Avri Doria:	It's one minute after, let me start. Can we put the checkpoint in on the recording now?
Unknown:	Yes, Avri this meeting is already being recorded.
Avri Doria:	Okay yes, I know. I think somebody had said something about there being a checkpoint. Okay let me start going through the agenda and then we will move to the roll call which is the second item. The first and main part of this meeting today is a discussion on the objection procedure where Dev will be taking us through what he quickly presented at the very end of the last meeting since we didn't allow much time there. I noticed there was some discussion on the list, but precious little.
	Hopefully we can come out of this meeting either being ready to send it on for more comment or knowing what we need to do in order to send it on for more comment. Then Cintra who is going to be covering that side of issues from the vice chair is just an update on the new gTLD beginning and anything that's been noted or how we are going to go about doing that. Then there is an update on the applicant support program that I will give. It probably won't be that much different from what I sent as email.
	And that is comments and comment synthesis and updates from any subgroup meetings. Then there is the pending action items not yet covered. Then there is any other business. Now it strikes me, and in fact, Heidi just reminded me that one of the new things that the ALAC and At-Large is looking into as an organization principle is having a secretary who takes notes during the meeting as opposed to asking staff to do that.
	And then staff would work with that person to get them published. I'm going to come back to this right after the roll call, but I want to have mentioned that and let you know that after the roll call I will be asking for volunteers on that and I will be asking for at least a volunteer for today but I would love to hear about someone who

	actually wanted to volunteer for that on an ongoing basis or perhaps two people who wanted to volunteer for that on an ongoing basis. Any comments on the agenda, any changes, additions? Okay then in which case can someone do the roll call?
Nathalie Peregrine:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, this is the new gTLD Working Group call on 16 January 2012. On the call today we have Avri Doria, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Alan Greenberg, Cintra Sooknanan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Evan Leibovitch, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Yaovi Atohoun. We have an apology from Hong Xue. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.
Avri Doria:	Okay thank you. And before I pass it on to Dev I would like to say has anyone volunteered to take the secretary position at least for today if not longer? Do I have a volunteer? Any volunteers it's awfully quiet.
Cintra Sooknanan:	Hi Avri, I'm already vice chair but I don't mind volunteering for secretary.
Avri Doria:	Okay thank you very much, I very much appreciate it.
Cintra Sooknanan:	You're welcome.
Avri Doria:	Cintra will be taking that task on and hopefully if she needs to leave she will be able to find people to help her with that. Dev the floor is yours.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Thank you. Well last week I proposed a flowchart regarding the draft ALAC process for the objection to a TLD. Well I received a few comments from you Avri and from Hong and I don't - and I will ask a question to Avri, should I go through the entire process again? Or just simply open the floor to questions?

Avri Doria:	I don't think so unless there is somebody in the group that feels that's necessary. But I think you did talk people through it. I would go through Hong's questions and mine even though you did touch on them in the group and then I would hope that there would be other people with other comments unless what we're saying is great, you did it in one shot with minor questions, onward to RALO review. But I don't think we're quite there yet.
	I would start by addressing comments and then hopefully there are other - is there anyone that thinks we need another walk through of the plan? Okay I think if anyone does later feel that a particular section needs a detailed walk through, please raise your hand and ask for it.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Okay, great. Well I put the link for the PDF for those who want to just open the PDF and review it. Let me just try to answer Hong's comments. Hong's comments, if I recall correctly, was that the flowchart described two distinct processes, one for consideration or submission of application comments and for the consideration of and filing of an ALAC objection. And yes there are two processes and could they be read in parallel theoretically, I would say yes but from a human bandwidth perspective I don't think it's feasible.
	And given that it's 60 days for the application comments I think ideally what should happen is that any adhoc groups would first focus on the comments and submit that within the 60 day window. And then turn to probably more serious consideration of the objection and what they want to file as the formal objection and so forth. And that may take some more time, more consideration especially since it had to then be voted by three RALOs to be as proposed in the draft process for ALAC to then consider as advice to whether accept or to reject.
	The second one was regarding whether ALAC has standing to - I [inaudible 00:07:55] what the applicant guidebook has stated to be that ALAC only has really standing to object on the limited public

