

New gTLDs WG 06-02-2012 Transcription

Avri Doria: Okay, well I think we've hit the hour and I do want to get started, and there are a bunch of people here so I'll start with a review of the agenda, giving people a few more minutes to get here.

So the first thing is the review of the agenda – that's what I'm doing. Then there's the roll call and then hopefully we can finalize the draft objection procedure for sending out to RALO review. Obviously there's more to be done on that as we get more thinking, as we get responses. So there's a cover letter and then there's the At-Large Objection Procedure final draft – go through those, make sure that any changes get status on the translations, etc.

Then I wanted to get into a short thing on planning for the upcoming meetings between now and Costa Rica and then start thinking about what it is we indeed want to do in Costa Rica. Then the two standard updates – one on the Applicant Support Program where I have precious little to say; then an update on any new gTLD issues that Cintra wants to alert the group to, or anyone else in the group that has seen to get on the list of things. Then review pending actions that haven't yet been covered in the meeting that went before, and then any other business.

Does anybody have any other business to add to the Any Other Business agenda slot at this point? No? Okay. I'll ask again at the end. Oh, I see I numbered two 7's and no 6 but I hope people will understand... And two 5's – I really did a good job on renumbering. I apologize for that but hopefully people can still follow the [sequentiality].

Okay. Any other changes, comments on the agenda? In which case we'll go with that. Oh yeah, I forgot to ask but I presume that we are recording. Please correct me if I'm wrong in my presumption. If not, Gisella, can you do the roll call?

Gisella Gruber: Yes, with pleasure, and I'm hoping that you can hear me well enough.

Avri Doria: Well enough.

Gisella Gruber: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's New gTLD call on Monday the 6th of February. We have Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Cintra Sooknanan, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Rudi Vansnick, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Hong Xue who will be joining us shortly on the audio bridge. We have apologies today from Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jose Arcé, Rafik Dammak, Annette Muehlberg, Yaovi Atohou.

From staff on today's call we have Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber and I believe Heidi Ullrich. And if I can also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. So the next item is hopefully to finalize the Objection Procedures to send it for RALO review. We have two written things, a cover letter and then the objection procedure itself. As I understand it both have gone for translation; I'm wondering if someone can give an update on where that process is at?

Heidi Ullrich: Hi Avri, this is Heidi. We have sent them to the translator as you mentioned and we are still awaiting them back. I would expect them mid-week, so if you wanted to immediately send the English version to the RALOs and then we can follow up with the French and Spanish versions mid-week.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. So let's see if we're at a point for everybody having no objection, but thank you. And of course if we get any changes out of today that will throw off the translation. I figure we're adjusting for those changes, correct? Obviously. [laughter]

Okay, so first, any objections on that from anyone? No? Okay. Moving on to the cover letter, the cover letter was... Fortunately I think the folks on staff went through it, cleaned it up a little. I think there were some other cleanups from a few members of the team, Tijani and others. So is there anything that needs to be discussed on this? Is there anything that's problematic? Is there any objection to this letter going forward as written? Let me see if there are any red things...

No red things so I assume that this letter can go forward as written. It was discussed last week, it was open for discussion and edit during the week on the mailing list. Some people did add changes and at this point I see no objections to this cover letter being acceptable.

Moving on then to the Objection Procedure itself that is also attached in an RTF format... Is it? Yes. Oh, Dev Anand, I want to leave this to you. As I look at it in the RTF, in what was just attached to this agenda I have trouble with it, so I wonder if you can talk about... It doesn't look like this particular format will work.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay hi, thanks Avri. This is Dev – are you hearing me?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Oh, okay. Thanks. Yeah, with regards to that RTF, it was a thing that was generated to send to the translation because...

Avri Doria: Ah, I see. Okay.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yeah, so the PDFs are still available as such and that could be the clean version. There probably are minor things to be done after this call, but yeah.

Avri Doria: Okay, can I ask a question then? What would happen... So somebody then would take the translated text and stick it in a pictorial version? Is that how it would work?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well, what I have also is some text to go along with it, the English text to go along with it, and that can also be translated. But as I anticipate, when the translator sends back the .doc file we'll then generate just a PDF again and we'll submit the PDF.

Avri Doria: Okay, so that should come out looking...

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yeah, I think when it converts to RTF it doesn't look as good.

Avri Doria: Yeah, it loses some of its pictorial content. I see Alan has his hand up. Another question I want to put in the queue to you is last week we had discussed the cover page where the content of each page was briefly described and I was wondering if you had had a chance to do that and whether that was already with the translators or not. But Alan has his hand up.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, either I'm missing something or I have a suggestion. The documents I've seen are the flowcharts, which don't have any text associated with them, and something called an Introduction to the ALAC Objection Process. Is there another document? It's not clear which document is the definitive one that the others are hung off of.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I can answer that. Hi Alan, this is Dev. Regarding the Draft At-Large ALAC Process, that's the English text which was trying to summarize the flowcharts appropriately. And I just uploaded it moments ago so...

Alan Greenberg: And where do I find that one?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I posted it in the chat and it's on the agenda page: the Draft At-Large/ALAC Process for Considering and Making Objections. I'll post the link again.

