

New gTLDs WG 27-02-2012 Transcript

Avri Doria: Okay the first minute of the hour has come and gone. I would like to start and make sure the recording has started. And the meeting is started. Hello to you all. The first thing this the review of the agenda while giving people more time to get here before [inaudible 00:00:25]. After the review of the agenda, do the roll call. Then the first topic of the meeting is planning for the Costa Rica meeting.

I'm not sure we need a full 20 minutes there and if we don't, that's great because that allows us to move on more quickly to the work item update. But I do want to make sure that with an hour meeting time in Costa Rica we really do have our planning done. Then basically in one section work item updates and the first thing is the objection procedure. It's been sent out for review. It's just basically on status. If there aren't any comment already to start sort of thinking about those.

Then the next thing is an update on the applicant support plan and there is specifically a discussion of some of the possible campaign social media and other campaigns to do that. I don't know if Scott is able to attend the meeting. I guess he was invited. And if he can make it, that will be great. Otherwise we will just have messages to pass back to him. And then there is an update on the tracking of the new gTLD issues, [inaudible 00:01:47] et cetera. Then the standard item at the end, pending action items that haven't been covered, looking at the list and making sure that we're tracking those.

Then there is Any Other Business, and as opposed to a seven next meeting, what I really meant to add is under Any Other Business whether indeed we needed a meeting next week. If we do have a meeting next week, it would be in the other time setting which I believe is 1600 UTC, if I remember correctly, although I may have that wrong. No, this is the 1400 UTC meeting and so next week it would be the 2100 UTC. Anybody have anything to add to the agenda or any changes to make to the agenda? Seeing none I guess we will go with the agenda, of course at the end of the meeting if we still have time, if people have other business [inaudible 00:02:55]. Okay next item can someone do the roll call please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Yes Avri, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, this is the New gTLD call on Monday 27 February 2012. On the call today we have Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Cintra Sooknanan, Carlos Aguirre, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Hong Xue, Alan Greenberg, and Yaovi Atohoun. From staff we have Heidi Ulrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

And we have an apology from Andrew Mack. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Now the next thing is the planning for the Costa Rica meeting. The first question I have is, do we have a basic agenda posted somewhere that we can quickly put the URL in the box for everybody to go to? I don't have that readily at my fingertips.

Heidi Ulrich: Avri I will do that in just one moment.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Basically if I remember what would be in that agenda is my conception was that we would pretty much follow the same pattern we follow on these meetings where we start the meetings and then we get into the three work items. Obviously the major work item that we need to talk about in this meeting is the objection procedure. By that point we should have closed the comment period from the RALOs. We will have had then about a week to basically deal with those comments and make any changes.

We're still, I believe working on the schedule - thank you Heidi for putting that there - we're still working on the schedule that has us pleading any changes we need to make to the objection procedure in time for the ALAC to actually decide one way or another or send it back for the work, whatever it is the they do with it at this meeting. Trying to meet that schedule was a request of the ALAC and it's a schedule that I've been trying to push too, so it does - it's been very tight.

And this last week, once we have all the comments will be very tight. And then we would also go through the other items. [Mumbling to self] Okay so yes we had objection process, then going through the JAS and applicant support program, especially the outreach and talk about it in that meeting and any other issues that have come up there. And then an update on the new gTLD issues and then I think we need to cover again is the timing of these meetings going forward.

Are we remaining on the alternate times or are we going to a single time, etc. And try and get discussed and settled. [Inaudible 00:06:36] if the substantive issues go too long, that's something we will have to take later. That's the current agenda and I'm curious if that is an acceptable agenda. Does it make sense to people? We've given 20 minutes to the objection process, 15 to ASP and 10 to gTLD updates assuming we stay within our tight guidelines. Each of those gets a certain amount of time.

I think there is a risk in this schedule with the objection process being something that we're trying to complete in Costa Rica, getting through that is the primary purpose. I will try to keep it within that schedule. I think if it needs more time, it will have to get more time in the meeting. But I would like to hear what other people have to say about the schedule and all the stuff I just said. Anyone? If there are no comments, we will just sort of run with this and deal with it as it goes on. Cintra please?

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you Avri. I'm just wondering Alan has raised in the chat for AOB, is there are any comments with regards to the Red Cross International Olympic Committee. Is this something we would want to put on the agenda and just raise at this meeting? Or is something we would steer away of and just [inaudible 00:08:34] comments.

