

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

Friday 02 September 2011 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the SO/AC new gTLD Applicant Support Working Group (JAS) Friday 02 September 2011 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-jas-20110902-en.mp3>

On page :

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Wiki page link:

JAS WG Final Report -- WG Comments.

<https://community.icann.org/display/jaswg/SO-AC+New+gTLD+Applicant+Support+Working+Group+%28JAS-WG%29>

The mailing list public archives can be viewed at:

<http://forum.icann.org/lists/soac-newgtldapsup-wg>

Participants on the Call:

GNSO

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

Avri Doria - NCSG

Andrew Mack - CBUC

Krista Papac - RrSG

At-Large:

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large

John Rahman Kahn - Individual - Adobe Connect

ICANN staff

Kurt Pritz

Rob Hoggarth

Seth Greene

Karla Valente

Glen de Saint Gery

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair
Carlton Samuels - LACRALO - At Large - WG co-chair
Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council
Alex Gakuru - NCSG
Cintra Sooknanan - At-Large
Baudoin Schombe - At-Large
Dev Anand Teelucksingh - LACRALO
Alain Berranger - Individual
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Dave Kissoondoyal - At-Large
Elaine Pruis - Minds and Machines

Coordinator: Good morning. I'd like to remind all parties today's conference is being recorded. If anyone has any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the second of September and on the line today we have Rafik Dammak, Tijani Ben Jemaa, John Rahman Kahn is on the Adobe Connect room, Avri Doria, Evan Leibovitch, Alan Greenberg.

And for staff we have Rob Hoggarth, Karla Valente, Seth Greene and myself Glen Desaintgery. We have apologies from Carlton Samuels, Alex Gakuru, Dev Anand Teelucksingh and has anybody else noted any apologies? If not, may I then just remind everybody to say their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and thank you very much and over to you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Glen and thank you everybody for attending this call today.

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry. We just have Krista Papac that has joined. Thank you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Hello Krista. So first I would remind everybody to send if you are - if there is any update for the agenda. It looks short but hopefully we'll have a lot of discussion. So the only change is that we will start out with comments from working group members and then we go to the executive summary.

Is there any objection? Okay. Let's start with the comments. So they are (I'd say) flagged in the document. So I hope that everybody had documents of them. So then we can start with the first comment. Seth, can you just remind us about the first comment?

Seth Greene: Certainly Rafik. People are going to have to open up the actual document if you don't mind to see the comments. If everyone could do that, I'd appreciate it. The first comment is I take it people can understand me without too much of an echo.

If you go to Page 2 of the - I'm sorry, Page 5 of the document, the first comment is under support evaluations part B. Are the support candidates applying just for non-financial support? If so, are these evaluated by the SARP as well? So that's a straightforward question for the group.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Seth. And just reading the suggestion from Rob in the chat and just what do you mean by an overview, that you want to give us an overview of what this count is after the last call?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. This is Rob. I was trying to encourage Seth to do that but I realize he was probably reading another document and not reading the chat comments.

Seth Greene: Sorry Rob. Yes. Let me see.

Alan Greenberg: Just to be clear, the version we're working on is the one dated the 30th?

Seth Greene: Yes, that's right Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you.

Seth Greene: In the last - as far as an overview goes, to create the document that you're looking at, the one that Alan just mentioned is dated 2011-08-30, what we did was we incorporated the latest comments.

I believe they were from Alan, Avri and Carlton and we also added the - and those were throughout the document. We also added an executive summary at the beginning of the document and for today's meeting if we could go through the comments that are - that came from a combination of the staff and the members themselves, then also look at the executive summary, that would put us pretty well on schedule for our deadline.

The comments along the right side of the document are a combination of more conceptual questions that at least as staff, we're not quite sure you've resolved yet. So we'll need probably some discussion Rafik and a decision on what the final consensus is all the way to just simple questions that came up during the writing of the sections at some point.

And they probably could take just very quick answers such as this first one. So that brings us back to this first question and that is on Page 5. Does everyone see those along the right hand side?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. So the first comment is about if support candidates apply just for non-financial support. So if I can give answer, yes.

And okay, they can be evaluated by the SARP but it depends how those non-financial support (people apply) because mostly for some of them ICANN can pay only the (broker role). So I think we thought that this part A, the financial or non-financials, should be provided (in the package). But it also depends to the applicant needs.

Seth Greene: Okay. Thank you Rafik.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: So Rafik, it's Alan. Did you really mean they're applying just for non-financial support?

Rafik Dammak: I think it's an exceptional case but it can happen.

Alan Greenberg: Rob, can you clarify your question or Seth rather? I read the question are they applying just for financial support and Rafik answered are they allowed to apply for just non-financial.

Seth Greene: Yes Alan. The question basically is a combination of both can candidates apply just for non-financial support for example, you know, assistance and any kind of non-financial support, assistance filling out the application but not for actually a fee reduction.

And then in fact on the other end of the coin if simply it's just non-financial support is something that would be awarded without financial support, would a match be made to someone donating their services even for candidates not asking for financial support? I assume the answer - I mean I understood Rafik's answer provided that's what the work group wants it to be.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I didn't understand the question. Now we should go back to the QA. Sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. We'll start with Avri. Avri, you can go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. First a question - will we also be reviewing all this new text that's here and we'll comment as we go through that? And then just to I think support your question, I think people could apply.

I think they'd have to meet the same requirements but I think someone could apply for non-financial support. I think though that we have to understand and I think the issue that we have to really answer is, is the matchmaker program or the clearinghouse program only for those approved by the SARP? And I would think the answer is yes.

Certainly other people could look at that list, that matchmaker and go and talk to someone themselves about making a deal and getting help with whatever. But I think that so the wiki is public, anybody can look at it, anybody can see who's offering and who is - you know, who needs something and operates outside of the (concept).

But I think any services provided by ICANN or any other groups that support you know, the qualified applicant needs to be just for them and entry has to be via the SARP. So I don't know if that nuances the answer that Rafik gave but that's sort of the way I'd be looking at it. Thanks and I'll get back to the comment that I have on the other stuff when we get to it.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. I don't think that we are not so different on what you said. Tijani can go ahead and then we have Alan and then Evan.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. Thank you. Even if it will be perhaps exceptional but if someone asks for non-financial support he can ask, that is no problem. But any kind of support, any kind, financial, non-financial - any kind of support must go through the evaluation of the SARP. The SARP has the key for all kinds of supports. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I support that someone could just apply for non-financial support. I suspect however, based on our criteria they would get rejected outright because they don't meet the financial criteria.

Even though they're not claiming to need or have financial need, we still have it as a prime criteria. So if we mean that people could apply for just non-financial support, we may want to go back and make sure that our criteria are worded properly. The other question that Rob asked or that Rob, Seth, somebody asked is can the SARP get a request for both financial and non-financial but only grant financial or rather non-financial support?