interest grounds and possibly on community grounds if the ALAC itself was the community that was implicitly or explicitly targeted.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks I think we need to be careful there because you just said the ALAC is the community. I think what we need to be saying is the At-Large community, not the ALAC, the community because the ALAC is a construct of ICANN where the At-Large, the ALSs and the RALOs are the interstates with the edge communities and community interest.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay thanks Cheryl. Okay the point is noted but yes and so going back to the community objection and a reading of the applicant guidebook, and I'm trying to find the exact page number, I think it's section 3.5.4 regarding the community objections. The way it reads is that the committee has to have the objector has to have certain qualifications and I don't think the ALAC has the standing to object to a particular community - on community grounds from that aspect. I don't know if anybody has any further thought on that issue whether ALAC should have standing or -

Avri Doria: Cheryl I see your hand is still up, is that [inaudible 00:10:08] making the point?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, thank you Avri. I think this is where we actually need to ask the ALAC as this work group needs to ask the ALAC to clarify ICANN's desire for the role of ALAC - notice I'm being very specific here - the Advisory Committee in the objection processes because I think if we just make the assumptions of our standing or lack thereof, based on what is written in the guidebook as it is, we may in fact, not meet the expectations. I think we need the senior staff of ICANN involved in this process to quite specifically tell the ALAC so the ALAC can tell us, exactly what their expectations are with regards to standing or otherwise, thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you; can I put myself in the queue? I see no other hands up.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Certainly.

Avri Doria:	Yes, this was one of the questions I had asked and I guess I have a slightly different viewpoint than Cheryl but that's only because I'm more presumptuous than Cheryl and I think that this group should assert that through ALAC's community objection rights pertain not to the Advisory Committee but obviously to the At-Large of which it is the representative. And certainly asking, confirming that and informing our chartering organization, the ALAC, that that's the way we look at it, if indeed we do. I know it's the way I look at it and having that confirmed.
	But I think one of the things we need to determine is so we as a group think that's what it should mean for ALAC to have a right to object, is on behalf of its community, if community is the At-Large, thanks. I see Cheryl has her hand up again.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thanks Avri, just to reinforce why your presumption is a very valid one. If we go back and I'm desperately trying to think which meeting it was, it will come to me. but when we were discussing in a public forum situation I don't think it was as far back as Brussels but I may have been, and the then chair of the ICANN Board was trying to, on the sly I admit, find out ways where the cost involved to objection processes at that time were going to be unreasonable for both the Advisory Committee to the Board that at least in that conversation seemed to have similar standing and that was the GAC and the ALAC.
	And there was talk of a number of inverted commas tickets in each round where we would have that many at no cost to us objections to be able to go through. But based on those sorts of conversations I think your presumptions are actually well founded. But I think we still need it in writing or in affirmation in some way, shape or form just to make sure that things haven't drifted since then, thank you.
Avri Doria:	Okay thank you, back to you Dev.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Avri, there is one thing going back to the community objection, and that is during the comment window of the application which is 60 days from the beginning of the application comment period, persons can also submit comments for objection ground, [inaudible 00:14:13] confusion, legal rights, limited public interest and community. We could consider also within the 60 day window whether we wish to submit comments to regarding these four objection grounds.

Now, the comments are not objections in themselves. And I believe the notes said and I will try - let me just bring it up here - it said that it would be reviewed by dispute resolution service providers, if there is an objection filed. It's not really - or the independent objector may also be who is looking at these comments can then decide to independently file an objection based on these comments. That's something to consider.

Instead of looking to file an objection on behalf of a community or for a community this can be an alternative process for us to consider during the 60 day window. Going to your comments Avri, suggesting a time line or timing for each of these events, I agree. I think that it should be because it's literally only eight weeks for comments, so it's not really that much time especially if there is going to be something like possibly 500 applications released in the first batch, which there may even be more later on.

