

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

Tuesday 30 August 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 30 August 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. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20110830-en.mp3>

On page :

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

GNSO

Rafik Dammak - NCSG - Council liaison - WG co-chair

Avri Doria - NCSG

Andrew Mack - CBUC

Krista Papac - RrSG

At-Large:

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

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

Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large

Cintra Sooknanan - At-Large

John Rahman Kahn - Individual - Adobe Connect

ICANN staff

Rob Hoggarth

Seth Greene

Glen de Saint Gery

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council
Alex Gakuru - NCSG
Baudoin Schombe - At-Large
Dev Anand Teelucksingh - LACRALO
Alain Berranger - Individual
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Dave Kissoondoyal - At-Large
Elaine Pruis - Minds and Machines
Karla Valente – ICANN Staff

Coordinator: Thank you. The recordings are started. All lines are open. Please go ahead.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the 30th of August. And on the line we have Rafik Dammak, Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Cintra Sooknanan, John Rahman Kahn is on the Adobe Connect with us, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Avri Doria, Krista Papac, Evan Leibovitch and Alan Greenberg.

For Staff we have Seth Green, Rob Hoggarth and myself, Glen de Saint Gery. We have apologies from Tijani Ben Jemaa, from Alex Gakuru and from Carlos Aguirre, as well as from Karla who is traveling today.

And may I remind you all please to say your name before you speak for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Rafik I believe it is.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Glen for the - for that. So okay, so I have some problems to access Adobe Connect so I cannot see if people raise their hand or not. And so for the agenda I think that you have it already.

I sent it I think yesterday with the latest version of the report draft. So before starting I want to remind people if they have any updates in their DOI and SOI to send that to Glen.

Okay so - and I want to give some update I think that Alan - so - or small - quick from me and he raised - he sent about that GNSO Council conf call was postponed for two weeks, which means that instead of the 1st September it will be in the 22 - the 22nd of September and - which means that the motion for the - needed for the report would be sent at...

Glen de Saint Gery: The 14th of September Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you for remind - thank you. Fourteenth of September - just I want to say that doesn't mean that we should - some needs the report at the 14th, but a few days before it will be more appropriate hence with the work, because given we are planning to organize it would be - to provide needed information to all the Stakeholder Groups and ICANN community about the work done in our report.

There may be some discussions with the Stakeholder Groups and there is no insurance or guarantee that some GNSO Council can ask to defer the motion for approval.

So we should give time for Stakeholder Groups and the Councilor who represent them in the Council to have time to discuss and debate about the report.

So maybe if we can agree about our deadline in that matter, so we can finish the report and send it in suitable time but - to guarantee that it can be approved by the GNSO and also by the ALAC, but the ALAC it sounds more fixable in that one.

So I will be happy to get your feedback on that. So I cannot see if someone raised...

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I have my hand up.

Carlton Samuels: Alan has his hand up Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Alan.

Carlton Samuels: And Seth after Alan.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Okay before I start Rafik, you're very, very difficult to hear. If you can talk closer to the telephone next time or louder it would really help. My take on it is that there's virtually no chance -- this is a personal opinion -- of it being approved at the meeting in September 22nd.

Only having to report for a week I think there's very little chance the Stakeholder Groups will be able to approve it. That does mean if it's postponed it would come up for a formal vote at the October 6 meeting.

I think - Glen, correct me if I'm wrong but I think that's when it is, which is sufficient time to, you know, for the Board to act on it in Dakar. It's

only two days past the publication deadline and it's certainly enough time for it to act.

If we don't have the report in time for the September 14 cutoff date, I think there's virtually no chance and that goes for the ALAC also, so I think we have no choice.

The earlier we can do it prior to that the better. My - I have a question though if we were talking about a Webinar, and a number of people in the GNSO said it's really important to get a Webinar up as soon as - or hold it as soon as possible after the report is out and prior to the GNSO meeting, which is on the 22nd so - or 20-something.

So the question is are - how are our plans going on that? Those things don't happen overnight and I presume it's not scheduled yet. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you Alan. Okay I will try to speak more - I'm really close to the phone. I am using another one so - okay yes, that was - I was trying to say that the 14th doesn't mean that it's a deadline for us to send me the report.

We should meet more earlier so that we can provide enough time for Stakeholder Groups to discuss, and so that's why maybe it means that - are not going to submit today but it - we will have few days more so we can do - review and refine our report.

But I don't think that we should take two weeks for that. Maybe one week can be enough. Ten days it can be the maximum that we can wait. About that - the deferral of the approval from the 22 September to

6 October, it's not just the approval of GNSO and ALAC which matter, but also that we give enough time for the ICANN Staff to submit implementation so the Board can take action in Dakar meeting.

So we are trying to provide recommendation but it's really critical that those recommendation to be implemented in time before the beginning of the launch of the new gTLD program in January.

About the Webinar updates, Karla is working on that. We have already some how to say the planning for that and who...

Carlton Samuels: Including content.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, and also suggest maybe who can be the speaker and how we will manage that. So I think we can give more details when - going to finish the report.

So the problem that working on the report at the same time there will be - cannot be easy to handle for the Working Group members, but that if - for preparing we're going to - it's already started. Yes, someone was laughing or something.

Carlton Samuels: Seth had hand up Rafik. I'll call for you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you. Seth, please go ahead.

Seth Green: Thank you Rafik. I just wanted to point out I believe you were not on the call yet when we were discussing the fact that something's gone wrong with the Adobe Connect room today.

So the text instead of where it had been placed in the pod as usual, we're asking people to simply go to the links that have been put in the chat room either to the wiki page that contains all of the text to be reviewed today and/or to the actual current draft that's also on the JAS wiki, and they'll be able to find all the text for review there.

The sections to be reviewed are also listed in the chat section, so perhaps we'll - we can help you with that Rafik since you can't see the Adobe Connect room. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Seth. Okay, any further question on that - on this topic? Okay, I think we can go now more into the sixth item. But just I think another remind - so we need to have a fixed deadline and then to schedule the next agenda of next calls regarding that.

I think I will work with Carlton on that one there. So let's go to the next item.

Carlton Samuels: And we're just looking at the new introduction Rafik, and Pages 4 and 5 of the current draft.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Krista has her hand up.

Carlton Samuels: Krista has her hand up, yes.

Rafik Dammak: Krista, please go ahead.

Krista Papac: Thanks. Hi Rafik and everyone. I just want to stress the importance of making sure that we are hitting these deadlines and, you know, setting ourselves up for the best possible chance of the GNSO having the time and ALAC having the time that they need to review this report in time to vote on it as quickly as they can, which then enables the Board so that's the first thing.

And, you know, I appreciate what you're saying Rafik about we need to set up some deadlines for ourselves as to when we need to execute on these things and have our final versions and our, you know, second to final versions ready of the report.

And then secondly it's great to hear that Karla's working on the Webinar. I think it's also important to have some dates set up for that or dates for when she intends to have that set up, so that we are managing to something because it's - everybody is so busy and it's so easy for these things to slip if we haven't even, you know, set up a target.

So I just - I hate to see all of this hard work not, you know, get voted on in the times that it needs to, and the further we push those deadlines the more we reduce our chances for getting that done.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Krista. I think your remarks are noted and thank you for the support. So I guess maybe we can - because it's about more process so we can continue that discussion about the deadline in the mailing list.

And - okay and we have today I think one hour and half for this call, so we are keeping with the previous agenda and then we'll update it with the new deadline for submitting the report.

Okay, so let's go to the introduction. I think someone has a problem with the Skype. To continue with the introduction, if there is any comments so Seth and Rob can take that feedback and to update the report. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I made some comments in the version I submitted yesterday on this in - if you were doing the whole section or paragraph-by-paragraph, then in Paragraph Number 4 it currently reads as if this report is only highlighting the differences between it and the milestones.

And I think it's important to make clear that this report stands on its own, and I suggested some words that would do that, you know, something like, "Although this report does not rely on previous versions, those readers familiar will see," because I - we don't want people to get the impression they have to go back and read those milestone reports.

That would kill it in terms of people actually looking at this. And on a minor typographical issue, interim reports, either both words should be capitalized or not capitalized but consistently.

And in Section Number 6 it says, "The recommendations made in this final report represent consensus." I think our practice is we should be identifying that it's full consensus except where otherwise noted. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. I think we - for the consensus we agreed about the same standard, so maybe that need to be checked.

Alan Greenberg: You're very faint Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: I said that we agreed about that standard regarding the consensus, full consensus, et cetera. And I think Evan had sent - I'm not sure, it's sent - or Karla sent a reminder about that a few weeks ago. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, just a quick point on Number 4. I had sent - I didn't send in but I attached to the place where they said to put comments, a commented version. But on 4 what we might want to do or it might be worth doing is having an appendix that briefly lists the recommendations from the previous MR.

I know they're repeated in here. I know it stands on its own but I think it might be important to have them bullet style listed without all the explanation and like an appendix or an attachment. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. I find it's really good on here, so that people can compare what was done in the mile - first milestone report and second milestone report and this final report.

Okay, any further comment about the introduction? Seth, do you have any question for Working Group members?

Seth Green: Thank you Rafik. No I'm - I've gotten that and have no other questions. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. I just need to check so if it's okay so we can move to the...

Alan Greenberg: Rafik, when you say introduction which paragraphs are you talking about?

Carlton Samuels: Paragraphs - up to Paragraph 7.

Alan Greenberg: Okay because technically 8 is still introduction.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: And so it's a smaller - the title is a smaller font so I assume it's still introduction.

Robert Hoggarth: No Alan, this is - go ahead Seth.

Seth Green: Oh okay. I was just going to say that if that's true Alan then it's my error. Sorry. The second section of the report should be - support should be also...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you then. As long as we're clear.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so I think we can move to the next - it's just the next page. It's about that support should be offered from the first round, Page 5. Okay, any comment?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it's Alan. I put - there's a number of typographical comments that I put in the notes - in my notes - not necessary to discuss them here, with the exception of - in Section Number 16 there's an XXX that has to be replaced and I'm not quite sure what it was, so I'm not sure if that's typo or content.

Rafik Dammak: Avri, yes please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri. I think the 16, isn't that - wouldn't that be it - 2002? Wouldn't that be the date we were going to? I had a question on 15. We say, "Of the current 21 new gTLDs," did we mean to say existing gTLDs there?

Alan Greenberg: I hope so.

Avri Doria: Thanks. That's all I had.

Alan Greenberg: Yes if - it's Alan again. And 16, if it's 2002 that's not an initial round. I don't think we want to confuse - I would simply put in the 2002 round or whatever the date is.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I was about to say that. It was - it wouldn't have been the initial one if it's 2002.

Alan Greenberg: We're already confusing people enough with rounds.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Okay. Oh, that should be updated.

Alan Greenberg: Avri still has her hand up.

Avri Doria: Oh.

Rafik Dammak: Avri? Avri, are you sure?