That is, not grant the fee reduction and any other financial support? I'd never thought about that before. I suspect the answer is yes, they should be able to do that but I don't know if we have ever discussed that before. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Yes Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. So as for the remark of Alan concerning people who will ask for non-financial support, that they will fail the criteria, if they are not needy they will not get any support. So needy applicants may ask for anything they want, financial, non-financial, it's not a problem. But they have to pass those criteria. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. Thank you. On the being needy and not, I mean I can't imagine a situation where someone can actually pull out the fee and not be looking for specific financial support but could also be unable to fulfill all of their business plan that includes for example starting RFPs and all that other stuff.

So they have a financial plan where by the skin of their teeth they can come up with the fee but they really need help pulling off the rest, they need licensing assistance and other things that may be able to come through the so-called non-financial support because if they looked at buying everything you needed for an RFP, that would be beyond their means.

But with the non-financial support of things like licenses and accesses and such, they could make it. So I think it's conceivable and that's why I say it should be possible. I think Alan's right that for the most part you know, you're going to want both. But I can just conceive of a way where they have part of it but not all of it and they apply and still count as needy even though they might be able to pull off the application fee in their concept. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Avri captured part of it. We're setting up a situation here where someone is going to have to claim financial need even if they don't need it as Avri said, by the skin of their teeth in order to get the non-financial support they really want.

I'm not sure that's what we want. We're almost setting up a situation like you'd find in developed countries where someone is deemed by the government laws to be not to be poor and therefore cannot get government aid but still can't feed their children because the cutoff between what is deemed to be poor and what is really poor is not - don't overlap.

So I'm just saying we should be aware of it. I think it's too late to change it right now but I think people should be allowed to ask for non-financial aid. Without financial aid I don't see how they're going to get through the sieve and maybe that's just too bad we didn't think of it early enough. I do think however as I mentioned that the SARP should be allowed if someone asks for everything to say no, no financial aid.

We think you can make it somehow but we do understand that you need help in this, this and this area. Bye-bye. That's it. Thank you. And on that last point, we need consensus of people who agree with me or disagree with me so our editors can actually put some words in. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, I guess Alan, I'll be the one to disagree. I don't agree with what you've been saying and I think I'm more along the lines that Tijani was. When we first set out to do the criteria, the main criterion was you wouldn't be able to do it based on the standard applicant guidebook.

And applicant would not be able to do it. It would be - the price and other factors would be an obstacle. The criteria has as its primary issue financial need. Starting to anticipate scenarios where somebody has enough financial need that they would apply but then were going to sort of micromanage well, they need this but they don't need this. I just see us as just getting into an area that is unnecessarily complex here.

Either they come in and they don't - and they're in an area where the financial obstacles would not allow them to put in an application. Otherwise we're trying to drop those barriers and I think we're getting way too fancy for our own good here by going into all these halfway scenarios.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Evan. I'm seeing a suggestion from Seth that we may hold off on this (until next session) and try to cover all comments. But we still have some people in the queue. Tijani and then Alan.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Thank you. People who are not financially in need can buy any kind of service. So if they don't pass the financial need criteria they will not get any kind of support. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I just want to say for the record I don't really disagree with what Evan said. I made a definitive statement to get the discussion going and I'm quite happy with going out of this that financial need is absolutely required.

I didn't hear a definitive answer on can the SARP grant just non-financial need if they disagree with that financial need is needed. I think I'm hearing the tone saying if financial need is not there the SARP has to say no period, regardless of what else was asked for. And again, I'm happy with that. I am just trying to get to the point where it's clear what our consensus is. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Okay. We have some problems with Adobe Connect. So we can I think probably just (as Seth said), try to cover all comments. Yes. Okay. So your question what the council (thinks) about this issue, I think we - it seems we cannot say that we have a full consensus.

Alan Greenberg: I think we do.

Avri Doria: Yes, I think we do.

Alan Greenberg: Anyone arguing for the case that people should be able to succeed in applying without being deemed to need, to have financial need? So financial need is a required criteria and if the SARP decides they don't have financial need then implicitly they don't qualify. I'm not hearing any.

Andrew Mack: I thought we had discussed this a long time ago. Is there - I'm sorry, I've got an echo on my line. I tried to get it.

Alan Greenberg: Everyone does.

Andrew Mack: Okay. So maybe I missed something but is there a case that we're thinking of where people would qualify without financial need?

Alan Greenberg: Andrew, the question was asked before you got on the call I think just for clarity.

Andrew Mack: My apologies.

Alan Greenberg: And we have talked about a number of scenarios. I think everyone is agreeing on that right now, that without financial need you don't qualify period.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: There it is. So I guess we can move to the next comment.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question before we move on?

Rafik Dammak: Yes Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Going - I think this is going back but I'm just curious in financial support in the text, B says the framing of continuity instruments and development funding.

I'm curious as to what it means for them to be the same point. And is that implying an implication between the two of them or is that just C and D weren't broken apart for some reason? That is, I don't understand the (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Can you give us a pointer to where?

Avri Doria: Under financial support point C in this executive summary.

Rafik Dammak: Avri, we are going through I think (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: We're going to discuss - okay. I was just worried that we were moving away from here. Never mind.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. It's just we start with comments and then we go to executive summary. Okay. I'm not.

Alan Greenberg: So we're now on the first comment for D under (that)?

Rafik Dammak: We are and still on Page 5 or C I think. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Seth, which question are you still - are we now talking about? Which one do you still need guidance on?

Seth Greene: My understanding - let's see Alan, we were at question under SARP. We're at the question associated with point C (at).

Rafik Dammak: Exactly.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Can we add what level of consensus?

Seth Greene: Yes.

Avri Doria: Can I comment on this question?

Rafik Dammak: Yes Avri.

Avri Doria: I think that the answer was yes if you want to include each and every one of those elements is the bullet point underneath it. So if you're going to break that up other guidelines.

So as the ABA underneath that, the ABACD whatever. So if all those guidelines are there you can. Otherwise, you have to say something perhaps that each of the guidelines receives its own - had its own level of consensus. But if you want to list them all I don't see any reason why you couldn't. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri.

Seth Greene: Actually.

Evan Leibovitch: A typographical question - the one labeled A bracket I assume is supposed to be C point.

Seth Greene: Yes, correct.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Seth Greene: Rafik, if I may.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Seth Greene: Could we just very quickly go through A, B and C and just quickly tell us what the level of consensus for each one were if people remember?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So we can start with A. If we can use Adobe Connect (results) if everybody agrees just to show that in Adobe Connect.

Andrew Mack: Excuse me Rafik. I'm trying to find out where exactly we are. Is it helpful to put up what we're trying to do consensus on (in this set)?

Avri Doria: Top of Page 5.

Rafik Dammak: Page 5.

Avri Doria: Top of Page 5 in the document. They can't put it up.

Andrew Mack: Okay. Top of Page 5 in the one with the comments on it or another one?

Avri Doria: The one with the comments.

Andrew Mack: Okay.

Avri Doria: Sorry Rafik for jumping in.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri.

Seth Greene: Okay. So for A can we simply say full consensus?

Avri Doria: (Yes, anybody can).

Rafik Dammak: No, yes? There is agreement, yes? So point C.

Seth Greene: It also looks like we can say full consensus for B. I'm just trying to Rafik, I'm just trying to help if you don't mind move this along because we do have many, many comments to go through in this one hour meeting.

