GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone on today's New gTLD Review Group call on Friday the 22nd of February, 2013 at 16:00 UTC. We have Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Adela Danciu, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Garth Bruen, Eduardo Diaz. Apologies noted from Alexander Kondaurov, Justine Chew and Kenny Huang. And from staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber.

If I could also just remind everyone to please state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Gisella, and good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. Just to go through the agenda items, we always have a standing action item regarding statements of interest. Any Review Group member can notify the group of any potential conflict of interest regarding any applications and so forth. So just for the record, does anybody have any conflicts of interest or statements of interest they wish to bring to the attention of the Review Group? Going once, going twice, going thrice… Okay.

Okay, very well. So just to review what happened on the last New gTLD RG call on Wednesday – what happened on Wednesday was a short call because the preliminary draft that was begun by the penholders, that's Adela and Justine, had only just really begun and also a request from IMIA, the submitter of the original comment that started the whole Wiki page creations and the discussions and so forth, we had requested them

---

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.

to fill out the community template. This is the same community template that listed the four criterion – community, substantial opposition, targeting, detriment and all the various factors in the table and so forth. And we had asked them to submit it.

And they did submit it, although they submitted it literally a half an hour before the call so there was no real opportunity to review their submission and the preliminary Google Doc. I should also mention that earlier this week there was a comment, a request for comment on .music from Constantine, I don't know if I can pronounce his last name correctly – I think it's Constantine Roussos asking well, seeing the comments regarding .health he wanted to open a comment on several .music applications. And I did reply that that time has long passed. We can't accept anything new at this point and I think you've seen my reply to Constantine on the list as well.

Since Wednesday I see there's also been some editing of the documents and there's been some comments by Garth and Justine especially on the document. There was also a submission that was received by one of the applicants responding to the IMIA's submission and that was also immediately forwarded to the list and also put up on the Wiki for information purposes.

One thing though that did happen also was that I did post the link to the Google Dog with the ability for anybody with the link to comment, and one of the applicants also basically started commenting on the Google Doc which, well as per process it was not the right thing to happen, to have the applicant actually comment on the document as it's being worked on. So I did reset the Google Doc for viewing by public only and

then gave permission to various RG members who if they want to comment.

[French audio comes into line]

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Merci beaucoup. Okay, yes, so I think that is a concise summary of what has taken place. The intention for this call was to look at the statement and see whether it was sufficient enough to pass on, to put together the draft objection statements for all the applications for .health and .jiànkāng, the IDN so that it will be ready in time for publishing for the RALO review on Monday.

So now that I've said all of that there's been several comments on the Google Doc, and I posted a link to the Google Doc in the chat there. So does anybody wish to take the floor to talk about any points that have been raised? Well Garth, do you want to take the floor on this? I can speak to what you have said in the chat but… Okay, well while Garth is… Okay. Well, just to start with one of the comments in the Google Doc, Garth was suggesting that given that the application for .jiànkāng, this is the IDN application from Stable Tone, Ltd. – what Garth was pointing out is given that the translation of that IDN string is .healthy according to the applicant, then perhaps we should not be targeting any objection statement to this string.

The thing is though, what I did discover though – and I've spoken to a few other persons… Ah, Adela, you want to take the floor. Please go ahead.

ADELA DANCIU: Yes, thank you. Can you hear me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, we can.

ADELA DANCIU: Since we are now at the Chinese IDN, I also made a comment regarding the targeting criteria on that, I was supposed to fill in. And Garth also agreed with my opinion that we should maybe consider dropping this objection because there is no [pointedness] regarding the scope of the string. In its application, the applicant, Stable Tone Ltd., said that he intends to target with this string the wellness care, leisure care, fitness and sports, healthy food and drink companies. This is a quote from the application. Therefore there's no direct association with health as understood by IMIA. Yeah, we have the comment below the document, in the document lower.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Adela, this is Dev speaking. I mean I hear the nuance here but I'm a little bit concerned that well one, the translation – and I was speaking to Rinalia who speaks Chinese and she insists that those two IDN characters do represent both the noun and the adjective, meaning the noun "health" and the adjective "healthy." And also if you read the statement from the mission purpose, I mean okay – as described it talks about the .jiànkāng TLD, and I apologize again that I'm probably mispronouncing this IDN – but the .jiànkāng TLD is intended to benefit

Chinese-speaking internet users by providing a designated and focused space for individuals and entities interested in issues related to healthy lifestyles, products, and services.