Alan Greenberg: No, she's down.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Okay, so I guess - oh that's good. I think we are progressing. If we'll - there is not any more - any further comments about that Page 5, we can go to the frequently asked questions in Page 41. Okay, any comment? So...

Carlton Samuels: For those of you following it, it starts at Paragraph 96 of the current draft.

Rafik Dammak: And - yes, in the Page 41.

Carlton Samuels: Forty-one, Paragraph 96.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Rob, yes.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you Rafik. It's great when you can see the hands going up. Thank you. Two general questions I think first in this section. One is this was sort of a cobbled together section that Seth I think and I encountered when we came on board.

The overall question would be, A, do you all still want an FAQ section and do you find that valuable; and 2, while we kept the current paragraph numbering just continuing into this section, it could also itself be a separate appendix as well.

That's entirely up to you all in terms of document structure and what value you think there is for these specific questions. And then finally whether you think that there should be additional questions that are not on here.

These are just the ones that were inherited from the previous draft. There could be more that you all think need to be there. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Rob. Okay, Rob you want to make a further comment?

Alan Greenberg: No, I think he forgot to put his hand down.

Robert Hoggarth: I got it. Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan and in answer to that question, I would prefer an appendix if at all.

Carlton Samuels: I...

Rafik Dammak: Sorry Alan, what do you mean that you want to keep...

Alan Greenberg: Rob asked whether it should be - if it's to be kept - should it be kept and if so should it be in the body of the text or an appendix, and I'm suggesting that if it is kept and I'm not - don't feel strongly about it, it should be an appendix, not the body of the text.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Avri and then Carlton. Avri please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, on the notion - thank you. On the notion of keeping it, it was put in in the original - in the first milestone report because there were a lot of questions that weren't answered yet.

I think by this point - and they were going to be worked on, et cetera. I think by this point most things should be answered in the body of the text. And if not, you know, either maybe we've decided that that's not important anymore, or we've decided, you know, somehow different.

So I'm not so sure that it's even needed anymore. And I do have a specific comment about 107 - Paragraph 107 when we get there. I don't know if I should do that now or later, but that's it for me.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Avri, you can make comments. About appendix, my feeling's that nobody reads them or really few people do such for to read them. So in any kind of report it says maybe the only purpose of appendix to make the report more long than expected. Carlton, please go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: I am - my feeling is that it really is not necessary anymore. It ought to be excised. I don't even think it belongs in an appendix, but I stand to be advised by the members.

Rafik Dammak: Avri, you want to...

Avri Doria: Yes, two reasons I left my hand up when I went - about to take it down. And I do miss the good old days when the Staff took our hands down for us when we were done.

Two things - one, I think appendices are often important even if people don't read them, because that's where you put factual lists of stuff, historical information, extended references, other discussions.

And I was keeping my hand up also because if we were going to keep this in, then we were going to talk about the Paragraph 107 and then I would've had an opinion. I can take my hand down now though.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Okay, four questions that we try to think that just my - I am speaking on capacity. Yes, we can keep them in the body so we answer some question and we are going to answer more I think with the Webinar, and also we have that public comment that we didn't answer yet to those comments made from the community. Alan, you want to...?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. If we're going to keep them and that decision seems to now have been made, then they need to be gone through carefully to make sure that they don't conflict because they're so - the wording is so old we need to make sure they don't conflict with what we're saying elsewhere, and that the question is still - question and answer are still phrased appropriately given the context. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: So Alan you suggest that we - to update them and to review them, to update them, to - so to avoid any conflict and to make them consistent with...

Alan Greenberg: Rafik, to be clear when I've done my review I haven't looked at them. I'm not sure anyone has.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so and now as we are working I think that the extend time can - we can have that extension that can help us to review them and to make sure that there is not any conflict. Okay, we have Avri and Seth. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, my question is did anybody speak in favor of keeping the fact that we've decided to keep it? I thought almost everyone that spoke in one way or another said, "No. Take them out. No we don't need them. No they don't even need to be an appendix."

So I think appendices are worth having, so I'm not sure why we've decided to keep it when no one has spoken in favor of keeping it.
Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. I think if we want to keep them either in the appendix or the body, they need to be reviewed and updated. But if there is a strong let's say position that - to keep them, so we can drop that. Okay Seth, you wanted to ask a question?

Seth Green: Thank you Rafik. I'm actually kicking my hand down. I was simply going to - along Avri's - the lines of Avri's comment I was just going to ask what the final decision regarding them is.

Alan Greenberg: Hello? Is anyone - Rafik dropped off the call, Carlton. Can you take over? It's Alan speaking.

Carlton Samuels: Oh okay, Rafik - we want to get back to Rafik. So we hear - the question was do we keep these FAQs and from what I'm hearing there's certainly the preponderance that says we keep them as a - an appendix.

Now even if this - an appendix the statement made by Avri and supported by Alan is definitely required. That means we'd have to go through each of these to ensure that they are still relevant and they are still correctly worded so...

Alan Greenberg: Avri - it's Alan. Avri is asking in the chat, "What preponderance?" I believe Evan is the only one to have expressed a strong desire to keep them at this point.

Evan's lost a lot of weight in the last number of months, so I'm not sure he's a preponderance by himself.

Evan Leibovitch: I represent that remark.

Alan Greenberg: You should feel good about it.

Carlton Samuels: Okay so...

Evan Leibovitch: Carlton, can I talk to this?

Carlton Samuels: Yes Evan, I was just going to ask you to air it a little bit so we can make a decision.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. This is Evan for the record. I like the idea of having some kind of an existing FAQ. However, I would go along with Avri and Alan that perhaps it doesn't need to be a part of this document.

So what I'm going to suggest because it slows the whole process down obviously in the time that it takes to go through, so perhaps we should

drop the FAQ from this file but keep it under consideration as a separate background document that doesn't necessarily have to go through the same vetting process but can be used to assist people who are having problems understanding everything behind the document.

Carlton Samuels: Avri, this seems to say yes to that. Alan, you have your hand up, sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I'll just point out that probably somebody with a good background in this whole process should read through it and see if there are any of those that really need to still be somewhere.

As I said, I haven't done it recently. Cheryl says she hasn't. I don't know if Avri has. Somebody with some reasonable history needs to read through it and make sure we're not losing something important in one of them. That's all. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Alan. So we are getting to a middle ground here. The idea that's been proposed now by Evan is that we excise it from this text itself. But we review them and with the hopes that we put them as some kind of separate supporting document to this. I think it would meet all of our objectives if we go that way. So for the record what we are going to do is excise the FAQs from the report text. We will work on a separate document of FAQs to be presented as a supporting document to the report. Okay. I see Olivier (unintelligible) - chat that they feel (it is an appendix). So let me ask the question directly, Olivier. Would you not support having FAQs as a separate document?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Carlton. Olivier here for the record - I just question the reason for putting it out as a separate document. Is it for archival purposes? Is it for to make the report shorter?

I mean, you know, I think that the FAQ questions are valuable because they answer questions which the readers might ask themselves. And one thing that I hope is that a reader will not send the - think yes, but my question has not been answered and they then will ask this question in which case they will have to be pointed over to the FAQ document that might be separate from the report.

That said, I don't feel particularly strongly about it. So it's really up to you. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Avri, Evan and then Alan.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes. I think to have them in the FAQ we need to close on them today, we need to make sure we have the right questions, we need to make sure we have the right answers and we need to do it now to make sure it can be appended in the book.

On the other hand, if that other document is a wiki page where once the doc is out we get questions, we hear questions, we answer questions and create an FAQ that is pertinent to the discussion that is on the wiki with questions we may not be able to think of yet. I think we've got a very useful activity, you know, whereas at the moment it would just be a blocking activity.

And so you know, we could even make the comment perhaps you know, you can mention somewhere that there was in fact at one point

attached to this document but that has been moved to a wiki to be a living document, a living thing. So but I think trying to close on it today and especially since we've spent all this time now process talking about it as opposed to substantively in the issues and no one has reviewed it, I think excising is really the best we can do and moving it to a wiki. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Avri. I see Cheryl is supporting that and I support it. Evan, we'll just quickly (unintelligible).

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, Carlton. I'll make it quick. I was basically going to say what Avri was going to in a slightly different format. Olivier, I totally agree that we need to have something.

But the process of creating an FAQ doesn't have to go through exactly the same kind of deadlines and vetting process that we have for the core document. So given the time constraints I'm just suggesting that we move that thing off to a separate development process that is as Avri very accurately said, more dynamic.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Evan. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I agree completely. I just want to highlight one of the things I think Cheryl said in the chat that the document in some prominent place should point to the wiki. So we need to set is up ahead of time. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. Yes, Alan. So that is just one small detail, it's an important detail that we could actually create a separate document, make it a

living document in a wiki and perhaps make a point or give a pointer to it set for the noting.

Rafik is back online so I'm going to hand back over to Rafik. Rafik, we are now at 47 I think, Page 47 - letters of agreement.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Carlton. Okay. I was listening to people talking about I think the questions. So we replied it would answer the question a few months ago and we have those questions from the public comment to answer.

It will take time but maybe we cannot do that now. And also we can get new questions during the webinars. So I also do agree that Avri's idea is good and makes sense. And then as Cheryl said, we need to mention that clearly in the document. So maybe just an explanation and text and a link. That link should then change so to be something static so it shouldn't be changed.

And to tell people that we are trying to answer a question on the fly so as we have a lot of feedback from the community. Seth, please go ahead.

Seth Greene: Thank you very much Rafik. Seth Greene for the record. I just am wondering what the preference is then. Should the link - I would imagine the link should be in the separate part of the appendix.

Is that all right with everyone? And my second question is since we're now keeping it would you mind turning your attention to the question at the end of Paragraph 107 regarding the content of the FAQ E, letter E?

Okay. So just two questions - where the link would in fact best fit and the question on 107 please Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Seth. Avri. Avri, can you hear me?

Carlton Samuels: Avri is probably muted.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I agree with Alan. The link should be really prominent.

Avri Doria: Sorry. I was.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. Sorry. I was muted. I was babbling on. I think that this is two things. One is since we're keeping it but we're removing it from this document so I don't think there is a great need to craft answers now and to do that.

I think Evan was the one that called it a separate work process. On 107 I think the comment is correct. That answer is kind of a mixed answer and is it correct? I think a new answer would need to be crafted that the first sentence from that paragraph talking about the ability for people doing the development to have some money.

And then also what makes it sustainable or the program is the foundation and the good work and the fact that successful SACs will be giving money back into a fund, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. So I do think it needs a different answer. But I don't think we need to do it for now. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. I think maybe Seth wants to make a comment. Seth.

Seth Greene: I'm sorry Rafik. I just didn't put my hand down. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Sounds like Avri, do you want to comment? Okay. Usually I don't lower the hand of people so please don't forget your hand raised. Okay. So I think there is some agreement that we will have space for these questions to work on them, not now but as Evan said, it's kind of another process to do.

And as Alan highlighted, this link should be really prominent so that people cannot sit and then go to that space to find this question. So we should avoid to have people asking the same question that we already answered. Okay. I think we can move to the next item if there is no objection. Okay. I guess that this is about appendix one on levels of working group agreement referred to within this report, Page 47.