I think definitely a timing needs to be established so like 15 days from the start of the application comment period this should happen 30 days, 45 days and then 60 days, that's when the ALAC - what will also happen is that ALAC will assemble all those comments and then ALAC as a whole then decides to start a vote to look at each of those comments [inaudible 00:16:44] it's submitted or not. I agree with your first comment.

Your second question and I'm mind has gone black as to what your second suggestion was. I think it was also questioning the community more along with -

Avri Doria:	Going back to the timeline and I actually did put my hand up this time and I see I'm the only one with my hand up.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Oh, sorry.
Avri Doria:	I will speak. No it's okay; I was waiting for a proper pausing place. On the timeline now this is one of the things where every time I read this book I get a little confused, there are two timelines. One is for the objecting comments - actually they don't even need to be objections they can be in favor comments, in the comment period and one is for filing the objection. And the timeline for filing the objection is a longer period of time, correct?
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	That is correct and I agree with you it is slightly confusing, but that is correct yes. I believe up to seven months for objections. But only 60 days for comments.
Avri Doria:	One of the things that I would like to suggest that we look at is a notion that this is sort of a poor man's parallel to the GAC advice in that during that 60 day comment period, which is the same as the GAC advice period, that the At-Large/ALAC specifically ALAC in this case, could have the ability to use the comment process to warn of an oncoming objection. Now yes it won't have the specific stated treatment that the GAC has but it may also serve as an early flag (not to use the early warning) but as an early flag to someone that they have an issue that At-Large may object to.
	I don't know if people want to think about that but to use those two time spaces in a complimentary way. And that doesn't mean that because something had an ALAC comment. This isn't just Avri sending in a comment. This would be an ALAC comment and we would have to put in a 6-week process for an ALAC comment if that's what we want to suggest, that an ALAC comment would mean that further work is going to be done on a full-fledged objection. And so it's an early flagging that we are considering an objection here. And I'm wondering if that strikes people as worthwhile, thanks.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	I see Cheryl has her hand raised.
Avri Doria:	Right.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Cheryl?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you Dev and I do apologize for my [inaudible 00:20:12] in the background there. Just building on what you were saying Avri that's very appealing to me in as much as anything that's gone through that level of I guess sanctions for want of a better word, but the ALAC in that 60 days has managed to say "Look we have edge communities that are sufficiently concerned. The regions have brought this up to us and we're commenting in this making an official comment for the want of a better word, in this comment period which is advice that we believe there is community concern in XYZ, then isn't that something that the independent objector should take quite seriously?
	Is there not perhaps a nexus there with the expectations of what the independent objector may wish to use as part of her [inaudible 00:21:03] material? Whilst I'm sure they can do something without anything being raised within that comment period, I would've thought something that was raised during that comment period, particularly via an advisory committee should have considerable weight, thank you.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Thanks Cheryl. Actually Cheryl regarding the independent objector, the way the phrasing in the applicant guidebook says is that the independent objector can use the comments posted in the - sorry during the 60 day window to then act on those comments and then file the objection on the limited public interest grounds or -
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Correct.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Community objection.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	I always saw that as one our exploitable pathways into triggering an IO reaction.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Correct but there is no formal - the independent objector does not have a formal - he or she can take those comments into consideration. It's not a formal - it's not like Avri mentioned - it's not like the GAC early warning where the ICANN Board must do this and so forth. But that brings up two questions on the timing, for example, governments can respond in two ways.
	The government can post a comment and there is a specific government comment during the 60 day window and/or the GAC can publish advice. And there is a particular procedure that has to be followed. The applicant is notified that the GAC early advice has been received and the applicant can then respond or drop out of the - well withdraw from the submission and receive a partial refund.
	But that is also published so this is where I think possibly - and this raises a question here - should there be a standing working group or be it this group, during the 60 day comment window to actively monitor and publicize all of these interactions that are happening, comments that may be of interest to At-Large, the GAC but I think the GAC advice would of interest to At-Large regardless. That needs to be published for the RALOs to discuss and so forth. Any thoughts on that?
Avri Doria:	I see that Alan has his hand up but I think having this group working during this period would make sense. This is the standing group as I understand it, Alan?
Alan Greenberg:	Several things, going back to the question of to what extent do our comments get factored in by the independent objector or to what extent should we make comments, I think part of that is going to depend on what the answer is to the previous question of what types of issues do we have standing to object to? If Cheryl is right and in fact we have a very wide ranging one, then there is less things that - where a comment is the only vehicle we have. I think one is going to influence the other.

