

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

TRANSCRIPT

Friday 09 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 09 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-20110909-en.mp3>

On page :

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

(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-newgtdapsup-wg>

Participants on the Call:

GNSO

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

Avri Doria - NCSG

Andrew Mack - CBUC

Carlos Aguirre - Nominating Committee Appointee to GNSO Council

At-Large:

Cheryl Langdon-Or - ccNSO Liaison - APRALO

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

Alan Greenberg - GNSO Liaison - NARALO

Evan Leibovitch - (NARALO) - At Large

Cintra Sooknanan - At-Large

Tijani Ben Jemaa - AFRALO - At Large

ICANN staff

Rob Hoggarth

Seth Greene

Karla Valente

Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Olivier Crépin-Leblond - ALAC chair
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
Krista Papac - RrSG
John Rahman Kahn - Individual

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

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you very much (Louise). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the JAS call on the 9th of September.

And on the line we have Rafik Dammak, Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Carlos Aguirre, Alan Greenberg.

And we have apologies from Alex Gakuru and Olivier Crepin-Leblond.

For staff we have Karla Valente, Seth Greene, Rob Hoggarth and myself Glen Desaintgery. And the noise that we are hearing on the line is unfortunately coming from Carlton's line the operator tells me.

May I remind you to say your name before speaking for the transcription purposes please. And thank you very much Rafik. And forgive me for having interrupted you. It's now over to you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Glen, no problem. Yes, hello everybody. Thank you for joining today's call. I think we are in the final milestone to finalize our report today.

Seth already sent the agenda and we are going to (roll) and hopefully to end in time as we go through quickly the comments.

So just I want to remind people that we are at the stage to finalize the report and to clarify about the (census) level not to really - to raise new issues or - so hope that - so we expect cooperation from everybody. And let's start.

Okay Seth, can you introduce the first I think the comments?

Seth Greene: Thank you very much Rafik. The - as Rafik mentioned -- this is Seth Greene for the record. The link is in the Chat. And I believe Rob, would you like to start with the comments?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes thank you. This is Rob Hoggarth for the record. Good news Rafik and Carlton is that I think there's only six substantive comments that had been raised or that have yet to be resolved through the various drafting discussions.

So I think we can go through those fairly quickly depending upon working group member comments. So I'll get started on them.

For those of you looking at the document, I'm going to be operating off the clean version. But I also have a redline version that I'm referencing if folks have questions.

The first one that we needed to resolve from an editorial perspective where we have questions was on Page 17 Paragraph 33. And the section is entitled Auctions.

Now the question that I ask in the comment and it's - that is Comment 2 refers to this sentence. Though the quantity of these funds is unknown and such funds would certainly not be available for the payment of fees in the 2012 2003 - 2012, 2013 rounds, auction based funding might be available.

And then the sentence continues, the query we raised at editors was is the payment of fees the consensus working group position or does the group want to substitute payment of fees with the term financial support of qualified candidates? Anyone have a perspective on that?

It seemed to me that payment of fees was going - was not going to be the sole result of the auction proceeds that were going to be collected but that it was going to be pay for additional things. And so that's way I was asking for clarification there.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi this is Evan. I'm sorry, I'm not on AdobeConnect.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Evan go ahead but we have also Avri in the queue.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh if Avri was first you - I'll (seat). Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. This is Avri. I think when it was first written certainly (payment updates) was the notion. However there is the whole notion - - and the wording might not be right -- there is the whole notion there

that the auction -- and I think that's why it's sort of ambiguous that the auction fees are part of what allow the reduction in fees.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Avri Doria: But I think your phrase, you know, for the support of or the financial support of applicants may be just as accurate and a coverall.

You know, but the point is that one of the mechanisms that we're positing to allow the reduction of fees is the known future existence of auction funds. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Avri. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Yes I wanted to sort of - I suspected Avri was going to say something like that. And I just wanted to sort of expand on to that.

When the fund was first envisioned and put out it was thought of as that would be the way that applicants were going to reduce fees.

In our document we are advocating for an across the board fee reduction, not an arbitrary one that's judged on a case by case basis.

So all of a sudden the - first of all the - in the use of auction funds to - and to directly offset, you know, to go into the pool to be used to offset fees is no longer an issue if we're advocating a free reduction.

So we basically had one or two - one of two ways to go. And it was unclear to me which direction. One that Avri was suggestion is that it's okay as far as we're concerned that auction fees go back into ICANN

general revenues to compensate for the fact that they're going to do an across the board fee reduction.

And the other possibility is that the fee reduction remains but auction proceeds go into the fund that's used to fund non-fee based costs from the applicants.

Rob am I clear or...

Rob Hoggarth: It - that's a helpful sort of context Evan. But I think just in the very pure editing mode here I'm purely interested in whether payment of fees is broad enough for your guys' concern here or whether you want to modify that phrase.

Evan Leibovitch: If - in the specific case of what you're asking for I think it needs modification because if we're advocating reduction in fees than we can't just sort of demand that the auction funds are - and we are going to go that way. So I agree with you about broadening the wording.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay we have Alan...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I was going to say clean and simple in answer to Rod or Rob. The change he's suggestion is the way it should be made.

I've heard no argument why we shouldn't use a broad statement at this point and some why we - why what's there is incorrect. So yes, change it in my mind.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Rafik are you prepared to declare consensus on that edit and we can go to the next one?

Woman: If?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, seeing no object either in the AdobeConnect or people speaking so I guess we have consensus here.

Man: Thank you...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: So and we can then - then we can move to the next comments hopefully that you can (see it).

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. The next one is on Page 22 Paragraph 42 in the document I'm looking at. Right now it's almost just a fragment of what the previous text that had been there due to various edits.

That section or paragraph reads this does not exclude that donors may elect to make larger grants or contributions directly to the ICANN created foundation notably reducing their grant making costs.

The comments that I reflect in the document is given other adjustments to the document, this paragraph does not appear to have any remaining use. And I flagged it as a candidate for deletion.

So the question for you all would be is it okay to just delete this sentence?

Rafik Dammak: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Yes I think it is okay to delete this sentence. But I'd also like to ask have you done that cross-checking throughout all of the document? Will we be able to cast all of these orphans off tonight? Just wondering how much we will have to go through in what speed Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Well this is now Number 2 of only six substantive questions or comments that I had...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: ...for you all so yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific. Okay, thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Cheryl. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: If I read this correctly -- and it's still early morning for me -- this says we cannot forbid - we will not forbid an external organization from using their money in however they want.

I can't see a scenario where we could forbid them from doing this.

Carlton Samuels: That's exactly what I see Alan.

Alan Greenberg: So I think that sentence has to go because it doesn't make any sense.
And I'll add one other comment not related specific to this.

Rob you said you're using the document that the link is - where the link is posted in the Chat. Your page numbers are off by several from the one I'm looking at when I followed that link.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: So I'm not quite sure why but just to note that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, the same on mine. I think it just depends on what system we've opened it under. I'm using an open office and I don't what Rob's using.

Alan Greenberg: I'm using Word but nevertheless I'm just noting that.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. That just underscores the brilliances someone's suggestion to number the paragraphs.

Carlton Samuels: (Unintelligible) all right? Cheers.

Man: Somebody is talking privately and we can hear them?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes Rafik. Carlton, is that okay for then - us then to move to the next one? There'd be no objections to deleting that?

Rafik Dammak: Yes we will follow that way so if people have any objections they should speak. Otherwise we'll go - we will move. So we can wait a few seconds but I don't see any objection of people who want to speak.

And we can also then (make a) comment too.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. The next one is not a flagged comment but it's something that stems from the discussion on the last call. And I think this is a query for you Carlton.

During the last call we had a discussion about the IPV 6 support section and Michele's objections to that language.

I believe that you had said that you were - after some subsequent edits that the working group did that you might try to reach out to Michele and find out whether those edits have satisfied those concerns.

So the first question would be whether you were successful in doing that. Absent that, then the question would be how do you want to handle the IPV 6 support section? We didn't make edits or changes to it of any substantive note. And so the result there is the language generally remains.

If I recall correctly the substantive changes that the working group pointed out were in the executive summary that softened the IPV 6 support language. But we didn't substantively change the text here.

Carlton Samuels: Rob I didn't get a - get a chance to get through to make (yellow). So I am thinking that we are going to go with what we have now.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. That's all I had on that section. But I wanted to make sure that we flagged that for you all.

The next item is my Page 33. And it's the item that (Andrew) referenced in his email yesterday or the day before.

The paragraph (Andrew) that you said in your note was 66. I have it in the version I'm looking at is 67. And it's the section entitled Servicing the Public Interest.

And the specific paragraph is a sub bullet of 67B. It's actually the fourth or the last bullet right before subsection T. And this was the paragraph and concept that we've revisited on several occasions with respect to the bundling issue.

