

Avri Doria:

So it's probably time to start. I'll start by reviewing the agenda. There's a good possibility that we'll have a rather short meeting today but I'm not quite positive. On the review of the agenda, starting with a review of the agenda; then going to the roll call; then the preparation for the Prague meeting. And I'd like to basically take a look at the two meetings we've got, look at what's on the agenda for those – I assume staff can give us the URLs for those to look at at the appropriate time; and then basically to go through as in all the meetings the review of the Charter issues; Applicant Support Program, objection process where I just want to go over the lead-up schedule.

And then I guess there's also an update on the membership of the Review Group, and then there's an update on gTLD issues if there are any at this point. And at the moment that my agenda item to update the roll-out issues chart which did not get done at the last meeting, nor did anybody send any new items to add to it that I know of. Then there's pending action items not yet covered, which I just mentioned one of and then any other business. Does anyone have any other business items at this point that should be added onto the agenda? No?

Okay, I'll ask the question again when we reach the item just in case it occurs to anyone. Any other items on the agenda, any changes, any comments - anything like that? Nope? Okay, in which case we'll go with that agenda. So if I could ask Nathalie to please do a roll call?

Nathalie Peregrine:

Of course, Avri. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the At-Large gTLD Work Group call on the 4th of June, 2012. On the call today we have Avri Doria, Hong Xue, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Tijani Ben Jemaa. We have apologies from Yaovi Atohou, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cintra Sooknanan and Rafik Dammak. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes and to mute your speakers and telephones if you're not speaking. Thank you very much and over to you, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you – this is Avri again. So the next thing is the preparation of the Prague meetings. I am assuming, I haven't been able to find them and I'm considering myself totally lost again until I have the time to find my way around websites, but I assume we have agendas for those two meetings. I can't imagine I would have been able to get away with not having established one. Can somebody give me the URL to that agenda? I mean I'll look for them at the moment unless somebody's got them already.

Heidi Ullrich: Hi, Avri. This is Heidi. I'm going to be giving those in just one moment, but we do have a Prague meeting page that has all of the agendas on them, and the agendas were discussed for these two meetings since the last call. So I'll put those in there.

Avri Doria: Okay, fantastic. Thank you. So let's go to the Monday meeting first.

Heidi Ullrich: And again, if you'll please scroll down you'll see it's in the late afternoon. These are all-day meetings.

Avri Doria: Oh, I see it, okay.

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, scroll down and then (inaudible). [laughter]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You're swarmed with agendas, Avri – you went from none to too many.

Avri Doria: I'm totally confused now. I have no idea what I'm doing or looking at.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, scroll down the page from Monday; I assume that you're looking at that one. So scroll down the page.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You don't have to scroll too far; it's basically the third box.

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, it's the one that is let's see, 12:30 to 14:00 – the agenda, I'll put the agenda in.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. And I see we have no agenda in either French or Spanish, okay. Okay, so basically at the moment what we have on the agenda is just our standard three issues. Now, normally in these meetings we don't do any open issues, but what I'd like to go through on this one, first of all, is this is as the objection process is starting - we should have everything in place. We're looking at the schedule, looking at that. One of the questions, and I've requested that either Kurt or someone be there, because one of the things that I've never quite heard from the staff is how indeed at the end of our process everything is fine to proceed.

And then all of a sudden it occurred to me that we had done a lot; it had been approved; we had been appointing members, but at no point have I got... and of course staff has done an immense amount to help us with the forms and such. But at no point have we actually had a discussion that I remember with Kurt

saying, “Yes, and when you’ve gotten to this point you do this for the submission.”

Os I really would like to understand that not for the comment period, but for the objections and also I want to make sure that we’re still dealing with one objection period, not three – I assume it’s just one but I want to make sure because I’ve occasionally heard comments that well, you know, a two-year-old objection was sent, does that make...So I just wanted to hear the staff on that issue but also that once we’ve done it and it’s been approved by ALAC and it’s been sent forward, exactly what does the process look like and what kinds of other interactions there might be.