Avri Doria: Would this fall under the new gTLD issues, is that something we need to cover then would that be the place to put it? Or do you see it as a completely separate item?

Cintra Sooknanan: I do see it as partially falling under but I would be happy to hear from Alan because I know he will be more versed in this topic.

Avri Doria: Hong just put it may be under gTLD updates. That would make sense to me, I would be curious to hear if anyone else has a view on that. In some sense we have a mandate of three items, objection, JAS and new gTLD issues, so I think - okay Alan you're being asked a direct question.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I certainly have no problem with it falling under the new gTLD issue. I raised it in respect to AOB in this meeting just because the timing is tight and this may be an opportunity. Certainly in San José there will be an opportunity to talk about it also. As I said on the mailing list, the intent is to fast track this all the way through Board approval on Friday. I have no clue whether that's going to happen or not.

Avri Doria: Okay anyone else? In which case Cintra I guess since that section of the meeting will be yours, I guess the recommendation to add that to what you cover is that okay?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Avri Doria: Okay is that an action item? I don't know. I guess. Adding something to the agenda it may be an action item, fairly trivial for an action item but anyway. Anyone else have anything on this? In which case why don't we move on? And that gives us more time for some of the substantive issues that I see in the next section. So in Section -

Alan Greenberg: Avri you're getting very faint.

Avri Doria: Oh sorry. In the next section, the work item updates, the first thing is the objection procedure. I guess the first thing I have is a question, have we gotten any comments yet? I haven't seen any but maybe I've just been oblivious but have we? Yes Dev please?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, there was one comment that was posted onto the Wiki space by Eduardo Dias essentially mostly typo type of suggestions, corrections which I have made updates to the document already. His comments regarding what happens during Week 8 of the application comment period, response to the query, how do we vote on comments if there are a large number of comments?

His recommendation was that we vote for each comment individually. And if there are many comments we could maybe advance the voting on some of them before waiting until Week 8 to do them all. I just put up the link to the workspace so you can see what Eduardo suggested.

Avri Doria: Probably worth talking about now, what do people think? Comments and suggestions? Yes Alan?

Alan Greenberg: It sounds like a reasonable thing to do. The logistics of actually doing it I'm not sure. It's almost a decision to make a decision at a different time. And so I think it's something we should keep in mind. I'm not sure we want to legislate it at this point. It may become unwieldy. But it's an attempt to simplify things but I think it might actually complicate things just because we would have to invoke that different procedure. Just a thought.

Avri Doria: I see Evan is putting some comments in writing, Evan would you like to speak to it or should I read your comments out into the record.

Evan Leibovitch: You can read it into the record, basically that's all I wanted to say.

Avri Doria: Okay, so Evan says "I don't know if things will be contentious to do it item by item. We can play it by ear during the meeting." Which meeting?

Evan Leibovitch: Well wherever it is that Eduardo wants to do this point by point thing. I mean -

Avri Doria: I assume this would have been something he would want in the process, no?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes his query relates to after the draft comments after the 60 day application comment period, how does ALAC treat if there is a large number of these comments to review and vote on during Week 8. Do we vote on each single comment for each single application individually? Or is there some other process that we could somehow do to alleviate it if there is a large number of comments to review and possibly vote on.

Avri Doria: It seems to be that being that the comments were each on different applications, it would seem to me that they would have to be voted on separately and that we would need some sort of balance that basically went through it comment by comment and had people agree or disagree, yes Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I think this kind of thing is going to be more amenable to a teleconference with the opportunity to have give and take on the issues, people speaking to them and then a voice vote at that point. I just can't see a whole list of convoluted electronic votes being taken. I think it's the decision process that we are going to need to look at the pros and cons and make decisions on.

And it sounds like optimally it's something that we do that people read the documents and then we have a teleconference and try to make decisions. That's the way I view it anyway.

Avri Doria: Would you envision that there could still be so after those discussions the need for some of the [inaudible 00:16:16] come to a vote. But that was the [inaudible 00:16:19] thing to be made at that time?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I would have envisioned voice votes being sufficient for this but yes we may want on some contentious ones to be able to document it more formally or give people an opportunity to review things or something like that.