Okay. So my guess is there is agreement about the working group.
Alan, yes.

Alan Greenberg: Rafik, it's Alan. I'm not sure what we're discussing. These are standards that are documented, that are come from the working group guidelines I thought. I didn't think that they're subject to debate.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I agree. Yes. But just I think to quickly view it, that's all boilerplate. Okay. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think that Alan is essentially correct, they are. However, things change over time. So I think it's important to have them here. And just

a note that I realized, we say unanimous and full consensus and I am not recommending that we change it anywhere.

But in a couple places we have a use of overwhelming consensus. So the only point I would make is then in one of the edit passes that our penholders do, they make sure that they looked at every use of the word consensus and that we're not using other sorts of superlatives and adjectives but stick to the defined ones.

And as far as it being a rule in the working group stuff, it's just a guideline. So we could have defined new states and meet them here. So but having - but I don't think we did any new definitions, right?

Alan Greenberg: If we're looking for extra work to do.

Avri Doria: I wasn't suggesting it.

Alan Greenberg: Nothing - that was Alan's snarky remark.

Avri Doria: Right. That's something that could have happened six months ago when we were wasting an amazing amount of time on every process nuance. So thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. If you want extra tasks we can think about but yes, I think the agreement is - the discussion is not about those terms that we used just that we think if there is agreement that we keep them as appendix.

And also as Cheryl pointed that we need to ensure consistency in the use of those terms in the document. Yes Avri.

Avri Doria: Sorry. I didn't put my hand down. But yes, we do need to keep them because standards change over time and these are the standards used in this doc.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Okay. (Bill) (has I think) quickly so we can go to the JAS working group background on Page 48. Alan, (you have something)?

Alan Greenberg: Unless there is a link missing but unless someone has anything substantive here, we're killing history but hopefully we're killing it correctly and I don't think we need to waste time on it when there are other issues of substance that we still need to discuss.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Alan. So just as we are trying this as really a quick review of this appendix, the remaining thing in that part is just the glossary. So and then we can back to more substantive discussion. So if there is not any objection, any comment.

Evan Leibovitch: Cheryl has her hand up.

Rafik Dammak: Cheryl Landon go ahead but someone was speaking. Cheryl.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: (Unintelligible)

Evan Leibovitch: Cheryl, if you're speaking we can't hear you.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: (Unintelligible)

Rafik Dammak: I think Cheryl has a problem with her line. This really sounds/looks like which character from Star Wars? I forget.

Avri Doria: Yes. That's it. We can hear her but not understand her.

Evan Leibovitch: All I could hear was a vague buzzing when she was speaking.

Avri Doria: No, you could tell that there were word fluctuations in the buzzing.

Rafik Dammak: Cheryl, can you speak?

Evan Leibovitch: Cheryl says she cannot unmute.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. You can ask - okay, Cheryl. (You can type). So let's wait a few seconds so Cheryl can type. Did someone have any comment in the meantime? It's welcome.

Evan Leibovitch: Cheryl said we should go on, that she'll type here in the chat. Olivier said something unknown in binary.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Does anyone have a quick translation for Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: There is none. It just says go on.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Olivier. (Unintelligible) - okay. And this is yes, to check that (the names are not there) so (that's fine). Thank you Cheryl. So I think there is not any further comment on this part.

And then we planned I think this call for one hour and a half. So we can have because now with this extension we can discuss more how

we should plan for the next days. And to fix guidelines that we need to stick to it. Yes Alan and yes Avri. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I'd like to hear from Seth and Rob on areas that they believe they still need guidance. As an example, in some much earlier draft I made a bunch of comments in what is now Paragraph 19.

They have been echoed in this report still as Alan Greenberg says but there has been no discussion and presumably since they were left in as comments Rob and Seth don't feel comfortable making arbitrary choices on their own and fixing them. Yet this is an absolutely crucial section on financial support.

So I think we need input from Rob and Seth as to what areas they need help on to get this report fixed in the critical areas that we can't ignore and that are not just typographical niceties. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. So you will ask that the section will need to be refined to have more feedback on that so we can work on that and maybe now and for next days?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I was suggesting those simply as an example. They may not be the only ones but they're ones where I have literally a whole screen's worth of comments when you view the document.

So I think those are the important ones that we need to fix. You know, the group can say I'm full of garbage and we should just delete my comments and that's fine. But I think we need some substantive discussion on the areas where Rob and Seth felt comfortable making

adjustments themselves. There may well be a lot of other areas. I don't know. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. I was going to say something similar. I don't think we need to spend a lot of time doing processes stuff on what's going to happen over the next couple of days.

I would think that a walk through of the comments, I know I did another read through of the whole document before this meeting. I put notes near a lot of Alan's things. I have loaded my document into the wiki thing but I also think that my comments are messed up typographically again. So they need to be looked at in some other way other than Word. But that's beside the point.

So I think going through Alan's issues I was going to say (I added) notes to a lot of them and most of those notes weren't this is just garbage, forget it. But actually it was something more substantive in response to that. So it could be worth walking through comments that people have got so that we've got another quick cleaning pass of this doc and I think comment (on other areas as well). Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yes, that's generally the intent behind leaving those comments in. It's as Alan and Avri stated, these were areas that and it wasn't just Alan and Avri.

There are things in here from Alain B., from Andrew as well where there were simply comments that folks had made in previous versions sometimes after the draft had been circulated and we'd had comments on it that I think do merit particularly from our drafting standpoint having not spent the incredible amount of time you all have had as a group to essentially just go through.

And a number of them may be just yes, no. But then others may raise some slightly more substantive issues that it would be very helpful for the working group collectively to discuss in real time. Given that you do maybe have and I would suggest probably no more than an extra week, you probably have bought yourselves at least one if not two or three additional calls following this time tabled schedule of two calls a week that you could still schedule time and go through them one by one. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Rob. Yes. So it will be agreed if you and Seth can highlight those sections to be reviewed so it will make it more easy for people so we can have a great discussion and agreement on them.

Rob Hoggarth: And we have done that, Rafik. Basically it's as Alan said. What I have left in is comments. I had a little hiccup with Tijani's last week. But basically what I did was I would leave a comment in but it looks like it's my comment now just because of the editing process.

But then I'll say AG asks or AD comments or EL you know, contributes. So those are already flagged. If you could look at those, we have preserved them as we go through the drafting process as comments. So even in the clean version they still show.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. So just maybe if they are not really needed maybe just to remove this reference or to have a document closed to the final version. So just for the (graphical) issue but, yes. Yes Avri. Avri says actually that trying to find this comment and we'll spend the 30 next minutes on that.

And Paragraph 19, is it possible to put this Paragraph 19 in the Adobe Connect?

Avri Doria: If you want to start talking. This is Avri. Do you want to start talking through (this thing)? I forgot to put my hand up.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Avri. Go ahead, yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. Hand is up, thank you. Yes. So do we want to start - so should 19 was the first place that I found that Alan and I did make a comment on it. So are we doing (that now)? I can talk on that?

Rob Hoggarth: You know, Avri, this is Rob. I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: Or do we still want to talk about doing it? Sorry Rob.

Rafik Dammak: Go.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. I'm sorry. I was immediately jumping to substance, not your process. I'll wait until (we change).

Avri Doria: No. I want to. I just want the chair's permission to get to substance.

Evan Leibovitch: Go.

Rafik Dammak: Avri, if you heard me, I said let's - I found your section (stamp code) and I thought that we should follow it. So I hope that it answered your question. So we can go ahead with (that type of).

Avri Doria: Okay. Great. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: One quick interjection, Avri. I'm sorry. But if either you or you know, whoever is designated could read the comment first because I'm sure that a number of folks are operating from a number of different operating systems and may not see it. So it'd be helpful to introduce each piece with the comment as in the documents.

Avri Doria: Yes. That makes sense and since I know mine got mangled a little I was going to read my comment as well.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. If you want, I can. Yes. If you just want to get started, that's perfect. Thanks.

Avri Doria: All right.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Yes Avri. We have a paragraph in the Adobe Connect so yes, you can go ahead and give your comments and then we can have a discussion. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. Well, Alan's first comment had been asking what are we saying here and what suggestions are we making. I was basically and we're talking about B here. And I was thinking that the paragraph has become pretty much almost superfluous to list it now since the fee

reductions had been spoken of as a sufficient response to this requirement.

So I was responding to Alan's question so perhaps I should have asked Alan to speak before me. But I think we should just eliminate it was my suggestion.

Alan Greenberg: I don't need to speak. My comment speaks for itself I think. I was simply saying that as stated following the reduction from 185 to 47 I don't know what it is asking for, for roll out of multiple IDNs.

I'm not sure if this is a bundling question veiled without the words or if it's asking for some other discount or what. So I don't know what it's asking and I strongly say we shouldn't have it if people in the work group don't know what it means it's not something that should be in the final report. So it either needs to be clarified or eliminated because we don't need fuzzy things that are not understandable. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Rob, you want to comment or your hand was raised?
Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: No. That was the process issue. I was agreeing with Avri that we should probably read the comments first. You've done a good job on this one and we'll just continue that with future comments. Thanks.

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

Andrew Mack: Yes. I understand the confusion I think and I mean this is even from the very, very beginning and I think it's one of our broad goals. My

question is whether or not we are going to put in things that are effectively a contingency if that, right?

I guess have two questions. Number one is if there are - we have talked about the idea of the fee reductions and what we're going to do if the fee reductions aren't accepted. So that's one place that this might have some resonance, might make some sense. And the other thing is are there other things that we can do outside of the 47,000?

And I'm throwing that open. Obviously I support the concept of bundling generally but I'm not trying to force that on the committee. I guess I see this as being valuable in having it and but I agree that we maybe need to make it more precise.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan if I may butt in. If you want to make it more precise can you suggest how you want to make it more precise? Because I'm not sure what direction it should be taking and that was why I raised the question.

Andrew Mack: I think it's a good question. Can I ponder on it (a minute) and get back? Because I just saw your comment right now and I just want to think about it and see if I can come up with some language or recommend to get rid of it. Hello.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes Andrew. I think if Alan wants to answer but we have also Avri in the queue. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I did have an answer and I'm trying to remember what it is now because I lost my train of thought. Let Avri go first.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay, I put my hand up because I thought we would be at C by now but I do have a comment on what Alan just said.

And the thing is we had already spoken in another section of this document of the not posing the possibility that they don't give the fee reductions and I thought that that was a decision that had been made and language had been given, but maybe that's still an open issue that we weren't saying to the Board maybe you do this and if you don't feel like doing this well here's another suggestion for you.

So from that perspective of Andrew's thing, I think, you know, we shouldn't be putting this in just as a backstop. Unless we've got a specific new fee reduction that we are recommending for multiple IDNs, it doesn't belong in a cost reduction top paragraph.