So I’ve asked for Kurt to come in a basically have a conversation on that. There may be other issues on the objection process that we would to discuss, but that was one. I don’t know if anybody else wants to comment on other issues we may want to discuss with that for others dealing with the objection process or other specific sub-topics that we should get into in the meeting, I’d ask to please bring it up. Any comments on that as an agenda item or any further depth that we need to sort of define for it? No? Okay.

Obviously we’ll be there; we’ll talk about the agenda at the beginning of the meeting, etc. Then the second item has to do with the update on Applicant Support. Again I’ve asked Kurt and Karla to be there to give us an update on what’s happening. We’ll get down to it later on the meeting – where it’s at now, but just understand where it was at that point, how the process will be unfolding over the course of the first batch and they to allow people to ask questions and make sure that we understand what’s happening.

In some ways it looks fairly clear; in other ways it doesn’t look so clear. I don’t know if there are other issues that people would like to bring up for that particular discussion to put on the agenda as issues at that point. Nope? Okay.

Then the last one is the New gTLD roll-out issues and what are the next steps. And hopefully by then I will have taken care of my action item. Hopefully by then people will have brought up any other issues that they’ve got. Maybe there

are no other issues and that's why it's been fairly quiet. We'll see issues, but for example, do we need to have an issue there about price caps and vertical integration? Is that something that we need to add to our list? How do we go about continuing to add the things; to try and get volunteers to sort of take responsibility for a topic and following them through and basically just talking through those particular issues?

So those were the three issues. Anything more that I would need to add sub-issues on the roll-out? And I think one of the things that meeting will be is an opportunity to collect any other issues that come out in the discussion, depending on how much... I don't know if Kurt and Karla will still be there but if they are, certainly would love their feedback on some of these issues.

I see a message. Dev asked if the independent objection will be in Prague and is there a need for the New gTLD Working Group to meet with the IO? I don't know. What do other people think? And if it was meeting with the IO, would this be the whole New gTLD Working Group or would this be the Review Group and in what context? So I guess no one's got a comment; I'll leave it open and discuss it on the list.

I guess it's worth finding out if he'll be there and then if he will, perhaps inviting him – I would think – to the second meeting, not to the first. But leave that for discussion to just meet and greet almost and talk about other relationships between the IO and the Review Group and the process. So, I don't know. Anybody have an opinion on if the IO is there – which meeting we should invite him to? Probably if they (inaudible). Anything?

Okay, while waiting for that, I'll just talk about the other meeting. Okay, so Huang agrees that the IO will join the second one. The second meeting is sort of billed as a joint meeting and it's an open meeting. But I have seen it as a joint meeting simply because the other group won't have met yet and it's sort of this group sort of opens for that group.

But that that meeting will be completely focused on the objection process, both issues that people will have in the room, I'm sure that we will have some

participation in terms of explaining what's going to happen in terms of the process moving forward, how it works, if we can get the IO in there – that would be good to discuss relationships between this group and the IO and so on and look at what their next steps are.

And I think at a certain point the meeting does become almost a Review Group meeting in terms of charting how they want to do their work. So part of the meeting I think there's that one. Now let me see – when is that one listed for? That's Tuesday. Is that one Tuesday? Yeah. What block is this one? There it is. I found it. Oh yes – general introduction, Review operations and duties; review of dashboard; next step. Yes, Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Thank you, Avri. I think that Dev had a very important point about the independent objection and even though Kurt would not be in Prague or it would be impossible to meet him in Prague, I think that we have to establish a relationship between the independent objector and the Review Group.

Avri Doria:

Yeah, okay, so well, first we'll get the answer part of the question answered – is he going to be there and see if we can invite him to one of our two meetings, preferably the Review Group one, but depending upon his schedule, perhaps even the other one and follow through from there.

Evan had a comment. Think about it - at one level the IO is like applicant support to the objection process. Those with the cash to launch their own objection will do so; those without means will use the IO. Yes, Andrew, I see your hand up.

Andrew Mack:

Avri, quick question. Do we have a clear sense of exactly what the role of the IO will be and where that role will begin and end?

Avri Doria: A clear sense on anything in ICANN is always difficult to say.