And (Andrew) it - I'm I think the one responsible for your consternation. What I tried to do was blend some of the comments that various working group members had made on that last call.

And I think my error may have been writing or suggesting the text the working group agreed and substituting that for the previous text.

What I'd like to do just real briefly is read what was in before to see if, you know, just so that everybody's clear what was in there before and then what I've changed.

The previous version of the paragraph read to address the potential needs of these groups, strong support but with significant opposition

has been expressed in the working group discussions for the concept of bundling. And then there's the dash and the sentence continues.

I substituted or inserted the words the working group agreed not to consider the concept of bundling in this program.

So (Andrew) I'll give you the floor to see if we should just in your view back out that change or whether you want some additional or have some additional comments on this paragraph?

(Andrew): Thank you, I appreciate it. This is (Andrew) for the transcript.

Look, I recognize that this is an area where there is difference of opinion in the working group. And I am - and I understand that. I'm comfortable with it. We do not need to agree on everything.

But the new language as it is just doesn't reflect the 18 months that we've spent on this issue. There has been - it - as it was originally written there is substantial support and substantial disagreement. And I - you know, I think that's what should be in the final document.

The fact that there are some people that believe that the proposed GAC ALAC language changes the validity of this or the necessity for it is certainly something that we can mention if we want to. But to take it out or to change it in the way that you have to, that just doesn't really reflect the work that's been done.

I respect it's a desire to try to bring - you know, to come to conclusion on it but that didn't work for me.

Rob Hoggarth: So your proposal would be to back out that...

(Andrew): Leave it as it is. Leave it as it was, excuse me which I might add is language that we've had in the document for quite some time.

Rob Hoggarth: Rafik I'm not seeing any hands raised on this issue.

Avri Doria: I have my hand up but somebody turned me into a microphone.

Rafik Dammak: Avri I'm not sure what it is, but it's not a hand. AdobeConnect but yes, you can speak.

Avri Doria: Right. Well it was a hand but somebody must've turned it to a microphone but it wasn't me because I don't have that power.

Thank you. This is Avri. I understand (Andrew)'s consternation. However I of course agreed is not, you know, consensus based language.

I do believe that there was a group one, an agreement, a consensus on not discussing this as part of the JAS working group, that it was a general issue that went beyond JAS and it was therefore not an issue for JAS to tackle.

There was a near consensus that in any case we shouldn't be arguing to do bundling. There was always some support, not strong support, some support from (Andrew) and maybe one other who persisted in keeping the issue alive and having the group talk about it. But the group never changed its view if this was a general issue, not a JAS issue and not something.

So I think the proper language is there was consensus that this was not a JAS Working Group issue. There was near consensus not supporting bundling but there was some support for bundling. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri for clarifying. I think your point of view (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Rafik a point of order. It's Alan Greenberg. Can whoever is on staff or whoever is the host who's changing hands to microphones please do not do that. It - you lose the speaker order among other things. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, noted Alan. But okay, no more change. It wasn't me anyway.

Alan Greenberg: Not but it was someone who did it after I requested in the Chat not to. Thank you.

Avri Doria: And my status isn't cleared because I was just trying to clear my status. I don't have a hand up at the moment and I don't deserve a microphone.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Avri okay, we will fix that. And we go to (Andrew). (Andrew) please go ahead.

(Andrew): Thank you. Avri I'm going to respectfully disagree 100% with your characterization of the situation.

I don't believe - I think there was discussion on a number of occasions as far back as when we had our conference call during the Lithuania IGS about whether or not this was on mission or off mission for JAS.

And that issue has been debated ad nauseum and we continued to keep that - keep this as an active pursuit. We had a working - a subgroup around it.

So your characterization of it as being consensus that this was not part of the JAS mandate I just don't think is true.

I think it fits what we've seen. And if that were the case then we wouldn't have had a working group. And it wasn't just me participating in a working group.

(John) participated, (Eric) participated. We had a number of participants and a number of long conversations about this issue. Certainly it is one on which we disagree. And that's fine. And I'm not suggesting that my opinion is necessarily the majority opinion even. But to characterize it as you do I just don't think is accurate.

I'm going to quote from last week's chat which I had the privilege of reading and in of which you said I agree that it's important that all minority opinions are given their due, the legitimacy of the effort demands it.

Look the truth is we did discuss this issue. A lot of people including a lot of senior people in this working group and senior people in the ICANN community support this concept and think that it has a place in JAS. And all I want is that acknowledgement. It does not need to be

the majority opinion but I think that that's historically accurate. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay we have Tijani in the queue. Please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. First of all, (Andrew) you know very well from the beginning I told you I support your effort for reducing the price of multiple scripts for a single string but not inside the JAS because the JAS is here to support the needy applicant not to anchorage multiple languages.

Second point, the work team that was set up was for the IDN scripts. It wasn't set for the bundling. So there is no - we never set working group for the bundling. It was only for the IDN.

Last thing, we always said and the working they are - in fact the - even the last version that just changed said that there is - there wasn't consensus about the bundling. There was never a consensus about bundling.

So I am okay with a minority report or minority opinion inside the report. It is - you're right. And I put it in my draft.

But to say that the working group accept or support or there is support for the bundling no, there is not support for the bundling. There is - I would say a consensus about not supporting the bundling. But there is a minority point of view that support the bundling. Thank you.

(Andrew): Tijani, I'm not suggesting that it was a majority position. I understand what you're saying.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay (Andrew). Take Avri you want to (unintelligible) again. Avri?

Avri Doria: Sorry I was muted. Yes this is Avri. I - first of all, at the time at which we had a consensus -- and I'll maintain that this was not an issue that we were going to pursue -- was while I was still chair of this group and such. But I'm fine with leaving that particular statement out.

There was certainly near consensus, rough consensus -- whatever we want to call it -- that we were not going to put forward a proposal for bundling.

There was always one or two voices that persisted in saying yes we must and made that an issue. So yes it is true. We spent a lot of time talking about it even after the group had come to a near consensus that we weren't (101).

I am not at all suggesting that the some support for it be suppressed. I think some support for it should be listed. And I think that if those who are part with you of some support want to write a treatise on why this is the right thing to do to attach to the report as a minority report that should do so.

Please don't say that I want to suppress minority opinion. What I am saying is that it was never more than a minority opinion.

And I don't understand the different between senior members of this group and other members of your group - of this that you brought in

earlier. I didn't know we had a senior and junior member organization.

Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you.

(Andrew): Can I respond to this?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, please.

(Andrew): Okay really quickly. First of all yes, I think we're more or less in agreement. And if everyone is content to leave the language as it was before I'm content to move on from this. My point is not to suggest that this was a majority position. I think you guys know that.

Avri my - I used the wrong term when I talked about senior people. That's not what I intended. Some of the people have been very deeply involved in terms of their time and effort over the course of many, many months is really what I was thinking about.

In any case, I don't think that there are senior or junior members of the group.

Rafik Dammak: Okay yes Robert yes, you want to clarify or to ask further question?
Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes thank you Rafik. I guess I was just trying to circle back to (Andrew)'s point which was are you guys happy with just going back to the language before or not?

It seemed to me that Avri's comment suggested that strong support but with significant opposition would need to be modified a little bit, perhaps with some different language. And if so, I just wanted to try to capture that.

Avri you had a really good three point bullets. I don't know if (Andrew) agreed with that but I think it was a little bit more detailed than just strong support but with significant opposition.

But I guess the first question would be is there agreement to go back to the former language that you had all been comfortable with I think up to the time that I'm the one who caused the problem for changing it and inserting that word agreed which was my own ignorance of your previous 18 months of discussion.

Rafik Dammak: Rob I think we need to stick to our - to use the formal language that we have about the level of consensus from - I'm not mistaking what you are asking for.

Yes, this topic was discussed for many - for a long time. But the problem was there was no real change. That's my point of view. There was no real change in the position of the members of the working group. And there was no real consensus about that issue.

Okay, I'm not sure, is (Andrew) and Avri want to speak or because I still see the microphone?

Man: I think the microphones are just stuck there. It seems...

(Andrew): Yes we can't turn them off.

Man: Yes.

(Andrew): I can't figure out a way to turn them off.

Man: I think staff have to turn them off.

Avri Doria: Their badges indicating that these two people have spoken much to - much too much already and other people...

Man: Amen, Amen. I agree.

Man: No, I don't agree.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay Rafik then to clarify I'll just - I will put back the former language and I will delete that additional language that I added. There was an additional little edit there that said after the words underserved language script I added the additional clarification as this was being obviated by the working group's fee reduction recommendation. Under the theory that both those edits contributed to the difficulty I'll just go back and reinsert the words to address the potential needs of these groups, strong support but with significant opposition has been expressed in the working group discussions with the concept of bundling and delete the other stuff I added. Thank you.

