

---

Avri Doria: Let me start going over the agenda then we will start. I assume the recording is running?

Unknown: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay so after the agenda we will go through the roll call. Then I want to talk at least briefly on the time period just to the upcoming meeting which means do we continue with the alternating times, just to make sure we made a decision to go the [inaudible 00:00:46] to staying on the one or two week schedule. I just want to have had that at the end of every meeting, the last couple, made some decisions with the staff about this meeting and just want to make sure that we're [inaudible 00:01:00].

Then there's a review of the feedback from Costa Rica sessions that should be fairly brief but then there's the main issue of this meeting which I think which is starting implementation work on the objection procedures. There's a few weeks left before comments period opens, etc. And I wanted to get that started. Then there's the just a quick update on the chartered work items, Cintra can't be at this meeting we will drop that one from this meeting schedule.

The only thing that needs to be said on that one is it will be on probably the next meeting schedule as a main item talking about how we move forward on that, how we organize it. What exactly we're doing as opposed to creating the list that we're creating now which is a great start. But this begins a period to start thinking about exactly what are we doing with that and how do we plan to handle it, measure it, etc. So that will be in a future meeting.

Then there's an update on the applicant support. It's in there but I doubt I will have anything further to say than what's reported about the meeting in Costa Rica. Pending actions and any other business, does anybody have any changes they recommend, and other business to be added at this point? No, okay then we will go

with that agenda. And in which case I guess Gisella can you do the roll for this meeting please?

Gisella Gruber:

Yes with pleasure. On today's new gTLD call on Monday 26 March we have Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Hong Xue, Yaovi Atohoun, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Tijani Ben Jemaa, apologies noted from Cintra Sooknan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Rafik Danac, from staff we have Heidi Ulrich and myself Gisella Gruber. If I could also please remind everyone to please state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, thank you, over to you Avri.

Avri Doria:

Okay thanks. So the first item on the agenda is timing and period of this meeting. Before the Costa Rica meeting, for the most part we had been meeting weekly to get the objection procedure created in time for the Costa Rica meeting. And then I think we skipped one meeting just before that. And for the most part the last period we've been weekly.

While we have some work to do in terms of getting the objection procedures started, once that group is created that we're going to talk about in the agenda item, I think that group will be meeting more which is sort of in a sense a subgroup of this so it does have a separate existence. And so I don't know that this group will need to meet weekly because that group may need to meet weekly. That's the question I ask.

We changed the time between UTC and daylight savings time because I finally remembered with DST stood for because calling it [inaudible 00:04:50] was wrong and I knew that. We've made the decision for this meeting to move it to the DST and that does affect some people differently than it affect others and that it affects some people by keeping the meeting at the same time relative to their time zone but for some people it moved it earlier. Was that the right thing to do?

---

Do we do that? And then the other thing which was actually the first topic is is continuing with alternating times fine? And are these? I'd like to open the floor to anyone on any of these issues. I see that we set aside 10 minutes, I don't know if we need it. But it's time to do a check in on timing. Would anyone like to speak on this? I see a hand, yes Hong please?

Hong Xue:

I'm not feeling well today so I guess I can't finish the call but I do have one comment. Our schedule is a tentative time zone works well in the group even though some of us will have to miss a half of the calls. And the second thing I guess the bi-week calling schedule is working. I don't believe we need to make it a weekly call, back to you Avri.

Avri Doria:

Okay thank you, yes and to back up with Hong said on that, the staff did prepare a list of attendance and indeed there were basically five people who made the meetings all the time no matter what time zone or actually there was five, one of who missed one. But by and large within that class of people that makes all of them. And then there were about five people that made the alternate times. Indeed it does look like alternating times; we could find no time last time we tried that was good for everyone. And the alternating times does seem to work. Tijani please?

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Yes thank you Avri. First of all I apologize for the remark I made on the list because of the DST time. I don't have any problem with this but the point was only because it was a surprise for me. But both are good for me UTC and DST are good for me. Second point, I do agree with Hong that we don't need weekly calls. But we may need a weekly call or perhaps more in the future. Let us do it as it is needed, not as something which is really costly [inaudible 00:07:54] now.

As for the alternating times even if I have – if any of these times are better for me but I don't my [inaudible 00:08:08] because I understand very well the other problem that is all, thank you.

---

Avri Doria: Thank you Tijani, anyone else like to comment? Okay so if I'm hearing that we stick with alternating times. We are biweekly. I'd like to comment on that. I think that that's good. I think as we start having this new working group or the objection working group they may be having weekly meetings but I don't think this meeting will need to. I think that's a great proposal basically schedule it alternating.