And I think it's most important that we actually get through all of them than that each one - I think the work group probably feels it's more important to get through all of them rather than to have each one ironed out perfectly. So I think it looks like from the Adobe Connect room if I'm correct that we only have Tijani with a thumbs up.

Avri Doria: No. We took our thumbs down after you said there was consensus.

Seth Greene: Okay. Great. So B is full consensus as well. I think we agreed.

Alan Greenberg: If no one yells out I think you can assume or put the thumbs down.

Seth Greene: If no one yells out. Okay. Great. So can we look at C, which is labeled A parenthesis? And I hear no one yelling out as Alan suggested so we'll say full consensus for that.

So that makes that very easy. We can say at least for those three that these are full consensus. Okay. If it's all right with everyone let's go on to the next comment, which is under G with parentheses. This has been decided that the (unintelligible) - is that correct, the text was a little - I was a little unclear on this. It could certainly be my fault.

Are the ICANN experts, there are going to be two categories of them? Some are going to be volunteer and others are actually going to be compensated or rather contracted? Okay. So I assume without anyone.

Alan Greenberg: You have to assume that. Otherwise you're deeming the volunteers to not have any expertise.

Seth Greene: Good. Thanks very much Alan, yes. That's right. I don't know about anyone else but I was just thrown out of the Adobe Connect room. Is everyone still good in the Adobe Connect room?

Avri Doria: I'm still there.

Alan Greenberg: I'm still here.

Seth Greene: Okay. I'm going to go back in. The next comment was actually taken from the full text. It's the one AD suggested, does everyone see that while I get back in the Adobe Connect room?

Andrew Mack: Somebody has a vacuum going on in the background. Is it helpful to mute yourself?

Seth Greene: Yes, I'm sorry Andrew. Is that Andrew? That's me. I apologize. I've been trying to look for the mute and I can't seem to find it yet.

Avri Doria: Hard to be on mute when you're talking.

Seth Greene: Yes. That's true. I found it though.

Glen Desaintgery: The mute is star, 6.

Seth Greene: Thank you Glen. It would be better if I muted.

Andrew Mack: Thanks. It's just hard with the echos and such.

Seth Greene: Sure. Okay. So we're up to the blue comment.

Alan Greenberg: Be careful on that Seth. We all have different colors.

Seth Greene: Okay. Forget the blue. We're up to the comment AD suggested. I suggest adding to the footnote something about using the gaming experts from ICANN who are able to recognize any and all methods of gaming ICANN systems. Does the added text address the comment? And that's regarding point D.

Alan Greenberg: Avri, do you mean ICANN staff?

Avri Doria: No, no. I mean - I had my hand up but I meant to say yes, potential gaming pattern clause in there is fine in lieu of a footnote I was asking for. Just the previous version didn't state or whatever, didn't explicitly bring that out and I wanted to bring that out. But yes, no, it satisfies what I was looking for here.

Alan Greenberg: I would hesitate saying that ICANN experts whether staff or volunteer can recognize all forms of gaming. The gamers are more inventive than that.

Avri Doria: Some of our gamers are more inventive than you or I could ever possibly imagine. And they see them immediately. It's just like a person with perfect pitch hears a note that's out of place. They may not be able to think (of it) but they can recognize them on site. Obviously all is always a problem and I had always in that sentence too.

Alan Greenberg: Seth, I don't know whether you're including a sentence like that somewhere but it shouldn't say we can recognize all methods if you are. Let's go on.

Avri Doria: In fact, we should probably just eliminate the word all from the English language because it's never correct.

Alan Greenberg: Have we lost Seth again or is he still off?

Seth Greene: I'm sorry. I was muted, Alan. Can you hear me now?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Seth Greene: The next question is that Avri was asking or outside experts also volunteers which is similar to the earlier question so we've covered that.

And then we're moving to the introduction, the next comment is - well, this is actually something, yes, that Rob and I were discussing and can we just decide right now what is the actual title of this report and then we'll be able to use it consistently throughout and we'll be able to come up with abbreviations for us that can be used consistently throughout? I'm going to go back on mute while you talk about that.

Avri Doria: Final report?

Alan Greenberg: This has to be the final report. We don't have any time to revise it. So the word draft has to be dropped.

Seth Greene: So it's not the draft.

Alan Greenberg: We can always revise the final report but this has to be deemed the final report.

Seth Greene: Okay, there's no - Alan, there's no stage after this in which it's going to go through public comments or anything? There isn't going to be a...

Alan Greenberg: Sure, but that's done on the final report.

Seth Greene: Pardon me, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: They will comment on the final report.

Seth Greene: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: If for some reason we deem that a change has to be made afterwards and there's time to do it in our overall schema then we'll have a revised final report.

Seth Greene: Okay, terrific. And it's not the final milestone report. We're dropping the word milestone I take it.

Man: (Unintelligible) each organization ask for final report so it's the final report.

Seth Greene: Great, great. Thank you, thank you. Let's see. Now we have a few pages of no comments thankfully. And we're back on Page 11.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Seth, if you can just refer to paragraph numbers that will help folks.

Avri Doria: Paragraph 21 at this point?

Seth Greene: Yes, we're on Paragraph 20, thank you Rob.

Alan Greenberg: Seth, going back to Page 7 where you have a highlighted insert link here, as a matter of course I would strongly recommend that you make that a link to the ICANN website which could then point to a Wiki if applicable. But Wikis are transient over years and reports should be useable five years later.

So I personally object to having pointers to a Wiki in a report. They can point to a website which in turn points to the Wiki if applicable but Wiki addresses change. Pardon me?

Avri Doria: Not that the ICANN website ever changes.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, but they're responsible for trying to keep the links working in theory.

Seth Greene: Alan, do I understand you're saying that you think all of the links should simply link to the main landing page for the ICANN website?

Alan Greenberg: No, no, no, to a - an applicable page. If the content is really on the Wiki then it should point to somewhere on our ICANN website which then points to the...

Seth Greene: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: To the Wiki, not direct links. (Unintelligible) too transient. (Unintelligible) confluence in four years.

Seth Greene: Okay, all right. You don't think that would be a little confusing for people at this point though when they're using the report most rigorously?

Alan Greenberg: You can go back afterwards and change them when it's archived, your call. I don't really care. I'm just saying for historic sake I've gone back to old reports and it's very frustrating when the links go off to nowhere.

Seth Greene: Okay, thanks, Alan. Well, I think Rob, are you going to take over at this point until we get to the appendices?

Rob Hoggarth: You're saying that with the sound of great relief in your voice, Seth. I don't know. Sure, I'd be happy to do it.

Seth Greene: And I apologize for the noise in the background. I am a bit relieved if I could put myself on mute.

Rob Hoggarth: Certainly, we're all just very (unintelligible) at the same time so thank you.

Seth Greene: You're welcome.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, just turning to Paragraph 20 Section B (unintelligible) because our last call (unintelligible) to try to provide us with (unintelligible) satisfied every (unintelligible). We would keep and (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Rob, you're cutting out.

Rob Hoggarth: I'm on an ICANN VoIP line, that may be the problem.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, people have too much faith in technology.