Man: Rafik...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Sorry I don't follow well Rob.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, please Rob repeat what you said...

Rob Hoggarth: I will.

Rafik Dammak: ...what did you say and just to see if people have no objections so we can move on.

Rob Hoggarth: Sure. I will reread the entire bullet then to reflect the differences. It will take just 20 seconds here.

The new - the bullet will now read to address the potential needs of these groups, strong support but with significant opposition has been expressed in the working group discussions for the concept of bundling -- that is reducing the application fee for support approved candidates seeking multiple TLD strings in an underserved language script period.

New sentence. The recently submitted GAC/ALAC joint statement describes this concept as lowering fees quote, for a string in multiple IDN scripts particularly where simultaneous IDNs are required in countries of great linguistic diversity period closed quote, end of paragraph.

That would be what it would read based on this discussion.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think I have question from Tijani. Please go ahead and okay, we have (unintelligible).

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. I think it's absolutely wrong. There is not strong support with significant opposition to the principle of bundling. No, it is wrong. It's not right.

There is a consensus...

((Crosstalk))

Tijani Ben Jemaa: There is a consensus about not - against the bundling. And there is a minority that won't - that advocate for the bundling. This is the rarity.

Rafik Dammak: Okay just to clarify there is a different level of concerns. So it's strong for consensus. So it cannot be just - we cannot label just consensus. We need to clarify with - in more clear way what is following for (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Okay Carlton I think. Yes Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Yes can I just suggest that we make two separate bullets on that one and make it - I don't like negatives. I read it with - like Avri said, we would, you know, leading with negatives.

So if we could make two clear thing, there's no consensus and another bullet that says minority opinion and deal with it that way just to move along?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, well we have also Cintra and Evan in the queue. So Cintra?

Man: Cintra said she was talking about something different. So Evan should go first if it's on this point.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I'm wondering if a single word change might cool a lot of this down. And that is changing the word strong to some to make it clear that there's some support for it but not strong support to give them - I mean that - would that be sufficient at least right now with where we're at to be able to make people comfortable with this?

Tijani is right, there is not strong support for this but there is some support. Is changing the word strong to some at least at this point in time going to be sufficient to make this work?

Man: I could go with that too.

Rafik Dammak: Okay we have a long queue now. Yes Avri? Okay I think Avri still has some problem to unmute herself. Avri?

Avri Doria: I keep trying to be good in muting. I basically think that the correct language is since there is rough consensus against including bundling but some support for including it. But those are the defined terms.

I think it's stronger than strong support for not including. I think there's rough consensus against it. I realize that's negative language. But I think negative language is sometimes the only correct language.

And but there is continuing to be some support for including it. And I think that is - but I do believe that there is at least rough consensus against it. And I think that should be said. Thank you. Going back on mute.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. So we have Tijani and then I'm not sure if Cintra wants to speak about the - this issue or just another point and then also we have Evan. So Tijani, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you. Exactly I support what Avri said. We have to express in the report there is a rough consensus, any kind of consensus about not considering the bundling.

But there is an opposition and we have to say it, there is a minority opinion for the bundling, so we have to express it.

I am not an English speaker so you are better than me, but we have to say that there is a consensus, any kind of consensus not considering the bundling. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so yes. (Andrew).

Cintra Sooknanan: Can I jump in?

Rafik Dammak: Oh okay. Are you going to speak about this topic or another point because first we have (Andrew)?

Cintra Sooknanan: I also do have a list of small changes to make the language more precise that I would like to go back to a bit later if it's okay.

Rafik Dammak: You want to - is somebody working now but I think it's better than to - because if we - I'm going to continue this session and probably some - we won't agree.

It's just only going to extend the discussion, so maybe you go ahead now. It's better.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, with regard to this point that Avri, Tijani, (Andrew) and Evan are speaking about, I agree that we should have both views for and against. But we - maybe we should suggest why the group was, you know, opposed each other on this point specifically, so that really I can understand that, you know, the group wasn't just opposed for no reason, you know, so maybe the rationale behind both for and against, okay.

That was my point on this but with regard to the matter as a whole, do you want me to go through my changes at this point, or would you like to take (Andrew)'s comment first?

Rafik Dammak: Okay Cintra. Okay we have (Andrew) and then Rob. Yes (Andrew).

(Andrew): Okay, I - I'm trying to get us to a final point. I propose that we go back to the original language, which we had been comfortable with for some time. And basically what we have now is we have some strong proponents and some strong opponents.

If we wish to say that there was some support and some against, I'm comfortable with that but - because that really reflects what the debate has been like throughout.

And I'm trying to come up with language that would work with that. I'm not sure whether people want to include Cintra's explanations or not, but maybe more detail than we need at this stage. I don't know.

But I'm happy to do that as well. I could probably live with Evan's language if we were to say that there's not a consensus but some support. I could probably live with that but I'd like to see if we can move on from this.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Can I - Rafik, just before Rob comes on can I say this? This is Carlton. We have - the reason why we - the - I really truly believe that the original language that was there was good enough at the time and the Work Group deciding it wasn't so we changed to this.

If we're going to go back to that second language, to the original language, the one we changed before now, those - some folks are going to be just as bothered because that's why the change happened in the first place.

Could we just agree that I hear that we agreed in principle that there was - using the consensus language for the bundling is that there was some rough consensus against bundling, but a strong minority view for bundling. Is this the sense of the committee?

(Andrew): I don't think that that's historically accurate, Carlton.

Rafik Dammak: So okay, just I want to speak now to (Andrew). (Andrew), I think that one of the problem with the bundling issue that takes so much time since I think the beginning of this working group, so that I do think that you didn't like that words - that strong opposition to this bundling idea and you kept I think advocating for that, which is I understand.

But we are at the end of this. We have to finalize this report and there are two things. There was no increase in the number of support of the bundling within the working group.

So I would like really to ask you so that you accept that we have now this, what we have. You - we could work some even compromise or we won't ever found that you just to submit minority report to now that you can express there was some strong support for the bundling.

So I want really to ask you to just accept this language. And let's see, I think we have Rob and then Evan. Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you Rafik.

Carlton Samuels: Can I just say this? Cintra asked the question was this a minority view in terms of the letter? I specifically referred the - this letter because I thought it would show a little bit more than a minority view in the community.

That is how I'm making a distinction between the community and this working group, and so the reference to the GAC ALAC was intended to reinforce the value of this.

And that is what I thought we got away with, and I know where to laugh to see if we took time to actually bring in something from outside the community to make the point without saying so that this is not just a single minority view theory, but this actually has some legs out to the community.

It would have satisfied everybody and what I'm hearing now, we're going back to the situation where we want to drop that. I think that would be - that would not be sensible.

I think you need to ensure that even though you have a minority view in this Work Group, the idea is broad and widespread in the community. That's what this was supposed to - that was intended to do.

If it is difficult to accept that then I am now thinking we have to make another move.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. Let me suggest a compromise. I - fortunately this discussion gave me time that I'm not normally good at for drafting on the fly, so let me try it again.

And I know there are a couple of places where we may do an Evan switch of the language. Let me reread again here. "To address the potential needs of these groups there was near consensus in the working group against a proposal - against making a proposal on bundling -- that is reduced in the application fee for support approved candidates seeking multiple TLD strings in an underserved language script.

There was however strong support in the working group for including the concepts. Then the recently submitted GAC ALAC joint statement describes this concept as lowering fees for a string, blah blah blah."

Does that help? I was trying to capture Avri's - so your concept which was, you know, to lead with what the near consensus was but then also to capture (Andrew) and I believe Carlton's point that there was strong minority support for including the concept. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Rob. We have Tijani then on the queue. Yes Tijani, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, two things. First, if you add strong minority support I don't care. It is okay. But if you leave it like this people will not understand. There is a rough consensus from one side and a strong support from the other side.

So what is the point of view of the group? No. It doesn't work like this. Second point, I agree with Carlton that the point of view of the GAC with the ALAC is to strength the minority point of view, and that's why we put it in the report.

We didn't remove it, so we have to express the point of views of the working group, that it means a rough consensus for not considering the bundling, and some support for the bundling and we put that - the statement the GAC and the ALAC, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

So it is a support - it is more support for the minority point of view but we have to express the point of view of the working group, not the point of view of everyone because we don't know.

If we would do another suggestion in ICANN perhaps we will have another point of view, so that's my point. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Tijani. Just to reply to Cintra I think Tijani was trying to explain that the - both wording have some contradiction, so that's - I'm - that's my understanding. So we have Alan and then Avri. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I'm basically agreeing with Tijani's first point. The words that Rob proposed where it says strong support for and near consensus against is confusing.

I think it's fine to say a strong minority report - or strong minority support. I - the adjectives in front of consensus are the defining terms. I don't think strong support, weak support is one of the defined terms and we can use it to - as long as we make sure it's clear.

