

---

Avri Doria: Is the mark on the recording set?

Gisella Gruber: We can proceed Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Okay so following the roll call the main focus of this meeting as in the last one is trying to finalize the draft of the objection procedure. I just added two other elements, one of them is the schedule on doing this and I sent an email about that just less than an hour ago. I apologize for my just at the last minute. There is also the first draft sent even later than the schedule that I sent on email. And then there is the review of the procedure so then getting into talking to Dev and the changes made and what needs to be done.

But I would like to get the first two covered first. Then there is an update on what's going on in the Application Support Program. Not a lot to add, a few concerns to mention. There is the update on gTLD issues; Cintra is not able to make the meeting. I will cover that one. We will see if there is anything to add. Review of pending action items that have not been incidentally covered during the other options and then AOB, where I added one element which is to bring up the review of our meeting schedule. We have said that come the end of January we would look at it and talk about where we went from here.

It's the end of January so I want to mention it, talk about it on the list and see where we are going. Anything, any corrections, additions, objections, deletions -- does anyone have a reason not to follow this agenda? Okay cool, in which case we will follow it. Gisella can you do a roll call for me?

Gisella Gruber: Absolutely Avri. Welcome everyone on today's New gTLD call on Monday 30 January. We have Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alan Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Evan Leibovitch, Rudi Vansnick, and Andrew Mack. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself Gisella Gruber.

---

Apologies noted today from Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Cintra Sooknanan, Yaovi Atohou, and Hong Xue. If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcription purposes, I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call, over to you Avri.

Avri Doria:

Okay thank you. Going right into the objection procedure and the first thing I wanted to cover was the email I sent about a schedule for this. And as I said in the note that I just sent, I'm assuming that the multitude of powers that be, although there aren't that many of them on the call, will correct me if I am wrong. As I understood from the ALAC meeting discussions that I participated in I guess it was last week, I don't pay that much attention to weeks, so I get really confused.

That ALAC would like to be able to approve these objection procedures in the face to face meeting in San José and would like to be able to announce that and I'm not sure to what degree, go into it, in ALAC's final declaration proclamation communiqué. I forget what ALAC calls its final speech on the Friday morning meeting.

Heidi Ullrich:

It's the Chair's Report.

Avri Doria:

Thank you because I knew the GAC had another name for it. I didn't know if you all did too. And I forget the names of things quite often. That would mean trying to work back on that schedule would mean that ALAC would probably want to have final copy in its hands no later than the beginning of the week, and that's the Sunday 11 March. That means that the rest of us would need at least a week to two weeks to deal with any of the RALO comments, put them in, to have time to talk about them, to have time to talk about them a second time.

And to basically make any changes that were prompted by comments, corrections, et cetera we got in the review. What going on on the schedule, what I did was I presumed that we would get two weeks knowing that one week was the worst case. And when I talked about the schedule, I assumed two weeks and then said at the latest, a later date which means though that we would be squished down to one week.

That would mean that we would need to close the review period by 26 February or 4 March at the latest. Now I wasn't clear whether we wanted to do a 21-day or a 28-day. If 21-day we would need to put it out by 5 February, 12 February at the latest. For a 28-day we would need to put it out by yesterday or 5 February at the latest. As I said, it's now 30 January. I wanted to talk about this more at the meeting. If we can get to the point where at the end of this meeting, we say that it's ready to go, that's great.

I am not positive that we're going to get there but we need to get there real soon. Having done that I'm going back to hands, I see Tijani has his hand up, please.

Gisella Gruber:

He disconnected we are dialing back to him, sorry.

Avri Doria:

Okay in the meantime is there anyone else who would like to comment or we can come back to it once Tijani is back. Okay we can come back. Okay Dev I see you have your hand up. Okay thank you go ahead please.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Okay hi great, thanks. Just one comment with regards to getting RALO comments, one potential complication is that we will have to get the doc - we probably might have to get the flowcharts translated. I don't know if that is - I believe we have to cater for some time for that to take place.

