CR - At-Large New gTLDs Working Group
Monday, March 12, 2012 – 14:00 to 15:00
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

Avri Doria: Or pre-cap as it were, of what the agenda is. The main item on the agenda is the objection process. And basically I'll talk, reviewing the process and changes, and this is a document that has been sent to RALO, I mean to the ALAC for approval and hopefully will be reviewed by them and voted on this week. So, wanted to go through that, wanted to go through the changes that had been made to that document based on the review that was done by the RALO.

Then after that, talking a bit about what's going on with the JAS Application Support Program; the process that's put on there. And basically talk about perhaps some of the concerns and some of the things that we can do to help overcome those concerns. Then the third item on the agenda corresponds to the third item in our charter, which are basically looking at New gTLD issues. As the gTLD Program rolls out, this group will be At-Large's way to sort of look at those things, identify where the problems are and move on.

I don't know if we should shut the door; it would probably make it easier. So, to go to the first item, which is the objection process. So, we've been working on that quite hard actually, and Dev, who will be talking about it some more, have been working on it quite hard, basically meeting weekly on it since this group was formed, because we wanted to make sure that it was in place in time for the New gTLD Review Process. And part of the process starts with the ability of At-Large to make comments on the New gTLD

---

applications in the first 60 days on those New gTLD applications, once they're out.

Then after that, there's another five months of process where At-Large, if it decides that any applications are objectionable – I'm not sure that objectionable – are worth of an objection, objectionable is a bit strong, but are worthy of an objection on the basis of either community or of the limited public interest. I keep having trouble with that phrase. I keep wanting to call it [MOPO] like we did in the beginning. But anyway, of the limited public interest, then there's a process by which this can be done.

So I'm going to quickly give – so we created a draft document, that draft document was sent to the RALOs, to the regional At-Large organizations for comment. We received a number of comments; changes were made to the process based on an analysis and a discussion of those comments. Then the At-Large New gTLD Working Group did a review of the document as changed after we had discussed those somewhat. And earlier this week we decided that it had been reviewed and it was ready to be sent on. So yesterday it was delivered to the chair of ALAC for consideration at this meeting.

So at this point, now that I've gone through the process, I'd actually like to turn the microphone over to Dev who can basically give us a quick recap of the process, with a special attention to areas that were changed or modified based on the review process. Then I'd like to open it up to any questions that people might have on it and move on from there. So Dev, please.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Avri; Dev Anand Teelucksingh.   Okay, so the process began with an overview of what was in the applicant guidebook, and the applicant guidebook stated that "The process for

objecting to a gTLD application, by which funding through ALAC objection filing would be granted, would require a bottom-up development of potential objections, discussion and approval of objections at the RALO level, and a process for consideration and approval of the objection by the ALAC."

So when we started looking at this process in the applicant guidebook, we noted that there was an opportunity for At-Large and ALAC to comment on the gTLD applications during the 60 day application comment period. So that's the proposal that treats, as Avri said, looks at both situations looking to submit comment during the application comment period and then looking to develop a possible objection statement for review.

So the comment period during the 60 days, I would say it's very similar to At-Large policy advice. We solicit comments when the application is posted on May 1st, which is on May 1st. A review group will create a Wiki space on the At-Large Wiki and then informs all the RALOs and all the At-Large via the mailing list and through meeting and so forth, and receive comments. And within the first month, after such comments have been received, a decision is taken by the New gTLD Working Group to decide whether a comment should be drafted, based on the submissions received so far. A first draft of that comment is done, more comments received, a final comment is then produced and then ALAC then votes on that statement and whether to submit it during that 60 day period.

For the objections, there's a seven month period from the start of the May 1st and what happens there is that again, comments are received regarding their objection. Possible reasons to object, based on the same community grounds or limited public interest grounds. And the decision is take again, and this time probably a working group is created, an ad hoc working group is then tasked

to look at, to review those objection statements, comments I should say, and then draft a formal objection statement.

Now, this statement has to be in the form that will be submitted directly to the dispute resolution service provider. So after doing a draft of that, getting more comments, feedback, a final statement is produced that is ready for submission to the dispute resolution service provider. And that final objection statement is then reviewed by all the RALOs, and there are five regions so there are five RALOs. And what happens is that at least three RALOs must approve of that statement, and essentially giving out advice to ALAC that we should object to this application based on this statement.

The ALAC then has the final decision of whether to accept the advice of the RALOs to then submit. So they will do a vote through the ALAC, and if the vote is "yes" then in coordination with ICANN then ALAC then files the objection to the appropriate dispute resolution service provider. I think I've covered the gist of that process.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Before I open up for questions, I've been reminded by several people that I was terribly remiss in not doing a role call. Somehow or other I forgot that this was a working group meeting and didn't do a role call; just thought of it as a meeting. So, how is it we do a role call here? Do we go around the table or does…? So please starting with you, saying name and I guess the involvement with this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'm currently the representative from ISOC AU into APRALO, and I serve the ALAC as their liaison to the ccNSO.