Avri Doria: Okay, I guess I would ask Dev does this seem like something perhaps warrants a few extra words, commenting in the section 8 or I mean it's not a change in any way. But would this seem to be something reasonable to both have as a response to the comment and perhaps and edit to our process just in case there would be a conference call, they would be talked through. And if you'd be any - and it would be decided by a voice vote in conference. But if need be one could decide on a vote process at that time.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I can put something in the explanatory, yes on the right hand side saying based on the number of comments received ALAC may choose to have a conference call and agree on these comments in that conference call and/or online vote for the more contentious gTLD applications, so that it can be properly documented. I can put some wording to that effect.

Avri Doria: That would be good. Also, I would recommend.

Alan Greenberg: Avri, just a refinement of that, I think we would want to schedule a teleconference ahead of time. Scheduling one on the fly because we think it's warranted is almost impossible. I think we ought to schedule it and cancel it if it's not warranted.

Avri Doria: Okay so basically you want to put that as a sixth point in the actual schedule [inaudible 00:18:17] teleconference scheduled and that's part of your response.

Alan Greenberg: If it's moot, then we cancel, but have the slot allocated. Otherwise getting people's time is really hard.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I can probably put in the flowchart between Week 7 or Week 6 to say based on comments received, a conference call is scheduled, something along that line?

Alan Greenberg: I think so.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, okay.

Avri Doria: Okay great. And then the other thing I was going to say is we probably need a separate document be started. I'm not sure who starts it, it may be me. It may be staff. It may be someone else that lists each of these comments and then lists the disposition of it in a clear way so that at the end of this process we not only have the changed document but we have a record of comments received and the disposition.

That probably is an action item that we have to make sure that the document gets started. Okay, anything else? That's the only comment we received. Any other comments pending on the objection procedure at this point? Yes Dev?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay there was more comments that was stated by Olivier and Carlton on the mailing list. I think I - I was trying to find the link to post it. But it's somewhere in the archives. Essentially Olivier had some concerns regarding the workload that this process is going to generate on At-Large volunteers and staff. And would we then be able to provide an estimation in person per hours per task as to evaluate the total workload that the process was going to generate. That was his concern.

And he was also concerned about have we considered ways in which this process could be played, either the [inaudible 00:20:29] the new gTLD process or so swamp the ALAC and RALOs in hundreds of objection processes. And how to reduce such a risk, if there is one.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you, so those two should get listed. Any comments on either of those two issues at this point? I see no objections. On a personal note on the second one, I don't think we've spent much time thinking about how this can be played and whether someone could do a [dosa] pack with them but anything can be played and most anything can be [dosapacked]. It does make sense that we should give some thought to how do we deal with those kinds of efforts should they occur. Yes Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Avri. I understand very well the concern of Olivier. It might be a problem for some of us but what is the alternative? Should we stop doing it? Shall we cancel this [inaudible 00:22:00] for us? No. So it might be a problem but we don't have any choice, we have to continue. Is there anything to do to overcome the constant [inaudible 00:22:18]? I don't know. I don't see anything.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I think this is a situation where I think the expression 'Forewarned is forearmed' kicks in that whoever the group is that's going to be doing the first level triage has to be cognoscente of the possibility and we wing it at that point based on what we see. But just knowing it might happen and being sensitive to it. I can imagine a couple of particular groups trying to use us to try and further their needs if things aren't perceived as going their way.

Yes, I can believe it's going to happen. And I think we simply need to be cognoscente and alert to it, that's all. I don't think we can do anything more at this point.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Well I think there is another part of it and that's the first part of the question was trying to figure out a work estimate and I don't know if a few of us would go off outside the meeting or on the mailing list and actually try and break down the tasks, look at the breakdown we already have and see if there is some notion. Because certainly the volunteers in this process should know that it's going to eat up their life for a while. As many things in volunteering do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You mean situation normal to you Avri.

Avri Doria: Well it's periodic. Some things take up more than others and there are some people that are always in that state and some people that go in and out of it. Anyhow that has to be known. But it would be good if someone could take a stab at predicting it, if nothing else then we start to learn skills on how to predict volunteer timing on things.

On the second aspect, this brings us back to a continuing action item and I'm not sure what's happening with it and I'm not sure whether I've forgotten to take some necessary formal steps but this whole thing of ALAC doing the scope discussion on when it comes to the objections that have to do with the community, what is the scope of what's within this groups scope and not within this groups scope because that's one of the places where the gaming could happen. Is sort of stretching beyond, remembering the issue we had. Is it just related to ALAC?