And then if sub teams need to have meetings or if this groups needs to meet again we revisit this issue when that becomes necessary and it may just be scheduling a special meeting to do a special task. And on the UTC/DST yes Tijani and yes a few of us and I didn't even include Cintra in the discussion. It was really between Heidi and I with other staff members giving quickly sort of [inaudible 00:09:30] what's being done here basically made a decision without consulting anyone but ourselves.

That's why I wanted to make sure we revisited it. I don't believe you caused a problem. I think it was good that you questioned it [inaudible 00:09:48]. Can everyone hear me?

Andrew Mack: Yes I can hear you Avri someone has feedback or is breathing very heavily into their headset.

Avri Doria: Okay on this issue I think we've concluded it correct, alternating times on DST until it's no longer DST and then we will probably roll back to UTC. But we will talk about it then. But so whoever's chair might end up making a one term preemptory meeting because we want to talk about it time. And we stay on biweekly until such time as it makes sense to not be biweekly. Moving on then, review of feedback from Costa Rica session. And I'll start this but really I want to collect feedback from other people in the group who were there.

On the applicant support process session, I think it was an interesting session. We had for the first time there, people that were perhaps looking for support. I don't have great feelings about

---

the publicity or the outreach. We got sort of global figures of all outreach and all such and meetings for example, perhaps at [inaudible 00:11:43] where somebody and there is an applicant support program that can be applied for. Outreach about the program was problematic.

Outreach about new gTLDs in general to the populations that we would've wanted to reach with this was problematic. But at this point I'm not sure what can be done. The application period doesn't look like it will be extended. I certainly haven't seen this group advocating nor did I see any group in Costa Rica advocating for it. So I had thought that there might've been some.

I didn't see it perhaps others did and so I'm not sure what can be done other than to make sure it doesn't happen this way again and to use this last week to reach out to any applicants who you may of to be reached out. And the one other things but I'm not sure how I feel about it, is even if they miss the 29<sup>th</sup> deadline they could still possibly do a cooperative application.

But I don't see how that would fit with the applicant support program because they would then be – the way the application would come out it would come out under someone that probably didn't qualify and so I would see that as problematic. But anyway I see two hands. I see Andrew and Tijani so I will stop babbling on my impression, so please Andrew?

Andrew Mack:

Yes Avri a couple of things, first of all I agree with you. The session on outreach, I was disappointed. I thought it was pretty thin. It wasn't broken out with the JAS and applicant support recommendations specifically. And all of the things that I heard from some of the people from some of our target markets were that they had received nothing in terms of the [inaudible 00:13:58] on the ground was very, very limited.

And I think that's going to be a big problem, I really do. I think it will be a – we probably should think about how we want to react if

---

in fact we don't even get the 14 groups or if we do get the 14 groups but they're not all of the quality that we would've normally expected just because people didn't know about it. I think that's a big issue. I heard one rumor that there was some desire to try to push forward some applicant support candidates in whatever would be the first batch.

And in fact, there was some discussion of that at the BC and in a couple of other corners that there might be some strong desire to make sure that there were applicants from the JAS appropriate applicants in that first batch, if there is a first batch. I want to get everybody's thoughts on that. I don't know I - we're going to have a tough go if there's not going to be a good showing in this first round, that's my concern.

Avri Doria:

Okay thank you. So I took a couple of things from that. One is that there's some issue about the batching. I think that would be difficult but it's an interesting thing in that the whole process for reviewing who the qualified support applicant the way it's currently designed takes as long as a batch almost. So that would be a difficult issue to look at, but certainly it should be looked at.

Andrew Mack:

Avri I didn't hear what you said, can you say it again?

Avri Doria:

Well basically the way the Applicant Support Program is designed to evaluate who is qualified to start at the same time as the first batch would start assuming there is batching, it's difficult to see how one would know who was qualified for support in the first batch during the first batch.

Andrew Mack:

Right. Let me clarify because it's a good point that you're making. The clarification is that what I heard and it's nobody's policy at this stage. It was something that I heard that was being discussed was the idea that everybody is concerned about the optics of having to JAS applicant in the first pool, regardless of what the first pool is called or what it is or how many it is. And the thought is without making any determination as to whether or not they

---

actually get the applicant support, the idea is to have applicant support - the people who applying for it in that first batch.