Man: That's right.

Rob Hoggarth: Seth, why don't you do the next two? I will call in on a mobile line which is probably more reliable.

Seth Greene: Okay, no problem. Again, I apologize for the - actually it's a leaf blower but let's see. We're on Page - if everyone could go to Paragraph 20.B, cost reductions to encourage the build out of applications requiring strings in multiple IDNs especially those related to underserved languages. That's one of the cost reduction types.

And the comment is after considerable discussion AM, Andrew, is going to try to modify if new text does not achieve work group's consensus this subsection B will be eliminated. Andrew, you've just told me a few minutes ago, am I right, that you've sent the language?

Andrew Mack: You're right, Alan and I worked on some language which I sent to you last night.

Seth Greene: Okay, we will put that language into the next version then which will be ready for Monday - Tuesday and we'll be able to review it then, okay?

Andrew Mack: That's fine. Sure, sure. Seth, if you could just include it that would be great. The - what I'd like to do is what we talked about that Avri suggested last time which is take a look at it, if it doesn't get full consensus we can decide whether to include it as a kind of a, you know, not full consensus point or what to do. But I think it does hit a lot of the conversations we've had.

Seth Greene: Andrew, may I make a suggestion? Would you like to just read that wording right now?

Andrew Mack: Sure, sure, sure. Okay. And this is the wording that Alan and I came up with. It's additional cost reductions for JAS approved applicants to encourage the build out of applications requiring strings in multiple languages, especially those in scripts who's presence on the web is limited - where multiple strings would support a single logical TLD and be viewed as part of a single entity.

Avri Doria: Yes, it won't get full consensus.

Man: Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible), do you want to ask a question?

Alan Greenberg: No, I want to add a clarification. I said I would support that although I think it's a bit late to introduce it now. I would support it but it would have to have clarity that we're talking about a conceptual single TLD, that is treat the multiple strings as variants. If I as a registrant buy a second-level domain it - for the same price I get both. It's not a second revenue stream for the vendor. It is treated as a variant would be in Chinese for instance.

Now that was the condition under which I would support it and that would have to be clear in the report for me to say that. Andrew and I were debating whether it should be in the text or a footnote but I think that's an important concept.

Andrew Mack: It makes sense.

Alan Greenberg: That it's a second character string mapping on to the same TLD.

Man: That's fine for me.

Alan Greenberg: Andrew, may I suggest that you revise the wording and we send it to Rob and myself?

Andrew Mack: Okay, revise the wording to include the - so the things we talked about?
That's good. I can do that, sure.

Alan Greenberg: And then as I understand it then it will have consensus, correct?

Avri Doria: No, it will not.

Man: It most definitely will not.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, Avri, did you want to make any kind of comments that could help Andrew revise it so that it does?

Avri Doria: I have my hand up.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Avri Doria: I was just starting out because you said the consensus word.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, yes. It's - we have a queue so I would (unintelligible). So Avri, I think she wants to express something (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yes, two things. First, also please send your revised language to the list. But the more important thing is I had one reason to be against anything that was even euphemistically building before.

I have a second reason for being against this one is the notion of a logical second TLD opens up a whole can of worms to say, variants like the Chinese case, opens up a whole can of worms that we cannot solve at the moment in the technical sphere of what that means to have two TLDs be logical variants of each other and how that works and how one does that technically.

And one is taking on either an incredible technical burden to do it or is taking on a continuing clause burden in terms of using operational and hand methods to try and link to TLDs. Or we have to explain in detail that we - by logical variants we do not mean a variant per say where there is aliasing and (unintelligible) TLDs but we mean you get two different ones but they are different but etc.

It's a mess and as I say, I double my lack of - my not agreement or lack of agreement with the proposal by including logical variants. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Avri. Seth?

Seth Greene: Yes, I agree completely with Avri's second point. I was trying to keep this short and concise. The approval of something like this would presume that the technical issues have been addressed. Now my understanding is there's a bunch of groups working on it and there's a good chance they're going to report by Dakar.

This is a group or groups that Dennis Jennings has been running. With out the automated way of addressing it there's no way we can approve it so that was a presumption that would have to be there. I'm not disagreeing at all with Avri's second point.

Avri Doria: Dennis's groups are just defining the problem. They're not solving the problem.

Seth Greene: Okay, well, my understanding was they were coming up with a proposal.

Avri Doria: No, they're just defining.

Seth Greene: But it doesn't matter, Avri, in the lack of a solution then this is not a viable alternative.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, those groups are working on many issues relate to variants. I'm not sure that there - as Avri said, it doesn't seem that they would found solutions. Okay, we have (De Jean) in the queue. Please go ahead.

(De Jean): Yes, thank you. I have said and we have said all several times during the work of this working groups that the bundling concept can be (unintelligible) - can be educated for but not inside this working group because this working group is for needy applicants to needy applicants.

We will not give an applicant two strings and to prevent other applicants to have a single one because he is needy. So it is out of the scope of this group and I don't agree to include it. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, clearly we don't - okay, Andrew, okay, please go ahead. And I will reply later. Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Okay, sure. Let me - let's not waste too much more time on this, let me see if I can come up with something that might pass muster, if not we'll come up with a Plan B. But we don't - I don't think we need to go through more of this right now.

I will circulate the language that we have to Seth and others, maybe the group can come up with some good ways to tweak it that might get at the point that we're trying to make. But I - I'm happy to put this as a minority perspective or just take it out all together if we can't come up with good language.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Andrew. I think we have agreement that we disagree about - that there is no - yes, we agree that there is no consensus on this. It's a minority view. And yes, you should - if you think that it's important, you should submit a minority report. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: No, it's okay. I was just trying to come to closure on it. If we don't have any additional support, and it doesn't sound like we do, but if we don't have any then it's too late at this point to bring in a concept which had been accepted earlier in the process. Perhaps unfortunate but so be it so let's go on.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Alan, we have discussed this many times and there was no progress on that.

Alan Greenberg: I did add a new twist to it this time which has a technical problem associated with it and, you know, I was asked to work with Andrew so I did. But I - unless we have something resembling a partial consensus, not just one or two people, let's not spend more time on it. We have too many other things to do.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Alan. I think Rob wants to ask questions to clarify this. Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. In light of - it now appears that you're going to be deleting B and we can talk in the drafting team about what the correct format should be for minority comments or statements regarding the report, what I recommend then is Paragraph 20 is literally going to now be Paragraph 20 - 20.A is going to end up being Paragraph 20. That's going to be the primary recommendation of the working group in this section.

Andrew Mack: Rob? A question for you, I still think if there's some value in this even if it's a minority view given the amount of time that we've discussed it and the amount of - and the fact that this is just partly a - as Avri and Alan said, this may not be as soluble now but it's a future issue but I think it's going to come down the pipe.

What about the possibility as we've done in other places of just including A and say full consensus and B and say, you know, not full consensus, you know, minority view or whatever it is.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, if you all agree to that I would propose you would have 20 being the full consensus recommendation and then a subsequent paragraph that says, and a minority of the working group members, you know, wanted to say the following, boom.