Is it just related to ALSs? Or is it related to any community that could be within an ALSs remit? Basically how wide is the scope of objection that the At-Large group looks at? And that's a discussion still pending on the ALAC and I'm not sure where they are on it yet and I'm not even sure that I've initiated it correctly there. And perhaps someone from ALAC can tell me whether ALAC is actually working on that issue. Alan I see your hand up.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I don't think it's one of those things we can really do ahead of time. I mean we're not going to find the words to describe the exact comments we might get that will cause us to question whether this is within our remit or not. And moreover, if something is raised like that I don't think one or two people should be deciding it on behalf of the ALAC. I think again this is the kind of thing that's going to need some face to face or teleconference rather discussion and then the ALAC making a decision if this is within our scope or not.

We certainly don't want to be accused of favoritism or one or two people making decisions on behalf of the group in these kinds of areas. But the hard decisions will have to be made. But I think they're going to be made communally. In my mind anyway, that's the only way to do it transparently I think.

Avri Doria: That may be. I think that that kind of statement has to come out of ALAC though sort of defining it. We did present it to them earlier as a question. I think they probably need to say that.

Alan Greenberg: Just a follow on to the extent that we want to model things on how the GNSO has been doing things recently, that's up to a Working Group to make a recommendation that this is what the ALAC should say. It may well be within our remit to recommend to ALAC what it wants to say. They can always choose not to.

Avri Doria: That's a possibility. Okay in which case that's something we still need to discuss. Because the last time we discussed it it really did come down to one of three possible scopes and we basically said we needed a response from ALAC on it. If the notion now is that we should come up with a recommendation of what it is, then perhaps we should be doing that. Hong is asking if she can get a PDF of the objection procedures.

The one on the Wiki cannot be downloaded. And then Evan had a comment written saying that the GAC process anytime you raise an objection, then who GAC has to approve for the GAC [inaudible 00:28:03]. Okay. That is certainly a good way of looking at it. Anything else on this particular issue or on the two issues that were brought up by Olivier?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Avri. Just to refer to one or two more comments that were made both on the mailing list. Carlton expressed some concerns regarding the knowledge required to formulate objection statements given the narrow - what's in the Applicant Guidebook regarding the objection [inaudible 00:28:57]. The limited public interest objection criteria, it requires that persons wanting to say well we should object to this application we really need to educate them as to well look it has to fall under this remit as specified in the Applicant Guidebook.

That was his concern. Hong also suggested that the wording of the title of and the current title is 'Draft Proposal for the ALAC to Submit Public Comments on and File Possible Objections to New gTLD Applications.' Hong's suggestion is to remove the word 'Possible' and just leave it as 'And File Objections to New gTLD Applications.'

Avri Doria: Okay. I assume we would also drop the word 'Draft.' Okay on that one if anyone objects to that change being made, otherwise I would say that would be one that would be easy to have responded to. I see no objections so perhaps that's worth following through on. The other one, any comments on the first issue that Dev mentioned?

Alan Greenberg: Can you remind us what it was?

Avri Doria: Yes please repeat it.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: What Carlton's comment?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay sorry well I just posted the link to it. His concern was if you look at the sources for limited public objection, that any objection connected to that rationale, you must be educated enough to be able to present your arguments in terms of what the limited public objection - what are the criteria for the limited public objection. Rather than having lots of people potentially saying we need to object to this gTLD because of something that is outside the criteria, it's going to take up bandwidth trying to explain to them that it's outside the scope of the criteria. So objection preparation is key. Okay Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes I think it was about the public interest objections?

Avri Doria: Yes. Which is being called limited scope objections now I think, what we used to call MAPO and then got called [inaudible 00:32:12]. I guess I don't see any hands. I'm not sure what we can do other than point people at the documentation. Have them read it and then basically make a judgment as to whether it met the criteria or not. I don't see any time planned for a great education effort. But certainly we should make sure that they have access to a pointer to the relevant documentation. I'm not sure what else could be done. Any suggestions from anyone? Okay so those are the issues. If we can - yes Cintra I see your hand up.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you Avri. Perhaps we can just summarize that section until into one page and if somebody raises an intention to object under this section we could just forward it to them so they could [inaudible 00:33:21] their thoughts. I don't know if this is an appropriate response or if we want to send them to the Applicant Guidebook. Because I don't think it's necessary for them to read through everything. I think we should actually give them a one page or something like that.