Andrew Mack: [laughs] Okay, okay. How about something that we could put down and use as a working document, you know, like a thinking...

Avri Doria: I don't know that there's anything outside of the Applicant Guidebook. Does anyone know if there's any other documentation? I don't believe there is anything outside of the Applicant Guidebook so someone correct me if they've seen something in the mass of extra documentation.

I suppose there's also looking at the advertisement where they were looking for one where they described duties and practice of the job as an extra component. But I don't know of anything beyond that. Does anyone else? No, so I guess that's about as clear a view as we've got.

Andrew Mack: Okay, I was just wondering because everything else is in motion and they all seem like moving documents so I figured we might have that update.

Avri Doria: Yep, I haven't seen any. Evan just said he hasn't seen any, but it's a good question to ask just to see and I'll certainly take a look around later to see if there is anything. So Dev also says nothing new. So if a whole bunch of us say nothing new, if there is it's really hidden. But, yeah, it's a good thought.

Anything else on these two agendas that should be added, that should be covered that's not being set up right? No? I see people are typing so I'll let the typing go by before moving to the next item just in case something. Okay, well, there it is.

Question – there are also applicant supports for objections not only support ALSs. Could you explain?

Female:

Hi, Avri. This is a response to Evan's comment that IO is kind of support to objection process. So people who have not resources to file application, they can submit to IO to help them to summon the objection, to my understand is our objection process. It's also a support for At-Large community. We mention the community, alright, so you know that. Back to you.

Avri Doria:

Okay thank you. I just hadn't had the context, so thank you. Okay, Heidi had a question. We'd like to have Michael Salazar, the New gTLD Program Director to be invited. That might actually be good for the first meeting or would that be the second meeting? It seems to make sense. I mean it... Heidi, is that a possibility. I hadn't even thought of it.

Heidi Ullrich:

Yeah, I can ask him. I think maybe both meetings would be useful.

Avri Doria:

Both meetings would certainly, but also especially I would think on the first one on the roll-out issues and such. But, yeah, both would be useful, certainly. Then Evan had one issue – In meeting the budget allocated IO this will create an effective limit as to how many IO objections can be raised. We certainly [don't think] there's a very high budget for the IO, but I don't remember the number.

As we meet an aroma, that should work – I don't quite understand that comment. Anyway, any other comments on the preparation for Prague? Okay, and in terms of the Tuesday meeting, I'll do a general introduction and Dev is doing .3. I'll probably look for someone else or have Cintra to do the Review Team – Review of Operations and Duty Members and the next step I'll help

with. But again, I'm maintaining my separation from anything but the process of the group and therefore would stand back from operations and duties. Okay, anything else on the process? I assume all of you aren't involved in having lost your hotel room?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We don't even know whether we've got hotel rooms until we get there of course. We usually find out three days before every...

Avri Doria: A bunch of us – or I think most of us or at least many – of us that reserved at the Hilton using the ICANN rate all got trumped out of the hotel and moved to other hotels on Friday. They had a glitch and they overbooked and basically they're kicking out anyone that was not reserved from ICANN but was reserved on the ICANN rate. So if you reserved on a regular rate, you're fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's appalling.

Avri Doria: I just found out I'm at a hotel 45 minutes away. It's a nice hotel.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That doesn't really matter then, does it?

Avri Doria: No, it doesn't. But anyway, so good luck to you guys on that 45 minute...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's ridiculous. There's no guarantee... I've heard traffic is appalling, Avri.

Avri Doria: Oh yeah, that's why I figured 45 minutes – I'll walk. Last time I was in Prague I was in a hotel in old town and yeah, walking is the quickest method.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Especially in the summer when everyone is there is even worse.

Avri Doria: Yeah, so anyway, hopefully you guys will be in the Hilton and not walking with me from old town, old Prague.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well if there's that type of... I mean, I won't. I'll be attending remotely whilst I'm in Sydney; I can't manage that at all.

Avri Doria: Andrew, you had tried to say something about this.

Andrew Mack: I was just noting that that's also – if you have to take a 45-minute cab ride, that's also a lot of additional expense that people haven't budget for. In addition to having to pay more money from the hotel, that's pretty crazy.