The other issue that I think we want to think about and I'm not sure what the implication is, is what happens if we make a comment on something we have standing to object to but don't object? Are we implicitly making a statement there which the independent objector may in fact, take as a message saying we tossed off a comment but clearly we don't think it's worth of a real objection. I think the things are intertwined. In terms of who does the flag raising that there is something we might want to think about, I'm not sure to be this committee although there may well be significant overlap between the group that is asked to do that and this group.

I would assume anyone in the At-Large community could raise the issue. I don't think it should have to come from a committee but who looks at it and decides does this warrant more focus by At-Large and by ALAC. I would think a group that is more interested in that specific issue rather than the overall policy issues would perhaps be a better vehicle than this working group, thank you.

Avri Doria: Thanks Alan. I stuck my hand up so I could make a personal comment. I think that in terms of something could very well reach the level where ALAC felt it necessary to comment on it and yet not reach the level of full-fledged objection for any number of reasons either because there is only money for a certain number of objections and one has to take the most serious or if I comment on an area where ALAC does not have the right of objection only the right everyone has of comments.

As for a different group being the one to do it, sure I think that that's fine if there is another group as you say Alan, it will probably be the same set of people almost with another set of meetings to calculate in. But it really doesn't matter one way or another, I was just thinking that if it has to naturally fall somewhere it can fall here. But you're absolutely right there could be a special objections committee put through to actually write those objections that have been decided on to be filed or something like that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes just as a follow on, one of the reasons I suggest a different group is I think there is going to be a significant amount of record keeping and clock ticking and things like that to say someone has raised this do we need to decide yes or no? It's just a different type of task than the working group. I would tend to say even if the people overlap that a different group be charged with it, if only not to put all the responsibility on the chair of this group.

Avri Doria: Okay I see Cheryl agreeing with you. We've got about five more minutes on this item slated for today where I think we stand before looking for the comments, I see no hands up, is that there is a general frame of proposal dates put together that seems to have general agreement with some things around the edges perhaps needing a few words to explain how the comment and the objection procedure feed into each other and when I look at Dev's picture I think oh yeah he already has that there.

And then sometimes I'm not sure, so looking for that, adding some notion of schedule both to the comment period that has a six week constraint and then basically doing end space scheduling on that. Okay if ALAC was going to put through an official comment in time and they would need it by when, which would mean this needs it by then and that and sort of come up with a Week 1, Week 2, Week 3 type of schedule on that.

And also some kind of longer schedule on how the objection process for anything that then at the recommendation perhaps of this group, or ALAC's decision without a recommendation that they just said "Okay these three look like they're the candidates for full formal objection." And then a schedule of that and I guess as Alan has suggested and at least Cheryl has agreed with a proposal that a group for each objection be put together or something, so those are the things to come out of this. Alan yes, I see your hand up.