Avri Doria: Thank you and perhaps as an extension on that, in terms of putting out the original information on comments, not only could that be provided, and I'm not sure we're thinking of just saying go read the Guidebook but was actually thinking of bringing out Section 4 and Section 3 of that. They could also be asked to give a pointer or a listing of what aspect of the process as defined or the criteria as defined they were making the objection in regard to. Yes Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I think perhaps asking them to provide a rationale for why they believe this is within the remit of ALAC.

Avri Doria: Based on the single sheet that Cintra mentioned.

Alan Greenberg: Based on that, based on the formal words in the Guidebook, whatever, yes. Part of it is also going to be the perhaps obscure or perhaps clear link in people's minds in whatever the group is applying and At-Large.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Yes Dev?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, just as a follow-up, ultimately regarding filing objection statements, the idea is that once there were enough comments regarding that there should be some objection based on the criteria, the Working Group has to then be formed to then try to put those comments into a form that's suitable for submission to the dispute resolution service provider.

Then the RALOs have to approve it and then of course ALAC then has to look at the advice given by the RALOs on that process. There is some - if there is any ability of that Working Group to try to rationalize what the comments are saying regarding the objection process, regarding the objection to that gTLD, then no statement can be then drafted for approval.

Avri Doria: Okay so it sounds like there are probably some words and sentences that need to be added in terms of for example, the obligation to create this information sheet and as Cintra said and probably a good first approach to how to respond to the comments. Okay anything else on objections at this point? I do want to move on to the next topic.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Sorry one quick question. Are we supposed to meet with the person regarding whether the Dashboard concepts could be implemented or not?

Avri Doria: Yes, that was a pending action item. It still hasn't happened but yes we are supposed to. That's still on the line. That's one of the action items that meeting should have been scheduled by now. But I guess it's pretty difficult to schedule. And I don't know Heidi were you the one who was actually trying to schedule that one, since it's already come up?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, it is still being worked on internally and we will give the call hopefully very shortly.

Avri Doria: Thank you. That's one less item we have to cover on pending action items not yet covered. Anything else before that, Cintra you say you will be happy to take the lead on this, what was the list?

Cintra Sooknanan: This was the one page.

Avri Doria: Okay great, Cintra thanks. I guess that's an action item recorded. And it's probably something that needs to be indicated in the next edit of the objection process. Just to make sure that the comment has been addressed and does that make sense Dev?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes sure, it makes sense.

Avri Doria: Okay then moving on, there is the next thing, the update on the applicant support process program. And there is a discussion of possible social media campaign to promote the ASP. Scott was excited. And I see that he is on the call. And he is a presenter and he has share my screen, so I give the floor to you Scott and thank you for being here this time of day for you.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you very much, it's my pleasure. I have corresponded with Cheryl and Olivier and Avri about this idea. As Avri has pointed out, time is short between now and the last day and applicant can register in the TLD application system. We're trying to think of more things we can do to raise awareness of the Applicant Support Program. And one thing is pretty rapid in today's age of social media. On your screen you will see a little jpeg file.

The problem with trying to - I'm speaking a little out of order, sorry. The notion that we had was that we would get people who support the Applicant Support Program to put a Twibbon on their Facebook and Twitter profiles. And for those of you who may not have heard the term Twibbon before it's an online analog for the idea of putting a bumper sticker on your car. It's basically as you can see there, you can put a little emblem on your Facebook profile photo or your Twitter avatar to show people that you are aligned with a give cause.

It does not change how Twitter behaves. If someone clicks on your photo, they're going to get your profile. They won't be taken to more information about the Applicant Support Program. It would be up to each individual to decided if they want to Tweet a link for example to the explanation of the program on our new gTLDs micro site. But nonetheless because of the way social media works, if you have whatever, 100, 200 followers, some of them are likely to see the emblem and they will also want to display it.

And as more and more of the community begins to put up this emblem, the hope is that through community connections, an extra little measure of awareness will get out to the parts of the world that need it. Obviously this is just one tiny and relatively cosmetic thing to do. But we still thought it might send the right signals, just as a symbol of community support for true TLD diversity.

We also thought though that if this was not being presented in the way that this particular Working Group embraced or if there is some way you would like to spin it or whatever we would really love to collaborate with you and make it an actual community effort. What do you think of doing this?