And that's what I said in terms of format, that could be a separate statement, it could be in the bulk of it - you know, in the body of the text, that's up to you guys as a working group.

Andrew Mack: And I also think we could use that - we could even reference some of the technical questions that other people - that people in the group have mentioned that make it difficult to move forward with at this point.

Rob Hoggarth: You guys certainly have another call on Tuesday and that can be, you know, just flag that as one of your agenda items just to resolve that item in your final call.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so we have a queue on this and...

Avri Doria: Mine is a quick question.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Avri.

Avri Doria: Was he talking about 20 but in my version it looks like 21. Am I looking at the wrong draft?

Alan Greenberg: Probably.

Avri Doria: I'm looking at 2011-08-30 that was sent out.

Rafik Dammak: It's 20.B.

Avri Doria: I have been looking at the - okay, to me it looks like 21.B. I must be looking at the wrong draft.

Andrew Mack: Just under title cost reductions?

Avri Doria: It's cost reductions .21 under financial support. Anyway, okay. I'll - it's the one I took from the email. I'll figure it out, thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so (unintelligible) we don't have - I don't agree with it when it say we receive a partial consensus. It's more minority than partial consensus. Yes, so if you want to ask further question?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, I was just going to continue your discussion. It seems as if you, you know, still have a difference of opinion on that so you may want to have a final resolution after you see whatever additional language Andrew's advocating for on Tuesday.

What I wanted to note just as a comment anticipating that we might move to the next paragraph or two is just as an overview you'll recall that this was an area that we talked about on the last call so you'll also see - particularly when Avri references Paragraph 21, some other changes there. Recall there were some additional sections after that and basically given the working group's advice we streamlined it all just into Paragraph 21.

So I welcome, you know, any concerns that people have about Paragraph 21 as well. We didn't get any comments by email but I hesitate to assume that because there weren't any that someone shouldn't have an opportunity to speak to it at this point.

I guess the question is just are you all okay with Paragraph 21? Then we can move to the next comment.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, which was - okay, I don't see any comments on that. So - what is the next...

Alan Greenberg: I personally would have liked to see - it's Alan, would have liked to see more specificity and maybe it's in the report. This is only the executive summary, I think, we're looking at on how we would like to see continuity (unintelligible) changed. Rob, is there any more detail in the report itself?

Rob Hoggarth: You are - we are in the body of the report, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: We are, okay. If there's no reference anywhere else to the types of changes that we would like in the continuity (unintelligible) I think that has to be somewhere.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, I'm capturing that. I will double check. I know that we discussed it in another section but in the editing process I don't know that disappeared. So we will look at it with that in mind and if there is not another reference we will propose some language that we can resolve on Tuesday.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Andrew Mack: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so in which case beige is the next comment.

Rob Hoggarth: Well, the next red comment - sorry, I'm not going to reference colors. The next comment, Comment 10, is Paragraph 59. But before you all get to that I also just wanted to flag for you the area around Paragraphs 47 through 54.

And in particular that was an area of some conversation at the end of the working group call and during the drafting team call. And it's primarily circulated around this support for third parties facilitated by ICANN. That's an area that if you look at the redline you see some substantial changes.

If you're - there's less than there appears to be because I had some formatting issues and had to basically destroy the formatting and rebuild it for a couple of paragraphs. But what we did in that section just as an overview for those of you who may not have been on the drafting call is - you'll recall, that section was a bunch lists and with the blessing of the drafting team I offered to do some introductory paragraphs to introduce some of those lists.

So a couple of those have been inserted into this section. The place where there was some substantial additional text and rewording involves Paragraph 51 through 54 about IPV6 support. The drafting team asked us to - I don't even think this is an American or Canadianism "to deweasel".

Avri Doria: It's an Avrism.

Rob Hoggarth: And change of the - you know, change the tone of the second paragraph within IPV6 support. Candidly what that did was, you know, once I did that it really seemed like we needed to just rewrite that section. And so Paragraph 51 through 54 do reflect some more comprehensive rewrites.

So I would invite those of you who haven't had a chance to look at that yet and I don't suggest doing it necessarily on this call unless you have a specific point or two, is take a look at that and, you know, if there are changes that we need to make over the weekend or prior to the Tuesday call please let me know.

Rafik Dammak: You mean that some - the wording in the Paragraph 52?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, I mean what I...

Rafik Dammak: Correct?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, I mean basically what was clear from the discussion you all had on Tuesday was that there wasn't a lot of clarity in what the working group said about IPV6 support in the draft. It's not that you didn't reach it as a working group but it just wasn't expressed clearly.

And so for example in Paragraph 52, you know, we just came right out in the drafting to say, look, the working group thinks that there are three substantial hurdles, boom, boom, boom; A, B, C. And then try to, you know, have the "deweaseled" language in Paragraphs 53 and 54.

And my only concern is, as all of you should have, it's new text. So if it's not as artfully described or if we've missed a nuance from some of your conversations I certainly want to correct or clarify that.

I was kind of reluctant to introduce new text this late in the drafting process but this section just seemed to scream for it.

Okay, no one needs to comment today on it but if you submit some written comments or something that would be great.

Rafik Dammak: So I think we have comments from Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, my comment is very quick. On very brief reading it looks like certainly 52 and 53 look pretty clean. I haven't looked at the long 54 one which may still have weasel fighting us. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: And Alan, okay.

Rob Hoggarth: And then Rafik, the next substantive comment for you all to discuss was some issues that initially Andrew raised and then Avri responded to up to Paragraph 59.

Rafik Dammak: Which paragraph?

Rob Hoggarth: Five-nine.

Rafik Dammak: Five-nine, okay.

Rob Hoggarth: I don't know if you want Andrew to sort of address his concern there.

Andrew Mack: I can do that quickly if you like.

Rob Hoggarth: Sure, that'd be great, thanks.

Andrew Mack: Sure, I totally get to the desire to have transparency. The question is only whether someone who is offering non-financial support will necessarily want to. The thought is this that if the - if you - if we get somebody who might be willing to offer non-financial support but they have a limited amount of that bandwidth to offer they may, you know - it may be possible for them to do that for one group of people that they're close to and not for another group of people or whatever.

I wouldn't want it to be a situation where we discourage them from offering that support because of a need to - the need to publicize more of the data than they are comfortable with, that's all.

Rob Hoggarth: I think I captured that correctly.

Rafik Dammak: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I think I tend to agree with Andrew. I think we need to give the support - the someone saying they were willing to offer support the right to pick and choose essentially based on their own criteria which may not be published. So I don't know how we word that but we've always - we've talked about that donors may have their own set of rules and clearly they publish them in whatever way they want to.

In this section where I think we're talking about the advertisement of donors, a donor should be able to specify that they will - they have criteria which they will judge without specifically saying what they are. I think we need to give them that prerogative. So I think we need to say that.