- 
- Avri Doria: How long a period does that take? I'm sorry I hadn't considered that. How long a period does that take?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I imagine it would take about a week, a rough estimate. But I guess staff would have a better idea.
- Avri Doria: Okay can someone from staff?
- Heidi Ullrich: Well actually yes I will see if I can get Christina Rodriguez to get a timeline on that during this call and get back to you.
- Avri Doria: Okay thank you, that's one piece of the schedule hadn't been brought up before and I neglected to consider. That would mean that everything, the plan itself, any paragraphs of overview that explain to people what they were looking at and would also a cover note need to be translated, and this is into what two languages or into more?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well two languages but yes this is more for the RALOs really not so much for ALAC obviously.
- Avri Doria: But for the RALOs we would need French and Spanish?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes. One other question and I guess this is regarding the timing, is it that we want to submit this to the ICANN Board for approval by San José?
- Avri Doria: Whether it needs ICANN Board approval or not is not an issue that I'm sure I understand. It talks about ALAC having a regular formal procedure. It does not talk about specifically said formal procedure having been approved by the Board. What I'm looking at is trying to get to where ALAC can make its decision on a formal procedure. Whether it needs to go beyond that date?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Correct.
-

- 
- Avri Doria: So the date I'm going for is ALAC approving it by the end of the meeting.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay well it's just that if ALAC has to approve it because that's the key obviously, the key thing has Evan has pointed out, once ALAC approves it then we have to then submit it to ICANN in order for ICANN to therefore approve of it's method and therefore see if funding is available or rejected. I see -
- Avri Doria: And this is - I think it's a moot point for this Working Group but I'm not even sure I understand why that's the case. But as I say that's an ALAC issue not a Working Group issue per say. What they do after we recommend it to them and they approve it.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Gotcha.
- Avri Doria: Right so I'm sort of staying away from that one other than to make the comments that I made. But anyhow that would only make our scheduling problem worse not better.
- Alan Greenberg: Avri can I make a comment on this?
- Avri Doria: Yes, please sorry and also do I have Tijani back in the queue? I lost track of my window with the queue stuff in it.
- Alan Greenberg: At one point I can't remember -
- Avri Doria: Okay see just you so please go ahead.
- Alan Greenberg: Yes at one point I can't remember if it was during the election for Board member or something else but there was some issue of bylaws and it was made quite clear by legal counsel that the Board does not approve ALAC procedures. They are solely for ICANN to do. That's as opposed to the GNSO where the Board does have oversight on them.
-

- 
- Avri Doria: You were just saying that the staff and Kurt Pritz has to approve these?
- Alan Greenberg: No, no, I'm saying that the ALAC makes it's own decisions. Now clearly the Board may come back and say we don't think those are good enough do it again.
- Avri Doria: So you advise -
- Alan Greenberg: That's always within their right. But for other things we explicitly have not had to go to the Board to have them approved.
- Avri Doria: Okay.
- Alan Greenberg: And I presume the same is the case here.
- Avri Doria: ALAC informs the Board this is what we're doing and the Board can inform ALAC we think X?
- Alan Greenberg: Presumably yes.
- Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Tijani please.
- Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you Avri. I'm sorry I was dropped so I don't know what was said. But as for the [inaudible 00:11:53] I think there is no problem because [inaudible 00:11:56] the RALO [inaudible 00:12:01] - [inaudible 00:12:04] three weeks and that three weeks is really enough [inaudible 00:12:09] for them to [inaudible 00:12:11]. And then [inaudible 00:12:14] we can use two weeks to make the changes and the corrections necessary and two weeks also is [inaudible 00:12:24] - [inaudible 00:12:27] and then on another [inaudible 00:12:30] everything will be ready for ALAC, thank you.
-

- 
- Avri Doria: Okay thanks. That presumes from there that we only do a 21-day review which I thought was reasonable and within the rules, I just wanted to make sure. As I say, I still have some insecurity about the rules and procedures within ALAC and At-Large. That's good. And if we can close on this today as this is the draft we are going with, that allows for the week of translation that came up, which I think came up while you were off the call. That would mean that February 5 would be the soonest we could send it anyhow given the need to get translation. Yes please Cheryl.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, just if this is a final - at the end of the day - I think it's great to go that way, it would also mean that Silvia could introduce it to the APRALO meeting this afternoon. Because that's not a translation issue we work in English. We can't translate in 58 languages, so we work in English.
- Avri Doria: Right yes and I was sort of counting on the fact that hopefully each of the RALOs would have someone who was a member of this group, but it wouldn't have been sent to them yet. It would just sort of be prestaging it.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes unfortunately I'm in a strategy Board meeting all day so I may not be at the meeting but if Silvia could table it then that means it can get pushed out to our lists and get our discussions going.
- Silvia Vivanco: Can you say that again please?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes Silvia if the draft process is completed as this particular work group is planning today, and if that happens before the APRALO meeting at 0500 UTC, which is [inaudible 00:14:31] I guess, if that draft can be tabled as an extraordinary agenda item to the APRALO meeting basically just tell them to get their act together, distribute and start talking [inaudible 00:14:40] ALS ASAP.
- Silvia Vivanco: Okay.
-

---

Avri Doria: Okay, Alan is your hand up anew?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Avri Doria: Please.