Avri Doria: Yep, I would like to open up the conversation on this. But I would also like while combined in that same conversation is that there were other suggestions being made within the group list about other things that perhaps can and should be done as part of the outreach. I don't want to limit the conversation to just the notion of the Twibbon and support or issues. But also like to open it up to see what other suggestions and issues people might have when it comes to the outreach.

Are there any hands? I don't see hands so I will start with my extra recommendation. Giving my personal view I think the Twibbon is okay. I'm not sure what meaning it would have to people. I'm not sure that it says applications for a TLD and if you're an appropriate applicant there is additional support for you. I'm not sure that it actually conveys a mission. When it is a ribbon it has a built in symbiotic people know.

But I have no objections to doing it; I'm just not sure how far it goes. I know one of the recommendations that I wanted to add to the list and I think I wrote it in an email, is that the regional managers that we have, who are people that already have an outreach into their local communities, who know where the groups of people who may be reasonable applicants for a gTLD but who wouldn't be able to afford it normally, should be drawn into this outreach effort.

I know I've talked to several of them and no one had come to them and said 'Hey this is going on, let the folks in your region know, especially given your intimate knowledge of those areas.' Coming back to the Twibbon idea, if I was putting anything there I would make sure that there was a QR code that someone could grab and instantly go to the program that.

Getting the QR code for the support program out in a ubiquitous manner, gives a lot of people another way. I know that Evan has his hand up. Because Carlton and others also have suggestions and others they want to put forward. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks Avri. First of all Avri I really like your idea of the QR code and secondly I've got a question for Scott. Is there approval to actually use this as a generic logo for the Applicant Support Program? That is not just being used on social media, but essentially being used on any documentation, on the component of the Guidebook being used for applicant support.

One of the things, this is sort of Branding 101, that this isn't just a little sort of thing that if you leave it just associated with social media, it might not be widely understood. If there is a logo and sort of a brand applied to this, is this going to be done consistently everywhere that applicant support is referred to within ICANN?

Avri Doria: Thank you, Scott would you like to respond?

Scott Pinzon: Yes, I would love to. Evan I think that's a question we could probably decide among staff on the call and this group. Where this emblem first showed up is we've made a fact sheet for the Applicant Support Program. It was posted last week and this was part of an illustration that was on it. We grabbed it as a possibility for the Twibbon emblem and if it is something this group likes then yes we can continue using it. And Olivier had even suggested it might make a useful lapel pin. We are also checking into whether those can be generated in time for Costa Rica.

The first vendors we found wanted a month to make them. We've got at least two who think they can do it in two weeks which is about what we have. Today I hope to find out what the pricing is. On the QR code issue, I don't object to it in principle but I see some logistic difficulties with it. One is that at least on an iPhone the QR code itself needs to take up about 80% of the space that's in view for the camera.

I don't know if a Twitter QR code would be large enough to function for a lot of people. The other thing is that you would then have to literally swap out your photo and have a QR code instead. And I think there are a lot of people who either would not or they can't because it's their company logo or something that's up there. I don't know if it would be adopted as readily as a little emblem like this.

Avri Doria: Okay that was more of a spur of the moment thought. But the use in making the QR code for this program for it to be ubiquitous in some way, easily found, easily seen, getting it distributed so that people see it is perhaps another thing to look at. Evan you have your hand up is that again?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, it was just another point. Scott if you're in a rush about lapel pins at least in my previous experience doing this, you may actually find the best answers to what you need in Brazil. That was in my experience the most competitive and plentiful source of lapel pin manufacturers I've ever found.

Avri Doria: I would like to add one thing.

Scott Pinzon: That's a good little tip, thanks.

Avri Doria: One thing like lapel pins and stuff while I think are a wonderful idea I guess, where do we [inaudible 00:47:57] in 13 weeks of the application process.

Evan Leibovitch: I was just saying if you needed really quick turnaround you might actually find a very competitive market there and you may find companies able to turn it around pretty quick.

Avri Doria: And by Costa Rica we will be in Week 9. Yes Cheryl I see your hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi, Scott I'm a huge fan of QR codes but I wouldn't see them as a Twibbon competitor. I would see them as another tool. And one thing that might be equally easy to get out and I do hope you pick on the podcast and radio outreach with little syndicated bits that we might be able to promulgate out to the areas we need in the comments as well, because that's something I know a number of the communities that our ALSs engage with has been saying is an ideal mechanism to get to their market.