So my question to both Adela and Garth, don't you think that the mission purpose is similar in scope as the applicants for the ASCII .health? And Adela, maybe you want to respond since Garth is going to type in his response.

ADELA DANCIU: Yeah, this is Adela speaking.   I'm not sure what to say about that because frankly I had some difficulties in coining the targeting criterion with all the applications. And the logic that I followed was something that I have to prove, that both IMIA and the applicant are targeting the same community. And I found for the other four applications some overlapping and in order to sustain that okay, there is a conflict, a contradiction between the applicant and the community represented by the IMIA but with this IDN I'm really struggling to find this argument in sustaining the targeting criterion – at least for this point, the statement contained in the application. If you can [add the health argument] to them, okay.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. So alright, well just to remind you that originally the comments from IMIA did mention this in the same context of the other three applicants for .health. So and just to mention what Garth has been posting in the chat, in his opinion no, .jiànkāng's and .health's scopes are not similar in the sense that it sounds like they're including green

tea and massage as healthy and this is not I the scope of the objection. And a healthy lifestyle is not the same as a health service or health providers.

Okay, well any opinion from Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry, this is Eduardo. No, I don't have any comments.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Let's see who else is on the call… Fatimata, any thoughts? Okay, maybe Fatimata… Oh, go ahead.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Hi Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yeah, hi.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Sorry, I was muted and I had to unmute my line before talking. I was saying that it can be kind of confusing just to refer to this globalization because it's listed by, that they all have organizations – a thing that is sort of reliable, I don't know. I don't think this should be the reason to just everything that is explained here. When they say that they're referring to healthcare and research in medical health and bioinformatics, is it because they're saying that? For me, for me – and I

EN

don't think it's something maybe, but for me .health [should be held] by a world organization, like World Health Organization, yeah. That's my-

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Alright, so well, unfortunately there's not many persons on the call but alright. So the sense is that because the IDN could be put towards the adjective rather than the noun this objection statement should not be… Well, either this objection statement should not be decided to be forwarded or a new objection statement, worded completely differently, needs to be done.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: But .health doesn't mean healthy. I mean we can think that it means healthy. It can be misleading because we have some groups, some organizations who could use that just to mislead people. I mean if .health-

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I mean the same characters are used. Depending on the context, is what I understand, that it can be used as a noun like "health" or as an adjective, "healthy." Eduardo and then Olivier.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yeah, this is Eduardo. I'm thinking about what Adela said and if the application doesn't target the health group I tend to agree with her that it's not targeting, to answer the question on the objection of targeting. If the question is "healthy" then is it the same thing? I'm not sure.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Alright, thanks Eduardo. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Dev, it's Olivier for the transcript. I have checked with members of the Chinese community whether .health in IDN Chinese translates to "healthy" and not "health," and apparently that assertion is incorrect. So I'm not quite sure how we can take Garth's comment on this but it appears from the feedback that I've had is that what Garth understood is the Chinese one being "healthy" rather than "health" is actually not correct. That's all, thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks Olivier for that. I see Garth is typing something there. Hmm…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If I could ask, and it's Olivier just as a follow-up if I can say prior to thinking that it would be "healthy" rather than "health" I would suggest that you ask a Chinese speaker like Hong for example or Edmon Chung or someone to actually check if that assertion is correct. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, this is Dev. I did ask Rinalia Abdul Rahim and she insists that the characters can be both a noun and an adjective. And I was trying to post the thing in Google Translate but the link is not working, it's being mangled by the Adobe Connect somehow so that… And if it was, well if

there was for .healthy there would have been an additional character. But again, this is now going into IDNs and stuff like that which we're probably not…

Garth is suggesting well, ask the application – if they fudged the meaning they may have provided false information. Well, I think the problem is, Garth, to answer that question I think the time for asking that is well…. I suppose they could issue a clarifying comment and so forth but the initial evaluation results coming out so soon it doesn't make sense that any applicant is going to make any changes now unless it's specifically to reassure any governmental concerns or whatever. And yes, I would think so – if they did fudge the application it would be their loss.

Alright, so well, I think what we should do is probably… I can see that we don't really have consensus yet and there's very few persons on the call – Adela, Garth is suggesting not to include it and Fatimata and Eduardo, if I understand it correctly you're both saying the thing is that it can be misconstrued as health and be used as health and therefore target the same concerns that IMIA is raising in their objection statement. So alright, let's set it aside a little bit for now at this point. The bigger concern is this – the actual objection statement itself.