Alan Greenberg: Just to point out that in the past when we've had things to translate, they are usually quite willing to do a translation and then if we have any changes afterwards, we red line them and then they can make the modified translation which is a much faster process than redoing it from scratch. That will give us a little bit more slack. If we can't or don't want to absolutely wrap it up today, we can still pass the document on to translation to get the first pass done and then we're fine at a week from now if that's what's necessary. We can still make the same timeline, I'm saying and we shouldn't rush the process if we're not really ready at this point.

Avri Doria: Understandable, although even not rushing the process we still only have like a week to get it out.

Alan Greenberg: Oh no, no, but we do have one more weekend and telling people this is your last call is sometimes an effective way of getting everyone to review it.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay so if I'm understanding correctly, what comes out of the schedule is that by and large the schedule process is okay with people and I ask in a second for a red mark for anyone who disagrees with what I am about to say, is if in general okay I have to add the notion of translation to that. We can submit what we have at the end of today to translation given the caveat that there may be edits, that a three week review is adequate.

Is that okay? Now let me go back to my screen where people can put red dots, anyone want to red dot that and say it's a bad idea, not the way to go?



---

Andrew Mack: I'm just curious. I'm a little confused, what are you asking for our red dotting on?

Avri Doria: I'm asking for your red dotting on the schedule that I've been talking about for the last 10 minutes.

Andrew Mack: Okay so the three week schedule.

Avri Doria: Excuse me?

Andrew Mack: The three weeks?

Avri Doria: Basically the three weeks, the sending out to the translation at the end of this meeting even though there may be some dangling participles to then work on getting the translation done knowing that it can be red lined if we do change anything else, to then give people at the end of this meeting a last week call on anything they wish to comment on and thus approving it the next meeting for sending out to the RALOs for a three week review that allows us a two week working with the comments we get from the RALOs to put into it, so that it can be sent to the ALAC before the beginning of the meeting in San José, so that the ALAC can review and possibly review it as [inaudible 00:17:37] desires by the end of the meeting.

Andrew Mack: Got it. Thank you, I appreciate all that, you can understand why I was a little confused?

Avri Doria: Really that was confusing? Anyhow, okay so does anybody object to that?

Andrew Mack: No.

Avri Doria: It was clearly in my mind. Okay now I put through a cover letter which as opposed to spending a lot of time on it now because I

---

would really prefer to get to the meat - and since we are not going to be sending out today, does the cover letter has to be translated?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: No, I don't think so.

Avri Doria: So anyhow -

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: If it's going to the RALO Chairs, so -

Avri Doria: I sent out just a quick thing to the RALO Chairs telling them what is enclosed, giving them the paragraph from the objections that caused this to need to be done and talking about the pressure of the schedule, then going into what the package contains. Now one thing to be discussed is an overview of the process. I don't know Dev whether you've got that or whether it's integrated in, then the step-by-step plan of the process that we've been reviewing.

And then the examples of the dashboard that you've put together and then saying please contact me if you want someone to talk about it at the meeting, et cetera. I don't want to get into wordsmithing on this at the moment. I would like to save that for please review it, discuss it on the list so that we can finalize it. It's relatively perfunctory. The only thing that would change is if there isn't a separate overview and I need to include that in the letter and we will figure that out in this meeting and I will add that shortly after so people can review that.

Any objections to doing that with this letter at this time? No, okay in which case then I turn the floor over to Dev who can talk about the changes he made since the last meeting. I will then also look at the chat to see what I've missed, but please if there is something in the chat that needs to be included in the conversation, and I'm not able to pay attention to all the balls in the air at the time, somebody shout out. Evan I see your hand up.

- 
- Evan Leibovitch: Hi Avri. Yes I just wanted to find out - I had typed a question into the chat and just wondered if anyone on this call is aware of any organization that is actually planning to use our process? Just as applicants have been preparing for quite some time, certainly there might be groups that have potential objections in the wings waiting to be brought forward once things get further down the process. And I'm just wondering if having some kind of test cases to work with might make our job a little easier.
- Avri Doria: I know of one group that is possibly planning to put in an objection but I don't know that it would come in through the ALAC, so that's hard to say.
- Evan Leibovitch: Oh that's what I meant, an At-Large based objection.
- Avri Doria: Well that, if I can, that also depends on - and that was the question I asked at the ALAC meeting and I don't know what all ALAC was planning to do on that question - which is the question of the scope of ALAC objections. Is an ALAC objection on community grounds just on things that is ALAC, is it something that is the ALSs or is it as Hong brought up, a wider notion yet of any of the user interests that ALAC perceives. And that's a question that basically this group has punted to ALAC itself because we don't know the answer. But the answer to that question determines who might be using the ALAC objection process.
- Evan Leibovitch: I'm not sure that question really needs to be addressed that badly. If an objection comes directly into ALAC or if it comes from an ALS or if it even comes from let's say an individual member such as a NARALO individual member or a member of the EURALO Board, these things could be brought up through channels and they can be brought to the attention of ALAC. Do you really think it's that much of an issue as in where the source comes from? ALAC is the group that has to put forward the objection.
-

