notify people that we hope not to be able to have to redo this 12 times again in the short time we have available.

Carlton Samuels: We will do that again, Alan. We will do that again. We send out the email again, and once the - it's (moved). We send out an email again that says this is where the last document - the final draft document is. Look at it in its entirety. It's building as we speak. Make your comments and drop dead on July 31st. We will do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Treat the outcomes - this is Cheryl for the record here Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Treat the outcomes of this work team's text development and deliberation, in other words what Elaine's done and what Avri has done, in an identical way on (unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: Yes. That's exactly how we're going to do it, Cheryl. No different. We - at least that's what I'm proposing, that the staff will help us to put out that document and we will start with the skeleton from the MR2 report, which are most of the items that are consensus, then we put these ones that we are now almost at consensus decision. We look at them in full together and we make our comments there so that we will meet the deadline.

That's the intent.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, okay.



Carlton Samuels: So there being no further comment on this, we are going to ask staff to treat this piece of work from Elaine with the substandard comments included and updated by Elaine the same way we have the piece by Avri.

Okay, I don't know if you - any - all of you see the response to my email that was done by Tijani, but the substantive comment from Tijani to the email that I sent out earlier was that he was not so sure that we have completed the criteria question, because he thinks that we - while we have substantive - I mean subjective criteria, we need objective criteria. Am I paraphrasing you correctly Tijani? You can jump in here.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Thank you, Carlton. It was a worry that I had since the beginning. When this text was put in on the Wiki, it was put at the very end of the milestone report drafting.

The problem for me is that we may - with this text, we may provide support to those who don't need the - don't need it, and we may don't give support who need - who really need it.

I explained very well on the email and it (unintelligible) the email because when you speak it's not the same when you write. I explained very well why I have this worry.

The Paragraph 3.2 says that we need - the applicants need to provide materials to the administrators that explain the constraints that the applicant is - have to apply. And they explain it as technical, as administrative, et cetera, et cetera.

I don't think that we need to assess those elements because they are - those elements are things that you can get with money. The point here is the financial need. People who don't - we - you can have a rich one that don't have all those elements. He can buy them.

So the question is how do evaluate - how to assess the financial need. For me, this paragraph doesn't give the real elements for this and will give it to the administrator to assess it subjectively, not objectively, because there is not objective elements for assessment. This is my point in this element.

I have other points in my email concerning the bundling and other things. But, this is the point that Carlton raised now. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Tijani. Is there anyone - Andrew, you have your hand up so you have the floor.

Andrew Mack: Thanks, Carlton. Andrew Mack for the transcript. I'm just trying to understand for Tijani, your concern is that - is it the targeting of any assistance that - to make - that we want to make sure that funds go to the people that need them the most. Is that correct? And that you think that we need to do a more complete job of trying to set out those criteria so that we don't leave it ambiguous?

If that's what you're saying, that does make sense. We all - we are aware - we are also talking about other kinds of potential assistance though, right? One being in price cuts, which - and then the other one would be in terms of in-kind support. How would you see those factoring into your question?  
Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Tijani, you want to respond to Andrew?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Go ahead, sir.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: yes. Thank you Andrew. The criteria is to decide whether the applicant will get support or not. And if the applicant will get support, there is a lot of kinds

of support that - as we dictated it in our successive reports. So what I am talking about is the gate to enter to this program. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Can I then ask a question Tijani so that people can focus on it? Your concern is how much money you have to show you have before you can be admitted to the program. Would that be a clearer way to ask the question?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. Thank you Carlton.

It is how it can - how can you prove that you are needy? How can you prove that you need money to apply?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: This is the question. And even if you don't have administrative means, if you don't have technical stuff, it is not the problem because if you have money, you can buy it. You can (have) the best stuff in the world.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, sir. I hear you. That's - so that's the question for this group.

Alan, you have your hand up so you have the floor.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. We've gone into this one a number of times. Several times, people have proposed arbitrary measures, and each time they have been shut down by others saying, "Oh, but this sort of group with is clearly needy cannot meet that criteria."

There's a wealth of experience in the world of providing funds to organizations. You know, to NGOs and to various other types of organizations, some of which have absolute amounts of money but need support anyway. And I think we need to go out of this group and we need to put enough words in our document so ICANN can consult with appropriate people to come up with some sort of measure, either that is quantitative or

that is qualitative and subjective, but nevertheless something that can be dealt with by evaluation organizations.

I'm not convinced we're going to come up in the next week with the magic metric which is going to address the issue. We need to define the type of thing we need and ICANN staff I think needs to be charged with coming up with the absolute thing that is going to be given to the external evaluators, (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan. Can I then ask you sir - I totally agree with you, and can I ask if you could reproduce those words you have in a neat little two sentence and put it to the Wiki in this area?

Alan Greenberg: I can try. I'm traveling until sometime late Thursday, so whether I can get that done for Friday or not, I'm not sure. But I will try.

Carlton Samuels: Well, not even if you don't get for Friday done, but I think that's the way it ought to - that's just me speaking.

Alan Greenberg: I'll take the task with the understanding it may not be there until next Tuesday or until the end of Friday, or something like that. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: That's fine. Tijani, it - I think Alan said most of what is - that we've been through that. I'm not sure that we are competent to decide what is the threshold here. And maybe, we should approach it just like Alan. That's why I'm asking.

Alan Greenberg: Nor should - it's Alan again for the record. Nor should we worry too much about whether it's subjective or objective. I think we know what the intent is, and we know there are plenty of instances in the world where people manage to do this well, or sometimes well; sometimes not well. But you know, I - we're not reinventing anything here.