I don't know if persons have been reading the objection statement. Does anybody have any thoughts about that? Adela, as one of the penholders do you have any concerns as to whether the statement is in a form ready to be published or not, or…

ADELA DANCIU: You mean the Google Document? I'm sorry, I didn't understand very well the question.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, the Google Document, the Google Document. Remember, the intent behind this is to use the Google Document to then put together the formal objection statements against all the applications and so forth and change any nuances to suit the application being objected to. So I mean do you think that it's in a form that could be taken by the Review Group now and applied and duplicated for all the applications for .health, or there's more work to be done?

ADELA DANCIU: This is Adela speaking. I don't know for the other part but for the part that I was editing, meaning the description of the targeting criterion, I have put it on each of the applicants in the same document. So they will have to be fixed to go each in the proper objection statement. So I consider this document in Google Docs, in the Google Drive as a draft to start with containing all the arguments for all applications. But the next step would be to finalize and polish up an objection statement for each of the applicants. And as I see there are still some comments attached to the text on the document so I'm not sure if we can really consider it as a final draft. It's close to final I think.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, true. I mean I have to say, I have to commend you, Justine, and Seth Reiss for really putting some work on this and getting some of the text in here. But my concern is really the timeline of this all because

well, as I mentioned on the last call the timeline would be that the statements would be ready by the 25th of February for the RALO review and once it goes out to the RALO review that's it – we can't really modify it or make changes or whatever. It's now really up to the RALOs to then accept or reject. And the RALOs would then have up to say March 5th, that will just barely give them seven to eight days; and then the ALAC will then have an opportunity to review the RALO advice I want to say on the 7th or even the 6th, because remember, the objection period ends on the 13th and therefore just looking at what has to be done, if the objection statements have to be filed we have to communicate with ICANN.

And I see there's now a process available for the GAC, for national governments within the GAC to apply for the funding for the [objection]. So I think the ALAC needs to decide by at least the 6th or the 7th in order to give time to coordinate with ICANN if, and I say "if" we decide to file the objections or not.

Okay, so Eduardo? What are your thoughts about it, just reviewing the text?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can you repeat that? Thank you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sure, this is Dev. Regarding the Google Doc, I mean I posted a link already and maybe you followed the conversations as the document was being created. What are your thoughts about the document or do you have any comments or concerns?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I don't have any comments. I can see that this is coming from all the stuff that we talked about last time. I think we've summarized some of the stuff that we've put there. This is Eduardo for the record.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Okay, well so you think that we can, do you think that if say we were to work on this statement over the weekend we can get something in time by Monday or…

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo again. Are you asking me or are you asking everybody?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, I'm asking you. I think I'm going to poll each of the members on the call on this, yes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I don't see why we cannot have this by Monday. I mean you did most of the legwork so…

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yeah. I guess some of the concerns, and I'm going to delve into what Garth and Justine are saying in terms of the substantial opposition. I'm just a little concerned that we find ourselves in the difficult situation of coming up with a statement that if we don't fully agree with, and remember, we've gone through this conversation before – that if the

Review Group itself doesn't have full consensus on it then it's going to be very unlikely for RALO review to reach consensus and approve the statement; and therefore the ALAC itself would also see this lack of consensus for lack of a better word across the RALOs and so forth and would take that into consideration. Adela, sorry about that. Go ahead.

ADELA DANCIU: Yes, this is Adela speaking. I have a suggestion of how to move forward with these three days that are left until Monday when we have to have the final document. Maybe we can allow, I don't know, like 24 hours on this final draft for more comments and more [reviews] of the text, and more additions and whatever is necessary. And then prepare the draft for each of the statements for each of the applicants so that by the end of the day on 25th February we have the final document. What do you think about that?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, this is Dev. Well, I [don't know] if my family is going to be happy over the weekend but I would say yes, if RG members are willing to commit to that to really work over the weekend within the next 24 hours and so forth. We can certainly make the attempt. Eduardo? Sorry, I see you have your hand raised?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yeah, this is Eduardo for the record. I am confused here because I heard you before that we didn't have consensus on this, and all I hear is there is no consensus really for one of the applications – that is the Chinese application. But I think there is consensus for the other ones.