---

We are going through the process for it to do so. But does the source of that objection really have to be very well defined? Can it not be through any ALS, through an individual, through leadership that has something on reasonable grounds; it still has to be considered. It still has to go through the process. But how much thought do we have to give to the source of the complaint?

Avri Doria: I think that's an ALAC question. and if you're correct and you're saying it doesn't matter to ALAC then - but I think it's something though that needs to be - and the question came up from Dev's earliest work on this, basically in the objection process talking about what was within scope and what wasn't, for an ALAC objection where the fee is applied. I do believe it's a decision you need to put a fork in somewhere.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay Dev I think - Evan perhaps you and I perhaps can talk some more and Dev also just to really get a frame and that's perhaps something that can be dealt with through the RALO review period. But anyway Dev I would like to turn the floor over to you so we can talk about your changes.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay thank you Avri. I posted the link to the PDF in the Adobe Connect so you can all open it and review it directly. I haven't really changed much of the first page. What I have made changes was in the second page, it looks very different. The reason what I did here was to simplify what happens after Week 4 of the application comment period. What I've done is I have created the second item which is the gTLD review group updates creates Wiki comment pages of gTLD applications based on comments directly received, seen on At-Large list or heard on conference calls.

And then there is a Figure 2A which breaks this down further. If you go to Figure 2A which is Page 3 of the PDF you will see why

---

in the end I had to do this. It turned out to be quite convoluted. But essentially it's a standard procedure that's done by the review group. if the review group has seen any comments on At-Large and it's a yes, then what happens is that the comment then for the evaluation panel's consideration or on objection grounds? The reason why I'm saying that is because what I decided here was that it needs to be separate Wiki pages to separate the comments for evaluation panel's consideration and a separate Wiki page for objection grounds.

Okay and that is why you see the two decision sheet on whether the comment is evaluation panel's consideration or objection grounds. It is very straight forward I think hopefully. If it's for the evaluation panel for example, does the Wiki page exist? If not then the review group then creates the Wiki page for the gTLD application. And then formally adds the comment, whether it got the comment directly via email or from the At-Large lists or it got it from a RALO meeting or it was recorded during that conversation about it.

And what happens is when you update the Wiki page the application dashboard will be updated automatically. I did a link to a very crude prototype gTLD dashboard. Let me just click on it right here and send it. I posted it in the chat. I'm sorry Tijani, go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, [inaudible 00:27:33] with my [inaudible 00:27:33] no?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I put my hand down.

Avri Doria: Your hand was raised but okay.

---

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay my apologies. Okay well Heidi has now raised her hand, Heidi go ahead.

Heidi Ullrich: Sorry no I was trying to put Tijani's down.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Very well, no problem. The idea behind the prototype dashboard which it's crude but what it does show is there are macros within Confluence which can track the number of comments. And for those persons who are logged in if you notice for the third item in that dashboard for like dot something you could click on that link and then the Wiki page will be created. You can assign a template to it and so forth. The idea for this dashboard will be that a gTLD Wiki page would only be opened when there is a comment to be put on it.

And as people add their comments the table gets incremented with the number of comments and therefore it would rise to the top as the gTLD application that is getting the most attention. Going back to the flowchart -

Avri Doria: Okay I see a question from Andrew.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Oh okay Andrew go ahead sorry.

Andrew Mack: Yes and I started to say this is too granular but one of the confusions that people a lot of the time is can anyone start a Wiki or start a thread or does it need to be a certain kind of person and if so, how would I as a member of the community but a less active member know that?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay as the flowchart says it's only the gTLD Review Group that does it. If you have a comment and you don't have a Wiki log on or anything like that you contact the review group and say "Look I have this comment about this gTLD application, here it is." And then the review group will then create the Wiki page and ad it in.