Alan Greenberg: But that's the flowcharts.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: That's the text.

Alan Greenberg: I just pointed to that link and I get flowcharts.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Oh.

Avri Doria: Two lines above it. Look at the first URL in the chat.

Alan Greenberg: Alright, I thought I opened everything in the chat.

[background conversation]

Avri Doria: The one that's called At-Large/ALAC Process for Considering and Making Objections.

Alan Greenberg: At-Large/ALAC Process... It's also in the agenda?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's also in the chat, in the room.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, in the chat. Sorry, I thought you said it was uploaded in the agenda also.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Alan, it's also in the agenda, yes.

Avri Doria: It wasn't in the agenda the last time I looked.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yeah, I literally uploaded it just before the meeting, yes.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: In the agenda it's the one titled At-Large Objection Process Final Draft.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: That file is the RTF file. I didn't upload that as such. That was the...

Avri Doria: There's the cover letter, then there's the Draft At-Large/ALAC Process for Considering and Making Objections.pdf file. Correct?

Alan Greenberg: And that's the one that bears the title "Introduction to the ALAC Objections Process."

Avri Doria: Yes, so that's a document that we've never seen nor discussed before.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, sorry.

Avri Doria: That's also a document if I understand that has not been to the translators yet.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: No, correct.

Alan Greenberg: Since we were calling it an "introduction" I wasn't sure if that was the first part of something or if that was the whole document. That was my question.

Avri Doria: No, I think that that is the Introduction that we discussed last week of a front page that basically explains the various pages of the flowcharts.

Alan Greenberg: Of the flowcharts, okay – that's what I was trying to understand.

Avri Doria: But because it's a different format-type document it's two separate documents I believe, but that is the page that is the introduction to the flowcharts document. Am I correct, Dev?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, that's correct.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: It may need some refinement because the flowcharts themselves are completely overwhelming. There's far too much detail for anyone to absorb and what you now have is the introduction, which is a paragraph or a bunch of bullets for each of the points... I think it's good but the format may still need some cleaning up, or maybe they need to be merged together, I'm not sure.

Avri Doria: If I can suggest, I think for probably post-review, I think that at this point they're coming with these two documents which at least explain what's on every page, and then every page with the availability of people from this group to discuss it. I think you're absolutely right that for a final version it needs more explanation and putting together and merging and everything, but I'm hoping that we can send this out for RALO review after today's discussion without that much more delay, otherwise then our final goals are... So I could see us being busy editors in San Jose and Costa Rica trying to get final things for ALAC to approve, but hopefully we can get to something that's sendable to the RALOs out of today's meeting.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I would suggest changing the word "Introduction" to "Draft" or something like that, because the document that is led off with the term "Introduction" is in fact the process we're talking about; and it's the comment and objection process, I think, not just the objection process.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Point taken, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, well I think it's actually probably good to walk through that particular document at the moment.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl has her hand up.

Avri Doria: Okay great, thanks. Cheryl, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Avri – Cheryl for the transcript record. If we're going to do a walkthrough I'll actually hold until then, because on some of the documents there were some minor comments I had referred to in the later pages of that document, and just for the record I agree with changing the title to as Alan suggested "Comment and Objection." So if someone would take my speaking rights away I'd be very happy – whoever gave me the microphone, it's time to move it. [laughter]

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay, Dev, so I think you've already got a couple comments. I would take then basically a quick walkthrough. Do you want to walk through it or do you want me to sort of move it along and you just sort of talk to the sections as they come up? How do you want to do this?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Either way is okay for me.

Avri Doria: Okay. Then why don't I talk and I'll just basically say "Okay, any issues on the first paragraph?" because I would like to just really march through this one. So we have an issue on the title, and what did we resolve the title should be? Dev, what do you think you need to change the title to?

[crosstalk]

Avri Doria: Excuse me, Dev, you tell me what you think and then others can say if you got it right or not.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I will probably change it to the Draft At-Large/ALAC Process for Comments and Considering Making Objections, which is probably a lengthy title. I think Alan might have a shorter one.

Avri Doria: Does anyone have a spiffy title he can use?

Alan Greenberg: "Comment and Objection Process."

Avri Doria: Right.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: "Comment and Objection Process."

Avri Doria: Dev, any objection to that?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: No objection.

Alan Greenberg: And I think just either ALAC or At-Large, not both. I mean it's ALAC who will finally make the objections, but anyone in At-Large may make comments, so...

Avri Doria: Right, but this is the ALAC, this is the ALAC.

Alan Greenberg: That's right. We're talking about ALAC comments. If anyone else makes them it's on their own right, so just ALAC I would say at this point.

Avri Doria: Okay. Any issues on Paragraph #1 of the proposed outline, Paragraph 2 under section 3.3.2?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nope.

Avri Doria: Any question on the [quotes]? Okay, moving down: grounds for objection. A formal objection... Excuse me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl.