So I don't think it is inconsistent to say there is strong minority support or a minority strong support, whatever, in conjunction with near consensus against. I think that's reasonably clear to a reader. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, I think that we have to differentiate between persistent support and strong support. I'm certainly fine with saying there was persistent minority support for including it.

But I believe that if we went back to the first Milestone Report where the consensus was defined on whether to pursue this, we'll find that there was at least rough consensus if not full consensus for not considering it.

And I don't think that we've ever - and that was done when there was a wide group of people. And one of the things that one has a lot of experience with, especially in working with working groups in places like IATF and whatever, is that one or two voices persistently arguing for something even after there's rough consensus not to do it does not change the consensus.

And that's pretty much why I'm being as painful as I may be being, is because early in this process a level of consensus was reached. There has been a persistent effort against it that remains to this day, and I want that to be expressed.

It is a valid minority view but that doesn't make it strong when you consider the size of the group. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Avri. Okay, so I think it's time to - if we are really - we just have 80 minutes till the end of this call, and it's just one hour. Okay Rob, you will speak later. Let me - give me just one minute.

I do think that there was a clear - we can discuss for a long time how is exactly a lot of consensus against bundling, but I think it's really strong. It was rough and there was - for bundling it was just really minority, yes, persistent and small minority.

But we think we need to find now a final wording and I would like to go for a rough consensus about - against bundling and a strong minority about it, so Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you Rafik. I was just about to read almost the exact same thing that you just said with - the only change that I am a little confused about is whether it's strong or persistent.

So let me read it first with your strong and then see if Avri still has an objection or wants to substitute persistent. "There was rough consensus in the working group against making a proposal on bundling.

There was strong minority support in the working group for including the bundling concept." So I guess the only difference between what you and Avri just said is whether we use strong or whether we use persistent in describing minority.

Avri Doria: I prefer persistent but it's up to the Chairs I think at this point. They've heard this discussion. Let's end it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Or we could do persistent and include both, which is fairly accurate in my opinion.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Rob sorry. Just can you repeat the words? I didn't hear it well. Please can you repeat that?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. There was rough consensus in the working group against making a proposal on bundling. There was strong minority support in the working group for including the bundling concept.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Of course those will be - and of course those will be separated by that, you know, the definition of bundling. But I just wanted to reduce the discussion to just...

(Andrew): Read it one more time. Do you mind?

Rob Hoggarth: Sorry. Sure. And do you want me to read the whole paragraph or just...?

(Andrew): Just the two operative parts.

Rob Hoggarth: There was rough consensus in the working group against making a proposal on bundling. There was strong minority support in the working group for including the bundling concept.

(Andrew): Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. I will - I think that - that was you (Andrew), the okay?

(Andrew): Yes, but it's time to move on. It's too early in the day to want a beer.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes, it's earlier in some regions.

(Andrew): Yes, apologies Rafik. I understand. Or late in the day.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Rafik this is Rob. Cintra had a comment about, you know, going back and noting a number of specific word changes which I think would be very helpful for us from just a drafting or editing perspective.

What I'd like to do is if we can there are just two more relatively substantive but may be resolved in just a sentence or two of discussion. There are just two more left, so if I could do those first and then we could visit Cintra's more detailed edits or grammatical changes I'd appreciate that.

Avri Doria: Okay next.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes Cintra.

Cintra Sooknanan: No.

Simonetta Batteiger: Simonetta.

Carlton Samuels: No, let's go with Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thank you. Okay, so the next one Rafik is just in D, so we were just having a discussion about the last bullet point in B. We've resolved that. Two sections later is D and I must confess I went back through my notes and I couldn't find whether we had resolved this Alan, so I left it in here.

In D it says, "Sponsorship by nonprofit civil society and nongovernmental organizations in a manner consistent with the organization's social service missions."

And Alan's comment was, "Is sponsorship the proper word here?" And Alan did you have a suggestion for maybe changing that word or...?

Alan Greenberg: I - it's Alan. I vaguely remember that Avri had a comment which might have resolved it. I don't remember exactly what it was anymore now, and I'm not adamant about this.

It's just that the word sponsorship in general was not the one we're using, but it's not big enough to worry about. No one's presuming that we're recommending going back to the model of 2004, so I don't think it's a big issue. If we have a better word we should use it.

Rob Hoggarth: Great, thank you. Unless Avri you have a suggested word to change or someone else does we'll leave it. And then Rafik the last one is...

Carlton Samuels: Avri's had her - raised her hand.

Rob Hoggarth: Oh I'm sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: I'm mad.

Rafik Dammak: I think she is playing with - in mute I think. Avri?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I don't remember what word I suggested instead of supported and maybe, you know, by the end of the meeting I'll have recalled it again. But I do agree with Alan that it rings an incorrect bell and makes people think of the fTLDs.

And since those are a named existing thing we should probably avoid using that word. And if I can remember what I thought yesterday or the day before I would tell you, and I'll think about it some more and I'll find it.

Alan Greenberg: How about advocated?

Avri Doria: Sure. Proposed. Yes sure.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: So what is that? So what was your agreement then? I'm sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Advocate was what I suggested and Avri agreed. I don't know what...

Rafik Dammak: Yes I think...

Alan Greenberg: Is says you're pro and you're for it, you're willing to argue for it but it's not the S word.

Rob Hoggarth: So it'd be advocated.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. Rafik the last one, and Tijani this may be actually directed to you, because this section was what we had cut and pasted from your very helpful edits on the last call.

The paragraph is my 68 on Page 35 and in particular I flagged Subparagraph or Subsection D, and the reason I did that is that I just

wanted to clarify that Tijani, when you moved the text over and we combined the two sections, this section was deleted.

And the question I had was that an intentional deletion or a typo? If it was intentional I'm happy to take it out. I would note that the group approved in totality your movement of the text, and I just wanted to flag this for clarification.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Paragraph 69 you said?

Rob Hoggarth: Sixty-eight. It's under Demonstrated Financial Capabilities and Need.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: I'm at 68 D.

Alan Greenberg: D as in dog.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: It's just that it disappeared in your edits and I didn't have the benefits of a redline to know whether that was an intentional deletion, or when you were cutting and pasting you just skipped over it.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It's in the text of edit.

Alan Greenberg: Rob, it's Alan. I can lend some light to this.

Rob Hoggarth: Sure. I mean, it's a binary decision. Keep or go.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: And also we changed the 45 to 47 and it was a real - only for the first. For the others I don't know why we changed them to 47.

Rob Hoggarth: Well I can explain. In my case I - when I saw 45 was changed to 47 I just globally changed 45 to 47.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It's only for the evaluation fees - the first.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, so you're happy to have this go back to 45?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I think so.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, dead air.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Avri? Avri?

Avri Doria: I didn't mean to have my hand up. Sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I did mean to have my hand up. On the 45 versus 47 we changed the fee reduction to 47 to be in line with the other one. I think Tijani is right. We didn't explicitly say change these.

I can live with it either way. It doesn't make any difference. In terms of whether this paragraph should be missing or not however, at my

request we had an exhaustive discussion last time on whether the 47,000 should be qualified as to what period of time.

And the general consensus was to leave the period of time unstated. That implies to me that there was an agreement that the overall paragraph stays, otherwise why were we discussing it so much?

So I think - I'm presuming based on the - that the presence of that discussion last time that no one was advocating removing the concept. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Alan, this is Rob. Just to clarify that your discussion during the last call was focused only on C, because C was the only paragraph that you were evaluating.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Because that had been - because D had been deleted you weren't talking about D.

Alan Greenberg: No, we in fact were and I - because I remember explicitly saying that maybe the continuity one is one time so that one doesn't need to be qualified.

Rob Hoggarth: Oh okay.

Alan Greenberg: But it - my comment originally applied to both.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And I recognize that it probably wasn't relevant in terms of continuity cost, because that was a one-time expense. And - but it still did apply to C although we decided not to do anything about it.

So there certainly was discussion that the - that that paragraph existed last time and no one raised their hand and said, "But we already deleted it." So I'm taking that as passive agreement that we hadn't deleted it, but I may of course could be wrong.

Carlton Samuels: Yes that's what it was.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan: I want to continue with my edits if it's okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Just to close that we're keeping Paragraph D.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No. No, I have the comment on Paragraph D.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes Tijani, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay thank you. I remember now. I deleted it intentionally because I don't know if you remember for the first Milestone Report we proposed to reduce the financial instrument - the period to six months.

And this milestone - in this Final Report at the beginning we said that it will be - it should be that - meaningfully reduced. But we didn't say how or how much.

Alan is right. He commented on the Paragraph D on the wiki and perhaps on the mailing list or on the wiki. I don't remember, but he commented on it and he said it is for the beginning or for a year or what is it?