- 
- Andrew Mack: Okay makes sense to me I just would strongly urge us to make sure we find some way of doing what [inaudible 00:30:05] has always done which is advertising where people need to go at the outset.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, sure. But actually the flowchart tries to get into that because the review group at the beginning of each week sends an update of the dashboard. And in fact if we go back to the flowchart on Page 2 for the first three weeks every week there is an update to the dashboard and how persons can comment on gTLD applications be it a direct address or -
- Andrew Mack: I'm hearing you. I guess my only thought is that people come in and out of this and in terms of their level of being up to speed and in terms of the level of focus. And just so that for anyone who is a relatively new entrant, if they can clearly see what they're supposed to do that can help.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay and the Wiki page can also have that information. Okay going back to the flowchart.
- Heidi Ullrich: Dev?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure go ahead.
- Heidi Ullrich: [Inaudible 00:31:09] had put a question into the chat whether it is not publically available for comment.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well sorry yes the person can only create a Wiki page if they are a logged in members through that Wiki space. And regards to the gTLD Review Group needing its own email address, I think that would be a good idea so that what happens is that that would be advertised in the emails going out to all the lists and so forth. Yes that will have its own email address so somebody could then contact them directly. And then the review group takes action on that. Andrew your hand is still raised but I see Evan's hand is up.
-

- 
- Andrew Mack: Sorry I will take mine down apologies.
- Evan Leibovitch: Okay hi Dev just a quick question. I'm looking on the dashboard right now, is the intention that every string being applied for is going to have a line in this table? Or only the ones for which comments have been received? And is this going to be something for which there are going to be designated custodians? Or is this just going to be anybody can submit?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay thanks Evan; I should have added more entries. The idea is that the first column 'gTLD Applied For' string would have the whole list of applications.
- Evan Leibovitch: So if they're - well I guess then let's take it a step further.
- Avri Doria: Can I add a caveat on this?
- Evan Leibovitch: Well hold on -
- Avri Doria: While we are talking though we have to make sure this is what can get built. It's just a projection.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes.
- Evan Leibovitch: One is an issue of mechanics and the other one is of what's there. In terms of the mechanics, Dev if I hear you right, every string being applied for will show up here. Now are we taking into account the fact that we're going to see multiple applications for certain strings? Or is each individual string just going to have one line here? Or are people going to be - so for instance if you have two different applications for string blah will there be two different lines there and each one - you know one may attract objections and the other one will not attract objections or how does that part of it work?
-



- 
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay thanks I believe that at the beginning of the application comment period all of the applications filed will be revealed. If there are contentions I believe there will have links to both applications to that string.
- Evan Leibovitch: So there will be two different lines on this table?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, my thinking would be that there would be two different lines.
- Evan Leibovitch: Okay.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Two different rows on the table I should say.
- Evan Leibovitch: The question and this may be for Heidi or somebody who knows Confluence better than I do is it possible to have a table column at the top of this that allows people to resort things based on different columns the way you can on a spreadsheet?
- Heidi Ullrich: Good question Evan. I would need to ask IT about that.
- Evan Leibovitch: Because that would be something that would be very useful here. If you had one string that was an application that came in for a string that was right at the top of the table and another application for the same string that came in much later, if we were doing things chronologically they would show up in very different positions. But if we were able to do an alpha sort then the various contentions would show up next to each other in an alphabetical sort.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well just to follow-up Evan, all the applications are - it's not like it's revealed in chronological order. It will be most likely sorted I imagine. In other words it's not like an application for one string will be in one row and then far down the list you will see repeat of that.
-

- 
- Evan Leibovitch: Oh okay so they're all going to be released in batches.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes because there is no evaluation until the end of the final submission date.
- Evan Leibovitch: Okay.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: But after that they do the initial evaluation to make sure administrative completeness is done and once that is done then they post the public portions of the application and the string.
- Evan Leibovitch: Got it. And so this will be an individual's task to take that list and populate the table with it?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Correct. If you look in the flowchart on the Week 1 that's the key thing to happen in Week 1, to pull that information from the ICANN website into the dashboard.
- Evan Leibovitch: Okay.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay alright going back to the flowchart, Page 2, essentially it monitors the mailing list, participates in RALO meetings, gathers the comments and puts it onto the Wiki page. And the Week 4 what happens is which is being shown on Page 4 is that a conference call is held and the - and this is a question I guess that the group needs to answer - which group actually reviews the comments and then decides who is going to draft formal comments on the gTLD application.

I am thinking it will be this working group, the New gTLD Working Group. In a conference call the New gTLD Working Group and the gTLD Review Group will then review the dashboard and then review the comments and then try to decide should a formal comment be drafted for that gTLD application based on the Wiki comment page. And if it's yes, then an ad hoc

---

working group or other person is just assigned to hold the pen to draft a formal comment on that application. Then the Review Group will then update that Wiki page to reflect our decision that a formal comment will be drafted.