Avri Doria: Actually it's less money for the hotel but yeah, one of the things that a few of us are demanding if this is going to happen is the Hilton better provide a shuttle. Anyway, that was my aside. Hopefully you guys are luckier with your reservations than I was. Fortunately none of these meetings is an 8:00 in the morning one.

Now moving on, anything else on agenda for the two meetings in Prague or are we feeling fairly good? I don't think we're having another meeting set up; I

don't think we need another meeting between now and Prague, but people can correct me on that.

Okay, let's go right to the update on the charter issue. Applicants for program – I've gotten no new news since last week. The GNSO meeting is – and perhaps Alan can add something – the GNSO meeting is this week, it's this Thursday. They've asked again for an update from Kurt and group. I believe they're going to get one; I believe the issue centers around the role of the CMR. I think they may be under misapprehensions of the extent of the role. I'm hoping once it's explained to them they sort of climb down off the horses and allow things to go through.

Depending on what comes out of that meeting could affect the process. I'm not quite sure. We're obviously also waiting for information in terms of with there being this many batches, with there being this many applications, what does that mean in terms of... well, obviously all the work of [what has been done] during the first, but how many applications are there for support; how many groups will be working – all of that was left very much in the air.

So that's kind of the information that I'm hoping we get by Prague, but just don't know yet. So Alan please.

Alan Greenberg:

Yes, thank you. I don't think the discussion at this point or at least so far in the DNSO is related to the CMR as such, but really a meta discussion on whether the JAS Group had a mandate to select and essentially appoint the CMR which potentially is what happened with the support of staff.

Avri Doria:

Well actually I don't see it that way at all, but okay.

Alan Greenberg: Well, the real issue – whether the JAS Group had the right to make a decision without forwarding that recommendation back to the parent group.

Avri Doria: They did make the decision.

Alan Greenberg: Well, a recommendation.

Avri Doria: Okay, the staff asked JAS for recommendations and they gave them.

Alan Greenberg: I understand. I believe the general tone in the GNSO is that recommendations – cause that's all a working group can do – it's not empowered to actually act further than that – must go through its parent body. So I think the discussion so to the limited extent there has been one has been that. Assuming that tone continues, I can't see how the GNSO will accept what happens and given that, I'm not sure what staff is going to do, so that remains to be seen.

Avri Doria: It is interesting because I'm not sure the GNSO has any basis for something or not. But anyhow...

Alan Greenberg: I understand that but that's nevertheless I think the way I read the-

Avri Doria: And I wouldn't think the staff would need to care. But anyway...

Evan Leibovitch: I was just going to support your point of view on this that this is something that is a matter of implementation bordering on micromanagement. Staff has asked for members of the JAS Group to help. This is not like official meetings of the JAS; this is individuals who've been asked by staff who demonstrated a willingness and knowledge in the field that have been asked to help staff.

I really don't understand what the role of GNSO is in this because it's not like staff is recreating the JAS for ongoing work. So I mean, Alan, we can anticipate stuff; people can get angry over the strangest things and we really can't stop them from getting angry, but I really don't think there's any standing to complain here.

Alan Greenberg: Evan, just for the record, you said you favor Avri's view. I wasn't giving you my view of...

Evan Leibovitch: You know what, I'm sorry. I'm giving you my view of how I believe the GNSO will be reacting and the subject of the discussion, not saying whether I...

[crosstalk]

Evan Leibovitch: ...as much as it wants but at the end of the day, I don't think it has standing. Staff has asked for help from individuals and it is not like the JAS Group is reporting back to anyone. Individuals are assisting the staff in doing their work. And like I said, we can't stop the GNSO from wringing its hands over things, but the defense against any complaints I think is easy to come by and well justified.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question of both of you? And that is I understand that At-Large, ALAC or ALAC Central Committee or what have you discussed the issue and has taken some position on it, though I don't know it's taken a formal position and I'm wondering whether (a) there is a position out of the leadership of ALAC and (b) whether Alan is being asked to convey that message to the GNSO Council.