Avri Doria:

I understand it. It seems like this is comment on totally redoing the approach that probably would've been better before not that we had much time but before it was actually implemented. But okay I understand what's being said. Two more things before I give the floor to Tijani, one Dev had asked the question what's the deadline for applicants to apply for applicant support. And the deadline for getting into the application system and having an account in the application system is the 29 March.

The deadline for finishing your application is 12 April. March 29 is the last day for declaring yourself an applicant and having a TAS account, so yes. The other thing that Andrew had mentioned that I had wanted to get on the table here and make sure was the notion of how does this group and I guess the question would need to be asked to the JAS group, how does the JAS group respond to how this program is being implemented and yes that's an issue that we need to have on the table. I don't see it as a rush issue, but I do see it as an issue. Tijani please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Yes, thank you Avri. As for the applicant support session in Costa Rica, I was a bit disappointed because I was making a lot of noise about the outreach but nobody no but nobody said yes. And nobody did anything. I don't there is anything to do now because everything is already done. I sent on our original list a reminder for the SARP but for the application I don't think there is anything to do now.

I think that we have a duty to advertise about the SAP applications. At least we will win this side of the problem. If everyone among us does what's best to make the new available everywhere perhaps will have a very good candidate for this panel, thank you.

Avri Doria:

Okay thanks. I think that's a great idea. I do encourage everyone to reach out to people they know that are horrified to get them to

---

apply for the SARP. And I think that's an excellent thing. And I think also that in terms of outreach, I'm sure all of us have done it, but if there's anyone you know that should be applying and applicant support there is a week left. Or actually there are two or three days to get them in as an applicant. That word of mouth is still possible. I know it's really late.

I know Tijani is probably right and it is too late to get anyone applicant support applicants. But just in case we have a couple more days to outreach. Anyone else want to say more on this before we move to the new gTLD issues? Okay I will open up the floor on new gTLD issues. I know that we've gone through the list. I'm not sure what issue sessions we want feedback from so if anyone else can speak to this?

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Yes, my main remark about this session is that when the question was asked to Kurt about the next round his answer is very clear, there is not a decision about a next round. Now even if people spoke a lot about the next round, I don't think there is anything already decided about it.

Avri Doria:

Okay thank you. Yes I guess there's pretty much only two decisions I would speak of as having been made on the next round and that's there will be one and there will be a review of this round before that one happens. And so yes from a staff perspective there is no implementation of a next round yet because until the review has happened I don't think they're actually going to schedule the actual date of the next round.

I would be surprised. But I do think we have the Board sort of guarantee that there is one in so far as the Board won't change its mind. So probably what you said Tijani is that there is no decision is probably the ultimate outcome certainly from a staff perspective. Yes Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Yes the second point is about the SARP. I remarked that Kurt spoke about members among the community and members from



---

outside the community, while inside the implementation group, you remember Avri they said no they will be from the community and in the community we have expressed so we don't need to go out to community, do you remember that?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: And in [inaudible 00:23:10] presentation he put in his presentation from and outside the community.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes I guess sometimes at a point like that I have trouble knowing where the community ends because as soon as you reach out to someone that's not already in this community and pull them in, but you're right. I think that goes with what you were saying earlier in terms of doing outreach that if you know someone who is a development funding specialist who hasn't been in the ICANN community already but the right kind of person, I think they should be reached out to and get them to apply. And that's just a for example.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes and it was our request, you remember?

Avri Doria: Right, yes. And I think that the SARP team is going to be pulled into the evaluation somehow but still not quite sure how that is happening. And if there's going to be a meeting of that small team and then perhaps augmented beyond that for going forward with the SARP team. There was a sort of an agreement though that the people that had been in the JAS Policy Recommendation Group would not be probably good for SARP. Okay anything else on that? And then there's the objection procedure where it was discussed, it was commented on.

And in the end if it was approved by ALAC meaning that the next steps of it are now on our plate. And in fact the next item but does anyone want to comment further on the objection procedures and the discussions we had on that? No, anybody else want to

---

feedback anything else about the Costa Rica meeting that's pertinent to the Working Group? Yes Dev please?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Just a quick question, to follow up with the application support process, are we aware of any applicants that have applied for applicant support?

Avri Doria: From a rumor basis I think we've heard that there are several. But staff has consistently said they cannot give any information about anything in terms of application either for support or applications in general until the information dump two weeks after the period closes. We're told that there are some but they can't say anything more than that.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay well alright at least there are some then. Okay I just wanted to find out.