If the decision to ignore the comments and say we are not going to do a formal comment, same thing, the review group updates the Wiki page and informing and putting down the group's decision to decline drafting a formal comment based on the comment received so far.

Avri Doria: Alan has a question and I have a question.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay well Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, certainly if an objection is going to be filed it has to be the ALAC to make the decision to do that.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: For a comment I'm not quite sure who is going to make the decision to make a comment and who is it going to come from? If it's coming from the ALAC then it has to be an ALAC decision. I think we need a little bit more specificity about who is going to make these decisions. We also have a potential problem that if there are comments submitted but no one on this group gives a damn to be honest or may in fact disagree, we're not going to be in a good position to draft a comment.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well then -

Avri Doria: Can I comment? My question and the answer to his may actually go together. One I'm not sure I see why things would come back to this group and why it wouldn't be that group that actually made the decision on taking something further, why it would shift group.

---

They're the ones that are reviewing the comments and reviewing the issues that are sent to them. Why wouldn't this group -

Alan Greenberg:

My comment applies to that one as well as this one so.

Avri Doria:

Right the other part of it is that I think there's always a notion at the end of any of these processes, but yes it goes to ALAC but I would think that this group that decided yes there should be an objection would be the one to do the work and would make a fully formed recommendation to ALAC that this be filed as an objection.

On who would write them I would think that it would be a combination - that group that decided that yes this needs to be an objection that we work on further would talk to the people that filed it and others to sort of build the interest groups to write it and not as I say throw it over the fence.

[Inaudible 00:40:46] the group, the New gTLD Working Group that really isn't tracking things that closely. It seems to me that if it's all focused on the Review Working Group and with the understanding that of course once they have a completed [inaudible 00:41:06] objections they're sending it to ALAC. They're not sending it direct in because it's ALAC that need to make the request to ICANN please pay the following objections.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Correct but this that is going a step further than the flowchart. And actually it does get explained further on in the flowchart. But what my recommendation for the eight weeks we just focus on the comments and not file an objection during the first eight weeks because to try to do that in parallel I think will just be too much, I think.

Alan Greenberg:

Dev I raised the issue of the objections just as a contrast that clearly for an objection it must come from the ALAC and I was

---

questioning for a comment to be filed does it need to come from the ALAC? If the comment is labeled as ‘This is a comment that was raised by a number of people and a gTLD watching committee did the grunt work’, that’s fine as long as it says that. but we don’t want a perception that this is being filed by At-Large or by ALAC if indeed it hasn’t gone through that process.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay well the idea would be and that would be on Page 5 would be just like policy advice. Once someone is assigned holding the pen and they produce a draft comment, you know everybody makes their comment on it and it's refined to make a final comment for ALAC to then vote on. That’s what happens.

If you go through the rest of the flowchart, the last week of the observation comment period, Week 8 which is Page 6, by then at the beginning of Week 8, all the statements and formal comments would be finalized and then ALAC will then vote on those statements and whether to approve or not approve. And if ALAC gives approval then ALAC will then formally submit that into the public comment forum.

Alan Greenberg: Dev are you presuming that we are going to put together some sort of guidelines for this group for the group that’s doing the decisions? Does one wacko making a comment on our Wiki page, is that grounds for us filing a formal comment? Do we need a threshold for more than one RALO or - clearly not more than one RALO because one RALO may have sufficient grounds where no one else cares? I think we need some sort of guidelines otherwise we’re going to be accused of favoritism and ignoring the people who we don’t like, because we are going to get some wackos.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Right well -

Alan Greenberg: Your wacko may not be my wacko.

---

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well why I try to think of an answer to that - Rudi's comment.

Andrew Mack: Well what is your command of the technical terms?

Avri Doria: Get back on track here.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, going back to answering Rudi's question in the chat, yes the ALAC can make a comment in this process. And it can also submit it directly to the public comment forum without any ALAC oversight or anything of that sort. What could happen also is that with the comments being submitted an ALS can go ahead and submit some of that, submit it directly on its behalf, directly to the public comment forum. It's for the objections however that's more stringent requirement.

Avri Doria: If I could add something?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure.

Avri Doria: I would think that the only time you would really need to use the comment procedure if somebody wanted ALAC to be the one to make the comment. Otherwise anyone can make a comment. It's only if they think a comment is important enough that it really requires the imprimatur of the whole Advisory Committee and not just a single ALS, a single RALO or what have you that are independent organizations and under their own names should be able to do things within their own context.