Alan Greenberg: My recollection – and I need to check our records before the Thursday meeting – is that the ALAC did in fact support whatever recommendation was made if indeed as Evan says, there was a recommendation of the JAS meeting which said that, “Yes, we believe the CMR should be former JAS members and this is the group that we are suggesting.” But I believe the ALAC did formally ratify that. Evan, can you or Cheryl... can you or... I know we said we were going to do it and I think we actually did that at the ALAC meeting. Is that correct?

Evan Leibovitch: I think you're right, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. But I need to check the words before the meeting obviously, but I believe that was formal action of the ALAC itself.

Avri Doria: So you would be conveying that as...?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, certainly.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Okay, Alan, your hand is still up. Did you have further comments?

Alan Greenberg:

Sorry, no.

Avri Doria:

Okay. Tijani, please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Thank you, Avri. I want to remind you that this procedure was started from our working group or this working group and our working group said we need to involve the JAS. So if you want, all the work was started in this working group which is an At-Large Working Group; and I remember that the mail sent from the staff to ALAC about the way forward. So we wanted it to be with JAS and not with our working group. It's our choice.

Now, first you are speaking about JAS. Anyone from GNSO can say JAS is a cross-community working group; it is chartered. And this working group doesn't have to do anything out of the charter; it is their right. So even if it's not a point of development, even if only anything, they say no, the working group has a charter and the working group has to stick to the charter. This is my point of view. Thank you.

Avri Doria:

Thank you. And as I remember, they did upgrade the charter at one point to say work with them on the implementations. Yes, Alan?

Alan Greenberg:

And that's their exact point. When the charter was renewed again to say it could continue working, the clause was explicitly put in, although some of us argued that it was input anyway, that the group must only report back to and make recommendations to its parent body. And that's the gist of the... I won't say of the complaint, but the concern.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Avri, to your recollection as one of the Chairs of this group, has the staff ever made a request to you to formally convene the JAS Group in order to work with them? Is this a formal or an informal thing? If this is an informal thing, we're all talking about something that's moot. If staff is asked for formal meetings of the JAS to work together with staff, then I can understand the GNSO point of view maybe.

But as I don't even believe that it's been called formally like that and instead staff has simply asked for people to help them, I think we're really over-blowing something here. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: My recollection is – and it may not be the best – is that the small group of JAS people who were asked to work with the Board decided that it was not within their mandate to make a formal recommendation and they decided to reconvene the JAS Group for one meeting. I think that was the sequence of events.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think that that's pretty close to my recollection too that... and it was that small group – those asked to work with the Board and the staff had always said that if there was more people needed for the task, they would go back to the JAS so therefore they requested that the JAS Chairs – only one of whom was in that small group of people – reconvene that group for that purpose.

And so I think it was in the process of the smaller group doing its task that they went to the JAS, but I don't know that there was any... I don't remember a formal request from staff.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think staff cared who did it. That small group felt it was past their responsibility level to make that formal decision.

Avri Doria: It was more if you were opening up to more people, well then you needed to open it up to the more people to volunteer more than level of responsibility. But anyway, okay, so that's obviously... but at the moment that what's going on in terms of picking the SARP, in terms of putting together the plan; in terms of getting it started is very much up in the air.

I think there's a certain amount of concern that the G Council will throw a wrench into the works at this point and they'll have to go back to the drawing board. I don't know. But anyhow, that's the kind of stuff that's pending but no answer. Anything else on ASP?

Okay, on objection process – just I added the schedule as I understand it to – and I just put the thing in – where this was for a review group member approval where I guess we're already at 4 June which means that the ALAC vote on the Big Pulse to choose ratify. The ALAC recommended select review group members is one day away from closing. And...maybe? Can you explain maybe? I mean it says 5 June but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm just aware and I can't say... I mean Holly would have better knowledge on what....

Avri Doria: And she has her hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ... the change recently had. But I did notice that that poll was closed and is then going to be reopen. That's my maybe; Heidi should be able to answer you.