Avri Doria: Cheryl, yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, it's just a piece of pedantry I suppose but it does fit in with the guidelines for how we're supposed to be writing in the wonderful world of ICANN. We just jumped straight into using "AGB." The first time "AGB" is used it should be used in full and then defined as AGB. I know it seems silly when we've been using it for so long but for someone who isn't permanently entwined on a weekly basis with the wonderful world of ICANN, "AGB" means nothing to them. So the very first time we need to...

Avri Doria: I think you're right. I think we need to accept as a general rule that all first use of acronyms of any sort, except maybe ICANN itself, that that first use rule should apply throughout the document. And I think it's probably good just for someone to make a check that first use rules are followed throughout. Thank you for the suggestion.

Anything else on that grounds for objection paragraph? One question I have is, is it clear enough to everyone that this is an explanation to the slide that comes later? Or do we need a sentence that says "Each of the following...?" It's basically, because when you look at the stuff that comes underneath – "Source: Section 3.2.1, Page 34," and that – but just to make sure that people know that this is referring to the pages of the flowchart or something? Or is that obvious to everyone already?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, Avri. It's obvious when we get to that which is lower down rather than right in that paragraph.

Avri Doria: Okay great, thank you. Okay, anything else on grounds for objection? I'm just reading it as I go along. Okay, any issue with moving on to "Who can file an objection to a gTLD application?" Okay, in that one, as summarized there's a repeating of what are the objections. Then there's the "ALAC only has standing to object if you feel the application is of limited public (inaudible) objections or on community grounds if ALAC/At-Large is the community that is explicitly or implicitly targeted."

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Avri, I have a comment on that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: For those who are looking at this, this is part of the first set of notes I did for the night of January 20, 2012. So I forgot to update the notes which I did... If you go down to the "Overview Summary of Draft Objection Process," I did mention the concerns regarding community grounds – that discussion is ongoing as to what extent the ALAC is standing to object to it, etc. So that is further down on the page. I just forgot to update the earlier text.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you for putting that in before anybody asked about it. Okay, Cheryl, I see you with a microphone. Does that mean you have your hand up or is that just me, someone gave you a microphone?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, somebody gave me the microphone.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. Okay, so anything on the rest of this section?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl again to confirm, Dev, you are updating the earlier part of the text?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, I will. Yes, I will do so, yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, then objection filing procedures. Okay?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I know it's silly but all of the ones that I would like a link to... The others are just quoting from pages of the Applicant Guidebook. A hyperlink to or having it appended, for some reason I just feel that the actual flowchart from the AGB should be linked rather than just that single sentence. I don't know why – it just makes me feel that way.

Avri Doria: Okay. Alan, I see your hand up?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, we changed the title of the overall document to include "comments" but the text doesn't really reflect that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I think this refers to ICANN's objection filing process flowchart in the Applicant Guidebook, not ours.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Mm-hmm, because that's...

Alan Greenberg: But if you go on to page... I don't know what the page number is; the page that's titled "Overall Overview/Summary of Draft Objection Process," which I think is what we were just starting...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No.

Avri Doria: Yeah, we were almost there.

Alan Greenberg: I see, we were almost there. Alright, I'll wait till we are there then, but I think my comment applies earlier and I was just using that as a reference. You'll note that there's two sub-bullets under Paragraph 2 – the comment period and the objection period, and the titles of these sections don't reflect that. That's the point I was trying to make.

Avri Doria: Which titles? In other words, this would be better if it just said "Overview/Summary" and left out of what it was? Then it can either include the objections or comments process; or just "Overview/Summary of the Processes?"

Alan Greenberg: Could be, but I think "Comment/Objection" would be better because we understand it but someone else might not.

Avri Doria: Then there's the other pending one, which I understood Cheryl was... Under the objection filing procedures section before it needs more reference to an actual something as opposed to just telling people to go read Page 172; and putting a linkage to the particular document should be included. That was the whole thing, right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That a link or copy should be appended.

Avri Doria: Okay, understood. Okay. So then there's a revision on the title – hopefully someone is gathering all this in addition to Dev so that there's... Because I'm certainly not gathering it. I guess (inaudible)'s online gathering it, correct?

Alan Greenberg: I hope so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. On the first paragraph of that new section, this is one of those places where I think it's probably familiar text and where we don't have to, I think, say "The gTLD Applicant Guidebook." We just can remove those words with a capitalized The gTLD Applicant Guidebook and just move it to a lower-case the gTLD Applicant Guidebook like AGB.

Avri Doria: Yeah, but it doesn't really matter if it's listed again and I'm saying it doesn't...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The two "the's" in line 3, they have to go.

Avri Doria: Okay, "The the," I see.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. The second paragraph, any of you? The two bullets? How about starting "The ALAC has standing..."

Alan Greenberg: Avri, it's Alan. The preceding pages only talked about the references for the objection process and we're suddenly here introducing the comment period out of the blue. We need some reference to what the comment period is and something like that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thought it talked about (inaudible) under "However, under [HTTC] new gTLDs points out that comments may be submitted on an application." So it mentions comments in a separate paragraph. It's not capitalized I admit.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, then I missed it and it should be highlighted slightly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And then on the preceding page, Alan, it does talk about the comments.