So my confusion comes that if we put this statement out there does it have to be for all of them or just a few of them?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hmm, well… This is Dev. You raise a good point, Eduardo, that the concerns that were raised regarding one application… I suppose yes, the Review Group could decide not to put an objection statement against one particular application and then file it against the others. I would say theoretically that could be done. My concern is to make that change at such a late stage it raises a little bit of concern for me because it will be the question of why did we not choose to do it against this application but we chose to target… Well, why did we choose to pick the other applications for .health.

So the thing is, and that's my concern here is the timing on all of this. Can we get agreement on all of this in this short timeframe? That's my concern.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, this is Eduardo again. So what I hear is that we have consensus on everything except the Chinese application and it's mostly on the targeting question that Adela brought up. But you know, when I look at the micro view of this, the Chinese characters are under all the applicants that we have for .health. I mean it's not a string that is called .healthy even though it might mean that. Do you follow what I'm saying? It's not in a different string category – it's under the heath category, all of them. So being this is .healthy or .health, to me it's health.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, sorry Eduardo, I guess I missed you. So what you're saying regarding the IDN aspect of this application, I didn't quite catch that. I'm so sorry.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, what I'm saying is that there was a conversation at the beginning where we were saying that this might mean "healthy" or "health" or whatever. But when you look at all the gTLD applications this one, the Chinese one, falls under the .health string, not under the .healthy strings. I don't know if…

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, okay. Well I mean the thing was we made the decision to actually go ahead, and that's why when we did the rankings and so forth, well… We did the ranking, we ranked all of this including this IDN application so we're kind of now changing our opinion at this late stage, which again, this is the thing that has my concern.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo again, I just wanted to finish. That's okay – I wanted just to bring that up, that it's not… The only thing that I am hearing you saying because of time is that we have to follow through with all of them, all the applications have to be in consensus – this is what I'm hearing. And if all of the applications are not in consensus then we don't fill out any objection at all because of timing. That's what I'm hearing – correct me if I am wrong.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, that is, you are correct. I mean if there is, let's say on Monday if we have the statements ready and there's consensus on some but not all we could file it. But well, I guess I'm a little hesitant about doing that and I don't know why as yet. Sorry, Fatimata, I saw your hand is raised. Fatimata, you go ahead and let me try to think this out. Go ahead, Fatimata.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you, Dev, this is Fatimata for the record. We worked on this statement based on the comment on .health and not .healthy or whatever. But still, I think we worked to work… I mean the idea behind all this at least from my point of view is that because .health, it might be misleading. And of course we cannot just, I mean we cannot work on another application and write a statement because of time – that's what it is. So it's very complicated. We can work on .health, finalize the objection statement; and if we want to object on another string I think it's too late now. But the thing is, can we make an overall comment on everything related to health? Can we have ALAC, can we have a statement on everything related to health? [Or does it need to be] to a specific application because we don't have time to do that anyway?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, well thanks Fatimata. I guess this kind of frames it in a better context – this is Dev speaking. Well, it would not… Well yes, we need to write the… The initial comments that IMIA sent last month did mention all, they treated it all as the same string with the same

concerns. So if you go back to their original statement, and that as the statement that we ranked and therefore created a Wiki page and so forth with that. So that's one thing.

The second thing is that okay, even if we don't have consensus we can prepare the statement for the other, well we have the .health ASCII version and perhaps, well either the objection could be taken up by the ALAC or something like that. That part cannot happen because well, because the funding for any objection statement by the ALAC has to show that it went through this bottom-up process where comments were solicited from the community and comments were received and so forth and so forth and so forth. And for the ALAC to unilaterally decide to… Well, even if they wanted to it will still come down to the same problem – the timing of trying to write an objection statement from a practical standpoint. But having the ALAC decide it wants to then object or to an application, well, the funding won't be available.