I think the only time I think something would arise to the level of do you go through this process is if it's important enough to have - and I think the same criteria you had later at another point that something becomes an objection if there are several RALOs that support it, is reasonable for an ALAC comment. If just one RALO wants it well why doesn't that RALO just send it its own

---

comments saying ‘This is from the North American RALO of’ and ‘We are the this - and we object to this.’

So it seems like subsidiarity of taking the comment from the level that wants to send it and only those comments that rise to the level of ALAC wide and important would go through this.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Right well so I got the ultimate question do you think is whether you think the ALAC would want to submit a comment on a gTLD application within the application comment period. That is really the key ultimate question. I could see to avoid the favoritism and so forth and being accused of it in trying to judge which ones to comment on and which ones not to comment on.

I could see that. if the decision would be that ALAC would not be participating in the application comment period at all, and this exercise is simply for the ALSs and RALOs to form out ideas and so forth then that could be a solution, I don’t know.

Alan Greenberg: Dev, I agree partly with what Avri said but not completely. I don’t think it’s an issue of whether the submitter thinks it should come from ALAC but whether ALAC thinks it should come from ALAC. I can imagine a situation where it is raised by one, two or three people or groups, whether it’s more than one RALO or not I don’t think is relevant, and the ALAC after deliberation and this cannot be a rubber stamp. ALAC has been accused of rubber stamps on occasion, it can’t be rubber stamped. It must be something that people really feel strongly about that the ALAC could make a comment.

Now on the objection process I don’t think it should need to come from three RALOs. I can imagine scenarios where one RALO feels very, very strongly and the ALAC supports that even though the other ones have not put objections in. I think we want to make sure that we don’t dilute the process by making it sort of a -

---

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well as a follow-up Alan, the problem is I don't think we have an infinite set of money to file objections. The problem will be for ALAC to then have to decide which ones - like which ones would go ahead and which ones would not. That's why I think you have to have a threshold for the three RALOs.

Alan Greenberg: I think the threshold is a decision process ALAC has to make. It may be a hard decision but -

Avri Doria: If I can comment and then we need to sort of start bringing this to a close because it is 50 minutes on the hour. I don't think for the threshold you need to have three of them wanting to make the objection. You must have at least one wanting and at least two concurring.

Alan Greenberg: Okay I can live with that. It doesn't get to ALAC unless it gets to that point, that's fine.

Avri Doria: Right and the RALOs do seem to be capable of convincing each other sometimes on something being important enough even if they don't have that particular objection. Dev did you have more that needed to be gone through today?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Let's see, just to say that the difficulty - regarding the whether the ALAC should submit comments, one of the other difficulties would be on Page 6, would be like how would ALAC deal with a large number of comments? Because the idea would be at the last week of the application comment period if there are so many comments it wants to file or vote on, how does that take place?

Alan Greenberg: We would probably need to schedule an ALAC meeting.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes and then literally go through and vote on it right then and there.



- 
- Avri Doria: I recommend that we think about it and talk some more about that but that becomes almost an issue we can keep discussing while the RALOs are looking at this and looking at the process in general and getting into some specific fixes over the next couple of weeks.
- Alan Greenberg: I have a question I would like to ask the group and not necessarily get an answer right now, are we really believing we are going to have lots of comments and lots of objections?
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: That's a good question.
- Alan Greenberg: Not ones that are sent into us but do we really believe ALAC is going to have so many objections we will reach the limit or that we will be voting on 100 comments? I'm not imagining that at all to be honest. I wouldn't be surprised if we end up with zero.
- Avri Doria: I would be surprised if ALAC ended up zero but I would also be surprised if they ended with more than three or four. But anyway - Andrew I do want to cut the discussion on this now though, so Andrew yes. Okay not hearing Andrew and only having seven minutes left, what I recommend and I want to see if there is any objection, is that first of all I think Dev there is one more thing that needs to be added to this and instead of perhaps an overview, it's a page that sort of says what is on - sort of like annotated table of contents that says what is on each of the pages.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure.
- Avri Doria: And it gives us like a description and I'm wondering if that's something that you could write up either before we send this thing to translation or it can follow. But it's something that would need to come fairly soon.
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I agree.
-

---

Avri Doria: If you're able to do it, that's best because you know what's on each of the pages better than anyone otherwise someone can stand up to help. But we do send this to translation as of now, as it stands now. We continue to discuss it on the list. We have a final cutoff at next Monday's meeting to do this. We will take Monday's meeting as scheduled and that means it would be the earlier time, the 1600 UTC as opposed to 2100 UTC continuing on alternation and that we continue that.