Avri Doria: Okay now we keep asking and basically is no information on applications until applications are closed. Okay anything else? Then we will move on to the next one which is the starting work on the implementation of the objection procedure. And from the approved plan we have developed call for participants to join in At-Large New gTLD Review Group.

Then the gTLD Review Group is tasked with receiving the comments from At-Large either directly via email or via RALO conference calls, creating, updating the gTLD Wiki comment pages, giving status updates of which gTLD received comments each week, informing RALOs of deadlines or comments to be drafted during the ACP, Application Comment Period, and for objection statements made during the seven month objection period.

Before opening the floor on this I want to make a comment and this is in the conflict of interest department. One of the things that was pointed out to me in a conversation on the chat is that I for example, have a relationship with two applicants and I can be open

about which ones they are, it's the .day and the .ngo. Either of those can I be expected to be a comment issue or even an objection issue, not necessarily from this group but fairly certain that people will think about it on both of them.

Now I'm just a research consultant for them not a decision maker in any sense. But it was pointed out that I have a material financial connection to that. So in that respect other than dealing with the process of getting the objection procedure going and getting this Working Group going, I obviously have to exclude myself from any things that even come close to deciding who and what is objected to or is comment on by this group, simply just to make sure that as one would use the word optics that I have no bad optics in relation to that.

And obviously if I were to take a real job with one of them then I would have to come back to this group and At-Large to see whether that conflict of interest made me even participating in the group problematic. I wanted to bring that up. I wanted to suggest that anyone else that is in a similar situation on an advisory board doing contract work for one, doing whatever make sure that they've sort of done that same sort of personal homework to decide whether there's any chance this thing could go wrong. And I thank Beau for sort of making sure that I looked at that.

Because before then I was like I'm just a consultant. I don't care whether they get it or not. In fact, if somebody objects it might make more work for me. Oh gee that could be a conflict of interest. Beau forced me to do my own personal homework and that's where I fell on it and I just want to point out to anyone else that has similar types of issues that they look at it themselves in terms of volunteering for this new gTLD Working Group et cetera and having said that I open the floor.

I guess one other thing I should say - I see no hands up so I'll keep going - is that what we need to develop now is a letter, I believe and I have no problem with working with a few people that would

---

want to work with to develop that letter to the RALO that basically says we're forming this group. We need you guys to pick a few people to do it. Please volunteer. Then that group comes back and in two weeks we've hopefully gotten that letter out.

I think as an end date for this we need the group to be formed if not forming by May 1 because that's when theoretically the comment period starts. We've got a little over a month to do it. But the rush is not on us. We can create the letter over the next two weeks, talk about the letter at the next meeting and then move forward.

There's time. It's not so tight that we need it weekly. One thing that I think we need to figure out is is it an open call to the RALOs and each RALO can put as many people as they want.

Do we want to suggest that now each RALO contributes one person, two people, three people? How do we want to do it? Do we want to - does this group pick its own chair/coordinator? Things like that we need to figure out over the next month, as the coordinator perhaps come from this group to maintain the connection? But so those are the issues I want to put on the table. I'm sure other people have other issues.

I'd like to know who wants to help me draft that letter over the next two weeks so that we can discuss it at our next meeting and get it sent out. The floor is open, hands please. Tijani please?

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Thank you Avri. First of all I want to thank you for your fairness because the conflict of interest we have to show that we are worried about the conflict of interest. We have to show that we are the first - show our [inaudible 00:33:17] and to explain what kind of things we can do and the kinds of things we cannot do, thank you very much and I encourage everyone else to the same because it is our level - it's how we will be seen by the others.

Second point, I think that the definition of the role of the review group has perhaps to be more detailed or a bit more clear. It is detailed but perhaps not too clear. Perhaps we have to - for

example for the third point giving status update of which gTLD received comments each week, to whom to give the status, where to be clear. For example, it's an example but in all those bullet points we have to perhaps to draft them clearly so that people who will volunteer for this group knows what they have to do.

I think that the 1 of May is really the last date to have this group formed I think because after that we will have already the list of the applicants and then the process will begin to run. And our Working Group, our Review Group has to be trained also, to get more information to be more or less trained to do this work, thank you.

Avri Doria:

Okay thank you. I see Hong has agreed. In terms of one thing that you said, we have basically two more on a biweekly schedule we would have two more meetings. So we would have a meeting on the 9 April where we would get the letter out to the RALOs. I don't know if two weeks is enough time for them to come up with the volunteers. And then we would have the 23 April as a week to make a decision on that group.