Alan Greenberg:	Yes a question and I should know this but I don't, are comments and objections due after publication of all of the applicants or based on a round by round basis.
Avri Doria:	All the applicants are going to be - it's going to be after all the applicants are put out.
Alan Greenberg:	We will have a finite number of weeks to perhaps review 2,000 applicants, worse case?
Avri Doria:	Yes.
Alan Greenberg:	So even if they're batched, the objection and review process is going to come at the very beginning, that almost doesn't sound right.
Avri Doria:	I think the GAC complained about the same thing as far as I know.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Yes.
Alan Greenberg:	Okay the implication of that is we really need to be geared up knowing what that date is going to be where they're publicized and we need to be geared up to handle that.
Avri Doria:	May date or there abouts.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	It's two weeks after the end of the submission of applications.
Avri Doria:	Yes, all souls day you know.
Alan Greenberg:	Well that's going to be a rather short time to do potentially an awful lot of work. We can't start soliciting people at that point.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Indeed, how true.
Avri Doria:	Olivier I see you have your hand up, please.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thanks very much Avri. I was just going to say I've asked for Heidi to add this item on next week's ALAC call for information and discussion. We will be able to - the whole of ALAC - will be

	able to discuss the setting up of operational groups for objections. I've said that we still have plenty of time to make decisions on it and we really need to have this mature with time. I think it's a good thing that this group addresses it and I hope that you will all be on the ALAC call so as to explain the situation to the ALAC, thank you.
Avri Doria:	Okay thank you. I will try and be there. Dev as we come to a close on this do you think you have enough information from this discussion and I'm sure Cintra has taken notes, to be able to sort of finalize this draft package so that we can just take another quick look at it at the next meeting and then take the next process of sending it further for review by the RALOs before it then comes back here, we respond to any issues and then send off to ALAC for consideration.
	Would you feel that between now and next week and perhaps asking any questions that come up on the list, things that aren't clear, so that we could have that and have a draft that was ready to pass further down the line by next week? Is that a reasonable thing to ask?
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Sure, yes by next week I will try to present a version 2 of this flowchart.
Avri Doria:	Okay thanks and then perhaps any surrounding words that explain how the things fit together and dovetail together and if you need help with that please say something.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Sure.
Avri Doria:	Olivier you have a microphone, does that mean you put your hand up and then got microphoned or?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	You're correct Avri, I put my hand and I certainly turned into a microphone for some reason.
Heidi Ulrich:	That was me sorry.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	I was just going to say the question I have is do you think it would be premature for this group to already look at Dev's flowchart and process and mark out which parts it thinks could be automated or optimized so as to reduce the amount of work that we will go through and that staff will go through as well. Or do you think that this can be done later?
Avri Doria:	Anybody have an answer?
Alan Greenberg:	I have some thoughts.
Avri Doria:	Alan speak up.
Alan Greenberg:	First thoughts are I'm not sure to what extent this can automated other than pulling down the list from a website somewhere of who the candidates are and where the information is and who the applicants are. To answer the other question I don't think there is an awful lot of time left between now and whenever we need to start working that we can afford to delay whatever it is we need to do. I'm rather sanguine on the automation issue but not of putting together the procedure and process to be geared up to do it.
Avri Doria:	Okay thank you. I see Olivier has his hand up and then Cheryl and then I will stick a comment after them. Anyone else want to get in on this topic because after this I want to do close stuff?
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	I would like to do my comments on it after.
Avri Doria:	Okay so I have Olivier, Cheryl, Alan, Dev and I will make closing comment and then we will move on to the next item. Go ahead Olivier.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thank you Avri. Let me just be blunt then, the GAC is currently working out some kind of automated system and working with ICANN staff to put a system together that would reduce the amount of processing it takes them for blind processing. ICANN staff does not have any time to spend in addition to what they are doing at the moment and have to do more operational stuff,