Avri Doria: Okay, Heidi, please explain.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, actually over the weekend you'll notice that the question was incorrect because it was asking whether the ALAC would ratify all of the recommended review groups, not just ALAC selected ones. On Olivier's team I'm sure that there's nothing that could be questioned besides the (inaudible) developed with correct questions. So that's what happened.

Avri Doria: So how does that change the schedule?

Heidi Ullrich: I believe it's going to be a five-day vote again, but I have to confirm that with Olivier.

Avri Doria: So that means that the training schedule that was 6 June and 12 June will also have to be moved.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes. Well, I know that we're already doing the Doodle for the schedule of the calls.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That was the reason for my maybe, Avri. Cheryl for the transcript record.

Avri Doria: Yes, okay. So okay, so that means that that too is somewhat up in the air cause five days would make the 12th the first possible day of the training. So then there would have to be... cause 13 June was prepared and ready to go; this then is the open of comment period and reveal day. So for some reason I expect that to be midnight or just before midnight Pacific Time.

But anyway, so I suppose that could mean a couple delays, in days delay in to the review starting. Also I don't think that that's catastrophic. I don't know that this group will have a lot of comments that have to be made in the first couple days of the 60-day period, but I guess I'll work with Olivier and others to re-task the schedule. Heidi, your hand is still up. Did you have another comment?

Heidi Ullrich: I do believe that Olivier (inaudible).

Avri Doria: I can't understand what you just said.

Heidi Ullrich: (Inaudible). I believe that Olivier does aim to keep the schedule on. That's how we're doing a Doodle, although [there'll be just a few calls over the week]. But I'll confirm to the list later today.

Avri Doria: So basically you would be doing a training session with the perspective members that have yet to be voted on with the assumption that they were going to be approved. And if not, they would come into the training late.

Heidi Ullrich: I have to confirm that. It might be a short vote too. It might be a three-day vote. I just have to confirm that with Olivier.

Avri Doria: Okay, so anyhow, looking for updates. I've probably an action item to update this group on the schedule just so people know what's happening in our [wonder]. Anyone else on objection procedure? Okay.

Update on roll-out of gTLD issues – as I said, I had an action item to sort of flesh out the table that I created but I did not do it. So basically the table remains as it was. At this point we have four items on it. I probably need to add a couple items. I haven't seen any other things from conversations. I will put on it as a possibility is the whole issue of vertical integration and [price caps].

I know that Alan is I guess working on a statement that ALAC will look at, but I figure that's a reason to add it to this table in any case. I don't know if anyone has any comments on that or anything else to do with this. Yes, Hong.

Hong Xue: Hi, Avri. Alright, I know that ICANN just announced the service provider for trademark clearing house and it is one global consultant service [with a long name] – Deloitte; another one is IBM. And what is the most interesting is that this is an upside down structure and that's because these two institutes can only provide peripheral supporting services.

The call for the trademark validation or certification will be done by the sub-contractor – very interesting. That is CHIP is based in Brussels and I guess it's a sort of ICANN divider. They have a long-term connection with ICANN. So I don't know why ICANN used this interesting structure.

Basically they should appoint one service provider – it could be CHIP and CHIP can use whatever technical support for the consultant service. But now ICANN appointed these two at global level and then these two appoint a sub-contractor that is CHIP. So this is a very interesting structure. I'm still researching why ICANN is using a system like this. No immediate comment – that is a very interesting phenomena. Back to you Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, so before going on to Alan, I have a question for you. I have opened it up; I have edited it; I've written trademark clearing house on the roll-out issues as a question and can I put your name down as token holder on this one to keep us informed and keep tracking it? Is that okay?

Hong Xue: Sure.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Yes please, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, two things in response to Hong. I haven't actually read all the detailed documents except they're available; I assumed that Deloitte and IBM put in a bid and that was the one that was accepted. I don't think that we specified the structure ahead of time. That's my guess but I haven't actually read the documents in this.

In terms of vertical integration the comment has been sent out. It's a very brief one and essentially it says that ALAC and At-Large have always been somewhat divided in terms of whether vertical integration is good or bad, but to the extent that it has been approved, we believe a level playing field is appropriate, but we have a concern that with one of the options that would be available for specifically VeriSign, is to simply adopt the new agreement.