Alan Greenberg: Yep, okay, then it needs to be highlighted slightly – that's all.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. So then we're down to the paragraph "The ALAC has standing to object..." The paragraph that begins "It is envisioned that the At-Large/ALAC could submit comments for consideration." "Comment for the ACP..." I assume ACP was spelled out somewhere earlier but if not it should be.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It needs to be spelled out there I think.

Avri Doria: Okay, it's the first time I had seen it, so... And that's what I meant: the first use rule should be followed throughout wherever it happens.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Understood.

Avri Doria: I don't know if that was the name of the rule but that's what I'm calling it. Okay, anything in that paragraph?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't see anything beyond the point of spelling it out.

Avri Doria: Okay. Then we probably need to get the spacing even, but then there's "For the remainder of the objection period after the ACP..." paragraph, any comments on that one? Then there's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, Cheryl here. I know it's silly but does ad hoc translate into the other languages? Because we're using "ad hoc" there and I actually try and avoid the use of "ad hoc" in...

Avri Doria: I thought Latin was used by everyone everywhere.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is it? I (inaudible), in which case it should be "an ad hoc," not "a ad hoc work group."

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Mm-hmm.

Avri Doria: I mean we certainly can't be accused of using English by using ad hoc. [laughing]

Alan Greenberg: Normally ad hoc is not hyphenated; it's just a word.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Okay, and the next paragraph that's "All RALOs then vote..."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. It's not clear that the RALOs are voting with each other as opposed to within each other. Does that make sense? It sounds like APRALO will give their own little vote...

Avri Doria: Well, don't each of the RALOs...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...each RALO is voting jointly (inaudible)?

Avri Doria: I thought they had subsidiarity and they voted for themselves in any way they needed and then their votes were combined...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine, but that's not necessarily how it reads. It could be read as "All RALOs vote" as opposed to...

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, so you're saying each RALO does... There needs to be an offsetting phrase such as "All RALOs as of their custom, or as per their own..."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

[crosstalk]

Alan Greenberg: If you make it "Each RALO then votes..."

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, yeah.

Avri Doria: Yeah, so each of the RALOs then vote on objections... Okay. Then we move down to Figure 1.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Now, this is where I have a minor issue. In each of the other... This bigger one's referenced three times here in headings, and there's three parts to either one. The text refers to three Figure 1s, and that's fine. The formatting I think needs to be changed because I prefer it Figure 1 and everything that happens in Figure 1 coming out, joining the other data; then Figure 2, 3, 4, 5. So whether it's Figure 1.a, .b, .c or whatever, I just find it jarring to have Figure 1 before, Figure 1 at ACP, and Figure 1 within first week of ACP. It should just be Figure 1 before...

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay. Okay, got you.

Avri Doria: Okay. So any issue with the content other than the hierarchy? So Figure 1 in the first instance was there's a call for participants and the gTLD RG – review group, and that one has first instance – then the bullets. Okay, any issues with the content of that? Okay.

Figure 1 in the second instance at the start of ACP. Any comments with that? Figure 1 in the third instance within first week of ACP.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I just wondered why we had to tell everybody in this point that the ALAC RALO Wiki [runs] the Wiki software Confluence (inaudible) there.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: This is Dev. I figured this is just in case for those ALSes who don't understand, who don't use the Wiki; and also for those persons that may be reviewing this when we submit to ICANN after the ALAC has hopefully approved this.

Alan Greenberg: If someone does not know the Wiki exists they're really not awake at this point in ICANN.

Avri Doria: Yeah, well there's new people awakening all the time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I have no problem with it being [built-in graces], it's just I think it's the first time in any document I've ever seen it, and that's fine.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I mean it may be something that would fit better as a footnote. I understand that it makes sense to be there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: A footnote works.

Avri Doria: If that part was taken out and just made a footnote to dashboard or you know, and put it in a footnote – would that be okay, Dev?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I have no objection to that.

Avri Doria: Then it takes it out of the flow of the text and because it is on the side of the flow of that particular piece of text.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, that's perfect.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay, so any other issues with that Figure 1.3 as it were? Okay, Cintra, yes please.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi, Avri. With regards to Figure 1 before we started the application comment period phase, it appears there are some grammatical errors in there. The last two bullets should be "giving" and "informing" and the comma after the first one, that should go.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sure.

Avri Doria: Yes, okay.

Cintra Sooknanan: Sorry, one other question. The last bullet: "Informing RALOs of their rights for comments to be drafted and for objections to be (inaudible)" – is it that all the comments, they are made as draft comments? Or is it...

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Oh, I can explain that.

Cintra Sooknanan: I'm trying to figure out how is it driven. It is driven by the objection statement or by ALAC saying that there is a deadline for comment?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well, no. The specific timing throughout the – this is Dev, sorry. There's specific timing throughout the entire process, especially during the eight-week process because the timing is critical given it's only 60 days. So like for example, within Week 4, within Week 5, and within Week 6 and 7 of the application comment period there are specific deadlines. Otherwise, if it doesn't happen then well ALAC just simply will not have time to even submit anything for the application comment period.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So Avri, if you just put a comma between "to be drafted" and "for objection" I think that solves the question in Cintra's...