And that would give us basically a week to get that group set up and working and perhaps even having a couple of meetings during that week. That could be the training as it were for the following Tuesday would be May 1 all things being equal, just looking at those dates. Dev?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Thanks Avri. I will volunteer to help draft the letter for the call for persons to be on the gTLD Review Group. Regarding the composition, I had put in the notes in the proposal that I suggest that two persons from each RALO and perhaps one person from ALAC per region. That was my suggestion. But definitely I think we need regional balance in the group, it's important as Cheryl mentioned in the comments. And indeed yes will probably have to clarify the details.

For example, giving the status updates, just to clarify for the record, it was to give status updates to the entire At-Large list and to the RALOs and within the RALOs itself as to what is happening with the process. So we assure that every week is an email going out to the RALO list, to the global At-Large list that this is what's happened so far. I think we will have to emphasize the point that given that we're going to be using the Wiki, the persons on the review group have to be familiar with using the Wiki and are comfortable using it.

I think trying to learn how to use the Wiki if you've never used one would be a little problematic. But then that's another thought. My other question would be that the persons would have to be fluent in English because I think we're going to have to be looking at the applications in English and therefore knowledge of English is essential. I don't think we'll have things like translation and so forth.

I think we also have to make that point clear when we issue the call that there may not be translation unless this group feels that the review group needs translation or interpretation for its work. I don't think it's needed. I will stop there now.

Avri Doria:

Okay thank you for helping to write the thing. I was kind of counting on you continuing to volunteer on these things and I very much appreciate it. I think you made good points. On the English I think that yes you're right. But I also think that writing and reading of English is perhaps more important than feeling comfortable speaking, although some speaking is obviously necessary but I think the main skills will be the reading and writing and especially the reading because it's going to take a lot of reading. I think those are good points.

I think on the Wiki I have a question, do you think that everyone on that team needs to be as equally comfortable with Wiki editing at first as perhaps some. Perhaps some need to be totally comfortable but I think if there are some that are totally

---

comfortable one assumes that they'll be a working group list that there are the comment areas, et cetera and that all would learn. Or do you think really that everyone needs to be as skilled and I see Dev and Hong, so please.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I would think yes. I would think familiarity with the Wiki and being able to add the comments and edit the comments and so forth, especially would be needed. And the reason why I suggested two persons is so that it's not just one person from each RALO that's completely doing this every week. What could happen then is that if you have two persons from each RALO they can alternate the workload each week. My thinking it would be familiarity with the Wiki being able to understand how it works, would be more important. I'm willing to hear the other comments or suggestions on it.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you Hong?

Hong Xue: I agree with what Dev said that the people from the RALOs should be using the Wiki as the workspace and also should be fluent in English. That is the only work language. But I [inaudible 00:41:27] the workload would be tremendous, only two people from each RALO and there's 10 people in this [inaudible 00:41:37] group would have to - would be very burdensome. I assume perhaps we need more people from the RALO level and this [inaudible 00:41:53] group may not be a very small group.

Especially think about the thousands of gTLDs springs to free will there's only 10 people plus one from ALAC. How will they handle that? It's incredible. I have to go; I'm really not feeling well. Back to you Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you Hong I hope you feel better soon and thank you for being on the call despite being sick. Okay Tijani, I guess the other issue on the table is more than two, if so how many? Tijani?

- 
- Tijani Ben Jemaa: Avri just before Hong could leave just to say that they are not 10 plus one, they are 10 plus five, one ALAC guy from each RALO. There are 15 and not 10.
- Avri Doria: Thank you. Okay so continue the discussion here, we will start working on the letter. Is there - at the moment we're at three per RALO essentially. One of the ALAC plus two other volunteers. Is that a proper number to start with? Cheryl please?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I disagree with Hong on the matter of the numbers, which is why I'm popping my hand up now. I think the regional balance [inaudible 00:43:27] is essential. I think a group larger than what was within the 15 or so is absolutely unworkable. Hong's conflict is thousands being reviewed yes okay fine, a lot of the work is done out in the regions. And if you have every man and their dog in the Review Group, then whose going to be doing the work at the regions anyway?
- I mean I just don't think that we will get more than many active individuals. I think we probably need to look at the ability to have people substitute for each other, if need be. But I don't agree with Hong that bigger is better on this by far.
- Avri Doria: Okay thank you. First of all I just want to point out that Hong did not suggest that we have everyone and their dog in the group. But I think at the moment that we have free, I think the group itself perhaps can be empowered to come back and say "Hey there's a big workload. We need another five volunteers so that's one from each region."
- As an initial group, how do people feel about three from each, in other words one of your ALAC and two other people and that it be left to the group itself to come back and say "Listen you got thousands and it's a deluge of a comment and questions coming in from all regions. And we just can't do it; we need to add another person." And you know we could sort of explain that in the letter as part of what we're doing. I think one comment Cheryl made is
-



---

right, finding three people from each RALO willing to work as hard as it's going to take, maybe challenging finding four from each would be at least that much harder again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's [inaudible 00:45:38] belief it won't happen.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes right.