So I hope that answers that question. Alright, so sorry, I'm just reading the comments on the chat here. I see, Fatimata, your hand is still raised? Do you have a follow-up to this or…

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: We cannot make a global one based on what you just explained, because if you focus on one application you have all these ones to work on. If we agree that, I mean for me, I don't know if it's a general point of view – if you agree to work on this as an objection statement for everything related to health I think we can go ahead and do it-

[crosstalk]

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sorry Fatimata, sorry, go ahead and finish.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: If not, if we just file it on one application for me it doesn't make sense.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: If we file an objection to one of the applicants for the .health?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Yeah, and based on the reasoning we're having we cannot target only one and not leave out the others if they're all dealing with health.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. The answer, and this brings up Eduardo's point which is can't we just make an objection to just one single application versus all of the applications, and the answer is yes. The thing was, yes, so the answer is yes. We can just simply decide to file an objection statement against one particular applicant based on what was in that applicant's statement, that okay, we felt that this one, the targeting and the four criterion were strongest with this one for example and therefore we felt like this one should go ahead and be subject to RALO review.

We could do that. My concern is whether we can do this in this short time before Monday. I'm seeing Eduardo. Go ahead.

EN

EDUARDO DIAZ:	This is Eduardo for the record. So let me see if I understood you. My comment in the chat is, to put a single objection that will apply to all the applicants under .health.
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	Oh okay, I misinterpreted you, Eduardo. I'm sorry, but no – each statement has to be filed separately. Each objection has to be filed separately, so in this case we are looking at, well, we were looking at the four applicants for .health and this IDN application. So we're looking at putting together an objection statement for every single one and then putting that out for RALO review.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Okay, this is Eduardo again. So I think as a group we make a small, we had a problem with the process when we did this because when we evaluated all the applications, I mean all the strings we looked only at one applicant. And we should have been looking at all applicants under that specific string and make this table for each one of the applicants. And I think that's where we made the mistake here. So really all we are ready to do is to write an objection about one applicant which is .health, I mean the TLD…
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	Alright, hold on, but which one… Can I ask a question to follow up on that, Eduardo? Then hold on, so why that applicant and not the other applicant for .health?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can you repeat the question please? This is Eduardo.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sure. If you go to the Wiki page on the .health, sorry, I have a bit of a dry cough here. Okay. Let me just get the link and put it in there. So as you can see there were four applicants for this string .health – dotHealth LLC, Goose Fest LLC, and dot Health Limited and Afilias Limited. So those were the four applications. So the initial comment from the IMIA specified that they objected to all the applicants; that's why all of them were included on the page. It wasn't against a specific one. If it was a specific one then I would have just only put the one applicant, if you follow, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yeah, okay I understand that. Maybe what I did is I just looked at one applicant by itself, the first one.   But anyhow, when I hear Adela bringing up the targeting specifically for the Chinese it's telling me that we should have had this conversation at that point in time, not now. That's why I'm saying that we should have a look at it… It gives me the impression that we didn't all look at all the applications to answer the targeting one. I [don't] remember hearing what Adela's saying now in talking about the targeting, about specifically the Chinese part when we had that conversation. So anyhow I think that we don't have time-

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: (Inaudible) because when I pulled them together I see Justine went through each of the applications, and I think I recall in your deep dive you went through the different comments on the application in terms

of…   If I can recall your document, Eduardo, you went into all the different applicants for it, did you not?

EDUARDO DIAZ: No, I did not. I looked at the first applicant so it was my mistake. So when you read my comments they're all directed to DotHealth LLC, something like that. But I'm one in the group, so…

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sure, sure. Okay, well I see Adela's also said yes. Well, I take it Adela, we considered the objection by IMIA as a whole on all of the five strings together. Adela, if you want to take the floor instead of typing it go right ahead. Okay. So well, so just to read this for the record, this is Adela in the chat: "Yes, when we filled in the table we considered the objection by IMIA as a whole on all of the five strings together and that was probably a mistake. The objection was also against all together."

I see Garth has crashed and reentered the room, okay. Well I mean there's several approaches we could take here. The first option is well, the first option is one, we try to as Adela suggested within the 24-48 hours we try to work… I'm sorry, to answer Fatimata's question before we continue, "Is there any way we can have more time to do the job right?" In my opinion no, and the reason why is because the objection period ends on March 13th and if you want to do RALO review and for the ALAC to then decide, the timing is just simply not there if you look at the calendar. I mean the 25th is probably *the* minimum, minimum last thing and that is also putting pressure on the RALOs themselves because the RALOs themselves will have eight days to then really look at

these statements and decide whether to support it or not. And I think even that is going to be a very big challenge.