[crosstalk]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So it will then read "So the gTLD RG starts with informing RALOs of the desire for comments to be drafted, and for objection statements." Those are two separate things with two separate deadlines.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Mm-hmm. Yeah, understood.

Avri Doria: Cintra, you still have your hand up. Do you have anything else?

Cintra Sooknanan: No, thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Okay, anything else on Figure 1 in the third instance here? Okay. And Figure 2, up to four weeks within the ACP – any comments? Okay.

Alan Greenberg: RALOs should have a lower-case “s.”

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Avri Doria: And if people notice any other kinds of typographicals after the meeting please just send them directly to Dev quickly.

Alan Greenberg: And in the third line it’s “subsequent,” not (inaudible).

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Ah yes, I’m now looking at it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [A thorough check will be done.]

Avri Doria: That’s got a nice ring to it.

[crosstalk]

Avri Doria: Anyway, Figure 3 – Week 5 of the ACP. Any issues or comments? Okay. Figure 4 – Weeks 6 and 7 of the ACP. Any comments? Does one need to explain the notion of holding the pen? It’s become such a common thing for us to say in the working groups but I’m wondering if perhaps we shouldn’t say “The person responsible for editing the draft,” or something like that just in case; or putting the footnote to “holding the pen,” just in case that common usage isn’t necessarily familiar, isn’t idiomatically familiar to others.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think it’s idiomatically (inaudible), Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, some way just because yeah, we use it, however...

Alan Greenberg: And it may not translate very well, so maybe you actually want to say what you mean.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: See how it sounds in French.

Avri Doria: Exactly. Idiomatic speak is always one I love using as much as I can. Cintra?

Male: (speaks passage in French)

Avri Doria: Ooh, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It’s probably from the French that we got it, actually, if I think about it, sure.

Avri Doria: So that was a [set sequence], thank you very much. Cintra, please go ahead.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you, Avri. Incidentally it might be (inaudible) – that may not translate very well either. I don’t know if you want to suggest a more (inaudible) wording because I think it should be a lot of times towards kind of... It could be put like that in the very beginning of the... Or even if (inaudible) you know? So I don’t know if we want to kind of formalize it [over time] or just say (inaudible) on that.

Avri Doria: Go ahead, Dev.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: This is Dev. Perhaps I could just say, I just would rephrase it to say “At the beginning of the week a conference call is held.” Alright? Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. So where were we? Were we on Figure 4?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yep.

Avri Doria: Okay, any other comments on Figure 4? Cintra, you had noted that...

Cintra Sooknanan: No, I’m lowering it now.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Figure 5 – Week 8. Any comments? Okay, no comments. Figure 6 – third and fourth month after the start of ACP. Any comments? Okay. Figure 7 – fifth month after start of ACP. Comments? No comment. Figure 8 – sixth month after start of ACP?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. It’s another use of “ad-hoc working group” being two words as opposed to hyphenated.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Two of them, actually.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Mm-hmm, yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I’m pluralizing.

Avri Doria: Yeah, those Latins would have never put it in there.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Hmm.

Avri Doria: Figure 9 – seventh month after start of ACP.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. Shouldn't they all be "of the ACP" instead of "after start of?"

Avri Doria: I don't know how much difference it makes but...

Alan Greenberg: Because we are describing the month of. I mean...

Avri Doria: Well, it's the start of the process. I mean the "P" is process, right.

Alan Greenberg: But "seven months after the start of" implies a division of one moment or a day at the end of the month, and we're really talking about what happens during the month.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, Alan – Cheryl here. [I feel a bit] uncomfortable with that because it has the week, week, week, week to then "month of." And in my head it's sort of like when you talk about a baby, and it feels like a pregnancy and delivery process, by the way – that the child is five days old, twelve days old, three weeks old and then you go to 18 months, 2 years, 24 months.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I didn't even realize. My suggestion was make it consistent with the weeks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Weeks of and then months after is fine.

Alan Greenberg: It's not a big issue, my preference.

Avri Doria: Right, okay. Thanks. Okay, so that takes us through all of the explanation, and then the next part is...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here.

Avri Doria: Yes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We are... This is where I assumed that Alan was raising his question earlier, that in the text related to those figures, I would have seen that the figures themselves would have been integrated into this document.

Avri Doria: Not necessarily, no, at least not for this task.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Avri Doria: Because basically I think that's a lot of material work to do, that kind of taking the slide tablet into the other. So in this case maybe it's worth putting a note down on the bottom that for the final document process... But also I'm concerned with the schedule we've got and also needing to give ALAC something they can vote on at the end, that we actually have time. I think you're right – the publication of the format, the publication of the objection process should be integrated although to be honest, also, an annotated table of contents which in some sense is probably a useful thing at the beginning and then "Oh, okay, I'm interested in what happens during the objection of Week 4 and I can go to it."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, Avri, I see what you mean. Yeah, and I'm comfortable with the annotated table of contents, but...

Avri Doria: I think we...