And that would have the effect not only of removing the cross-ownership restraints but also would remove price caps. And it's not at all clear that that would be subject to any outside comment and that's something which could have onerous results. So that essentially is the comment. It's been sent out in email; I don't know if it's been posted on the Wiki yet.

Avri Doria: Okay. In terms of having... thank you. In terms of having that issue on the roll-out issue chart, is it okay – I'll ask you the same question I asked Hong – is it okay to put your name down as the token holder on this one for this group at this point?

Alan Greenberg: Sure, but by that time I think it's going to either have been accepted as an ALAC statement or not and you know, I think it will be a done deal. But yes, I have no problem with that.

Avri Doria: But we may end up having a longer term issue with it when we're talking about roll-out issues, etc.

Alan Greenberg: Depending on how ICANN responds to our comment – yes. Correct.

Avri Doria: Yeah, yeah. While I'm at it since I've had two for two, I'm getting people to volunteer for stuff. On the other items that we have on the list and part of the way of determining how far we want to take these things, is there someone that wants to hold onto the token and be responsible for basically carrying this group forward in terms of framing what the issue is?

I have three items on the list... oh no – one we decided not to pursue, so we have digital archery which has no token holder yet and we have outreach program for New gTLDs that has no token holder. Do I have any volunteers here for... okay, Hong, I see your hand up.

Hong Xue: Right, this is response to Alan's comment. There was a public bidding period opened by ICANN that is end of November last year. I myself, ICANN

received a score of bidders and I'm actually on the Implication Assistance Group – IAG – that's specifically for implementation of trademark clearing house, so I've been following the whole process. So Deloitte submitting their bidding – that is not the point actually. The issue here is why they are selected – that's the interesting part.

Avri Doria: Heidi, you still have your hand up. Have I been ignoring you?

Heidi Ullrich: No, sorry.

Avri Doria: Do I have a volunteer for following up on the digital archery issue or is it not that important to us at this point? Okay. Same question for Outreach Program for Applicant Support. Is there someone that would like to take charge of that issue going forward? Okay. I will leave them token holder-less. Please, if you think it's an important issue for us to follow up on and develop a statement on as it were, please let me know.

Male: Avri, I'll be following the Applicant Support thing obviously like you will be, so I'm happy to contribute in.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Tijani, please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you Avri. I wonder if it is necessary now to work on the Outreach for the Applicant Program because everything is done. We will not get more applications for support.

Avri Doria: Yes, I understand that, but one of the things that this has to do with is also basically creating short reports explaining the issues, problems and things we think could be improved in the future. So that's... you're right – we're not going to get anything more at the moment, but if it's something that we as a group want to give ALAC a comment further on, then it's something we have to work on.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay.

Avri Doria: So that's it for me on the update on gTLD issues going to pending. Anything else on any of our charter items before I move on? Nope, okay. Going to pending action items not yet covered. Okay, I have that one open in a window somewhere. Okay, so Avri to fill out roll-out issues, table chart and add references – that one remains on the list. I need to add the references yet.

Members of the New gTLD Working Group send suggestions to the roll-out issues table to the list. That's an ongoing one that's [backed up]. And then Alan to raise CMR issue as issue at 22 May ALAC meeting under AOB. Did that meeting ever get to AOB?

Alan Greenberg: I don't know if we got to it but I believe we were at the issue.

Avri Doria: Right, the issue did come up.

Alan Greenberg: I think we changed the order because of that.

Avri Doria: Right. I would say that one was done. I think members can send suggestions for roll-out issues is an ongoing action item. As they occur to people, they should mention them and I keep the one that says I've got to add references for things on the list already.

Anything else on any of this? No? Any other business that people have thought of during the meeting? Nope. In which case I think we're done with 10 minutes to spare and I thank you all.

Participants: Thanks. Bye.

Avri Doria: Oh, one last thing. Sorry. No meeting between now and... I'll say it on the list also – but I don't think any meeting between now and Prague. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There is no need for that; no need at all.

Avri Doria: I'll also put it on the list, just to make sure. But thank you all. Bye-bye.

[End of Transcript]