I mean Eduardo, you and Garth are all a part of RALOs and members of the RALOs. Do you think it will be very difficult, I mean do you think it will be easy for the RALOs to really get understanding and then decide to approve or not approve the statements if we reduce that time even more? I think we need a minimum of eight days at least, and I say at least as a bare minimum because there will need to be a conference call at least by the RALO or granted maybe an online vote to do it. And then that needs to be documented in some public way, the RALO support has to be established so therefore the ALAC itself can then take that advice or not.

Okay, so Fatimata, I hope that answers your question, so I don't think we have that much more time left. So… [laughing] Okay, so we do have, as I say we have a few options here. One, per Adela's suggestion, try to refine the statement. We already looked to… We can draft a statement as-is for each of the applications, the four for .health and the .jiànkāng one and let the RALO review decide whether to support it or not. So for example, the RALOs can then say "Well, we don't support two objection statements on .health and the others we support" – the RALOs could do that. And then so you'll have different statements, how should I put it… Different opinions expressed on each of the objection statements.

The second thing is of course we could decide that well, one, we could decide to… And I have to admit, well I don't really want to do it but we can accept the situation and say well, if we do not have consensus right

now and given the… Because remember, ultimately this statement is going to a dispute resolution service provider, and that service provider is going to then have to ask the applicant to respond. So ultimately we want to come up with a statement that well, passes the burden of proof so that it withstands the applicant's response. So we can say that, the second option is to say that given the time constraints of coming up and looking at an initial review of the .health applicants and coming up with an effective statement that would pass RALO review and ALAC and the dispute resolution service provider's review that perhaps we decided not to pursue a statement.

I'm trying to think of a third option here but I think those are really the only two options I can think of – take the 24 hours, the weekend to try to finish up the statement applied to all and then let the RALOs decide whether to support each of the applications separately or not; or decide no, we should not proceed with the statement. What are your thoughts? And perhaps, Olivier, if you wished as the ALAC Chair, if you have an opinion on this feel free. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev, it's Olivier for the transcript record. I've been thinking about this issue of having enough time, not having enough time and so on. I've discussed the current work that you're doing with regards to the different applicants for .health. I'm not quite sure whether it's such a simple yes or no answer, a straight thing where everyone will vote for it by just signing it off like this. I think there are various points of view in At-Large and with the RALOs of course being involved as well.

I don't think we can squeeze the process so as to make it go any faster than the timetable that we've put there. I'm really concerned if we're pressed to do something fast and then the process itself becomes attacked by whoever it is who will say "I don't think that the process has been pursued properly and I think that this whole process is a joke." I'm really worried about that so we need to take the time, and if it means that we might be delayed in providing our answer by a day or two then so be it. I'm not saying we will be able to do so but I would at the earliest opportunity inform ICANN and I don't think that we're just dealing with the matter of one or two days.

But I really realize the pressure that is on this group herd an I appreciate the amount of work that you have on your plate, so unfortunately I have no way to ease this.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks. I appreciate what you said and I would support it. It puts the Review Group in a difficult position here to come up with something that can withstand the dispute resolution service provider's four tests, satisfy the RALO reviews and so forth, because ultimately we are drafting this statement because we want the objection to succeed. I think that's why we're attempting to do the statement in the first place. Sorry for this dry cough everyone.

Okay, thoughts, comments by Adela, Eduardo, Fatimata? I'm just reading the comments here. Yes, so Fatimata, yes, that is correct. So I would support your comment as yes, the committee will go by the principle of preserving their interest that they'll have to define on each

application. Yeah, that is correct. So there will be five separate statements that they have to look at.

Oh, I see everybody's been disconnected in the room – well, that's wonderful. I see Eduardo is saying "Well, let's try to work over the weekend and try to get the statement ready by Monday." Well, I guess I'll just have to wait until Adela and Fatimata can respond.

Well the schedule is the same one – we will try to work over the weekend and try to flesh out the statement, and then produce the objection statements for all the applications and then let the RALOs decide which one they want to go ahead or not. Correct, correct Adela. Okay, and I see agreement from Fatimata and I think Eduardo also said that if you have to work through the weekend so be it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Dev, what is the goal, the deadline for sending to the RALOs? How long will they have?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: They will have I'd say eight days, nine days tops because… I'm sorry?

HEIDI ULLRICH: What are those dates?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, so the 25th is I think when we must absolutely have all the statements ready. The RALO review will take place up to the 5th, possibly the 6th of March.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Can you repeat that? I didn't get the dates.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, the 25th of February, statements are readied and published for RALO review. Okay?