[crosstalk]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...there is so much information in it that even if it's drawn to be almost a slide presentation form, which is sort of what it was in my head, then we could link it slide-by-slide if need be to each of these paragraphs.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, clarification: when you say "integrated" do you mean the flowchart, each flowchart is inserted after the text? Or are you talking about all the flowcharts appending all of the text?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, in my head the final published document is the text we're looking at now and the figures were actually inserted in situ, but that was in my head.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, one-by-one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [It could be with] the annotation in the table of contents or it could be both annotation table of contents and a, you know, "See Slide B9," "See Slides C9."

Avri Doria: Right. I think that these are all good things for us to discuss later. I don't think we want to try and do that before going to edit. I think those are really important considerations for us to look at for the producing of the final work, but with this crash course that we're on, I think trying to discuss that even or resolve that at this point would be [one-plussing] ourselves. Alan, you have your hand up or did you already cover that in the...?

Alan Greenberg: No, no – that would have been part of it but it's a small part. Right now we have nine pages of flowcharts I think, or something like that, or at least nine flowcharts and four pages of text describing the flowcharts. I think we need a summary because this is just overwhelming. No one's going to be able to read through this and see the overall picture.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: This is Dev. On Page 3 I tried to summarize the process.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, maybe I'm...

Avri Doria: That is an overview summary. Maybe it needs to be embellished as time goes on, especially given what questions come back to us and as we present it to other people. There's always a difficulty in sort of assuming the ignorance of everybody that's going to read this and we end up overkilling, whereas we could tell someone questions we get when we're presenting that and what further explanations would be required.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, you're right – it is there. Alright, I'll withdraw it but I still have a niggling concern that we're overwhelming people and they're not going to be able to read it through and really get the picture of what we're talking about. But I'm not quite sure how to fix it because you're right, there is an overview there.

Avri Doria: I think at this point it's going to take someone who knows it talking it through at each one of their meetings to make sure that it is because it's a complicated process, and any process is difficult to explain without 100 pages. Hong, I have your hand up.

Hong Xue: Thank you. I'm muted. I wonder if you can hear me?

Avri Doria: Yes, I can.

Hong Xue: Oh good. I have one question, one comment. The question is a general one – it's not specifically about any line or any paragraph, but I see that the whole process is completely based on ACP, the application comment period and I'm very happy we changed the title of the document into the "Comments and Objections." I completely agree with that. Then my question is that what is the status quo of discussion of relationship between comments and objections?

I went through the whole process. It seems that we're collecting comments and we build on the objection process of these comments. But what if in zero circumstances no comments were received for one application, but if later on three RALOs agree to jointly propose for an objection against it. Will it be possible or it must be built on comments on the ACP?

Avri Doria: Okay, I don't believe... Cheryl, I saw your hand go up in the middle. Did you have a response for Hong or was it for another issue?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That was another issue.

Avri Doria: Okay, then let me go to Dev then to respond to Hong's issue, then I'll come back to yours.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, thank you Avri. This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Hong, I don't think that would be possible. It has to be some comments submitted beforehand, before the RALOs would just suddenly by themselves vote. They have to vote because an objection statement process has to be drafted fully for the RALOs to vote on, and the only way for that to happen is if there were enough comments and discussion I guess to warrant that "Well, based on the comments, based on the discussion let's create a working group and draft an objection process," which is something that's no more than 20 pages.

It's mentioned on the Applicant Guidebook but it's a very specific document that has to be submitted to the dispute resolution service provider. So it is that statement that is going to be voted on by the RALOs or approved by the RALOs for ALAC to then decide whether to accept the advice or not.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Hong, did you want to respond to that?

Hong Xue: Well, thank you for the offer. I need more time to think about that but the last point I had to raise was that now [in Line 2] you are using the [code dropbox.com] is being blocked by a great firewall so I am not accessible to that. I wonder whether if there is any other channel we can...

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks for that. Yeah, we'll have to come up with another, some other not being blocked by you I guess, although you'll have to let us know as more things get blocked. So yeah, thank you.

Okay, one thing I do want to point out though I don't know how much difference it makes is that even though the formal 60-day comment period does close there will be the ability to continue putting in comments. Now, I don't know if we want to take account of that in this process. I don't suggest we take it into account for sending it out for review but it's something we should keep in our minds as a possibility. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And just to your last point, Avri, I wouldn't entwine it here but it's one of those good to know and excellent to be able to use things. When I put my hand up it was to some extent trying to come to terms with some of what Alan was raising, and then when I was listening to Hong I thought my proposal of shifting things around a little bit without changing text, I'm happy to add – just where the text is – may actually make it clearer and help in what Hong was raising, and that's the relationship between the comments and then the ensuing ALAC objection process.

If we were to go to the top of the document, have the "Introduction to ALAC Comment and Objection Processes," then have, alter the quote and then the line, and then we went straight into the "Overview and Summary," the [full section] of the overview and summary; and then before we go into any Figure explanations have the paragraph on the grounds for objections and then who can file – I think it makes, at least for me, the flow indicates how it's coming from individual commenters, gathering enough critical mass, being put forward by an ALS into RALO processes, into RALO voting, and then you get if three RALOs agree the ALAC objection process kicks in.