So I think that that's really the issue here. If there's something else that perhaps we should be doing for multiple language people, then perhaps it should be listed in the appropriate section, so - but unless we're going to come up with a new recommendation for cost reductions specifically geared - and I think this was also discussed somewhat in that GAC meeting that they had expected the notion -- I think, or at least some of those participants had -- that across the globe fee reductions made the special build-out fee reduction superfluous and unneeded. Thank you.

And I'll get back to C when we're back to C. So I'll take my hand down and then I'll put it back up when we're ready to move on.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. I remembered why my hand was up. It was in comment to Andrew's suggestion of we don't know if the Board is going to accept our recommendation on fee reduction.

The way I take is if the Board doesn't end up with a significantly reduced fee for those approved applicants, then we have failed, the GAC has failed and so be it, the Board makes the decisions. And they'll have to deal with any aftermath of that.

There is a question in my mind whether the Board will follow our recommendation and the GAC's recommendation and ALAC's recommendation that the \$2 million not be used to fund the fee reduction and I could see the Board coming to a different answer on that than what we've recommended, but that still yields a fee reduction.

So I don't think we need to worry about what if there is no reduction at all in the cost of fees and 185,000 is it and the applicant has to come up with it. I think that there is almost no chance of that unless the whole thing is rejected point blank in which case so be it, we've lost.

But I don't think we need to look at the interim case of they accepted in principle but don't give a fee reduction. It's really an issue of where it's funded from and therefore I don't think this section is applicable. I don't think we need to worry about it in this case. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: This is Evan. I - Alan, I would just to turn something slightly around. If the Board rejects what we are putting forward, then it is not the GAC,

the ALAC and the JAS working group that has failed. It is the Board that has failed the community with the bottom-up process.

Alan Greenberg: I'll accept that answer.

Evan Leibovitch: That is we've got to make that absolutely clear.

Alan Greenberg: And I will Evan. I don't disagree. I'm just saying that that's a contingency that we don't need to address with the minutia in our report.

Evan Leibovitch: I understand.

Alan Greenberg: And...

Evan Leibovitch: And familiar.

Alan Greenberg: Exactly.

Evan Leibovitch: I totally agree with not playing out a whole bunch of what if scenarios.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: The Board, the community, has asked us for recommendations. We are giving recommendations. If the Board chooses to go against that, then it's basically making a statement not only on this particular program but on the entire bottom-up process of its creation. And I'll leave it at that.

Carlton Samuels: Which is one of the reasons I thought I made it very clear that my personal position was that the business of staggered fee are not to be included because you're then doing on the one and on the other handing kind of business and I don't think that's appropriate.

Alan Greenberg: Let's keep on substance and not philosophy at this point. It's Alan speaking.

Carlton Samuels: It's not even a philosophy. It's just I vote to have that section - entire section excised.

Alan Greenberg: I haven't heard any disagreement at this point except Andrew who's going to think about it.

Andrew Mack: Which entire section are you talking about Carlton?

Avri Doria: B.

Carlton Samuels: B.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Well let me look at Alan's comments and see if I can come up with something that would fit what we're trying to do. Okay? If you don't mind putting a bookmark in it and - because I think it is important and if I can't come up with something to the group then we'll pull it out, okay?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. So okay...

Avri Doria: Moving on?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, if there is no comment, I'm not sure how I can conclude in this part. Yes, Avri, you have a suggestion?

Avri Doria: Yes, I have a suggestion for that and I have a moving on. The suggestion for that is at the moment, you know, it looks like either he'll - Andrew will come up with something that convinces everybody that remains or we have a paragraph where B is not excised, it is moved to the bottom and it says there was some support for and then, you know, what Andrew wants to frame in that, you know, alternate position.

Again, it's not an effort to excise alternate viewpoints, but it's to take it out of the mainstream and say these are the things there was consensus on and there was also, you know, support for, strong support for, you know, at least one person argued for, you know, and then the proposition that Andrew wants to make there.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Andrew Mack: Avri, I think that seems reasonable and maybe I could get with you afterwards to try and explain what I'm going at and see if I can get your feedback, okay?

Avri Doria: Sure thing.

Andrew Mack: Thanks.

Avri Doria: I got a whole day ahead of me. It's only 7:00 a.m.

Andrew Mack: That's right. We got lots to do. Let's get going.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, guys. Just I have a question for Andrew. Andrew, when you think that you can give some suggestion or rewording? Not necessarily now. I understand that it cannot be easy, but when you think that you can text - send me something that we can discuss about?

Andrew Mack: Sure. Within the next day or so should be no problem?

Rafik Dammak: Really?

Andrew Mack: Within the next day or so. It should be no problem. I just - I'm mindful of not trying to wordsmith on the fly. I don't think that's the best way to use our committee's time. That's all.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: And can I suggest that Andrew you - at the same time you can work with Seth and Rob on this because it would be good to have them involved in it from the get-go?

Andrew Mack: Absolutely. That sounds great. Well I'll just create a little email chain and we'll just try and work out some language that way, okay?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So we have Alan and then Avri. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Well Avri seemed to be first, but I'll say what I'm going to say very quickly. Just to be clear, I was not arguing for or against the intent of this. I was saying I don't know what it means. And I happen to be supportive of bundling, as it turns out.

All I'm saying is we should not have a prominent item at the top of the report which I as a person who has missed very few of these meetings don't have a clue what we're asking for. And that was the issue. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: That was the reason why it was made reference to the Board resolution to tie to it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Avri?

Avri Doria: Are we moving on?

Rafik Dammak: You raised your hand Avri, so that's why...

Avri Doria: Yes, yes, yes, and what I'm asking is can I go to a new topic yet?

Alan Greenberg: Please.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. That's...

Avri Doria: Okay. Then moving down to C, Alan had also asked are we making a - was reduction of registry service related expenses through modifications to guidelines such as...Alan asked are we making a specific request or just less than replace C with (Gail)'s text. I'm not sure what that was. Need to - oh, yes. This has been going to Rob himself speaking, not Alan.

And then basically I made a comment based on that thing. I think we had specific recommendations about time, for example, in both MR1 and MR2, and I think we also talked about other creative methods.

But again, I didn't think we had a specific reduction in fee, though a few weeks ago we talked about one at some point, but I don't think we ever got to a point of having a specific reduction in fee that we were suggesting for either all SAC, S-A-C, applicants or for some portion of them.

So again, I'm not sure that C belongs here, though it belongs somewhere because we don't have a specific fee reduction we are recommending in this case. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, on - the text was replaced from the one I commented on to what Evan had suggested, at least that's what the comment says it was done and I presume that's correct.

As worded right now, it is really problematic because it talks about modifications to guidelines such as the continuity instrument. Changes to the continuity instrument guidelines is something we've talked about periodically, but at this point I believe is not in the report anywhere, so making reference to something which we then don't talk about in detail is quite problematic.

If I remember the discussion correctly, it was with the intent of changing the continuity instrument from something which would support the - a full-blown registry that's actively trying to be a commercial vehicle and get new registrants and make it viable to a continuity instrument which will keep the registry alive and keep domains working and names resolving without any attempt to try to

make it a viable business. And the cost of those two things are radically different.

We talked about it but I don't believe it ever made it into words in the document. So if indeed...

Carlton Samuels: Alan, this...

Alan Greenberg: ...we want that kind of reduced minimalist continuity instrument, we need to actually mention it in and describe it in some level of specificity. Thank you.

Something I support but it hasn't been done and I'm not the expert on it.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Carlton, did you want to make comment or...

Carlton Samuels: I was going to tell Alan the reason why it ended up that way was that when we ask the question of what would be this reduced reduction in the cost of continuity instrument, what exactly would it cover. You have - the question was would you have it cover just these minimal requirements and what is the charge against those.

The answer was well we don't know that detail so it - the reference was that we expect that there would be a reduction in cost, but we don't know the detail at this time. That was the answer at the time.

So this is probably a representation. It might be a little bit off. But that was my recollection of how we attempted to justify that reduction.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, thanks. One thing in terms of this issue, and I guess it partly goes into Paragraph 20, 21 where I think we're talking about the same thing...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...I'm not sure we're talking about the same thing. I think certainly a separate paragraph is a better place to discuss it. Although - or what we need to put in C is what's in 21 and say the specific recommendation we're making is that it be a fixed 12-month obligation not a - and then if that's a specific recommendation and, you know, I think we may have had consensus on that in the past, so that might be worth capturing that way, but I certainly don't think it needs to be C and Paragraph 20, 21.

And if there's other content that should be brought out separately and I don't know what that other content is. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Avri. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, Paragraph 21 is not what I was referring to. Part of 21 says reduce the time of the continuity instrument but doesn't change the intent of it. What I was suggesting and was discussed earlier and in fact Eric said it was a discussion going on in some other group, and I don't remember exactly what group that was and Eric is not participating at this point.

The intent was not a shorter period of time. If we're going to bring a new gTLD into the world and then it's going to die, I think the one thing we don't want to do is to have names not resolve any more, and 6 months or even 12 months not a very long time in the life of the internet.

And there is not a large cost to keeping a domain alive capturing, you know, what the contents of the registry database is and running it on a disk somewhere. There's no maintenance. You don't even have to renew names. They just stay there forever and it will continue to work.

There's relatively lost cost associated with that. Not zero, but they're ultimately low, and that's what we were talking about earlier and that's the one that was lost along the way. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Avri, you want to reply or to make comment? Avri?

Carlton Samuels: She's probably...

Avri Doria: Sorry, I was muted again. I mute off as quickly as I put my hand down.

I think then that - I remember that discussion. I don't remember though whether that was a recommendation that was global or just for, you know, support-approved applicants or candidates or whatever.

But even so, if we're making that recommendation, it doesn't belong here. It may belong in non-financial methods of support if we're suggesting that somebody named continuity.

By the way, I disagree with the principle of names not resolving. I'm one of those that says if they fail and go out of business, they fail and go out of business. It's sad, but that's just part of this.

But given that there needs to be an instrument, if we have another proposal that is a non-financial solution, then great. We should put it in, but it still doesn't belong here. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thank you, Avri. I saw that there was also some discussion in the chat room. And Andrew is volunteering to give some background to help him and Seth to work on this section.

Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Can I ask a question about the issue of the continuity instrument? We agreed that we would not have enough time to delineate the specific language as how the reductions would be and so this attempt in 21 to say if you reduce the time for it, you might reduce the cost. That was how it came about. Is that not enough?

I'm asking the question.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, this is Rafik. Alan and Avri want to answer that. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I'll just point out that if the group were to agree that the reduced continuity of the type I was talking about is something that we want, we don't need to give numeric numbers. We can just say it in words.

As Avri has pointed out, not everyone agrees and maybe the group doesn't agree, but if we believe as a principle that we don't need to say it must be reduced \$400 a month or \$400 a year or whatever the number is, it simply needs to be stated as a concept. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. I think it's better to not discuss about numeral suggestion because it will be a discussion itself.

Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, I guess I was going to disagree. I think that if we're saying we've already managed to have a consensus saying it should be reduced for support-approved applicants from 6 to 12 months, that is a financial measure because that's a multiplier on one side of the equation.