Carlton Samuels: That - thank you Alan, because that's my second point. I don't think we should worry too much about grouping them into subjective criteria or objective criteria. I just think that we should put up as many as think are useful, and those that we don't know for sure, we should say it the way we - Alan just said it. That's my feeling on this.

Alan Greenberg: Tijani has a rebuttal it looks like.

Carlton Samuels: Tijani, you have the hand up. You have the floor sir.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you.

My main, if you want, objective is to have criteria that prevent to give the support to people who are not - who doesn't have to get this support and to - and trying to give it to the real needy applicants. Don't forget that even in the last resolution of the Board, they are talking about support to the developing country applicants. So they are always speaking about the needy community, the needy people. So we have to be sure that we will give it to the needy people.

When I speak about objective and not subjective, I mean that I don't want it to be up to someone who decides on something that is - that you don't have anything to say it is wrong or it is right. This is the problem.

I don't say we have to give the threshold. We cannot give the threshold, but at least define what are the criteria. What is - what are the elements of the judgment? You understand?

If we let it to the reading or the understanding of the evaluation of one people or some people, it - I am not sure it will be a really objective - really objective - really - the support will go really to the needy applicants. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Thank you Tijani.

Alan, you have your hand up. You have the floor sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Just a clarification of what Tijani said. He said we need to. I think ICANN and the other donors need to. We need to put in place - we need to specify to ICANN what they need to do to get to that stage. No one's arguing about the end-point. We don't want gaming on this kind of thing. We don't want to give money to people who don't need it, and we prefer not to miss the really needy ones because we got the specifics of the thresholds wrong.

I don't know whether it's then going to end up being subjective or objective, and I don't know who it is that we're going to use to do the final evaluations of the, "Yes, you need it." "No, you don't." But the end point is clear and I think that's what we need to make as clear as possible.

And any guidance we can provide to ICANN staff, (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Work back from the end-point.

Alan Greenberg: And doing this is good. If we can't provide the detailed guidance, we need to specify to some extent how they get it. And I - you know, I don't think we're going to come closer than that.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Alan.

Tijani, you have your hand up so you have a response.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. Thank you. When I say we need, we --working group -- that we were ordered by the Board to find a way - a sustainable way to help those people. That's my understanding. We are proposing - or prefer we are not deciding. We are proposing, and we - and my feeling is to propose something that we are convinced in. That's it. I am not deciding. We are not deciding. That's true.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I just think that we're going past the threshold of something that this working group with the expertise we have can do, so we need to define it carefully enough so ICANN can...

Carlton Samuels: Can pick it up.

Alan Greenberg: ...find the right people to help.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Alan, I am...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: (Unintelligible) by that criteria.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Alan, I am not talking about threshold. I am talking about elements of the (unintelligible). Elements.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not disagreeing.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: All right. Thank you. It's - we've - it's five past the hour. We started a little late as you recall. I - yes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. Cheryl here. My Internet (unintelligible)...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...so I'm no longer in the AC room.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Cheryl. Go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just - this is a hugely important issue, this thing raised with Tijani's email and with Alan's response, which I'm very comfortable with the way that Alan is proposing how we approach this, just by the way.

Can we make sure that we give sufficient time on - for example, our Tuesday -- if Alan may not have any (unintelligible) by Friday -- agenda to really discuss this? Because, it's going to be I think an incredibly important thing - something that we need to get the wording right on.

Because in our final report, what - in my totally biased view, we should be doing is spending a great deal of energy in making sure that the community that we are representing our views are saying to ICANN, i.e. the Board, "In consideration of how the ascertainment of what is or is not a needy applicant, the following issues we believe are paramount." We're not suggesting that you know, ICANN go out and try and develop a skill set to do it. It's quite probable that it should be externally sourced. But, we do need to sit where the edges of the paddock -- we believe -- should be (unintelligible).

And to that end, I think we're going to need A, some conversation. But perhaps Alan, if you could pop your draft takes onto our Wiki space and throw at it the email list, I would like to think that it's a topic that would get a fair amount of comment and discussion going in preparation for whichever meeting we discuss it at. Thank you.



Alan Greenberg: I'll do that, and thank you for those words, which when I listen to the transcript will make their way into the document.

Carlton Samuels: Well, thank you very much Alan. That is what I thought would come out of it. If you noticed, Tijani put it to the list - a response to my question. I'm happy to see that we have some traction. We're asking each and every one of us if you have additional comments, please make it to the list. We are even suggesting to you that you may have comments like Cheryl that might illuminate Alan's agreement to prepare some words for the report.

So if you have it, please put it to the list. That's where we would love to see it. And if you have specific language, include those too. And if you...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, Carlton, I'm not on Adobe anymore. If Tijani can either resend that message he referred to or point to the time and date it was sent, because it sounds like...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: This was this morning.

Alan Greenberg: This morning? Okay, fine.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. And it's on the list.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, then no problem. Thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: So I'm just imploring everyone again, please use the process that we are severally agreed and get the - your responses out to Tijani. I'm sure that Tijani would be willing to answer as he as answered me and we can move it along. Thank you very much.

It's the - nine minutes past the hour. We are way past top of the hour. I think we have to close this call. I think we have made some substantial movement. We are going to ask staff to begin to do the movements of the content from us into a space that we will begin to formulate the final report. Our drafters will be working in concert with staff in doing this, and we hope by next week we will have something for us to look at again in detail in a more holistic manner.

Thank you one and all. Have a good day.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you everyone. Thank you (Ricardo).

Coordinator: Thanks.

END