Avri Doria: Dev, how does that sound to you?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yeah, it sounds good to me on first thought.

[crosstalk]

Avri Doria: Also within the context of is it something... Because the next thing I'm going to ask is how quickly can you make all these changes like hopefully today so that the group on the list can at least take a 24- to 48-hour review of this before we can send it on? Because we can't send it on until you've made changes, people have looked at them and we've had at least some time review. I hope that we can find a way to send this through without having to have yet another meeting to talk about it. Alan, your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Cheryl's comment captured most of what I was going to suggest, that as when Dev was answering Hong's question of the relationship between comments and objections, I do think we need to make that clear. And I think what Cheryl said captures it. As an editorial comment, though, I wouldn't want to cast in concrete the rule that we cannot file an objection unless there were comments submitted during the comment period. The objection process is six months long; things may well come up two or three months into the process that we weren't aware of earlier and that are so onerous that the ALAC decides it warrants an objection. So I would put something like "Typically objections would be filed based on comments submitted and things like that," but I wouldn't cast it in concrete as a rule. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, I see Dev's hand and then I'd kind of like to close the discussion on this, we only have seven minutes left of the meeting. I see Hong with her tick. Yes, Dev.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, just to say that with regards to comments, comments can be submitted on the objection process after the ACP has ended which is after the eight-week ACP period. So the comments can then continue to flow in the objection process part of things and then a formal objection statement can be drafted from that.

Alan Greenberg: Okay careful, because now we're using two different definitions for the comment period. [laughing]

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well, I'm talking about the... I don't know how to put it, the post-ACP.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I know what you're saying. I'm just saying be careful that we don't end up using two different definitions of the same term.

Avri Doria: Okay, so I'm trying to bring this to a close and I know I'm rushing things, but the schedule I've got from ALAC has put me in sort of a position that I need to rush. And I think it makes sense and we really do need to have this decided before May 1st if not a whole lot sooner. So Dev, are you able to make the changes that have been discussed and touched on on the call today, today?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well, if I get an audio recording. I think there's a lot of comments here so I just have to step through them and make the changes for all of them, as well as looking at the notes. So but yes, later this evening yes, I can do it. It's even a Google Doc – I can share it for other people to make edits to this document if they want to help edit.

Avri Doria: And especially I would ask Alan and Cheryl, not to exclude others, but Alan and Cheryl who had a lot of material suggestions on how to do this and how to do that – if they wanted to coordinate with Dev and actually do some of that I think that would be great. I think since it is a Google Doc at this point, do make sure you coordinate and it doesn't get out of skew and that Dev continues to hold the pen on it. But if you guys can work with him to get some of your changes in I think that'd be great.

What I propose doing, and I want to see if there's any disagreement, is I can't send out the package to the ALAC Chair until this is approved. I am assuming, and now people will have to give me a response to this, that since we have no real current comments on the process itself that didn't come out in this discussion that I can do a 48-hour on-list last call on this before a.) sending any changes and this cover sheet to the translators, and b.) being able to deliver the package to the Chair. I see two agreements. Does anyone object to me making the call based on a 48-hour last call on the document? That gives everybody enough time to make sure they've seen it.

Obviously I'm asking you all to pay attention to the list over the next two, three days so that you see when that call has been called and can respond. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri, Cheryl here. I assume it would be to the list "If you have a problem get that to the list, and we have to get this to (inaudible) problem."

Avri Doria: Right, and in fact the way I would structure the last 48-hour call is it ends after the last comment has been resolved.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Mm-hmm.

Avri Doria: So in other words, if somebody puts in a grammatical or a typo, no – that's not. But if somebody puts in a substantive issue and the list goes back and forth discussing it and we resolve it, then the 48-hour call kind of restarts to make sure that people have had time to accept what goes out.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Avri Doria: If that makes sense, and I guess...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just a caveat, that if it's substantial changes and discussion on the list then it's the restart of the clock.

Avri Doria: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think if it's a call for... There's a difference in the world of GNSO and the world of ALAC where in some work groups as you painfully well know you actually have to physically put in your hand and say to the list "No, I have no objections that is ongoing." That is I think unnecessary here. If you've got a [cold one], let the list know and that will do.

Avri Doria: Yeah, especially in this space since we're talking about a draft that we're shipping out for comment. We're not talking about a final recommendation on the process. I think when we're doing a final recommendation on the process the issue might be a little stricter. Yes, Dev?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, just one quick comment. Regarding the Figure 9, there is no Figure 9 as actually drawn on the flowcharts as of yet. I just please "life" as the reason for this, but so I would hope to get that Figure 9 flowchart also drawn up properly. But the logic of it is stated in the text now, sorry.

Avri Doria: Okay, fine. But if you don't get the Figure 9 then perhaps you want to just indicate that it's not a figure and just call it "Process Final," and just give it a different title and not indicate that there's a picture.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, so I guess we're on that. We didn't quite complete though I'm hoping we've got a process in place where we will have completed within the next two, three days.