And I think he's right because we don't have to fix an amount of money for the continuity period, for continuity instrument. It depends on the regions. It depends on - nobody can say it - the continuity instrument must be X dollar.

So that's why I deleted it. I think that we spoke about it at the beginning, and if we want to detail it we have to do it there not here.

Rafik Dammak: Okay Rob. Before - Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I think Tijani's right. If one place we're saying reduce the period of time which implicitly reduces the dollar amount, I think we should be consistent and say the same thing wherever it's applicable. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Alan. Rob go.

Rob Hoggarth: So it sounds like it's a raging agreement to take it out, right?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, thank you. Mr. Chairman that concludes the comments I had flagged and I'm...

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Oh, so we went through all the comments. No more - any substantive ones that we need to discuss?

Rob Hoggarth: Well just - now Cintra's comment's going back.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you so much. Okay, so I know that the page numbers are a bit off, right, so it may take me some time to go through and refer to specifically where one - some correction's need. So right now Page 5, when you are talking about SARP...

Alan Greenberg: Give us the paragraph number Cintra.

Cintra Sooknanan: Sorry, Paragraph Number...

Rob Hoggarth: It's the Executive Summary Alan. There's no paragraph number.

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Okay sorry.

Cintra Sooknanan: Part C, right. Let me just go back to - sorry. Right, you see, "When the SARP rejects the support candidates, the SARP should," should that be should or should it be shall explain its reasons?

Are we giving them an option to explain or not? Or shall they always explain their reasons? So I just want to suggest that should be changed to shall.

Rob Hoggarth: If I may Rafik.

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much. The reason that the Executive Summary is all in the should sense is that the introduction, the first line or two of it, explains that this is simply a summary of the recommendations by the Work Group.

So as recommendations they're all should statements rather than future tense shall statements.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. Secondly, on Page - sorry, Line 3 of C, right, you see, "Work to improve its applications and reapply for support." Is this a reapplication or is this a fresh application for support? Is it a new application for support?

Carlton Samuels: No, the sense is that it needs to be - you take the amendment so you apply - you have the old one. There's something wrong with it. You augment it and you put it in again. It's a theory application.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, this is saying iterations are okay.

Carlton Samuels: Yes that's all.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. Page 7.

Alan Greenberg: That's assuming time allows.

Cintra Sooknanan: Right. Number one, I just want to suggest that we decide what we want our acronym to be. Should it be JAS working group or working group, because I don't want too many acronyms choosing on JAS working group and working group, either/or, and also you have support program and DSP or - yes. So should we just decide on one to make things simpler?

Carlton Samuels: The WG is always qualified by JAS so it should be qualified by JAS, so wherever you see WG it - we should put in the qualifier JAS.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. With regard to Line 5 which says, "Will be to provide financial and non-financial assistance." Is this partial or full financial and non-financial assistance?

Carlton Samuels: I'm not sure what you mean there.

Cintra Sooknanan: The way...

Alan Greenberg: Where are you?

Carlton Samuels: Where are you Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan: Line 5 of Paragraph 1. "The goal of the support program or DSP will be to provide financial and non-financial assistance." Are we referring to full financial and non-financial assistance, or full and/or partial financial and non-financial assistance?

Carlton Samuels: No, just financial and financial. We don't know what it's going to be yet.

Cintra Sooknanan: So you - okay.

Carlton Samuels: It's the evaluation that determines it whether it's going to be full or partial.

Cintra Sooknanan: Because the way this is written it sounds like it's full. In my mind it sounds like full support, so I think perhaps it - we should qualify it as being full and/or partial or maybe just have that as a separate note that this will be decided.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. This is an Executive Summary and I think the statement is 100% accurate, and I don't think we need to qualify it at that point.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: We are talking about providing financial support, not definitive of complete financial support.

Carlton Samuels: Of complete, yes. It's - it isn't intended to be definitive here. This is why I'm saying that it - that only happens when you've gone through the process. We're just referencing support, financial and non-financial in Executive Summary. The major - it's the major ideas.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. Can I comment on Cintra's previous...

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...statement that - when I put my hand up. Yes, regarding the shorthand JAS working group or working group, in this report we are using the term - we're using the term varyingly.

In most reports when the term working group is used within a report, it is referring to the present working group, the one that wrote the report. So I would tend to leave what we have alone at this point.

Global changes almost invariably cause problems, you know. If you do them en masse you will inevitably change something you didn't mean to change. Time is short and I think it's fine to say either JAS working group or working group implies that this working group and leaving it at that at this point.

I would not advocate spending time on it and without time on it it's likely to introduce problems so...

Carlton Samuels: Well the introduction also says JAS WG or WG so it's - hereinafter it's...

Alan Greenberg: Right. I'm agreeing that the wording there should be left and not tidied up to have just a single acronym.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, it's - read that as a hereinafter. Well read the document...

Alan Greenberg: I did but Cintra was advocating that we pick one and change everything to be consistent. I'm saying...

Carlton Samuels: No. No. I'm not suggesting that at all.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...agree at this point.

Carlton Samuels: I am not suggesting that at all. I'm saying that it is qualified and it -
leave it at that.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. Paragraph 3, which says - Line 4. It says not to rely on any
knowledge of the working group's earlier Milestone Reports or second
Milestone Reports. I do find it - this is kind of confusing. I would prefer
that instead of rely on, you say require.

So it does not require, so you know it's required from the reader's
perspective, not that it doesn't rely on any knowledge of the working
group's earlier work.

Rafik Dammak: I actually disagree. I think it's the active tense, rely on, that is here.
Required suggests that there is a formative kind of, you know, you go
look it up and read it up. No, I don't think that's what the sense of this is
saying here. It's saying if you came into this from Mars, read it and take
it for what it is.

Cintra Sooknanan: When you say it's - it is a document. The document does not
rely on, so it does not build on any knowledge of the working group's...

Man: Right.

Cintra Sooknanan: ...earlier Milestone report or second Milestone report. Is that
your meaning?

Man: Right, yes.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. Could I get in please? I'll assume - I'll take that as a yes.

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: I'm the one who advocated putting words like this in somewhere, but I don't think they're relevant here at all. The suggestion to put something like this in was to follow a sentence - I don't know where it is now - to follow a sentence that says this report builds on the recommendations or the conclusions of the Milestone reports. And the way that sentence read, it implied - it might imply to some people that they needed to know exactly what was in the Milestone reports and therefore had to go back and read them to understand the current report.

So I advocated adding essentially a disclaimer saying yes it builds upon the previous ones but does not require you to go back and read them. It stands alone. Somehow this sentence got transposed where it is now.

I don't know if a previous sentence was deleted or this is a summary in the Executive Summary which is taken out of context. I don't remember which, maybe Rob or Seth can enlighten us. But I know I proposed those words explicitly to make sure the previous sentence didn't imply that you had to go back and find the other reports and read them quickly.

Rafik Dammak: That's the point of it, if you prior shoot it out of Mars, you wouldn't have to.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Rafik Dammak: But that was what was intended to be here.

Alan Greenberg: Right, but the sentence that it was modifying is not in this paragraph, so I'm a little bit confused. Rob or Seth?

Cintra Sooknanan: No but in my opinion, this sentence states that it's our - this current document doesn't rely on any of the previous work done. It does not rely on any knowledge of the working group's earlier Milestone report. I just want rely on change to require.

Alan Greenberg: I don't really care about that.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. So what does this sentence ask?

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Are our editors offline at this point?

Seth Greene: No Alan, hi, this is (Seth). Rafik, the - I was actually just offline for a second. I know the issue but the paragraph specifically is...

Alan Greenberg: We're in Paragraph 3 of the Executive...

Cintra Sooknanan: It's seven.

Seth Greene: ...of the introduction?

Alan Greenberg: Of the introduction, correct.

Seth Greene: Yes, yes, thank you, Alan. And you're saying, Alan, that a sentence is now missing?

Alan Greenberg: Well I don't know, I don't remember if I made this comment in relation to the Executive Summary or text that was somewhere else in the body. But I know I made the comment that we should add this is - stands alone to follow another sentence which said this report builds upon the conclusions of the Milestone reports, or some wording like that. And I was just counteracting that, saying it builds upon them but you don't need to go read them.

(Andrew): Alan, this is (Andrew). Can I just give you a quick feedback from the floor, having listened to this now for a little while?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

(Andrew): I sense that we may be trying to solve a problem we don't need to, in the sense that your mentioning of it in the way that you do, I totally get and appreciate why you're trying to do it. But it left me more confused as, you know, trying to imagine myself as a first-time reader. Maybe we take out the references to the Milestone report one way or the other, include them as annexes...

Alan Greenberg: (Andrew), you're not disagreeing, I'm...

((Crosstalk))

(Andrew): Oh okay, okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...that I added these sentences because there was a prior sentence which now isn't there.