And I think that Eric's proposal which I also remember in fair detail should be put somewhere else in the document because it isn't a financial proposal. It's a work-around for leading a financial proposal. So it's a different sort of thing that needs to be brought up separately. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. So do you suggest that we put that proposal by Eric or how we can work on that? What kind of work-around are you suggesting? Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay. I just put my hand back up. Perhaps I'm saying, you know, we turn C into the suggestion about the reduction from 6 to 12 month multiplier because that's a specific recommendation on a cost reduction that would belong under that heading that I believe this group already had consensus on.

I think then we could transform the 21, 21 section that currently discusses - that's further reduction recommended, and maybe reductions isn't the right word, but further, you know, adjustments to financial requirements for new gTLD applicants and then 21 could be a development of Eric's notion but certainly done in a straight-forward, understandable manner.

So that's a concrete suggestion if we're going to keep it in. And then we can attach to 21 whatever our consensus value; does it have partial consensus, is there strong support but not consensus, and which I figure it's one of those two. There's either strong support but not consensus or there's partial consensus on it.

I don't think Eric's (paragraph) ever got to the point of a full consensus but there certainly was strong support for it and I leave it up to our co-chairs to figure out after we've described it and talked about it whether it's strong support or whether it's got partial consensus. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Avri you want to comment - okay. So just to clarify, Rob or Seth, do you have any question on this topic so...

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you Rafik. I'm laughing to myself here because I have substantial questions. Not having been around for Eric's proposal is there text that I'm just missing Avri that is in here right now that is quote/unquote Eric's notion or is that somewhere else?

Avri Doria: I don't think it's in here and I think that that's what part of the point that Alan was making, if I understood is that it does seem to have gotten lost.

There's certainly an immense amount of text in email but I think Andrew who made the offer of saying I have talked to Eric a lot about this, I think I understand it and maybe he can help get to the wording, but - or there's finding in some earlier versions from earlier writings in email, but I don't see it in here and I think that that was the point Alan was making is that there was a suggestion that got a lot of conversation, had mixed levels of support that doesn't seem to be reflected in the document.

Andrew Mack: Avri, just to be clear, this is Andrew. I was talking about the earlier piece around supports for IDNs and...

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

Andrew Mack: ...underserved languages...

Avri Doria: I thought...

Andrew Mack: ...which is a big issue that he is also supporting and he and I had multiple discussions. The chat didn't sequence that's all.

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

Andrew Mack: We had already moved on.

Avri Doria: I thought you were referring to this issue. Sorry.

Andrew Mack: No, no, no, no, no. But he and I had lots of conversation with the other ones and so I'm trying to wrap in his thoughts on that. That's all.

Avri Doria: Rob, I can probably help you reconstruct some of it, give you pointers if I do a little bit of searching on what that issue is maybe help you get some first text for people. Although Alan may also be a good one because, you know, he was there even more than me.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. I would note that your recommendation was a conditional one. I think you said that if we decide to put it in then we need to develop Eric's notion in a straight-forward manner, so I think there's still that conditional question whether you all want to do that as a group because it sounds like it's going to be somewhat challenging.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Rob. Andrew, do you want to comment?

Andrew Mack: No, sorry. My hand was up from before. Apologies.

Carlton Samuels: Can I say that is the challenge that I see here with a week tops to go to get this thing finalized, I think we have to call time on this one here. That's my own view.

Rob Hoggarth: Well then to confirm Carlton, what I do have clear guidance on at Avri's recommendation that everyone seemed to - or sent to her, at least no one objected to was to transform C - you know, basically to move the current Paragraph 21 into C and have that be reflected as a quote/unquote cost reduction.

And then what remains is if anyone can suggest some language for potentially adding some other stuff, great, or otherwise as you suggest, there's - the clock has sort of run out on that.

Mr. Chairman, can we keep just for purposes of closure on least this section, did I miss any guidance on D, 19D? Would you guys skip from C to 21?

Alan Greenberg: I don't see (unintelligible).

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. So you skipped D, all right.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Is there a quick resolution to D or not?

Alan Greenberg: I have a comment if you get to me.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So we have Alan and Avri and we should have one hour and half for this call. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. On the continuity instrument I think at the very least we need a statement saying we believe that for the class of applicants we're talking about, the current required continuity instrument is ridiculous, even if we don't provide any answers to it. I think we spent too much time on it to ignore it and not mention it at all.

I personally believe that the full-blown continuity instrument for six months makes absolutely no sense at all. We're going to continue a going operation with the hope of selling it to some other thriving business which is the whole intent of the continuity instrument and then let it drop off the cliff six months later.

I think that makes very, very little sense, but that's something we need to put some words around.

In terms of the Section D on IPv6, again, the paragraph that I commented on is no longer there and was replaced by Evan's. I think the one on there is really very fuzzy right now and basically says we should only require people to do what they feel is necessary for the communities that they're serving and I don't think that addresses the IPv6 issue at all.

I cannot see the Board and the community backing down on IPv6. I think we need to give them viable ways of addressing it. And people who are more knowledgeable than I have said tunneling will functionally work and therefore I think we need ways to making sure that the new registries can provide IPv6 in a ugly, perhaps, but acceptable way, acceptable, that is functional and not be, you know, tilting at windmills of trying to stop the Board's focus on IPv6 as a future direction. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, thanks. On the first issue of the continuing instrument, I think before - you know, I think somebody should write it up and I think we should figure out what level of support we've got support for it.

On D I agree with Alan. I think that D should just be removed because we've already got the requirement under non-financial support for assistance with the whole tunneling response.

And I think, you know, for whatever I think about the IPv6 juggernaut that's being crammed down everybody's throats, it's not something we can do anything about.

Alan Greenberg: Well put.

Rafik Dammak: That's funny laughing. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: No, I was just agreeing.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Strongly.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So Avri, no? Okay. That's it I think for the ITC fix, we can not say that we have full consensus on that. There was I think kind of a discussion on that topic in the mailing list.

Okay, we are about three minutes after the end of this call. If there is no further question or comment, maybe we can stop here today.

Also if there is any other business that you want to talk about, so otherwise we will adjourn this call for today.

Yes Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you Rafik, I'd like to point out that this last half hour was extremely helpful. I think that while it was somewhat confusing to us as staff we will make an effort and collaborate with Andrew to add some additional text here to clear up these comments.

Our goal is to produce revisions based on the discussions that took place today by the end of today so that you guys have another draft to look at. I will preserve the other comments that are not yet resolved.

And for your information there's probably around 12, you know 10 to 15 substantive comments that you can probably run through in the extra time that you have bought.

Can I ask when you intend to have subsequent calls, are you going to continue on the same schedule and just sort of push off the deadline for completing this by a week?

And so does that mean a call Friday and then a call next Tuesday?

Rafik Dammak: I think we need to discuss about the agenda because the previous planning was made the deadline is for the end of this month.

So we need now to update the agenda for the next I think only three goals regarding that. So it depends of the latest version that you are working - you would work with, only it would said so if you can (embed) and include all this comments and new rewording.

So we can make it if you for the next call and continue. But if we need more detailed agenda, so we - maybe we need further discussion later.

I think we have the extra call today.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir, that's true, I was just thinking for the rest of the working group that's not going to be on your drafting call whether you're going to have a call on Friday.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, we will have a call, so we are continuing the calls anyway.

Carlton Samuels: We - can I just say as far as I'm concerned we have until next Tuesday to put this to bed. I don't see us going beyond next Tuesday to wrap this up. We're going to have the call after now the drafting call immediately after the end of this call.

And probably will get some of this stuff organized. And I would suppose that we use Friday's call and have to apologize, I might be traveling on Friday morning at the time so I might not be able to join.

If I get to Miami early I'll be able to join but if I don't I won't be. It would help if all of these little niggling comments we kind of get them out of the way on today's drafting call, it would help.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Carlton. Okay, Rob and Andrew, I think you will have the last calls.

Andrew Mack: Just a quick thing, Carlton I understand what you're saying about trying to move the typos and wordsmithing out of this. But I think we're - a lot of people can't make the drafting call and I just want to make sure that we take the things that we really need guidance on and make sure that they still make it into these calls, even if the wordsmithing goes later.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Andrew I quite agree, and I use niggling comment, niggling is in the sense that they're ticklish, they are substantive but we need to - they raise a lot of issues, that's what I mean.

They raise the issues all over again and that's what I don't want to - us to go down that road. That's why I'm thinking that we can use this drafting call to get substantive agreement from the persons who raised the issues.

So that we move it along, that's what I meant.

Okay, so I think we can end here and then I will ask people who want to - who are going to attend the (ICSA) call to wait, maybe we can take like a break of three or five minutes.

It's already late here and I think it's more late in Australia now. So this call is adjourned for today, thank you everybody for this hard working, we will have to go I think for one more - one week more but we will have the final report hopefully.

Thank you everybody, good night, have a nice day and see you on Friday.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Rafik, take care. Could you all just remain on the line for us, could we just - this is the line we're going to use for the drafting call.

Andrew Mack: Carleton?

Carlton Samuels: Yes sir.

Andrew Mack: Yeah, it's Andrew, I have a conflict right now, I can't - I'm sorry, I just - an hour and a half is about as much as I can do. The - I will get back to you with the language that I promised in the next day and a half so if you will just table that for right now and get back to you on that and we'll take a look at whatever notes you come out of the drafting call with, okay?

Carlton Samuels: Yes sir. Good, that's agreed.

Andrew Mack: I appreciate it, I'm sorry, I'd like to stay on, just like a lot of people I'm just a little full up.

Carlton Samuels: I understand, but that's important. As long as you can get that bit in we will kind of you know and run it by Seth and Rob first thing.

Andrew Mack: Okay yeah, will do. Cheers, thanks.

Glen de Saint Gery: Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Hi Glen.

Glen de Saint Gery: Hi, yes it's Glen. Carlton I'll leave the lines open and you're going to take a little break?

Carlton Samuels: Actually no I was thinking we'd just go straight into it Glen.

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay fine, good. Because the operator has been informed that's all right. And you want the recording to go on as well Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, keep the recording on yes.

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay, thanks so much Carleton.

Carlton Samuels: Rafik you still - Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes sir?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, you're still in charge my friend, I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: So somebody tell me am I supposed to be here in this or not.

Carlton Samuels: You're supposed to be hearing it Avri, it's very important.

Avri Doria: I'm supposed to be here, okay fine, then I'll stay since I can.

Carlton Samuels: It's very important for you and Alan and...

Avri Doria: Usually on Tuesdays I can't do it but I can today.

Carlton Samuels: Oh lovely. Because the comments, Avri what I would suggest we do is we give Seth and Rob an opportunity to as they usually do to say what they hear and what we are asking for.

And then could we just go look to the comments and between the several of us that are on here, Cheryl is on, I hope she is, she usually is very useful, very good at kind of slipping down the middle here some of these things.