HEIDI ULLRICH: And the final… Sorry, 25th February through which date? Eight days then, right?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yeah, so that would make it on March 5th. Eight days from the 25th is March 5th.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, and then the ALAC will have to make a decision by say the 6th or the 7th in accepting the RALO advice or not, and then that's because by the 13th we have to submit our objection to the dispute resolution service provider, coordinate with ICANN to pay it and so forth of course if the ALAC decides to go ahead with that.

So the question from Adela is "Can the RALOs adjust/modify/comment on/improve the statement?" Unfortunately no. The problem with that is that if a RALO wants to make a change then it will then have to go

back through all the RALOs to relook at it and so forth. So there simply is no way to really do that so that's why the Review Group's deadline of coming up with a statement, well, there's no way to modify it afterwards. So it's either reject or accept for the RALOs. There's now "Can we change the argument or can we change anything?" That's supposed to happen now as we are drafting the objection statement.

So the thing would be that well, okay, so I guess the course of action is this. We are going to really try to work hard over the weekend and really try to put together the final objection statements for all of the applications. On Monday, I don't know whether to try to have a call, perhaps we can do it on the list because I think to try to organize another call on this short time will be difficult. I think we'll just have to work on the list and see do people support this statement as is from the Review Group I'm talking about on Monday. And once we have consensus on that point we can then say okay, the RALOs can now review it and the RALOs can then take into account any of the comments from any of the applicants that come in or whatever, like what DotHealth did in terms of what they submitted on Wednesday.

The RALOs can then take all of that into account and then say "Okay, we will support this application instead and not support this application." And the more I think about it, given the difficulty – and I appreciate what Garth is saying about the IDN and so forth. My instinct is that we could focus on the four applications for the ASCII .health but I still think we need to draft it and then decide at the very last whether, well, if it works – whether it really is sufficient. And maybe the RALOs themselves can make that call, whether the noun… And maybe APRALO would be in a much better position to really make that distinction call

about whether .jiànkāng means "health" or "healthy" and so forth; and they can make that stronger determination rather than us.

Okay? Okay, well I see it's now… Any further comments? I see Eduardo had left. Adela, Fatimata – any final thoughts? So we're going to really try to work hard on this objection statement, work within the next 48 hours. And I have to really appreciate and thank you the Review Group members who are putting so much time and effort into this so that by Monday we will have the statements ready for RALO review and then we will release them all as such and then let the RALOs decide which ones they wish to support or not, okay?

And I think we also, as Fatimata pointed out to Heidi, one of the action items is that we'll probably have to give the RALOs a head's up on this so that they can hit the ground running, so the RALOs are aware of this – so they can begin their preliminary discussions or whatever so that by Tuesday they can hit the ground running, so to speak. Are other RG meetings necessary? I would like to, Heidi, but I'm a bit concerned whether people would be able to attend the call. That's really my huge concern.

Can I suggest to Heidi and Gisella, can you get some I would say appropriate times for both the Asia-Pacific times and so forth so that even if it inconveniences me in my time zone it doesn't matter at this point. I want to get a wide range so that persons from AP, like for example Seth Reiss and so on – it's very difficult for them in Hawaii to attend these calls because it's just something like 7:00 in the morning for him and so forth. So if you can come up with a Doodle… Okay, so let's put together a Doodle for Monday to look at those final objection

statements and if it's not in a state to be ready then I think that will be that. Okay, so Doodle to go out with appropriate times for a call on Monday and okay, is that action item captured?

Okay, thanks Gisella. Great. Okay, any other thoughts or comments then Adela, Fatimata, Olivier?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Dev, this is Heidi.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, just to clarify that first action item – the RALOs will need to be made aware of upcoming Review Group objections so that they can start the review process quickly. Is that one for you, so will you send that note to them?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'll send that note. I'll work on that note and send it to them, yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thanks very much.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Alright. But we can probably say that we can… Well alright, I'll work on the note. [laughing] I'll work on the note and send it to the RALOs on

the upcoming Review Group objections. And the other one is staff to send a Doodle with a wide range of times to suit all for a call on Monday to look at the final statements. Okay?

Alright, I think that's about it. I see a check mark from Fatimata, great. Adela, any final words? If not I will adjourn the call, or Olivier if you have any comments obviously. Going once, going twice, going thrice… Okay, very well. Thank you for the call and this call is now adjourned.

[End of Transcript]