(Andrew): Okay, now I - you can understand why I'm confused.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...or it was done in relation to a different part of the report. That I can't remember at this point.

(Andrew): You can understand my confusion though. Thank you.

Man: Okay guys. (Unintelligible) after the end of this call - this call at the end of this conference. I think Avri wanted to speak. Avri, you can go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thank you, this is Avri. I assume I'm off mute. I guess I agree with the point that we should say that this document builds on - I don't know that we need to say it stands alone, because I am actually not sure that it does stand alone. I think there's reasoning, you know, once Cintra mentioned previously on another comment that we needed to include the reasoning, that reasoning is included in the Milestone reports but it's not repeated here.

And so therefore I actually think it's necessary to say it rests upon those, it's based upon those, it goes further. I think giving references to them, including them in annexes or whatever is probably a good idea. I'm not sure about the length of the documents, if they're physically

included as opposed to included by reference, but I think they're important.

And it may be worth saying it builds upon those documents and the reasoning and arguments for many of the decisions listed in this document can be found in those documents. And so that both takes care of Cintra's notion that we really need to tell people the why, but it also takes care of the necessity of keeping this document a fairly clean one that gives the decision and methods. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Avri. Seth?

Seth Greene: Thank you very much, Rafik. I'm wondering if I could just call the workgroup's attention to Paragraph 4 right under it. That's actually where I believe we moved your sentence to that is now missing from Paragraph 3, Alan. Does the workgroup think that Paragraph 4 actually handles both Alan and Avri's points, or should Paragraph 4 be changed?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. Yes, correct, thank you, Seth. The lead-in sentence of Paragraph 4 was why I proposed what is now at the end of Paragraph 3. If anything, it should be moved down into Paragraph 4.

I'm not sure I can read it with full presence of mind right now, but my suggestion to add that - that the concept that is at the end of three was in reaction to the first sentence of four.

Seth Greene: I think, Alan, what we...

Alan Greenberg: It may just that we put it in the wrong place.

Seth Greene: Sure. I think, Alan, what we did and the workgroup might want us to put it back as you're suggesting, but we tried to do it - just the editors, we tried to divide out the two ideas and just to clarify it all by first making the point more strongly that this report can in fact be read alone and is meant to. And then, as a secondary follow-up point in Paragraph 4, add the point that however, it does in fact build on the earlier report.

Alan Greenberg: I can certainly live with that. I'm sorry; I may have introduced a complete red herring by doing that, by raising the issue of the origin of this. By the way, with reference to what Avri said, I agree that much of what we're doing was created in the Milestones and explained there. There are some things in the Milestones that we reversed along the way. So I think we need to be a little bit careful about what we say about the Milestone reports. Thank you.

Cintra Sooknanan: This is Cintra. May I just say that even if we move it to Paragraph 4, the meaning is still going to be the same. You're just saying the final report does not rely on any knowledge of the earlier documentation, which is not the case. What you're trying to say is the final report does not require from the reader any knowledge of the earlier reports.

Man: I can live with that.

Cintra Sooknanan: "Rely on" needs to be changed to "require" because it's - the document, the final report is building from the earlier reports but it doesn't require from the reader to have knowledge of those earlier reports.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Cintra. I think when people read the report, the last version, it's always the difference. Okay, I guess we talked a lot about this and we need to move on. Seth - I'm not sure, I think Seth is - he had his hand raised. You want to speak, Seth?

Seth Greene: I apologize, Rafik. No, thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so Cintra, did you still have some comments?

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes I do. Paragraph nine - sorry - Paragraph 9 you talk about - sorry, Line 3, "enables support to approved candidates residing in developing economies." I'd like to advocate that we include "registered and residing in developing countries or (unintelligible)" Right? Because companies can't reside.

Okay, so just to put in "registered or residing." The last sentence of this doesn't read very clearly. It says there are "five clear reasons for this determination." Should we say "as follows" and then make 10, 9.1 suggested?

Alan Greenberg: I think - it's Alan. I think the style we adopted for this is to number paragraphs in pure sequential numbering, not to indicate the subservience of them. Too late to change that now, I think.

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes, but - okay, if that's the case, then if you look at it, right, 11 is - falls under the first part, right?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, 11 is the second part of the first point. It may not be the best style but it's the one we're using and it's far too late, I think, to change the

paragraph numbering style and the overall visual style of the document.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. I want to suggest some rewording of Paragraph 13, Line 3. Since - it says, "since the international global resources belong to all," I want to put in there, "and in keeping with ICANN's theme of one with one Internet," and then you can put in semicolon, "the diversity competition and innovation," et cetera. Right, so...

Rob Hoggarth: I'm sorry, Cintra, what paragraph are you in? This is Rob, I'm sorry.

Cintra Sooknanan: I'm in Paragraph 13, Line 2.

Rob Hoggarth: Thirteen, thank you.

(Cheryl Hayes): (Cheryl Hayes), Cintra. Why do we need to put the ICANN tag line in there? I see no advantage to it at all.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. I just think it supports the first line more, that's all, right? But if you don't want it in then at least after "all" that should be...

(Cheryl Hayes): Leave it alone.

Cintra Sooknanan: ...a semicolon, not a comma.

(Cheryl Hayes): Yes.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, that's all the comments I have up to now, up to this point. That's as far as I got to, which was not (unintelligible). Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Cintra. Rob or Seth, any concerns with - do you still have any questions or clarification that you need before I - yes, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. It's actually a follow-on question from something that was raised while - sorry, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record - while Cintra was making her edit suggestions. I was under the impression that pre - prior, I can't even speak at the moment - prior to this going to a final document, that the paragraph numbers are removed, that the paragraph numbers are simply a convention we are using during our editing process, that this is not going through in a document form like some legal documentation with paragraph numbers associated or line numbers associated with the text.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, and so it's more formatting suggestion. I agree with you, Cheryl, about that.

Man: Yes, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, so that's now more to make - clear up with what we did, and to see if there is anything to do and so we can move on. Yes, Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you Rafik. Cheryl and Carlton, if I can push back a little on that - with a document of this length and the fact that it's going to be translated into a number of non-English languages, my experience at least with our, for example, our Geographic Regions Review working group is that it actually helps people throughout the process,

translators, people who are reading the document and the rest in other languages, to maintain the paragraph numbering.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Alan, you want to speak about that?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I certainly do. I agree with Cheryl that this is - as I said to Cintra, this is not an optimal set of - an optimal formatting, but I think it's really too late at this point to make that change. If the paragraph - the paragraph numbers give us some level of structure. Without paragraph numbers, I think you really do have to go into numbering sections and subsections and things like that and indenting, or whatever the style is.

You just can't everything flat running through with the only difference being heading numbers. So I don't like it, it's too late, and in addition I believe there is content within it that refers to other paragraph numbers which would have to be adjusted. I think it's just too late to do that at this point and I can live with straight paragraph numbering as it stands right now.

I mean, we already have some level of indenting. If you look at section eight, section 38, rather, it has A, B, C and other sections have sub-numbers like that. But I...

Woman: That's how it should be.

Alan Greenberg: But there are other places where it would be needed if we don't have raw paragraph numbers. And I'm not sure that's something we want to require at this point. I agree it's not the way I'd like the report to look, but given the timing, I'm not sure we have a lot of other options. I won't

Speak to what I thought the intent was, because I don't think we thought that far ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Alan. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, hi. I guess I totally disagree. I love paragraph numbers. I think every final document that people are going to use as something to refer to should have paragraph numbers. I guess as a staff member at the UN, I - all documents were numbered paragraphs and it makes it so easy to know what you're talking about when you're talking about document content.

So I strongly suggest we leave them and start thinking about doing them for every final document. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Avri. So that that's said, and Rob wanted to speak, but then I saw that Rob lowered his hand. Rob, do you still want to speak or if not, we can move to Seth. Seth?

Seth Greene: Thank you very much, Rafik. It's Seth, for the record. I actually just wanted to point out, Rob and I did consider actually both these arguments, pro and con, the paragraph numbers. And a compromise that we came up with that I think may serve the purposes on both sides is that in the final document, while we suggest that we keep the paragraph numbers for the reasons stated, we are going to, if it's all right with the workgroup, we're going to - what's the phrase - gray them out.

You know, instead of having them be the same black text as the actual substance of the report, we're going to have them in light gray along

the left-hand column. I think that might help some of those of you who do not like the idea of keeping them.

Rafik Dammak: That'll help. Any - Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, for the record, I love paragraph numbers. I just prefer structured ones where you can tell the structure of the report from the numbers, and not just number them sequentially, you know, ignoring the structure. I agree completely with Avri that it helps immensely to be able to point to paragraphs by a number. I just happen to like the structured format better. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes, Seth?