Avri Doria: So we have basically at the moment at two from each RALO and one from each georegion and from ALAC and for that. Okay anything else to be said on that? Do I have any other volunteers other than Dev and I to write this letter? I mean the two of us can probably do it. I don't know if there's someone else that wants to contribute. I'm probably figuring that either Dev or I can put a first draft on either the Wiki page or ether pad somewhere. And then go from there. Yes Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you that's exactly what I wanted to say. If you give the first draft, I will contribute, sure. But another point Avri perhaps the Review Group needs to have working methods. It's not easy to do deal with these tasks. Is it first come? And the others will not do anything when they catch up? Or will they have a periodic meeting or call to deal with all of the comments that come in that week?

We need to define some working methods for this group, how everything works. Do we need to consensus of all the members to decide on one thing? Or would it be decided by the majority or the some groups, some members etc.?

Avri Doria: Okay thanks why don't we put that one as a discussion item on the list for this week. And a discussion item for the next meeting where people bring their suggestions. I think it's a good idea to give them at least an initial guide on working group methods with them having the right to work within those constraints. Perhaps go further, etc. so why don't we put that as a discussion item

---

continuing on, take it to list because we're at 51 minutes on the hour.

I don't want to get into that one now but I think it's an excellent topic for us to look at. And we would have a month. We would have until 23 April when we pick people and start talking to them about their task, to actually get that completed. So we would have an extra couple of weeks. Good I see no hands up on this, does anyone have anything else to say on objection working group, the new gTLD Review Group? Yes Dev?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes by all means we can take that discussion regarding how the work review group would work. I have some ideas of how it would work. We can expand on that on the mailing list. I guess the other question would be well collaboration with the GAC on how they are going to approach their early warning system and whether there is a method of possible collaboration. And I'm trying to remember during Costa Rica what did staff commit to would there be a prototype of how the applications would be displayed or viewed before May 1 would be my question. I think there was no commitment given.

Avri Doria: I think there was a commitment for us to have another conversation on what's going on and so I think one of the action items is we need to follow up on that and that's Olivier, you and I who are the ones who were talking to the people on the staff working on this. And when we were in Costa Rica we had just given them the procedure that we were going to follow. We talked somewhat about the systems they were setting up and they were going to get back to us and this was the week we have sort of talked about being the earliest time they could get back to us on what the plans are.

I think you took us right into the action items section and I think that's where we are on the cooperation. First of all it's the staff cooperation with the tool and then there's the cooperation possibility with GAC once we know more about how they're

working. I think those are both things we should follow up and see what's going on. Okay anything else on this topic? I see Andrew has said he would be happy to be a reader/contributor to the letter once the first draft is out, okay. Basically we will work that way. I probably won't get a first draft done for at least a day or two, probably the end of tomorrow I should have it.

Although I find I'm already committed to too many things over the over next two days. We will stop this topic here on pending action items not covered; I don't have the URL in front of me.

Heidi Ulrich:

Avri but we're still waiting for the notes to get back on that. And those action items that are on the agenda from a couple of weeks ago.

Avri Doria:

Okay, at the moment our action items to catch up on our action items. We've at least added one or several of them this time which include getting a draft of a letter out in the next couple of days so people can discuss and we can decide on it next time. Making contact with the people on staff on working on the tools for this, doing outreach for all us, this is an action item for all of us, doing whatever last outreach we can do both on application support and SARP.

I'm starting work discussion on the mailing list in terms of working group methods for the new gTLD Review Group. Any other action items I have forgotten that we need to make sure we follow up on? Did staff catch any that I didn't recite and I know my order was haphazard? Any other business anyone needs to bring up wants to bring up? No?

In which case, unless anyone objects, I thank you for a very good meeting, first meeting back from at least for me, from Costa Rica, back into the swing of teleconferences and I thank you all and will talk to you again on the list soon and for this meeting in two weeks and good bye.

---

[End]