Can we just go to them and get them out of the way? I think it would help the others since you know most of the substantive discussion is staying in this small group.

Maybe we can get those out of the way, the ones that are still lingering. Would that be useful?

Rob Hoggarth: I'm sorry Carlton were you talking to Seth and me?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, yes, yes Rob. I think I will give you an opportunity to do your usual feedback and then we close off that.

And then if we could just go to some of the comments, the comments that are left with the small group here and just work them through.

Rob Hoggarth: Certainly happy to do that depending on who's on the call, folks maybe be able answer certain ones and if we can't then we can skip them and at least you know try to drill down a little bit. How much time do we have?

Rafik Dammak: I think we have at least 40 minutes.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. Yeah I think today's call went well in terms of looking at certain sections, you made it clear just the decision with respect to the FAQs. Seth you can - Seth can clarify my interpretation of our IM conversations that he's in a position to go ahead and move forward with setting up a wiki page so that we have a link and things like that.

I think the management of that page and things that come subsequent to the webinar and the rest will be back in Karla's capable hands but

that seemed like very clear direction from the working group so we can proceed with that plan and pull the FAQs out of this final report document.

There didn't seem to be a tremendous amount of interest in the background section. But we're going to go back through and clean, purge, add you know the various things that (Earl) suggest in terms of making sure the links work, filling in any of the areas that are (unintelligible) in terms of citations or (unintelligible) maybe noticed in certain places where we just realized that the document continues to be in a state of flux.

So we are putting in at paragraph X because you see in a couple of places we put in at paragraph X and then the paragraph numbers changed. So it's somewhat in a state of flux.

I think you had some general good discussions and folks were glad somewhat to have some additional time to go through this and I think the time can be well spent in terms of further polishing and dealing with some of these comments that we haven't had a chance to get to.

Finally and I'll confess that this financial support and the edits here are somewhat challenging. If Eric were on the call I would say this, that is the notion of pulling some of his brilliant thoughts to a straight forward very pithy statement (unintelligible) challenge for Seth and I having not been on those previous calls.

And so we (unintelligible) and Avri's offer of some support there but my vision is you guys are going to end up with just the revisions to see, that's not (unintelligible) D and then paragraphs 20 and 21.

That's my instinct at present. Makes it more streamlined, I think (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: I don't know why I'm having...

Man: Rob you're cutting out badly.

Rob Hoggarth: And I'm sorry, I don't know why that is, I'm literally six inches from the phone, I hear clicking in the background, I don't know if that's from someone else's line.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I hear the clicking myself.

Rob Hoggarth: And that's not from my line. So I'm sorry, so I'll repeat the last little bit there. I think the challenge is sort of what does the - this A, financial support cost reductions end up looking like.

I think it ends up looking like a much more streamlined section in which we rewrite C as Avri suggested you know basically pulling in the concept of Paragraph 21.

And then it seems to me the D - there was consensus that D disappears and then absent you know some brilliant last minute recitation of Eric's previous thoughts that that sort of doesn't make it into the final version.

If someone comes up with something over the next several days that's fantastic and we can plug that back in.

Evan Leibovitch: Guys this is Evan.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I know that I seem to be the only one that is still supporting something to try and bring across the intent of D. But have we truly given up on trying to give support to candidates without making them dependent on the fund in terms of the IPv6 roll out.

I mean I heard the word juggernaut and yeah, this is a matter of maybe you know trying to light a candle in the wind in advance of you know this overwhelming common wisdom that you can't do anything to block the inevitable and quick roll out of IPv6.

But who are we kidding, you know if right now somebody's in a community, especially in the developing world where this kind of thing is going to be found, you know do they have the infrastructure to roll out IPv6 at the very beginning?

You know that might end up being one of those costs that almost becomes a deal breaker it seems to me. And so you know maybe D as it's currently worded doesn't belong there.

But can we really absolutely be silent that candidates are up to the whims of the fund to be able to figure out if they can meet the IPv6 requirement?

Rob Hoggarth: Alan this is Rob. When I said that was coming out, I interpreted the working group's discussion that it was handled well elsewhere and you've got three full paragraphs at 48, 49 and 50 that talk about IPv6

support so my interpretation of your discussion wasn't that you aren't mentioning it in the final report but that it just didn't fit in with Paragraph 19.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, yeah sorry, I'm looking at 48 and 49 now. Like for instance I'm looking at 49 and already you know while this will be a difficult decision for the ICANN board to make you know we're already doing second guessing.

You know I really, really dislike wording that sort of tries to say well we know this is what you want but you know we're here to make recommendations of what we think is in the best interest of candidates.

If the board is going to override us, the board is going to override us and we can't do anything about that. But doing you know this kind of second guessing and while we know this is what you want and you know getting into the second guessing and mind reading.

To me that kind of tone does not belong in a document like this. You know to me I'm okay with taking out D but 49 needs an overhaul because I really, really hate that kind of mind reading kind of wording.

Man: I agree with you there Alan, saying if you exercise that mind reading bit it would work. And I think that it would say all that we need to say.

Evan Leibovitch: Well do you understand what I mean by the mind reading tone?

Man: Yeah, I know what you mean by that and as I read this now I see what you're saying, it just jumps out at you.

Evan Leibovitch: Rob do you get it too?

Rob Hoggarth: I understand...

Man: Can the rest of us get into this please?

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, don't ask me, I'll let the working group members.

Carlton Samuels: Rafik is up. Rafik you still with us?

Evan Leibovitch: I think it was Alan wanting to talk.

Man: Okay in the absence of a chair I'll simply talk.

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: I was just muted but carry on there Alan, Rafik is on.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you. Evan you started off as saying we shouldn't say that we can't stop the juggernaut of IPv6 deployment. We don't need to stop it, it's stopped.

You know there are significant problems we know there are, what I believe we are not going to stop is the ICANN intent to try to push IPv6 because of the issues.

And at this point if we're looking to save costs from - for new registries, I think we should be fighting that they shouldn't have to implement the extensible protocol with registrars because there are other ways of doing it.

And that's a bloody expensive thing to implement, but we're not. We're not taking core parts of registry requirements and saying don't do it because these guys are poor and maybe they can get around it.

On IPv6 there are some real issues of not having access in some places or the expertise not being available. And I think those are what we should address.

I think the solution, the viable solutions without having to try to either mind read or change the direction of elephants which are moving is to provide you know pass through type capabilities, whether it's tunneling or whatever.

And to provide expertise and perhaps financial help if finance is the issue of getting IPv6 support. So it's expertise, financial help if necessary and tunneling if that's an appropriate way where access is just not physically available.

I don't think we need to go into more than that, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: And like I just said, I'm okay with taking out that D section, I'm just suggesting a slight reworking of 49 to take out the mind reading tone of it.

Alan Greenberg: That's fine with me, the mind reading was only put in because other people were saying - were asking for what I believe was impossible. There's no point in us flogging really dead horses.

Man: Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, okay quickly, so we've already decided that we will take out D so I don't have to argue for why taking out D any more and I'm totally in favor of getting rid of weasel words wherever they are in the thing.

I think somebody going through and excising every single weasel word would be just fine and make our recommendations flat without any oh but please sir.

So yeah.

Evan Leibovitch: So you understand my point about 49.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, that's what she said.

Avri Doria: I call them weasel words, you call them something else.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, so we're good on that.

Man: We'll do our deweaselizing effort on that paragraph.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: So 49 will be appropriately unweaseled.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Man: We'll make the effort and you'll tell us whether we did a good job.

Carlton Samuels: Seth, you listening?

Seth Green: Yes, I am Carlton thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay so you don't have anything you want to add here Seth?

Seth Green: Yeah, Olivier has had his hand up for a while though. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah hi, this is Olivier. I agree with unweaselizing the paragraph, definitely. My views on IPv6 are completely opposed to Alan's and to some extent Avri's but that's not get into one of these debates because we'll spend hours on it, thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Olivier, appreciate that sir. Cheryl? Cheryl still on? No Cheryl's not on, okay. All right, so we got that one sorted out. Can we move to the other one, Rob were you complete with your setup because we got to the part of addressing the comments in the flow of what you were saying.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. I mean and that finished my summary, if you now would like to turn to some additional - and that was very helpful guidance on 49 so we've added that to our list.

If you would like to then move just to - you now in the time allotted just start addressing additional comments we can just go through the document.

There's not another comment until Page 16 Paragraph 37.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, let's do that.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. Let me read the comment and then let you all react to it. I'm sorry Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: I've got a question, yeah, on that decision, I guess that the comments that I put into the comment site aren't in this document yet, is it worth bringing those up now or do you want to wait.

Carlton Samuels: Yes Avri, please bring them up right now.

Avri Doria: Okay in which case I have one at Paragraph 33.

Carlton Samuels: Great.

Avri Doria: Right, yes. Basically the only thing I had here is at the end it talks about our deferred to cover the cost of application fee reductions for support approved candidates and I just figured since we also mentioned elsewhere that it can be used to argument the fund or foundation which probably mentioned that second use here as well.

And the note I wrote was is it also worth mentioning that beyond this use auction funds could be added to the money available to the yet to be established foundation.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, it is worth our putting it there. We have lots of discussion around that.

Avri Doria: I just wanted to give the wording I had put in my comment, that's all.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks Avri, we'll go back and capture that.

Avri Doria: Right, then I had something to add to your 37 comment so I'll wait for that.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you and just another housekeeping note Carlton and Alan have already submitted some comments.

I've interpreted those as mainly just straight edits and in what I was able to glean from them, they did not change the substance but we're only direction at cleaning things up.

So that's why I'm skipping the 37 because I didn't see anything else that was...

Carlton Samuels: Yes sir, you're quite right, it wasn't substantive changes, just changing the wording a little bit.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay and one other thing, and I'm sorry I skipped it, you had made a comment Carlton on the call a little bit ago about staggered fees and renewed a pitch to take out a reference to staggered fees.

I did not interpret that as getting you know any support so my interpretation is that staggered fees stay.

Carlton Samuels: Yes sir, you didn't just - it's not been supported.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, thank you. Yeah Paragraph 37 I just asked this question because I wanted to be clear about the previous discussions that you all had that I listened in on.

And what I asked was in reference specifically to the last sentence of Paragraph 37 where we say only qualified support approved candidates would benefit from these mechanisms.

I asked can you all please confirm that because I heard different things on the call and wasn't sure what the consensus was.

Alan Greenberg: Alan, I'd like to speak.

Carlton Samuels: Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, we're certainly not talking about making any recommendations to the general applicant, so any recommendation we make is for supported applicants in my mind.

I - the trouble I had with leaving this one in as it is worded is that the staggered fees were always in relation to the rebates that would be given if an application was not successful.

And it's not clear to what extent there will be rebates if a supported application is not successful and therefore the staggering is very much a fuzzy issue in my mind.

And that's hwy I was questioning whether we should leave it in as it's worded right now. I can live with it, but you know it's a little bit awkward, thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Alan took us briefly back to Paragraph 22 Carlton so I guess if you can...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Alan (unintelligible) I think it's a clarification, Alan's quite right that it was intended - it was linked to - strongly linked, I would say not casually linked but strongly linked to the rebating notion as I recall.