	creating Wiki pages manually, making lists, etc, etc. you can forget about the whole objection process if we don't also make part of it, so this is why I'm asking the question, thank you.
Alan Greenberg:	Can we go piggyback on what they're doing?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Yes, Alan you're absolutely right. And I'm going to - because I am in touch with the GAC representative who is specifically dealing with the automation side for the GAC - and I'm hoping to be able to piggyback on that. but that's why I wanted this group to try and point out what parts it [inaudible 00:36:23] and maybe it's just an exercise that Dev can look at, what part of the process could be automated and then I will compare this with what the GAC is automating and see if we can piggyback on this and have staff either let us use the GAC based system or modify the GAC based system for us to have our own tool for it, thank you.
Avri Doria:	Thank you, Cheryl?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you; I couldn't agree with you more Olivier. I think the whole business of whatever is put together for the GAC; however it can be exploited for our user communities as well as [inaudible 00:37:04]. I just wanted to raise the issue that I put in at this point, I did put in the chat which is the need to have these sort of operational review groups in existence even if it's just in preparation ready to go.
	But they need to be in existence in each of the RALOs because at the moment if ALS was to - individuals within an ALS were to go "Oh we don't like that name" when they find out about the name and that in itself is probably going to be an automated system to get that out to the edges, then there is a real risk that two months can go past before it actually comes properly to ALAC's attention. If we need some flowcharts shortcutting and to do that we need, I think, to have some delegated authority to a review group that also exists out within the RALOs.

And I also said RALOs/regions because it may be that an end user community which is not an ALS raises a concern, the ALS or an individual RALO member may be approached and be asked to bring this forward into our system. And I think we need a gate keeping mechanism that also has a direct communication conduit to trigger things to happen in a prompt and efficient manner. And that's certainly something I think we can look at in the flowcharting and nodes where we have the critical points can be identified.

And if that's the case, that might actually be very much in synch with what's going on with the GAC process because it may have cost their decision node out at a country level for our concerns to actually be officially put to the local GAC representative and let the GAC system pick up some of our concerns if that's going be more efficient. We just want the end game to be what it needs to be not how we get there is probably less important.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I see we have Alan and Dev. I was going to give Dev basically last word on it. Alan your hand came up, since I closed the queue on it but go ahead please.

Evan Leibovitch: He can have my spot Avri.

Avri Doria: Oh okay.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you I was going to say there were other hands ahead of me. Just a very short comment that Cheryl, I think has now put body to what I was saying earlier of we need to be geared up. We need to be ready to react immediately once there is information available otherwise the timeframes are going to be far too short. If you look at our normal mechanism of we can only do things when a monthly meeting comes around and if things have to be done at multiple levels in the hierarchy, we're going to have four more months pass before we can actually make a decision than exists in the allowed timeframe. Cheryl, I think, has given a good start to the kinds of

things we need to do and need to be doing right now to be prepared to respond, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, Dev give us - one thing I want to ask with what Cheryl said and Alan said, it looks like they added some chunks of work on to what we would need as part of the package you would deliver tomorrow, do you need help from perhaps Alan and Cheryl in terms of wording that or are you comfortable taking that on and please the floor is yours.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay thank you Avri. I think I need help. Any assistance will be welcomed. And I will probably contact Alan or Olivier or Cheryl for assistance in wording. And I can then show them what I have been modifying and what do you think of it and get some feedback that way. Quickly regarding the automation, it would be good if we could somehow find a mock up of how the gTLDs would be - how everything would be published. And then we could also try to automate that using a spreadsheet or something like that just so we have all of the applications in one location.

I don't know if that is possible or whether the GAC has knowledge of how it's going to be published. I welcome - Olivier contacting the person who is handling the automation that would be very interesting to find out. And that's it.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. It sounds like we have several action items coming out of this and Heidi is being good at trying to train me to think in terms of action items. We have the action item of seeing what we can find out about how the data is going to be published and wrapped more about what GAC is planning for automation so we can look at dovetailing or piggybacking as people talked about. Dev has a brining his first draft to a releasable draft that can go out to RALOs. We have a bunch of stuff to add to that. I see that Cheryl agreed with my volunteering her to help. I don't see Alan as having agreed with my volunteering him to help.

Alan Greenberg: I -

Avri Doria: But I'm sure he will respond to emails sent by Dev.

Alan Greenberg: I didn't know an agreement was required when you are volunteered to do something. But yes of course I will be willing to do that.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Those are the [inaudible 00:42:44].

Alan Greenberg: No, Avri, no one has ever given me the choice before.