Andrew Mack: There also may be a situation in which they will offer, you know - might offer some support to a candidate and then a different level of support to a secondary candidate, either one that they're less closely connected to or if they've run out of those, you know - that which they can do for very cheap, the stuff that they can do for slightly less cheap or whatever would be the equivalent of that, you know. The point is we wouldn't want them to - wouldn't want to discourage them by making them have to publish it in front of the world.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I'm not sure it's saying they have to publish and terms and conditions. It says they have to do it in detail. But I agree with Andrew based on, you know, knowledge of donors. They may want to - they clearly may want to have their own criteria.

And it's not clear that ICANN should be in the business of publishing exactly what that criteria is or that they should have to lock it in ahead of time. ICANN has to be fair, open, and transparent. The other donors don't have to be.

Rafik Dammak: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, hi, I actually have a, I think, a slightly different view on it. I think that while ICANN doesn't have to publish their standards at all their standards should be published. And I think ICANN has to know and those people do have to publish their standards somewhere for ICANN to be sending them applicants. I mean to be sending them information and such. So I think they do have to state them somewhere.

I don't think it's ICANN's responsibility to state it but I think it has to be, you know, transparent within their own application processes that ICANN should not be facilitating somebody going into a black box. They don't know what it is. Certainly they can go there on their own, certainly the funders can find them on their own, but if ICANN is facilitating something it should be facilitating into something open and transparent, thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I have a question for Avri. Does that imply in your mind that the criteria is cut and dry and that if the applicant meets the criteria then they must be accepted, otherwise they will be rejected? Or does it allow discretion that says the donor can select the top two or put a total of \$100,000 into it but not exceed that in terms of their donation into the process?

Avri Doria: No, and implication is always in my mind, but - and for instance, in someone else's but no, I'm not saying that that has to be a, you know, point system by which they can judge themselves. And even those are subjective when you get right down to it. But I think it has to say, you know, you need to be from Bulgaria and you need to this and you need to that. In other words, they have to describe what their class is.

Alan Greenberg: But so they're allowed to make this judgment call and act on that on which they actually choose to support and which they don't.

Avri Doria: Everybody makes judgments, even our staff is going to be making judgment based on criteria.

Alan Greenberg: Exactly, that was the point I was going to make. Okay, as long as the wording is - implies that they can give the overall guidelines but aren't giving a commitment to fund if you meet this criteria I have no problem with it, thanks.

Avri Doria: Yes, that's what I mean.

Rafik Dammak: Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Okay, so I think maybe what we're talking about in the end is degree because I think at the - we all accept the idea that there should be some sort of transparency. I think it's certainly more important if there's any ICANN co-financing on the line.

If there's no co-financing it effectually in my mind moves to more of an area where you've got - it's a - you know, it's a two-party transaction between the receiver and the group whether that be a foundation or a corporate or whoever it is offering the service.

But so I think I guess the point that I'm trying to make is only that there may be a situation where it's a little bit arbitrary almost, you know, where yes okay, you know, it might be that it's the Nigerian Trust Fund that only supports work in Nigeria.

But what if it's just a group that is making an appeal and they say well we'd really like to get support, they happened to meet somebody who would be willing to offer them support and convince them to support that program?

Would this kind of a criteria system preclude that? Does it make sense? I'm just trying to keep - leave it as - I understand the desire to make it visible. I'm

just trying to see if we can create the flexibility that we want so that we don't miss out on anybody who might be wanting to propose.

Alan Greenberg: Andrew it's Alan. The scenario you just described if someone finds someone can't they do it? And the answer is yes but not if they're - if they're brokered by ICANN there's got to be a little bit higher level of transparency.

Andrew Mack: Okay I - maybe it's just a question of degree. As long as it's published somewhere what they're looking for and what you're suggesting then Alan is it just - it would be open to other candidates who feel the same...

Alan Greenberg: It would be open to no guarantee. All the criteria says is don't bother applying unless, you know, if you're not, you know, a - you're an Nigerian epileptic.

((Crosstalk))

Andrew Mack: You could always write...

Alan Greenberg: ...all Nigerian epileptics but we may.

Andrew Mack: And the truth of the matter is is that criteria can always be written if you really have one candidate a mind. But at the very minimum it should - you're saying it should be something that the world can see. I'm comfortable with that.

Rafik Dammak: Okay I think maybe Rob wants to summarize this discussion about this and have some questions. Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir thank you. Let - please tell me if this modification to Paragraph 59 works for you all? It would start with some new wording.

To ensure transparency of the ICANN process, the Working Group agreed that nonfinancial contributors should publish the general parameters, terms, and conditions that go with their offer for support.

Those contributors would not be precluded from offering different levels of support to different classes or types of applicants. For example providing dah, dah, dah, dah, dah. Does that language take us in the direction that you all have discussed?

Alan Greenberg: Rob it's Alan. I think that's very close. It should imply they also have the discretion to say no and that may just be a very, very minor, minor change to what you have. What you just read out sounds pretty good to me anyway.

All right, my instinct would be, you know, a footnote that says, you know, obviously, you know, ICANN can't bind these parties and they, you know, the financial contributors have the capability. Now I'm not leading. I'm just brainstorming. Are responsible for the final decisions or something like that?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: You've captured what I'm trying to say. We'll now trust you to go draft something we'll look at it.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay I don't see any objection or disagreement. Okay so we are ten minutes after the call maybe if we can finish with one or two...

Man: There's a paragraph 60 change I see.

Rafik Dammak: Sixty?

Man: Yes, I see several comments on 60.

Rafik Dammak: Yes my suggestion was that we end with this comment so...

Man: Oh okay.

Rafik Dammak: And then after we may adjourn the call. So but the problem I think Andrew who made the comment is left the call.

Man: Well the first one's Avri.

Rafik Dammak: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. Yes I'm here. Okay on 60 I had to go back to the clean version because I was looking at the redline version.

I think beholden is yes, I called it a weak term. I'm not suggesting a necessary change to it but I'm - I guess I'm identifying it as weak so that we don't weaken it further. But I think obligated or indebted are good terms too.

So I'm fine with leaving beholden. I'm fine with obligated, indebted as perhaps being better terms. So feel free to change the word to either of those two from my point of view. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: I would use reliant other - not beholden.

Avri Doria: I think that's even weaker.

Rafik Dammak: Avri is it - doesn't this term mean to be dependent?

Rob Hoggarth: No it means you get down on your knees and kiss their feet because they're so good to you.

Avri Doria: Yes that's exactly what it means. And I think that that...

Rob Hoggarth: I don't like that term.

Avri Doria: Okay but it's weaker than enslaved by.

Rafik Dammak: Let's go for yes enslaved by. That's okay.

Avri Doria: Indentured to.

Rob Hoggarth: I don't think we should be editorializing.

Avri Doria: And that's why obligated is fine as I say. I wasn't looking to strengthen it unless somebody tries to weaken it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Avri. Obligated sounds expressing the meaning but still politically correct so...

Avri Doria: Yes you know me, I'm always in favor of being politically correct.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So if there is no disagreements on this and that - well that's - maybe we can move to the next comment Avri?

Avri Doria: The next one's not mine. It says it's Andrew's, although I guess I note something on it but...

Andrew Mack: That gives you the right to talk.

Rafik Dammak: Rob yes, go ahead.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes this was really a continuation of the beholden discussion in which, you know, Andrew said I don't really know if this is where we want to go.