Seth Greene: Oh, I'm sorry Rafik, no my hand is down.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so I guess we are ending with the discussion about the format. I'm not sure that's a good sign that we ended without any substantive issues, but anyway.

Alan Greenberg: If we're down to formatting, we've done a good job.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, definitely. Okay so just the hour now, at one hour, 36 minutes, and this call, I guess, we've reached the end. Okay, yes, (Robert)?

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. I just wanted to confirm how you would prefer for us to take the next steps, Rafik. Our plan was to make the edits that have been expressed on this call and then produce a clean, final version that we will circulate to the list, and then we'll, you know, leave it to you, Rafik and Carlton, I guess, as to how you want to proceed with circulating it

with cover letters or things like that. I know that you've had some discussions with Karla about public comment process and things like that.

But I'm talking just so we've got the logistics of wrapping up the draft. We will have that document produced, if not later today, probably some time over the weekend, that we'll circulate to all of you. And I'll let you define what the process will be from then, Rafik.

I'd also note that at the beginning of this call, probably before the recording, you and Karla were talking about firming up the date of the webinar, and you probably want to do that on this call as well. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Rob. At least for my - for the GNSO side, we need - I need to submit the motion and I think on Wednesday, and then that will set us to some 34 before that. So if you - the clean version will be circulated in the weekend, it's only the, I guess Monday, for really people to make comments and if they find any typos or something, just we can correct it, (unintelligible) not really to go into substantive discussion.

I'm not sure about the deadlines for the (unintelligible) may be, Carlton can clarify that, then we can submit in time for the reports in order to have our chat in the organization to approve the report. And then to get - they should get the report before their respective calls. Yes, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I was going to raise the issue that Rob already raised, but I'll support it. There are - a number of GNSO Councilors had suggested that the webinar was something that was imperative prior to the

Council meeting. I haven't seen a date announced yet for it and getting people to participate on such short notice is going to be rather problematic.

We really have to set a firm date and time for it a while ago, and since we didn't, we cannot wait anymore. This is a really important issue. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Alan, and we had a discussion about that with - before the - that we got the recording started. Karla, (unintelligible) me and Carlton, we suggested the 13th a few days ago, but it's too late now. I guess we - mostly we can't organize next Friday, maybe the week after to have enough time to publicize and also to prepare that webinar - the content of webinar and to have the presenters. So maybe we can summit so we have either next Friday or another day, should be like...

Alan Greenberg: I would point out that in general, and this workgroup is an exception, Fridays are an ICANN-free day that we in general don't schedule meetings for ICANN on - teleconference for ICANN on Fridays. And doing it on a Friday I think reduces the number of people who are likely to attend.

Rafik Dammak: Maybe it's the first time to hear about it, because one of my first important working group in ICANN, the call was always organized on Friday.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: So I am happy to hear that, so next time we will ask no working group calls on Friday. Yes Karla?

Karla Valente: Hi. So what I hear is September 16, Friday. We will send invitations to SOs and ACs. I need to know who is going to speak so that I can communicate with this individual or, you know, individuals about the exact content, refine the PowerPoints and so forth.

Now, I would like to remind you that the webinar will be recorded, so if somebody's not able to attend on the exact time and date that we set up, they can always review the recording. Of course the recording doesn't allow for the Q&A, but still, it gives at least some access to what was said.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so maybe you - I think, as co-chairs, we will be present. But we need people from the working group there, so maybe to see if there is some volunteers, or we can nominate...

Carlton Samuels: Can I volunteer Avri and Cheryl Langdon-Orr as speakers on this webinar?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No you can't volunteer me.

Carlton Samuels: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think it's inappropriate, Cheryl, for the record. I think it's inappropriate when the ALAC is going to be considering the document for me to present the document.

Carlton Samuels: No I don't mean that present, to present the entire document but as a support of the presentation, you know, chip in from time to time.

That was a (plan) I'm...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Point.

Carlton Samuels: ...that we were asking. Rafik's comment was that we could have some support from the working group.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I'm ignoring the webinar. When is it?

Carlton Samuels: Sixteenth.

Woman: Next Friday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If the working group wants me to do something, I can. I was planning to ignore it, but.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, Avri?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If the group wants me to do something, I can. But I guess by - well no I - well yes, sure.

But I think that the group has to think that, you know, I'm able to express all the viewpoints fairly and so, yes.

Carlton Samuels: Avri, let me tell you what my interest is just so you know the background that we're going to present Rafik and I but with (unintelligible) of the funding and the foundations which I think will draw some (unintelligible), you know, extensive conversations.

It might be useful to have your support especially in that area.

And that's the thinking behind.

Avri Doria: Sure, yes. Now I the 16th I can be available, so sure.

Rafik Dammak: In fact, Avri, thought one of the first idea is not really just to prevent we more to be there to make (unintelligible) or to coordinate or to reply.

But to reply to some question but it's mostly that we have people from the working group to reply for specific topic and so that's why is to ask people who want to volunteer so we can have more than two or three or four.

Yes, just we need to how to coordinate that and to dispatch the different topic because I guess we can expect a lot of (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, fine. And the best traditions of (unintelligible)...

Carlton Samuels: That was the intent and I'll tell you why I also thought of Cheryl and forgive me, Cheryl.

The other part that I thought would probably have some controversy is the process. And I thought you might be very helpful there in terms of support.

That was the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is there a particular - it's Cheryl for the record.

Is there a particular question, then, of course, I will jump in.

But I don't think it's appropriate to present. Now I've heard two different approaches just in the last five minutes. One was for a presentation approach where Karla asked for presenters and then the other was for a suggestion that you and Rafik as a coach here would simply act as moderators.

And then other people are asked, you know, doing Q&A. I'm not quite sure who is actually going to run through about that point presentation this point.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, I think we're still with the chairs doing the PowerPoint presentation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that's exactly not what Rafik just said so my confusion...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: May I speak please?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you two discuss it and worked it out yet.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I speak. I have my hand up.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. (You may).

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. I think that the proposal of Carlton for Avri is very good. Cheryl apologized and that's okay, but I think that Alan can help.

Alan Greenberg: That was my - thank you, Tijani, that was my alternative.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, so I think that the two presenters will be Avri and Alan. This is my proposal. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think it's not just to have presenter, it's more to have people who can answer the questions so we need to organize that.

I expect a lot of questions because the shortest time...

Tijani Ben Jemaa: And that everyone of the group can answer questions...

Woman: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:...but there is people who always in the group from the beginning till the end and we contributed a lot so they are better put position to answer the question. I think so.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: That's exactly right ,Tijani.

Carlton Samuels: That's part of the appeal to asking for that kind of structure that's support.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Okay. I'm seeing the (unintelligible) from Karla. Karla, you go ahead.

Karla Valente: So here's what I have so far. webinar's to take place on the 16th of September, which is next Friday.

I'll take a look at what is the better time but maybe we use around the time that we have this working group's call.

The presentation in PowerPoint and, Avri, I will address the presentation and send it to you, you know, just for a (kick start).

Carlton, Rafik, and other working group members would be present (IANA).

I suggest we dedicate 30 to 45 minutes for Q&A. If we do the presentation one hour, at least 30 minutes for Q&A.

If we do it more than one hour, then we could have more time for the Q&A. We must keep in mind that we might not have time to respond to all of the Q&A and maybe members from the (unintelligible) (IANA)s will complain about the short notice and we'll have questions about the report and we want the opportunity to ask questions.

So we need to have an answer to them regarding is the answer that we will be conducting another session in the (car) going over the report in which we can discuss in more detail. Any questions that they have maybe that's the answer.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Karla, just the webinar is quite important because it will be before our (unintelligible) organization to make decision.

The (unintelligible) will be more to present to the community what we did (unintelligible) so they are both important, but we need to focus now on this webinar especially that we need approval from GNSO council or (unintelligible) of the decision at the next GNSO council call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The ALAC, Cheryl here, the ALAC call is only the following week. So the timetable works about but you also need both chartering organizations to consider it so.

I know we seem to be focused on the GNSO and more to the webinar but I would assume that ALAC and at large would also be its ending (webinar) and has been an opportunity for them to, you know, we've got 15 ALAC people and we don't have all 15 of us involved in the work group.

So it's going to be important for them to be out and be brought up to speed and have any deep diving into the details done as well.

Rafik Dammak: Cheryl, I'm not saying that I support GNSO so well but I will set some deadlines and that's why it's (sorry) to explain especially that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'm answering you on the deadlines making it clear that it suits the ALAC deadlines as well which was a question, Rafik, you asked earlier.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Our meeting is on the last Tuesday of the month and this date suits those deadlines as well.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, but it should only issue that why I was asking because we are going to send in the report next week and I need to submit portion on Wednesday and the next GNSO council will be in 22nd.

And there is a real risk that we can and defer the decision to approve the report if they couldn't find reasons to answer to the questions.