Avri Doria: Yes, well I wasn't really giving you one either. Okay so any objection to moving on to the next topic? And thank you very much Dev for taking the incredible responsibility of drafting this and then for carrying the meeting through on this section. The next one I turn over to Cintra and I don't know how much she's done on basically with the program haven't now started with that being therefore the beginning to the third chartered item here of -

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes Cintra I can hardly hear you.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay I will speak up a bit. May I just ask staff to take notes on this section to me please while I just -

Heidi Ulrich: Yes, I am taking over.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you very much Heidi. I just want to speak a little bit of the new gTLD application [inaudible 00:43:48] opening, right. As we call know there has been quite a bit of inquiry by international organization [inaudible 00:43:57] as well as [inaudible 00:43:59] regarding this opening. [Inaudible 00:44:02] ICANN started [inaudible 00:44:04] applications for new gTLDs at [inaudible 00:44:11] 1200 UTC. Here is actually a website that I wanted to link to which gives a demonstration of the [inaudible 00:44:22] and that's located on ICANN's website.

                         I don't know how many of you have seen it. There is the link. Right so just so that you know that because [inaudible 00:44:53]

2012 questions and [inaudible 00:44:56] fee upfront the two [inaudible 00:45:02] March 29 which is the last day to register by [inaudible 00:45:06]. And it's a [inaudible 00:45:08] which is the last day that ICANN can accept the new gTLD applications. There were a few press releases from top level domain holdings which announced that they have the intent [inaudible 00:45:24] file [inaudible 00:45:24] applications.

And I have more on that [inaudible 00:45:32] he, in a statement just basically saying that it's a historic day for the internet and they speaking on behalf of our company he said [inaudible 00:45:47] their part in creating a vibrant new wave of innovation, consumer choice and web creation on the internet. I will show you the link to that. The only other thing I really want to say on this is this is an important date.

I do feel that the other two dates that I mentioned which was the 29 March and 3 April will really be more important dates in that at that point in time we really see the kind of decision that ICANN is making on this [inaudible 00:46:34] domains. And what kind of critical protections they put in place. That's it for my section. I don't know if there are any other issues or anything else on this you wish to discuss.

Avri Doria: Thank you, does anyone have anything they wish to add to Cintra's - obviously we haven't seen the beginning of the problems yet and perhaps there won't be any but thank you for giving people an update. I've been through the TAS memo/demo it's kind of fun. It's amazing how much work you have to do before you even get to pay your $5,000. At least there is some work you can do before your $5,000. Anything else further on the update of the beginning of the program?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I didn't put my hand up.

Avri Doria: Okay yes Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Just very briefly we might want to ask - I gather from the Twitterverse and other social networking comments from Dot Green that they've gone down that pathway and probably [inaudible 00:47:42] of their money by now, I don't know. All I've heard from that aspirant gTLD of the process was that it was quite user friendly and worked very well. That this work group, or Cintra you could contact Jennifer and Annalisa from Dot Green and just get their real feedback.
Avri Doria:	Yes that's pretty much the feedback I've been getting from various people that I have been talking to so far is that there really have been no glitches. Okay anything else on this before I quickly move on? We have 10 minutes left. On the applicant support program, first of all, as I sent out - most of it I already sent out in the memo - there was an updating. They basically took to heart most of the comments that were made, including those from the intellectual property community that had gone back to work, that has been in the JAS about having a trademark as long as you warrant that brand, not necessarily excluding you.
	They did take into account the direness of the penalty and accepted Alan's argument essentially that being excluded from the program was sufficient unless there was a egregious gaming behavior. Though they did admit in conversation that they weren't quite sure how they would identify that and make that stick. It has to be so bad and obvious to the whole world for them to actually hold the money back. That's in there as a thread but it's hard to see how it would actually be used. We had a fairly and there are other people on this call that would - Alan I see your hand up please.
Alan Greenberg:	Yes I just wanted to comment that I can't think of another time in my history at ICANN where we have been listened to as much as in this last round of little changes they made. Not to mention that this is a Board committee and not some other part of ICANN. I think we need to make a mark of this in the record books.