Quickly on meetings, and we'll need to get back to this because we've got one minute left on this – I think the alternating meetings, and this is in the email I sent out and then an update. I think alternating meetings does work. There's five people, three in one time zone, two in another who basically have never attended the alternate so my assumption is those people couldn't participate in our meetings if we didn't do a form of alternation. Perhaps another time we can look at whether these alternation times are optimal, but I'm suggesting that we keep these alternation times through Costa Rica and then we certainly look at for the next chunk of time how we proceed.

Also we've been working on an every week meeting. I don't know that we need that anymore between, because what we have to do right now is finish this, get it out then wait until we get more comments on the other issues – basically they're moving along. I don't know that we're going to start anything of great significance between now and the meeting, and so I basically had suggested two different schedules. If we needed a meeting next week then it was Schedule B where we meet today, we meet the 13th and we meet the 27th and the times alternate. I think that's the situation we're in.

I don't think we need another meeting for objection next week but I'm not sure, and perhaps we're better with Schedule A which assumes we're meeting next week and then has one more just before the Costa Rica meeting. And I'm wondering if I can see a show of hands... Yeah, but which one? A show of green checks for Schedule A.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Schedule A, yep.

Avri Doria: Okay, so I see Cheryl on Schedule A. I see, okay, can I see a show of green dots for Schedule B? None for B. Can I see a show of dots... Okay, so Cintra prefers B? Can I see a show of people.... (interference) And this would be Schedule C. Do we really need to continue meeting every week between now and Costa Rica, and that there's enough work and whatever to warrant that? Okay, so I have one A and one B. I am really stuck with no opinions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [laughing] Gotta love those democratic processes.

Avri Doria: Yeah, Evan's not [fussy].

Alan Greenberg: Make an executive decision.

Avri Doria: An executive decision, and of course the safe executive decision is "Okay, we're stuck meeting every week." But I think we have to go with the one that says we meet next week. I have to say that I am not sure I'll be able to meet next week because I'll be in Geneva but I'll check with Cintra to see if whether she can take the Chair of that and we'll get back to all on a meeting schedule.

We're now three minutes over. We did not do a report on where we're at with new gTLDs or the ASP, the Applicant Support Program. I guess both Cintra and I can send a brief update to the list if we have anything to put – I'll send one to the list. And other than that I believe we'll have a meeting next week and I'll try to make it from Geneva because I feel like...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, Avri, is there a preferred... I know we're going to do the rotation of times but is there a preferred time for you next week to make it easier from Geneva?

Avri Doria: Actually, the rotation going to 21:00 brings it to 22:00 Geneva time and that will work fine for me, because in fact doing it at night will be easier for me than trying to make it during the day when the UN is open.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so the situation as it is already planned will work better.

Avri Doria: Okay, so I will plan on the [6th] and then we'll see what goes from there. Thank you all and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sebastien has his hand up, Avri.

Avri Doria: Oh, okay. Sorry, Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet: Sorry, Avri, to take this just at the end but as you may know or maybe don't know, we are at a Board Meeting workshop, it used to be called, a retreat today and tomorrow in Los Angeles. And I was not able to follow everything your working group is doing, if there are three ideas that you want absolutely to be in my head to be able to discuss some issue about the New gTLD Program please do so. My meeting is starting in one hour but the subject will be forward over the next two days and it's not just the next hour when it's absolutely necessary for me to receive it.

I just have to tell you that it's happening and it's why also I think it's good that you're meeting next week because I hope that some things will come out, not as an official decision at all but to push some subject and that we will need to come back to your working group, the sub working group of JAS and so on and so forth. And thank you for all your hard work. Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: Okay, and I will take Chair privilege and say the first three words that come to my mind when I think of things the Board needs to keep working on are the outreach to the people for the JAS ASP, the raising of extra funding and that continuing, and the inclusion of the subgroup into the work that's being done to prepare the [SARP] materials. I feel sort of like "Yeah, yeah, yeah, we'll let you know when it's happening. When we've got something for you to edit we'll give it to you to edit." So I believe we're sort of being pushed away.

Those are the three things that come to my mind and but I encourage people to write to the list other things. I see a checkmark; I see Evan with his hand up. We are six minutes over, but Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, just one thing, Sebastien, and thank you for participating and even for coming here to raise the question. We're spending all this time working on an extremely well-done and elaborate objection procedure. Meanwhile the Board is having to deal with requests to have exceptions and automatic objections for groups like the Red Cross and the IOC. I'm just hoping you can take back with you perhaps the sentiment that since we're doing such good objection procedures that maybe there's not a need to have such automatically reserved names. If these things are so obviously to be protected then an objection mechanism already exists, and creating some very specific exceptions I think sets an extremely bad precedent to the multi-stakeholder model. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. I'm clapping at that one and at that I close this meeting. I thank you all. I apologize for the [approximate that may have appeared as forced] (inaudible) but I'm really trying to drive towards the deadline. So thank you all very much and thanks especially again, Dev, for all the work that you're doing and for agreeing to get yet another revision out by tonight. So thank you all and talk to you next week.

[End of Transcript]