That's why also when I advocated for the delay for the deadline of the GNSO council was one of the arguments was that we are going to organize webinar to let all because the (unintelligible) take hold the groups to ask the question about the report.

So I'm not really into competition between ALAC and GNSO...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm not suggesting that, Rafik. I'm saying that the dates will suit the ALAC as well.

Rafik Dammak: Okay so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we'll be considering in the 27th.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, we are all there. We are all on the same page.

Rafik Dammak: Okay maybe I (unintelligible). Sorry it's...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Sorry?

Carlton Samuels: We are on the same page.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so. But one of those guys, I think that Karla was in the beginning that said that we should have two webinars so to allow people from all

around the world to attend. So I'm not sure about the time and how we can manage that.

It will be in the same day or we have two days? Maybe Glen have more experience in organizing webinar can give us some insights about that?

Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, Rafik. I think that you're right. We should perhaps have two times and in other webinars, what we do we usually make an earlier time say 1200 UTC and then a later time, 2000 UTC.

Rafik Dammak: Ten UTC and 2000 UTC.

Glen Desaintgery: About 1200 UTC and 2000 UTC because sometimes 1200 UTC - 11, 1200 UTC is very early for the Pacific region. But it covers a lot of other regions and then the 2000 UTC will cover the Pacific region well.

And I think it's probably - it's early for Australia but it's probably not impossible.

Is that right, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It says 6:00 am for Australia. It's 4:00 am for New Zealand. And it tends to be (unintelligible) unfriendly for Hong Kong, which is two hours behind.

Glen Desaintgery: So we could best make it at a bit later than 2000 UTC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Check with (unintelligible) or Glen. I think he thought will find that more Asia-Pacific time friendly comes in at around the 2200...

Glen Desaintgery: 2200, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:...the 2100 or 2200 and certainly at the 0500, 0600 works well in Asia-Pacific.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: So, Cheryl (unintelligible) is suggesting the 2200 UTC?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No I'm just saying they're the times that work well for the broadest times zoning in Asia-Pacific. Either that or at 05 or 0600 also works.

Rafik Dammak: It will be 8:00 am in Japan, so I guess it's nine in Australia or something like that or?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's right.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay well we'll work with Karla on two dates. Don't you think so, Karla, two times?

Karla Valente: I have it at 1200 UTC and 2200 UTC.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes. I think that should probably...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I think that's a nice split and it certainly should cover most. Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, yes.

Karla Valente: Okay and we run for about one hour? One hour and a half?

Rafik Dammak: One hour and a half I guess then.

Yes, because it's not just presentation, I think. And we are going to ask people to attend those two - well maybe not on the same days is better because it can be (challenging) it's....

What do you think; it's not the same, not on all Friday maybe to start one on Friday and one in Monday.

Carlton Samuels: Have one Monday?

Karla Valente: I think it's better...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Cheryl here for the record here. I don't know whether it's a different set of experiences, but I know just I (unintelligible) to do two time zones on the one - sorry, two time blocks on the one day to covering.

If you're doing the 1200 and 2200 UTC probably need to then look carefully at which one you offer into Asia-Pacific timing.

If you...

Woman: Yes, this is (unintelligible). The 2200 UTC on a Friday would be a Saturday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly right.

Woman: Where is if we did the 2200 UTC on Sunday night then it would be Monday.

Or if we did it Monday night it would be Tuesday. For me I can't go any later than Tuesday because Wednesday I'm flying somewhere.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So you just need to watch that you don't run into what's effectively a weekend in the Asia-Pacific area.

Woman: What's the 48-hour block the question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And...

Carlton Samuels: So what about doing it on Thursday. How about Thursday night?

Rafik Dammak: Thursday night?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thursday - so 22 on Thursday and 12 on Friday?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Neither Olivier or well - it's Olivier and I both have calls and, in fact, some of your - I don't know how many of your councils in the GNSO are involved in the (DSSI) work group, but we meet every week at 2300 on Thursday.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Cheryl, I am also on that call. Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Forget it. Let's do it so that the 2200 UTC ends up on Monday in Asia-Pacific.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Avri Doria: How does that work for (Chaz) working at night on a Sunday in Marina del Rey?

Karla Valente: Yes, I'm going to have a meeting. This is Karla, Avri. I'm going to have a meeting with the IT support today and track on their availability.

What I want to make sure is that IT - I am available, of course, but I have to double check with IT if they are available.

If we could do Monday at 2200 UTC, I think the chances are just higher for them to be available.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That makes sense then.

Avri Doria: It is nice but you are, of course, available but it is your Sunday night.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I also have a remark. So maybe also the time it will be really short for people to read the report.

So maybe if we go for Monday and then we give them enough time to read the report to prepare and then they can ask the questions.

So Monday can work, I think, can be good compromise. We have this ICANN stuff to be available I think.

And also which ask me to check if there is any working group have having call at that time so what do you think?

I think we have a constraint that people need to read the report or we cannot rush them to in just a few days to read it and also to avoid any (unintelligible) problem.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are you talking about Monday the 19th?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can't...

Rafik Dammak: And also give Alex enough time to prepare.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because on Monday I need to call the DotCoop call at 1300 UTC.

Rafik Dammak: 1300 UTC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that's the DotCoop call, which everybody's not on. And so that seems to be a fairly workable day from the GNSO (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: For GNSO and for ALAC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's fine. It's fine, it's perfectly fine.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I like this logistic discussion. Okay, so I guess we have...

Karla Valente: Rafik, this is Karla, just to clarify.

So on September 16th which is next Friday, is in California the time is going to be 1200 UTC. And on September 19 is going to be 2200 UTC.

Is that correct?

Rafik Dammak: No, I was, I think I will say this is to have both on the Monday.

Karla Valente: Oh I'm sorry. So you want both on Monday?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. The idea is such - yes, she explained that made it (approximately) (unintelligible) to would be on the same day and so I tried to explain that two will not have enough time to prepare and those people to within (unintelligible) and so on.

So, just to organize on Monday and just to that (unintelligible) try to check if there is any call and going will be in going at that time so to avoid any overlapping.

Karla Valente: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Karla, if you could just send me a little message, I could send (unintelligible) up to the groups so within a few hours today that would help a lot too.

Karla Valente: Yes, I have a meeting with IT and some other people that help organizing webinars today in a few hours.

So I'll finalize the details and then I'll send it to you. The only challenge is going to be that we're not going to have the presentation until Sunday in advance to anyone.

But I'm going to give just a short description that this is the webinar is really to present the final report and open for discussions and questions that people might have prior to considering the report.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Okay let's see here if we should (meet) right here in one of specific area that's more late in Australia now.

So any other business?

Karla Valente: I have one question, Rafik, this is Karla. Are we going to hold the meeting next Tuesday?

We have still have the analysis for the second (Biostone) report. We did a summary of the public comments, but we didn't do an analysis response and I was wondering if we could do that.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, we need to start working in the public comments. So we are going to have report, I guess, on Monday or no in the weekend.

People will reply and I guess on Monday and I hopefully just to correct some type of I think (unintelligible) but yes we can start in for two reply to comments on Tuesday.

And also because we are going to have questions in the webinar and if we cannot reply to them during the webinar we need to reply to them later.

I'm just wondering if we should have Friday off because I guess we reached some level I think is not sure but I think we really worked hard and the Friday and not right so. In the summer and we need to have shorts day.

Yes. And we still have things to do. So yes, let's go for the start of the public comments. I'm sorry, in Tuesday. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: No objections or do you agree?

Carlton Samuels: No objection at all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can you, Cheryl here. Can you note my apologizes for the Tuesday, it's the ccNSO Council meeting I need to attend that.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, thank you for joining us on it's late.

Avri Doria: You have to learn to do two calls. One in each of your (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Sorry? Avri? What did you say?

Avri Doria: I was just asking Cheryl why she hasn't learned to do two calls, one within each ear yet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I'll tell you what there's times when I wondered about that Avri, but so far it does get a little bit difficult into AC rooms.

I can only - I found two AC rooms at once, but not two actual teleconferences at once.

Avri Doria: Oh.

Rafik Dammak: I have to say in (unintelligible) correct question. Which is more hard? The ccNSO Council or the JAS working group calls?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I've actually been in the JAS working group AdobeConnect rooms while ccNSO Council's staying on, but I doubt that you'll be doing a lot of AdobeConnect room work when you're going through the public comments.

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry are we all set of thinking of having another meeting on the 16th of on the Friday of that week? Another JAS meeting?

Rafik Dammak: I was thinking that we should like to cancel that call for Friday.

Glen Desaintgery: Cancel it. Okay. Thanks, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I guess we reached the time to end this wonderful call. Thank you everybody for working hard. I think we can say that we did it (12) in terms of summer.

And thank you again and see you on Tuesday.

((Crosstalk))

END