Avri Doria:	Yes and perhaps one of the things you'd say is because it was a Board committee and not just staff they would listen but anyway, a combination.
Alan Greenberg:	Well regardless it's clear that they were actually listening to the words, not pretending they read it and saying it doesn't apply to us. And the fact that it was a Board committee makes it all the more interesting.
Avri Doria:	And I've certainly already sent my personal acknowledgement and thanks to that to both - to certainly Chris and Kurt.
Alan Greenberg:	We can hope it continues but it's certainly a message that is different from most of those that we've gotten over the years.
Avri Doria:	And they know - now we were supposed to get an update on the SARP stuff over the weekend. We haven't gotten it yet. And they were going to fix some issues or look into some issues we brought up with the SARP document. I haven't seen those yet. And they have also accepted, in the last meeting we had, the whole notion that in terms of any issues that remain, criteria that remains to be nailed down. And in the preparation of the training materials for the SARP we're not looking for a way to have those reviewed by at least the subteam if not the larger teams moving on.

The JAS recommendation that the JAS volunteers and others be able to continue working with the staff on the derivation of the SARP training remains acceptable. We just haven't figured out a method for it yet. And also what's still open is regularizing those meetings. I haven't had a chance to talk to Kurt to try and figure out how to do that. But in principle it has been accepted. I think in this respect as Alan says it's going as well as can be expected.

The door, as I understand it with the Board, is open for us to come up with proposals and try get more money from the reserves into the kitty especially once we've seen how many applicants there are, how much money, etc. That is still an open issue. We did not

change their minds on the $2 million versus reserve fund but they do remain open for argument. As for the funds foundation I understand that that's still circulating in conversation within the Board and something will happen but the 'what' and the 'when' is still difficult to predict.

That's where I think we're at with that stuff. I don't know if anybody in the subgroup wants to add anything. I also received Fouad's email with suggestions. I responded to it just before the meeting asking him to clarify some of the issues. I didn't know whether it was me that was unclear or the documentation that was unclear. If it's me that was unclear, yes that happens a lot. If it's the book that was unclear then we should note it and bring it back to staff explaining that there is a problem with the clarity here, please help.

One of the other of those has to happen, so hopefully Fouad will answer and let me know whether it was me, and if it's me there is nothing that can be done about that. But if it's the book, I will see what can be done. Anything else on that anyone wants to add or ask? Okay we have five more minutes, pending action items not yet covered. When I look at the action items - Alan to submit revised text for specific section of draft statement on AFC, he did that. It was submitted. It was listened to.

Avri to submit revised statement before the end of the public comment on that, Avri did that. Evan to request ALAC executive for endorsement and posting to Board correspondence page.

Evan Leibovitch: I did that.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Objection process proposal, staff with Olivier or is that with Cheryl to create a Wiki page for the collection of comments on the new gTLD.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, none have been done.

Avri Doria: Okay, so that one is still pending. Okay -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Everything we [inaudible 00:55:06].
Avri Doria:	That should be a CLL not an OCO right?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	It possibly was an OCO but regardless of who - which of the two of us it is, still needs to be done and we need to get Matt on it. Matt can just copy to both and Olivier and I will sort it out.
Avri Doria:	Having issues that are so close to those of us that are constantly mixing letters up is very [inaudible 00:55:33].
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Avri it's the criteria to become a chair of the ALAC now, you have to have three letters in their name.
Avri Doria:	Okay.
Alan Greenberg:	And they have to be the same three letters thought.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	A hyphenated name as letters - you know what I mean.
Avri Doria:	That will save many people of that job. That takes us through pending action items, I see no hands, does anybody have any other business, or any other issue s they want to bring up? Anything that came up already during the meeting and they didn't get to speak their peace? In which case seeing no hands, hearing no voices, with three minutes to go, I see Cintra the call got dropped but I think the call is over.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Well done.
Alan Greenberg:	Thank you.
Avri Doria:	Thank you very much and I will talk to you all next week and talk to you in the middle on the email list, thanks a lot, bye.