So I don't have a disagreement with Alan on that. What he's thrown into the ring is whether or not we shouldn't reflect that notion in the paragraph on staggered fees.

And I'm perfectly happy to hear because that's my recollection, my recollection that staggered fees was linked, not casually but it was linked to the rebate option.

Rob Hoggarth: I'm getting confused at this point where we are.

Carlton Samuels: Oh you raised the issue of staggered fee.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, sorry I may have raised that incorrectly, sorry.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. We are agreed that it's only support approved candidates who benefit from the mechanisms.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, I'm not sure why when I did this review I linked it to staggered fees, I don't see the relevance to that at this point in time.

Carlton Samuels: Oh we just assumed that you had backed it because it was a (Chad).

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: But I think you are right, in saying that maybe what you need to do is to make it very clear that the staggered fee was just not sitting out there on its own.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay yeah, but I don't think this comment is in relation to the staggered fees, I think that was incorrect right now and I'm not quite sure what - I need to read it again, why don't we let Avri talk.

Carlton Samuels: Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah, thanks. I'm still on 37 with the qualified support approved candidates with benefit. And I agree that the mechanisms defined for fee reduction in this are only applicable to support approved candidates.

What I'm concerned about and so maybe it can be cleared with just a clarification, a sentence is that for example the fund could give money to non-qual support approved candidates.

And as so if somebody submits a proposal for a way to provide a service to many applicants and they are not themselves an applicant.

Now that's specifically referred to the mechanisms in use - I mean you know so that's the problem I have with that sentence is that certainly fee reductions only apply to them.

And what we want it to say and this is the part that's difficult to get said is if a applicant is applying for money from the foundation to build a...

Carlton Samuels: Mega Iris.

Avri Doria: No, no, no. Not to build to basically registry's purposes in other words they want to borrow money because they are a registry and they need to buy some hardware. And it's not a wider proposal. Then it's only to FACs that it's proposable.

So for the individual applicant it is true that only support approved applicants as applicants can get aid through (SAARC) approval.

But others could who weren't applicants and who weren't asking for the money for their own application's purposes...

Carlton Samuels: Right.

Avri Doria: ...could still submit a proposal that benefited many applicants.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, so what you're saying...

Avri Doria: I understand that's hard to say but there's a distinction there (actually).

Carlton Samuels: I think I understand what you're - so let me see if (I say). If you add a sentence that says where funds are - foundation funds, funds available to the foundation may be otherwise attached.

Avri Doria: Well, yes. I could almost see two sentences. One of them that says insofar as funds and - insofar as fund requests pertain fully to a single applicant that applicant must be support approved candidate.

Insofar as proposals referred to services that may benefit multiple...

Carlton Samuels: That applicant.

Avri Doria: ...FACs.

Carlton Samuels: Applicant.

Avri Doria: Then - right. Multiple applicants.

Carlton Samuels: Right.

Avri Doria: You know those are permitted as well. Obviously the sentence is not right.

But those are the two ideas.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: That - right. And (Seth) and Rob, does that answer your question? Are you clear on this distinction that I've been trying to make? I'm not sure everybody agrees with it but that's the distinction (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I'm going to muddy the water before, so you may want to hear from me before you ask them that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Yes go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: We now (have an) issue that the first one that I would file a minority report over if I don't agree with what it says. We're advocating that a foundation be created because we believe it is the necessary requirement to be able to use funds from auctions and things like that. Foundation or equivalent because we believe it's an essential way of supporting the applicants that we're - that our business is to support.

I very strongly believe that such a foundation if needed anyway even if we never had this discussion and there are a whole bunch of things that in its lifetime which could last decades it might do.

And I do not believe it is our job at all to try to restrict what it could do. Now if someone wants to fund lollipops in lollipop deprived areas because we believe if people suck on lollipops they will use the Internet better, that the foundation could do.

If the groups (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: That (doesn't) disagree with what I said.

Alan Greenberg: Pardon me?

Carlton Samuels: But I think that's exactly what Alan (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: That doesn't disagree with what I said.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not finished yet.

Carlton Samuels: Oh okay.

Alan Greenberg: If the group that wants to give out lollipops happens to also be applying for a GTLD so be it. All we're talking about is that a foundation should be created and its funds should be available for - to use to support applicants under this program. I don't believe we should say anything else about what it can or cannot fund.

Avri Doria: I think we almost still agree. My point was about using it for their own application for their own registry build-out whereas what you said is that an applicant who happened to also be wanting to do something for the public of eating lollipops, you know, it can be any applicant.

And what I think is since we are recommending this we are making a recommendation to the foundation that when considering requests from applicants that...

Carlton Samuels: Do not just (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...they should be (SAARC) approved if they pertain solely to the (applicant) (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: To the application. Yes.

Avri Doria: Right. So I think we're sort of agreeing.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I mean if X says I want some money to help me build my application. By the way as part of this I intend to try to build a general registry for Africa or registrar for Africa or whatever, that's a valid thing for the fund to consider.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Not under this process.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, and I think...

Alan Greenberg: (The process) is solely to support applications and applicants under the new GTLD Program.

That's not to preclude the fund doing other things in parallel with it even in the same timeframe and even to the same target audience but not in support of their applications.

Carlton Samuels: So did we - can we just have a sentence that says this does not preclude the fund from engaging in other mechanisms that might be worthwhile.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think that's said earlier on actually. I don't remember for sure.
Rob (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: So we leave it at that. If you say that sentence would you not be okay with that Avri because I understand what you're (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Are we dropping this last sentence?

Carlton Samuels: No, we're not dropping the last sentence.

Avri Doria: Okay, we're clarifying it.

Rob Hoggarth: Clarifying it, right. So we say (while) clarifying support would benefit from these mechanisms, the fund we would not preclude - the working group would not preclude the fund engaging in other support activities, something of that nature. Would that work?

Alan Greenberg: I'm lost. At this point I would need to see it.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, well we'll take a shot at it and then I'll just flag that this is an area that you look at. I mean we'll make sure when we produce redline and cleans that you clearly see what the redlines are.

Carlton Samuels: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: This has been very helpful though. And I think the key element there that really helped me is that it's benefit - you know only qualified (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: The benefits are not only for our support approved candidates from the fund. That others could benefit from it. That's the idea.

Alan Greenberg: But we're only talking about this program.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: But we're not restricting it from doing other things and...

Carlton Samuels: We're not restricting it from doing other things.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...some of us (has)...

Carlton Samuels: That's what we want to get into here. So you could put the words (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I'd really like to hear what Rob thought he understood.

Rob Hoggarth: Well I thought I understood it then, until we had the last couple sentences.

Let - yes, give me 30 seconds to sort of work it through in my...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: ...head and spit it out to you and then see if this makes sense. The idea is and I'm sorry if I'm - if I go back to my own 101 here. The idea is that there was an overall expectation that the working group comes up with this foundation concept or as Alan says, a like type mechanism.

This foundation does two things. One, it manages this program according to the recommendations that the working group is outlining in this final report. The foundation also has another life to it or can have a broader life in which it also funds additional programs. That doesn't take away from anything you're saying here. What you're saying is in addition, you know, some of these - the foundation can participate in additional activities that are of benefit to the Internet community.

Is that too broad a statement?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Avri Doria: I - no, I - this is Avri. If I can add to what you said, yes, to the Internet community. And I think the piece that Alan and I were sort of agreeing on but having trouble doing so is that it can even benefit the applicants in this round.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, who are not support approved applicants, right?

Avri Doria: Exactly. It just needs to be a general thing. So yes, I think you've got - I think that is it.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. We'll give it our best shot and look to you all for approval. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Is it reasonable to say that even the things that the fund is meant to fund are meant to be of indirect benefit to supported applicants?

So in other words it's one thing to say okay, there's two facilities. One is to give money to the supported applicants to help them do what they're doing. But the other component of this is giving to other efforts that will also reduce the barriers to entry of supported applicants but it might also help others.

Avri Doria: (Correct).

Carlton Samuels: So we're talking about two different levels. So there's direct contribution that is the fund will give money to applicants. And then there's the indirect meaning the fund will - can give money to other efforts that will reduce the barriers to entry of certain applicants.

Is that not a reasonable way to put this?

Avri Doria: (This is Avri). I think so. I think it goes so there's the third option which is and the fund could decide to do something that doesn't have anything to do with, you know, this round of applications. It could be preparing itself for who knows what for the second round. So there's other things it can do.

But in relation to this program I think your A and B are exactly, the indirect and direct is a good explanatory mechanism.

Man: Yes. And I don't even think that we have to put in a time or a round of restriction of what we're talking about.

Carlton Samuels: No, there's no time around of restrictions. Just an effort that will...

Man: But this (ends) with relation (to the program).

Carlton Samuels: But can we go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, if this foundation wants to support university research in alternatives to the D&S process...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...then that is a completely viable thing for ICANN to fund.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: If it wants to see a - fund a university chair in esoteric uses of Internet domain names that's something it could fund. It has nothing to do (with) GTLD.

Avri Doria: Those are two projects I support.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I agree.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: (Unintelligible).

Carlton Samuels: We - I think (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Let's not lose that because that's an important issue that made the resolution.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. I think that is accepted Alan.

Avri Doria: And I intend to apply for money in both of those areas.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: So Rob (unintelligible) fund this?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. I think we have some good direction there. Before we go forward and I apologize, if we can take a quick step back because one of the concerns I have as I have shared with (Seth) is sometimes edits do raise potential issues. And there - and I misspoke earlier Carlton when I said that all of your comments and all of Alan's additional ones here were non-substantive. One of your comments did cause me to pause. And I would like to get confirmation from the Drafting Team as to our correct understanding.

If you could all look back at paragraph 27 I believe it is. And Carlton you can help me a bit with this.

You asked for some edits. We were talking about the make-up of this working group to advise ICANN about the creation of the foundation. And we were calling it the Board Foundation Recommendation Working Group.

And paragraph 27 says the working group recommends that members of this Board Foundation Recommendation Working Group be drawn from, you know, all of the ICANN supporting organizations. You made an edit to suggest that it was not the Board Foundation Recommendation Working Group but the Board - the Foundation of the Board.

And so I want to take a pause and go back to that to either confirm your understanding or mine because mine was from your discussions that first you all talked about the make-up of the working group that was going to be advising ICANN. Then in later paragraphs you actually talk about something different.

But I want to confirm the understanding, the consensus understanding of paragraph 27 and I probably completely (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: That works for me. Your 20 - this is Avri. Your 27 works for me.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Avri Doria: I mean that's kind of what I thought we were doing.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay so I just - and I don't want to call you out on this Carlton other than you seem to have a different interpretation. I just want to - fine.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. That my interpretation was a little different but I - again I'm going to be - I don't want to raise and reopen this. I'm guided.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Guided. It's the working group that is the issue here.