Then Carlton, you know, Avri commented. Then Carlton added the sentence that I flagged there. So Carlton added as edits this has the risk of

undermining the principle objective of this initiative and if embraced must be with the full knowledge of this risk.

And so the question is, you know, with Andrew gone Avri do you think this addresses that concern...

Avri Doria: Yes I think it, once again, I think it's a politically correct in the middle not quite problem statement that says beware of this. So yes I think that's fine.

And obviously I can't speak from Andrew but it doesn't get rid of the, you know, yes the helping hand from big brother does not mean that he will steal from you in perpetuity.

He might really be a good guy so let's not prevent it completely. I really am not totally political correct on this subject I admit. So yes I think it's fine.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I like the idea of encouraging. I'm not sure notify is the right word but encouraging ccTLD operators to step up to this.

I think we're - we take the chance of alienating people who may well be good guys and want to help by using strong...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...terms here and I worry about that.

Avri Doria: I don't. I don't think any genuine good guy is going to be offended by the knowledge that there are many, many bad guys out there and they're one of the exceptions.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Avri Doria: I think it will prevent the Wolf in sheep's clothing though or may, that bad guy masquerading as a good guy.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Avri.

Avri Doria: I'm sorry I'll shut up now.

Rafik Dammak: Avri I didn't ask you to not to say shut up but yes. Okay I guess there is no disagreement here. Rob you want to clarify something?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. I just wanted to ask you and your chair capacity a process question. In the past this is on Friday this has been a one hour call. You're being very productive.

Typically you've had a drafting call after the main call. You've made tremendous progress. Your 60% through the document. There's probably still a another eight to ten substantive comments left.

I don't know if you want to continue and the folks that can stay, stay for the next hour of what would - half hour of what would typically be a drafting call or whether you wanted to just adjourn, do the drafting and then convene the whole group again on Tuesday and finish the job, up to you?

Rob I think it's better to finish for this call. Then maybe we can add 50 minutes and to make more progress in comment and instead we can counsel the Draft Team call. But even if we have draft in (unintelligible) it can be really short so...

Man: For some of us it's going to have to be really short.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I am asking that this call be short. Yes Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. It's a generic comment. I have not said that my comments are not reflected on this version neither in the modification of the text nor in the comments.

So I don't know why. It's not a problem for me but I will keep speaking about anything I don't agree with. And I will send an alternative text for some parts that I do think that we need to change them in this way. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay maybe. I don't think there is any - there was any intent to - and to - for to integrate your comments.

Maybe Rob or Seth can reply to that. I'm not sure. Or maybe your comments are just go along with others so and they are integrated just one comment.
Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: And we're just about to get to what we just finished comment 12. We've got in about four pages Tijani some comments that you make on Page 32 and some comments you make on Page 34.

I know we had a separate email discussion where we've had some formatting issues. But I thought that we had captured, you know, because this is now the three or four versions since the last set of edits.

So again my apologies if I've missed something in the formats like comments on a comment.

But I would hope that during the conversations we've been having that you've been expressing those thoughts as we reach those areas. Again my apologies if I've missed something in the comments on comments.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, no problem. I will send them again by email this time. And you can notice for example that you captured my remark about the formatting text but not about the substance inside the same paragraph. So that's my big concern.

So I - it's not a problem. I will send you an alternative text. And I hope it will be either integrated if there is a consensus or at least mentioned in the comments.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so what is the next comment?

Rob Hoggarth: The next one is comment 13 which is the heading right between Paragraph 61 and 62.

Alan said although I support the intent of this section the timing is problematic. The new gTLD application as filed must give sufficient indication of the RSP to allow ICANN to evaluate their credentials.

How can this be done in a scenario where there is just an intent to create the RSP?

And then Evan had suggested some rewrite to that heading. But I don't know if the rewrite of the heading actually addressed your timing concern Alan?

Rafik Dammak: Provide to me what you have first?

Alan Greenberg: All right, I'm just reading it.

I don't really care about the heading. I put the comment on the heading because it was in reference to the section.

So the question is if the section is still saying people should be able to and are supported for saying gee, I really want to build a registry, I think that implies a week TLD application which - you know, we may support but I don't think ICANN is going to support it.

I - but I'm not very closely familiar with this. It may not be until an application is approved that ICANN then goes and audits the registry. I'm not sure.

So I don't know whether my concern was real. I was just raising a flag to make sure that what we're talking about did not create a Catch-22 situation where we're - what we're saying we're going to support is not possible not viable.

But I haven't done my homework to know whether that is really a concern or not.

So I bow to someone who really understands the gTLD process. And, you know, Karla comes to mind with a long history in it more than me or Karen Lentz who I don't know if she's on this call.

Man: And what would you need from them to satisfy you in this on this then?

Alan Greenberg: If we're advocating that this process, the whole support process be encouraged to support a registry in the making the question is will that by definition mean the application is going to be rejected in the real evaluation part of it of the application itself? I just don't know that.

If one never looks at who the registry is and what their capabilities are until the day or week before it's time to sign a contract it may not be a problem.

If that part of the evaluation is early in the process it could be problematic. That's the issue I was raising. I don't know the answer because I've not studied the evaluation process at that level of detail.

Avri has her hand up so she apparently has.

Rafik Dammak: Yes I was going to ask Avri to...

Avri Doria: Yes obviously I'm not the expert that Kurt, Karen or Karla or any of them would be. However I have been studying this.

And while certainly one can argue that having a registry that is an incumbent and knows how to do all this stuff including the new stuff in it can be helpful in an application, it is not required.

If the answers to the technical stuff are complete and proper and knowledgeable then the testing of the technical capabilities is at the end of the process.

So yes, you're taking a chance that when you come to the okay, everything's been decided and now, you know, before going live we have to - (Ianna) has to do is are you a viable registry and do you have the viable operations, that does, at the end of the process. And you can fail that.

And of course one of the things that, you know, incumbent registries sometimes say is and you're more likely to fail that if we haven't helped you which is of course possibly true.

But if the requirement is not there till then and so I think knowledgeable answering of questions would give people a year or at least half a year to get everything else cranking up if that was what was in their plan and they had a coherent plan for how they were going to do that. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. We have Alan and then Krista.

Alan Greenberg: Okay if that indeed is okay and then presumably ICANN would allow, you know, if you say I'm using ABC registry which we're going to build and we want some help and everyone says yes we're going to help you and when it comes time to put up or shut up at the end of the process ABC registry was never incorporated assuming one at that point could go to, you know, Neustar

or in deference to our next speaker AusRegistry and say fine, you know, we were hoping to do it in Rwanda. We can't. We'll do it in some other place.

And as long as everyone, you know, ICANN is going - willing to accept that then I have no problem with this whole thing and I raised a red flag which isn't important.

Avri Doria: Oh that would probably be hard to do it at the end.

Alan Greenberg: Well...

Avri Doria: Yes to fail then they do something different that I'm not crazy about.

Alan Greenberg: Well no, no not fail. You know, you just come to the point where you say, you know, where it's got time to point some went to the URL for the registry and it doesn't exist yet, you know.