With the QR codes, something as simple as a business card which we could even grab off a page that gave us a set of resources we could use which could be a simple locally if need be that you might be able to get a few to actually have as show and tell at the ICANN meeting which has the logo from the fact sheet. I should point out to you Scott most of us still haven't seen that fact sheet. It's all very good releasing it on the ICANN side but unless it gets pushed out to us we don't know it exists most of the time.

I like the fact sheet. I think we should all be using it and referring to it. And just the QR code that then takes people to the online resource which is micro site and the fact sheet, etc. It could also be a very powerful and useful tool that people could print locally to use as required. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes, thanks. And in fact one I guess that would go along with that Cheryl is getting that fact sheet and hopefully QR codes stuck on the fact sheets pushed out to all the ALSs within the next couple of days. As I say, I keep pointing out we are halfway through the cycle now. Getting that pushed out to all the ALSs, asking them to push it out to their memberships seems a way to get some very quick [inaudible 00:50:29]. I don't know. Anything, any other comments? Yes Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just a follow-up on that if you don't mind me jumping in. It just appeared to me at that moment we really need to make sure Scott and his team are hand in glove on the global partnership because of their regional office outreach of the [inaudible 00:50:57]. I'm sure he is but, you know, I'm good at trying to teach my grandmother to suck eggs.

Avri Doria: Okay I will ask Scott to respond. I'm not sure I understand your comment, but perhaps Scott did.

Scott Pinzon: Yes, so there are two things that I would like to attempt to address that have come up from this group. I have talked to Mandy in global partnerships regularly; by the way, I should mention this great communication effort I'm not actually in charge of it. Barbara Clay is the one who ultimately guides it. She is at a friend's funeral today. That's why she is not on the call. I'm happy to speak on her behalf.

Anyway the desire that you describe Avri of having global partnerships people behind specific potential applicants and sheppard them through the process, you wondered if they were empowered to do that and the short answer is 'No.' One of the complexities of this thing for all of us who are involved in communicating it, is that after the Board passed the New gTLD Program then they told us that ICANN is supposed to be neutral about it.

And so all our communications not just about applicant support but the whole thing is supposed to be educational and here are the risks and here are the possible upsides that you decide kind of thing. And so actually finding specific people and trying to take them down through the funnel of all of our complexities is something that GP is not permitted to do. That's a discussion, if that's to change it needs to happen I guess at the Board level or something.

Avri Doria: I see Cintra's hand but since it was - I wanted to jump in and then I will give it over to Cintra. Is perhaps not [inaudible 00:53:18] but making sure that all these people have been educated and know about it. I don't see how that's non-neutrality. But perhaps I don't understand, Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi Scott, my question really goes towards a little bit about GP response but also in terms of my comment that I raised on the list which was even if you don't have that remit to go on sheppard people or applicants, why don't you work with At-Large or work with the ALSs or organization on the ground who may be aware of potential applicants.

I personally have the feeling [inaudible 00:54:06] of outreaching things. I don't know if this is available because it's not under your remit, these kinds of partnerships with our organization can be possible as far as I'm aware, thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Any other comments to add at this point?

Scott Pinzon: I have one more if I may?

Avri Doria: Okay please.

Scott Pinzon: The - well two maybe. Cintra to your comment, it's part of why I'm here today is I want to work with the community. As far as what kind of coordination has happened with At-Large, like I say Barbara guides the program so I don't know what has gone into that aspect of it. The other thing I wanted to ask about is that many have pointed out that it would be great to help these people discover this by talking to them on radio and several other sources that are not online, so that the place where I'm lacking understanding is what we're asking people to do is to run a registry.

If they are not online enough to see online resources about the Applicant Support Program I'm not comprehending, how they will be able to run a registry. I don't think radio is a valid outreach for that region.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's so easy Scott for that particular quagmire. You've got service providers you can use; you can even find the micro site links to. It's the awareness requirement is for the ground floor community source needs analysis just getting it on the Boardroom's agenda. And that is going to be a need that someone has to be listening to their radio and go oh hey that would be relevant for my NGO organization community assisted type requirement.

It's just, it's not so much targeting the business entity that will run the registry but rather creating the awareness in the not for profit NGO community-based sector which we believe is going to be most benefitted by the Applicant Support Program.