Avri Doria: Yes, because that group will then...

Carlton Samuels: The Board Foundation.

Avri Doria: Right. That group will then determine what the Board does.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: I mean what the foundation looks like, that...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...I don't think we're getting into that at all.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. So it's my mistake Rob. I over analyzed it.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. Thank you for being open to that discussion Carlton. I appreciate it.

Avri since I didn't have the benefit of being able to print out your wiki comments and didn't have the time to annotate Alan's version, and Alan by the way I'm now on 48 hours without power not just 10.

Avri Doria: Oh really? I didn't realize you...

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...powerless.

Carlton Samuels: Where are you Rob, in New York?

Rob Hoggarth: No. Washington, D.C., the suburbs of Washington.

Carlton Samuels: Oh good Lord.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. (PEPCO) is famous for its incompetence.

Carlton Samuels: Oh yes. I live in Alexandria.

Avri Doria: I can't get home but I have power.

Rob Hoggarth: Well and so with that caveat Avri the next comment I have is not until paragraph 52. Do you have anything between 37 and 52?

Avri Doria: Yes. I think so. Let me see. I think I had one at 42. Now let me see. Oh yes, that last sentence. Most foundations and donors do not have

sufficient Internet governance related expertise to make proper individual grants to our support candidates.

I found that a really problematic statement. We shouldn't go around judging what talents they do or don't. I think though that we were talking about the relevance of a (SAARC) recommendation to those funders as well because of the work that will have been done and so on.

So, you know, I agree that we want to try and bring donors into the fund and I think that external donors would also that don't want to come into the fund should be guided by (SAARC) recommendations if they care. It's at least part of their stuff.

But I don't think we should go around talking about the expertise they don't have.

Man: Agreed.

Carlton Samuels: Agreed. Strike it.

Rob Hoggarth: So delete the sentence. Delete it.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I would.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Strike it. Good catch.

Avri Doria: So yes, the first sentence is fine. Yes. I mean that's what it says. They can give one check and then they don't have to deal with it.

And so yes, that's great. So that was my comments there.

Carlton Samuels: Let's strike the second sentence beginning with most foundations.

Rob Hoggarth: And besides...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: ...I don't think the sentence was right anyway. It's not clear that the skill they would need would be Internet governance related expertise.

Carlton Samuels: Nope. No.

Avri Doria: That's true too, yes.

Carlton Samuels: No.

Rob Hoggarth: I mean and the sentence without that is probably true for us also that we don't have the expertise.

Man: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: And we're doing it anyway.

Avri Doria: Okay. My next comment was and it's B just before 44 where you say support a relief and that was a glossary clarification. I think support is good. I think relief is problematic but you asked the question.

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: Okay (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: I gave an answer.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. And thanks. And this was a much earlier comment. I think this was a (Carla) one. So you're just commenting that this - it remains nonfinancial support period.

Avri Doria: I would think so, yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Avri Doria: The question was there so I answered it.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Avri Doria: At 45A I got a little confused in this. I think for example I - the notion of 45A and the note I had, I'm not sure I agree with this. People can start doing this anytime and they don't need to be, you know, and the need won't be dissipated until April 30. Oh okay.

So people were saying oh it's already so late. But he needs application (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: That was the intent. That it was late.

Avri Doria: Right. But, you know, some people are going to finish writing their applications, you know, not recommended but on April 29th. And so assistance will be needed until then.

So A, I don't think, you know, we necessarily need to wait until the whole report is approved before this aid starts. And second of all, I think it's going to be needed for at least another six, seven months. So I think there's time for it.

Rob Hoggarth: So are you suggesting that the parenthetical disappear?

Man: I would.

Avri Doria: Yes, I would say yes. Just get rid of, you know, the parenthetical because yes.

Rob Hoggarth: How about due to timing this support may be problematic for the first round period?

Carlton Samuels: Because and so in the context of this.

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: Identify this potential problem (but say we advocate).

Carlton Samuels: It's within the context of this working group recommendation.

Avri Doria: I think this is a nonfinancial support. I think as the wiki is built showing the kinds of mix and matching. I think there's plenty of time to help people write their application, even the people that I know...

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...that are money bag people are still just writing their application questions and answers now. I mean that activity has basically just started. Most people (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I agree with you Avri.

Avri Doria: ...the next guide book before you could - until the next guide book comes out you can actually almost have a maybe a draft because you really don't know the question you're being asked yet.

Carlton Samuels: I agree with you (okay).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I mean (we) know that they're going to - so it's not late.

Carlton Samuels: We can strike it just for closure.

Avri Doria: Let's put it this way. As a contractor I'm still hiring myself out helping people write applications. So I think in terms of our pro bono service there's still lots of opportunity.

Rob Hoggarth: Right because you would potentially say you would write - do it for free for some applicants who couldn't otherwise afford it.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: Exactly. And so that's what this non-financial support is is doing the same thing some of us are doing as consultants for people with bags of money for free for others.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay great. I will strike the parenthetical and change un to of in the paragraph 45.

Avri Doria: Yes. My next comment was on D which was the one about for registries located in IP or V6 connectivity is limited or not available. ICANN will facilitate support.

And my indication there was I'm not sure how ICANN facilitates. Certainly a commitment to encourage support from V6 providers since enforcing the decision, (recording) V6 seems reasonable. But I'm not sure what kind of facilitation is within ICANN's remit.

So I was looking for like encourage, promote, whatever. But facilitation, unless we could say what we mean by facilitate I had problem with that as the word.

Rob Hoggarth: And should will be should or is will fine?

Avri Doria: I think...

Man: It is.

Avri Doria: ...it has to be should or must.

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: But we can't - I mean yes. We're putting out requirements. We're not being descriptive. We're being normative.

Rob Hoggarth: Right.

Avri Doria: And will is kind of like a normative, I mean it's a descriptive.

Rob Hoggarth: So ICANN should encourage support from IPv6 providers to provide IPv6 blah, blah, blah.

Avri Doria: I think we could even go stronger. Could promote, you know.

Carlton Samuels: Promote.

Rob Hoggarth: Promote, okay.

Carlton Samuels: Should promote. ICANN should promote.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, then at H, I was just asking is it still the case? I thought they were translating it. Oh no, in all scripts and allow from (IBM). Never mind my question was stupid. Of course we're not.

Okay, and then I didn't...

Rob Hoggarth: I'll put a slash between for and by. Okay.

Avri Doria: Right. And then I didn't have anything again until I think support for third parties facilitated. That's an unnumbered paragraph between 47 and 48. So I guess it's a part of 47 but I don't think that would be difficult but.

Carlton Samuels: (Who have) collected.

Avri Doria: Yes (for from) - then there was someone had marked this as unclear. Do we need a page where entities will each provide assistance can be listed? If yes, maybe we should be more specific.

And then I say I think yes and I agree. This should be more explicit. I think the wiki is a start but I would be looking for a function or like a clearinghouse/matchmaker, i.e. something active.

Rob Hoggarth: And I think at some point I'd put in an edit, a matchmaking list but...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: ...what I...

Carlton Samuels: Why don't we just call it a clearinghouse?

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. So are you thinking then that there is a - an introductory paragraph right in there under support for third parties facilitated by ICANN?

Carlton Samuels: Yes. And we said ICANN...

Avri Doria: That would be good. Yes. That's good. Something that explains that and talks a little bit...

Carlton Samuels: Explain what we mean.

Avri Doria: ...more. Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. We'll work on that. And by the way there's still and this is something we made a conscious decision on. Because of the formatting and ultimately looking at a table of contents we did not break out in a lot of these headings whether it was A or B or subpart, something else yet. And once it all comes together then we can do that. So that's why you've got some things are bolded and some things are not.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: But that's part of the final proofing.

Avri Doria: Right.

Carlton Samuels: Moving right along.

Avri Doria: My next - okay my next thing was an answer to a question Andrew asked in 52 and - yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay (wait a second) because we have...

Avri Doria: Oh we have some (relief) for them, okay.

Rob Hoggarth: I just want to confirm and we kind of skipped it. We skipped 45, I'm sorry, 47D where I think again this was (Carla) had flagged the term underserved markets and said, underserved markets, developing economies, etcetera, consistency with glossary, so I guess there, just to acknowledge if we will go back and make sure that we're using the same terminology there.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Avri Doria: Sounds good.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. And then just also to confirm although it wasn't a flag comment, previously in this call we talked about cleaning up the (weasel) words, (de-weaseling) paragraph 49.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: We'll do that, okay.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, next Avri is the (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Okay, 52 it's responding to Andrew Mack's question of, because it had mentioned the (IT) wiki and of course and not sure why we're calling this particular.

And really when it was being written that was the first example that came to our mind. What I think is there should be a set of examples here. You know the (IQ) wiki is probably not the right one anymore.

But, you know, there - whether it's the (COCO) or whatever, there should probably just be an example perhaps bulleted list of some of the examples of information places that, you know, just so this is clear and that's for. For example there are a couple efforts undergoing at the moment where people are giving template answers to the questions. There are places that are giving descriptions of how to build a V6 tunnel. There may be places that are giving descriptions of how to roll your own registry, how to do your own backend, there - etcetera.

So if we can just somehow, maybe it's not an explicit list but an implicit list defining like the things I just said, you know, sites that give help in answering questions, sites that explain how to build IPv6 tunnels, sites that explain how to create a registry, something like that is what I meant.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Avri Doria: As opposed to just an IT wiki which, you know, is probably happening but is just one example of that kind of thing.

Man: Guys, sorry. I've got a hard stop at half past. So I'll follow-up by email.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. I have to run. I mean but I really would like to get through the next two little bit. Is that - so from my reading Rob, there's about seven other comments that are here.

Rob Hoggarth: I'm quickly counting. We've got to 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, just about 15.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Guys I will have to...

Rob Hoggarth: So we've made good progress.

Carlton Samuels: (All right).

Rob Hoggarth: So maybe we just...

((Crosstalk))

Evan Leibovitch: ...(unintelligible) so I'll see you guys later.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks Evan.

Carlton Samuels: All right Evan. Take care.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Carlton Samuels: Bye.

Rob Hoggarth: Maybe the approach Carlton is just to continue to do this in the calls remaining. Because I think we're making, you know, as we go through this you guys are doing a great job coming up with suggestions. It's simply a matter of getting you to as a group be able to focus on them.

So I mean if you just - as your agendas for the remaining calls it could be simply just to go through and flag these.

Carlton Samuels: All right. Because I think we have to call it right now.

Rob Hoggarth: Sure. What I will do is as I indicated, I will keep these in and so...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: ...in the next version and (Seth) and I hope to have something done by, you know, midnight tonight or early tomorrow morning another draft version.

And then perhaps you and Rafik could ask working group members to just, you know, add to the comments.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: And that would be a way to be more efficient with the future conversations.

But this was great. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. All right, thank you everybody. I think we have to call it now.

Man: Okay, thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Take care. Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you very much.

Carlton Samuels: All right.

Man: Thanks everyone.

END