If ICANN is flexible enough to allow someone to switch registries which they could a year after deployment, then I don't think there's a problem with it.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Krista?

Krista Papac: Thanks. This is Krista. And thanks for that Alan. So my understanding of how the technical questions are addressed, and I want to clarify this because I think there might be a misconception.

There - it's a technical response. So it doesn't say for somebody - for instance so let's take applicant support out of the conversation for one second.

Somebody that has signed a contract with AusRegistry to provide the back end services it doesn't - and Karla keep me honest here, if application doesn't

necessarily say AusRegistry is who's doing this, there's a response - there's a technical response to a technical question.

So in this scenario coming back into applicant support what they're going to need at - for the application is a technical response and if there isn't an actual provider that could be challenging for them. I don't really know.

Because right now what happens with applicants that are outsourcing is they're getting the technical response from their outsourced provider.

So that's the only gap I see in what - I agree with what Avri said. I agree with what Alan's saying. I just see that there might be - it might be a little problematic for these supported applicants if they don't have somebody that can provide them with a technical response for the application, hope that made sense.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes and I totally agree. And there are groups of people that I know of are in the process of gearing up to be able to help people with those technical responses.

So that is the kind of aid that can be provided including by some of the incumbents and new guys that are out there offering registry services.

One of the services, the nonfinancial support services they can offer is to help people answer these technical questions properly.

I totally agree with Krista that someone that's never run one of these things or isn't a really advanced technical person could answer them just by sitting down reading the application and writing an essay.

So indeed one of the kinds of nonfinancial support that I know of a couple people that are gearing themselves up to try and do is to help people with answering these technical questions.

But she's absolutely right. Without somebody to help them or without having somebody that, you know, someone has come back from living in the US and was an operations manager for a registry and is now back home in Botswana and can do it, you know, it would be hard. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes it sounds like I raised a red herring and for that I apologize. I thought it was something that we needed to talk about.

What I'm hearing right now is you are not in the application committing to a specific registry and they're going to hold you to that.

So if I think I'm going to be using AusRegistry but six months from now AusRegistry decides the Internet was a fad and they're closing up business presumably I'll be able to switch to Neustar or someone else and my application won't have to be discarded completely because a vendor I was looking at has decided to change their business plan. It sounds like it's not an issue and perhaps we just need to go ahead. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so we are one hour and half of this call. Hope that we can wrap in just five minutes. Krista?

Alan Greenberg: Whether Carlos said Alan you're correct but I'm not sure when she typed that so I don't know with response to which comment it was.

Rafik Dammak: So maybe you are correct on everything Alan. So...

Krista Papac: Hi. Just for the record Alan there's no chance of that happening.

Alan Greenberg: I just I like making examples which are way out in left field.

Krista Papac: As I know. I just want it clear.

Alan Greenberg: Maybe I'm going on record as saying the Internet is a fad and should be discarded.

Krista Papac: Yes so building on what Avri and Alan are just saying I just want to sort of bring it to conclusion it's answer now. They can answer now and build it later.

I think the only again, I just want to make sure that we're clear on this so that when this gets rolled out that other people are clear on it is that the answers that are provided are going to have to be the answers that - so if the technical provider has a certain infrastructure and that's what you submit and then later on - actually this is a question for Karla maybe even. And then later on and you have - the infrastructure is very, very different from what was in application I don't know how that impacts them in the testing phase. That would be the only thing I'd be worried about.

But again I agree that they can - I completely agree they can provide the answer now. It has to pass criteria and they can, you know, build it later. So thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Krista. I think Karla wants to answer and to clarify. Karla?

Karla Valente: Hi. So my understanding is that when you go through the first phase of the evaluation they're going to look at all the technical answers.

And once you've reached the delegation phase is a more in-depth kind of review. So at this point if an applicant chooses another provider I don't think there is a problem.

I don't believe there is a problem as it is in the application now. It's just that it has to be coherent, everything that was answered has to be coherent.

You know, and he still has to prove the technical capability at this point because the testing is more in-depth.

But we do realize that there is a possibility that someone might change business partners within this timeframe. Does that help?

Rafik Dammak: I saw that Alan agreeing with you. So I guess yes.

Alan Greenberg: I wasn't agreeing but saying I like the answer.

Rafik Dammak: Okay it - okay it's like Facebook like okay. Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir one before you adjourned this day's work I had one final question on this section. And I think that provides a nice sort of wrap up. And then you can just start with candidate eligibility requirements on your last call.

And the question is right before -- and this is on right after Paragraph 64 on Page 30 of the clean version there was something inserted very early in the process I guess that said Appendix blank provides a sample list of potential provider types, not exhaustive or complete that the working group has reviewed during its deliberations.

(Steph) showed me a, you know, I guess a rough Excel spreadsheet that I guess Elaine Prius had provided at one point earlier in your conversations.

The question here would be do you see a value in appending that sheet to the report? Or do you think that they list that has been provided in this section is sufficient?

Rafik Dammak: Okay any comment?

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. Absent any comment and because I think Elaine had during the first call that I joined -- I think it was her voice -- contributing to the listing now Paragraph 63 my recommendation would be not to, you know, added to the 60 plus pages of this package already with another appendix.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Rob I was just asking if those who are still on the call have any comment or question. But yes, Avri, I think Avri was on that team?

Avri Doria: Always have a comment. I was actually just as Rob was saying don't put it in another appendix. I was thinking of where else could you put it or do you think another paragraph describing a possible mechanism?

I think a possible mechanism is best in an appendix but, you know, or what, put it on a wiki? I think that then gets just as messy.

But, you know, a wiki's a good place for a mechanism. And appendix is a good place for a mechanism but I don't think it should be in a paragraph necessarily. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. And it's not even a mechanism. It's just a list.

Avri Doria: Oh because it's called a mechanism.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: We'll look at that one more time and evaluate based on what you suggested Avri. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay I guess we with (interest) of time that we need to - we should adjourn this call. Some people are already leaving.

Thank you for attending. We are doing a lot of progress. Let's hope that we get clean version as soon as possible with correction and addition and then hopefully we can continue on Tuesday.

So we have still some substantial comments and also we the executive summary. I guess that's all and again can be done the next call. So thank you everybody.

Man: We're all adjourning now, no drafting call, is that correct?

Rafik Dammak: If you want to maybe for ten minutes or 15 minutes but I'm not sure that's really needy. And then we need that...

Alan Greenberg: Rob, Seth I'm happy to go away but...

Man: Oh do I have an opportunity just to say go away Alan on a public call?

Rafik Dammak: You do certainly with great pleasure it'll be (unintelligible).

Man: No I think you guys did a good job of spending an extra 40 minutes doing additional drafting so I don't think an extra ten minutes would have anything at this point.

Man: We're good. We've got our...

Man: Thank you all then with...

Man: Okay.

Man: ...capital letters.

Avri Doria: Yes okay. Bye-bye everybody.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Have a good weekend.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Have a nice weekend. Operator please stop the recording.

Coordinator: Thank you.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you Rafik. Thank you everyone. Bye-bye.

Rafik Dammak: Bye-bye Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: One we...

END