

New gTLDs WG 09-01-2012 Summary minutes

Participants: Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon Orr, Cintra Sooknanan, Jose Arce, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sebastien Bachollet, Alan Greenberg, Rafik Damak, Hong Xue, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Yaovi Attohoun, Andrew Mack, Evan Leibovitch

Apologies: Olivier Crepin-Leblond

Staff: Gisella Gruber, Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani

Summary Minutes

Response to ASP Review

AD posted The ALAC approved statement on the Preliminary [New gTLD Applicant Support Program: Financial Assistance](#) to the PC to make sure it was posted somewhere. Some items have now been overtaken by events. AD reviewed changes. Asked whether the WG believed a revised document should be sent in.

TBJ: Yes, ALAC should submit the comment. I fully support the changes.

the changes in the updated discussion were discussed. A few changes were recommended.

Re: Suggestion from Tijani that those applicants who pass the evaluation but who do not get a grant should be given an advantage in the next round.

AD: One concern might be that the next round will be in 2 or 3 years. How do we know their financial situation is the same? Do we go back to them?

TBJ: This point was included so that people who met the criteria, that people in the 2nd or 3rd round, get priority. Their situation will evolve. However, if they pass the criteria again, they get priority.

AM: There would be some look-back?

AD: Yes.

AM: Does this mean that they need to re-submit or we need to re-evaluate their criteria?

YA: If the program has room for 2 or 3...in the same condition, I think we need to be more...I think that more specificity needs to be included.

AG: If we have enough funds for 10, and 30 that pass the criteria, then this is good. Keeping it vague at this point will put us in a more reasonable position to do good things.

Avri offered some text revisions based on Tijani initial; proposal

AD: TBJ, are you now comfortable with the revised text?

TBJ: Yes.

AM: I see AG's concern re slippery slope. The way it seems now, it seems the key thing is to get involved in the first round? Re getting involved in 2nd round, what exactly does this mean?

AG: In my mind, it could be as little that anyone involved in the first round, we give them an extra two points.

AD: Reviewed revised text.

AD: \$47k is a lot of money. It seems wrong, that people should lose their money because of that. However, if someone needy applies for it...

AG: I agree re the money. It doesn't make sense to tell a needy person that you are taking their \$47k. Gaming process, not so sure.

AM: I'm trying to understand how this is written. I agree with AG re the double-whammy. However, does it also work if you are too rich, then the money can be taken?

AD: Yes, if you're rich, then you are gaming and you forfeit your money.

AM: Which funds of an organization do you count? Can we do this in absence of some sort of criteria? Gave example of a local NGO.

AD: Makes sense. This is related to lack of specificity. I'd be surprised if they would take out the text re money in the gaming.

AG: There are two aspects to the gaming – one is the refund, the second is that you are locked out of the round. Also, we've made public what string you have applied for. Even if we give a refund, there is still a penalty associated with gaming.

AD: What are you recommending?

AG: We don't need to be so specific re this issue.

AM: We do have one penalty re gaming in place.

AD: Is there objection to leaving the letter as written? Please submit revisions to the mailing list.

AG: I will submit some text.

AD: Any other issues? The next changes, was the resource of reserve funds for outreach. Does anyone object?

AD: I see Seb's comments re \$2 MUSD reserve funds..

AG: Where is the latest version?

URL was entered on chat screen

AD: Anything else on this item? Deadline for comments is 23:59 UTC.

EL: Would you like me to bring this up on the ExCom call today to discuss whether the statement should be from the ALAC? Also, the ALAC can submit comments after the PC.

AD: I think that it is important that this WG submit something on this topic. It is also ok for the ALAC to submit something on this topic.

AD: Will ask TBJ to be added to Implementation group.

Objection Process Proposal

DAT: Reviewed his draft objection process.

HX: Discussed independent objector.

AD: WG to take issue of independent objector to the list.

Further discussion of the Objection process on the (list, wiki, chat group) is encouraged.