Gisella Gruber: Avri it's 1400 UTC.

Avri Doria: Okay sorry thank you for correcting me. Okay so any objection to sending this as it stands now understanding there may be some changes to the translators and French and Spanish are the two? I see no disagreement and one agreement. Alan your hand is still up am I -?

Alan Greenberg: No I just forgot to take it down.

Avri Doria: Okay so proceeding on that track and Dev will also write up a sort of cover sheet that has a couple of sentences of what is on each page, so people have an understanding of what they're looking at and we will discuss the cover letter more. We will bring this all to a close at next week's meeting but it's just a temporary close because we're sending it to the RALOs but we will keep working. Okay so that's that one, we don't have much time for much else. Any last words on this work before moving on?

I see none, I will jump. Okay update on the application of support program, very quickly they're going to be putting out the announcement for the SARP members in the next couple of days. They did pass the copy by the subteam and I think today was the last day or tomorrow was the last day for comments. In terms of the further work we've gotten sort of a mushy reply on - we will let you know when we have stuff on the guidelines to review.

I personally don't think that's quite good enough and we will keep pushing them. And we also haven't gotten any word yet on what they're doing on outreach for the Applicant Support Program, so I'm going to continue pushing on that. I would be happy if others did too. That's where we stand on that, Andrew I see your hand up.

Andrew Mack: It's a stupid question, are they doing anything on outreach?

Avri Doria: I haven't seen anything yet other than they put it in a press release. It shows up on the front of the page saying we are doing this. It shows up whenever they make a statement or respond in a letter to some congress person that we've got this kind of thing going but I haven't seen an outreach program. I don't know if anyone else has.

Andrew Mack: So basically it's an outreach program based on people who are already in the loop?

Avri Doria: Kind of yes.

Andrew Mack: Kind of misses most of the world.

Avri Doria: No but Andrew what I'm saying is I haven't seen the program. I'm obviously in the loop for what I see is [inaudible 00:56:52] - [inaudible 00:56:54] so I don't want to judge them as not having one. I just see no evidence of one.

Andrew Mack: Fair enough.

Avri Doria: Okay so anyone else on application support? On new gTLD issues, did Cintra comment on something in her email? I don't believe so. I don't know of anything new. We're in Week 3 of the 13 week process. Oh yes that Matt had created a Wiki page to deal with the gTLD issues but that she hadn't had a chance to populate

it. I suppose anyone who does see a new gTLD issue that this group should take a look at and discuss, should work with Cintra to get that into the list and then we can get it scheduled into meetings. She said she will get to it on Tuesday. Are there hands up on this? Yes I see Alan?

Alan Greenberg:

Yes back on the previous subject of outreach on the new gTLD support program I'm not particularly obsessing about outreach about the program itself. If people are not 'in the loop' in terms of the concept of new gTLDs it's a bit late at this point I think. I think we're really talking to people who are not sure whether they can afford to do it but are already know what ICANN is and how to spell it and know what a TLD is.

The outreach part I'm more worried about is the part that is supposed to going on concurrently of finding donors to support the program and that part I'm much more worried about because those are people out of the loop that we are looking for.

Avri Doria:

You're right and that is another point that we should continue to bug them on and I will bring that up at the next meeting because issues I would like to bring up are probing and basically getting ALAC to push on more funds if ALAC wants to put in a proposal on let's talk about those reserve funds again. And also if ALAC wants to push the button on hey where is this review - where is this planning team for how to raise money further? And these are recommendations this group could make to ALAC to push further. I would like to put those on next week's agenda if I can.

Alan Greenberg:

Good.

Avri Doria:

Okay so that covered the new gTLD issues. On the pending action items, let me see - there was further investigation necessary on Confluence plug-ins. I think now we've added any ability to sort on a table, et cetera. But I think that's all part of the discussion

mentioned in the next line about working with GAC and relevant staff on the request on objection automatic tools. I think the whole tool issues, what can we do in Confluence, what can we do in a new tool, what can be worked out, is all very much a 'To be discussed' issue.

Matt as mentioned - the Wiki has been created. We are now two minutes over. I see no hands. I mentioned the AOB on scheduling our meetings; I will take that discussion to the list further on what we need to do. Just quick instinct my feeling is we need to continue weekly until san José and then probably not after but let's talk about it more on the list. Anyone else have a last word? I see no hands. I apologize for going over. I thank you all especially Dev who has been doing the most work of any of us. Bye-bye.