Avri Doria: Very often what might happen is the leadership of those organizations might be the ones who hear it on radio and they're not the ones that are the IT people [inaudible 00:57:07] organization.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely Avri. You've got to get it to a Board's ears.

Avri Doria: I think that's why a wider outreach, why do you put things in Forbes Magazine when you want to hit the business community, is because you want their leadership, even though they haven't a faintest idea of a registry is, let alone how to run one. That's not the issue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Marketing/Socialization approach.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Any other comments, Alan I see your hand up.

Alan Greenberg: I agree with all of that philosophically but we're two days away from the last day to register. If people aren't even cognoscente or haven't started talking about it yet, isn't it a bit too late? I mean I did - if we had done this months ago, it makes complete sense.

Avri Doria: We're still six weeks away and we are four weeks away from the closing of registration, not two days.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry it's March 29 not February. I withdraw I'm sorry. I need a remedial course in reading months.

Avri Doria: And so that month. Yes I think if something went out immediately, that month, especially since there are a number of people on the network now that have written so many applications that sitting down with people for a month they could still get it done. Anyway I think you Scott for coming. I hope you will convey some of this to Barbara, who until this meeting I didn't know what he person that was ultimately responsible for all this. But I appreciate that.

Scott Pinzon: May I ask should I proceed with the Twibbon idea, what does this group think?

Avri Doria: I don't think anybody here objected to it. I'm not sure there was strong thinking. I don't know I don't understand how it will actually get more applicants but I don't see why not do it.

Alan Greenberg: Scott if you do it and I support the concept, make sure there are resources available that people can point to, so that it's usable. Not just I'm curious about what that is but we'll never find out.

Scott Pinzon: Sure and one follow-up question, I would like to look into the QR code idea and I heard a key phrase from Cheryl which was available to print out because my other question is what can I put the QR code on that we can get into people's hands quickly enough for them to use it. But if it's printable then is that something you might encourage the ALSs to take advantage of?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes, I think there is no doubt about it.

Alan Greenberg: The QR code is one of the things I was talking about that people should be able to put that into whatever it is that people look at when they see this curious thing at the bottom left of their picture.

Avri Doria: And I think the QR code somehow belongs on your fact sheet so it's not just that people type in a URL they see there but they can quickly grab it. But anyway -

Scott Pinzon: Okay thank you very much for that. I'm going to try and make that happen in the next few days.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you so much and I think that what is being told in some sense is the At-Large and RALOs and ALSs, are really ready to help with the dissemination of this. And yes it's late but we have to still try.

Scott Pinzon: I agree and I agree with you on the point that not enough has been done. I absolutely agree.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can [inaudible 01:01:06].

Avri Doria: Alright we are now two minutes over. We are going to do basically the update on gTLD issues. One of the things that had been left uncertain was is whether we had a meeting next week. It would be in the 2100 UTC slot. At this point I would suggest that we have that meeting, that we start with the new gTLD issues then just to get that going and then that we spend the rest of the time looking at whatever objections have come in at that point, so that we are as ready as possible for the objection process to end.

Is that an okay approach to that so I can end this meeting close to the hour and we meet again next week to work on those specific two issues? Anyone object to doing that? Okay and that means we will get to the IOC/RC issue then or is that too late Alan? I see you agree with a check.

Alan Greenberg: It's certainly not too late to be input into the GNSO for Costa Rica. the meeting with the GAC where we're going to try to find out form GAC people how they view what's been done so far is this Friday.

Avri Doria: Okay but that's a GNSO/GAC meeting or is that a drafting team?

Alan Greenberg: That's Drafting Team GNSO and GAC to whatever extent people are interested.

Avri Doria: I think hearing what happened on that will be a great part of the discussion on Monday.

Alan Greenberg: I'm presuming anyone can dial in if they really want to.

Avri Doria: Okay well make sure people on this list have that information so we can pass it [inaudible 01:02:59] don't necessarily see it.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure they're formally invited. That's different from -

Avri Doria: Okay if you can [inaudible 01:03:08] please do.

Alan Greenberg: If it's on a public list or something like that I will point to it, yes.

Avri Doria: Okay anything else before I close this meeting? I apologize to you Cintra for getting you prepared and then not getting to it. I recovered some of the pending items and go through and put it on the list. Anything else before I close four minutes late? I thank you all, thank you Scott, for participating in the meeting. I thank you all and I will talk to you next week. And thank you. Bye-bye.

[End of Transcript]