EN

Andrew Mack: Wow Cheryl, that was a lot. Andrew Mack; I'm one of the JAS members amongst other things.

Evan Leibovitch: Evan Leibovitch; vice-Chair of ALAC and a former co-Chair of the Joint Applicant Support Working Group.

Hong Xue: Hong Xue; from China, member of APRALO.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani Ben Jemaa; member of ALAC and let's say a member of the working group, New gTLD Working Group.

Yaovi Atohoun: Yaovi Atohoun; member of ALAC and the working group.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Dev Anand Teelucksingh; LACRALO Secretariat.

Avri Doria: Avri Doria; Chair of this working group and a member of At-Large.

Cintra Sooknanan: Cintra Sooknanan; member of LACRALO, as well as vice-Chair of this working group.

Rosa Delgado:	Hello, I'm Rosa Delgado. I'm representing the European Broadcasting Union. We applied for a TLD, so I don't know if it's the right meeting I should come or?
Avri Doria:	You're certainly welcome to be here, yes.
Rosa Delgado:	Yes, thank you.
Jeffrey Smith:	I'm Jeffery Smith with Commercial Connect and we're applying for the .shop, still applying for the .shop TLD.
Dawn [Yakela]:	Dawn [Yakela], member of the Media Net World Alliance.
Chris Dillon:	Chris Dillon; University College, London. We are very involved with teaching languages and we're interested in particularly in IDNs.
Pascal Bekono:	Pascal Bekono from Cameroon and ICANN Fellow.
Aminata Sy:	Aminata Sy from University of Senegal; ICANN Fellow.
Jose:	Jose; ICANN Fellow.

EN

Ron Sherwood: Ron Sherwood; ccNSO/ALAC liaison.

Alex Stamos: Alex Stamos from the CC Group; we're doing security services for registries and gTLDs.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I'd like to ask the people that are – oh go ahead, and then I'd like to ask the people that are standing around the edge, or sitting around the edge to just walk up to one of the microphones and introduce themselves as well. Huh? And introduce themselves.

Jim Prendergast: Jim Prendergast; Gallway Strategy Group.

Alan Greenberg: Alan Greenberg; I'm the At-Large liaison to the GNSO and a work group junkie.

Ken: Ken with Global Top Level, applying for a new TLD.

Morgan Snooson: Morgan Snooson, Chairman of the same, GTL.

Alejandro Moscol: Hi, Alejandro Moscol from Peru an ICANN Fellow.

Peter Lamantia: HI, I'm Peter Lamantia, part of .club, a New gTLD applicant.

Amanda Fesengdon:	I'm Amanda Fesengdon and work with [Brett Fausett] on a variety of new TLDs.
Female:	(inaudible) from China. We are applying for gTLD.
Joseph Choo:	Joseph Choo from CentraNIC, we're helping out to [conserve] gTLDs.
Philip [Wergler]:	Philip [Wergler] from Switzerland DNS [NET].
Avri Doria:	Thank you. So I welcome the working group members, I welcome the Fellows and I welcome all the applicants.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	There are some now.
Avri Doria:	Yes, more and more all the time I understand. Okay, so I guess getting back to now, the objection process, obviously there's, as was explained, there's the two parts of the process. It's not meant to be threatening to applicants, but it is meant to basically deal with any issues in terms of the At-Large or ALAC community and in terms of the public interest. So I actually guess I'd like to open it up now to any discussion or questions that people might have about the process, especially to those from ALAC who will be voting on the process.

I'm assuming that you all have got it, I apologize for not having it on the screen, it's coming up. But what you'll find when you see it, and it is available and somebody can probably put up the URL. It not only is explained in words, but it actually is flow charted, on a week by week basis, what will be going on; how it will be reviewed internally and so on. So it really is quite an involved process to get it out. It's certainly not something where there any intention to make it easy to do.

So I'd actually like to open it up to questions now. Alan, could you turn off your microphone? Thank you. There are no questions on it; no one would like to ask anything? Because if not, I'll move on to the next topic.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [If it] actually came up.

Avri Doria: Huh? That's true, if it came up. Yes?

Male: Excuse me? Could you just go through the timeline where you can submit?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is the flowchart actually going to come up or is it?

Female: It's on its way.

Avri Doria: Yeah, okay.   So then we can just quickly go through the flowcharts.

[background conversation]

Avri Doria: At which point Dev, I will turn the microphone back over to you to go through the flowcharts.

[background conversation]

Avri Doria: Yes please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Really just a matter of filibusting I suspect, but it's kind of important to not have too much dead air in a transcript. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I think when you do see the flowchart, what's important to note is that what we have designed in our work group for the At-Large community, recognizing this is global and five regions and from the edges type stuff, is going to be markedly different to what as applicants you're going to see, I suspect, with an early warning system out of the GAC. We are a very, very transparent process here. Names will go up onto a list if they have been raised. It's that sort of – "and then in the next weeks, the following things happen." So you'll find it is in a goldfish bowl is what's important to recognize.

                                We're trying very hard, and I apologize that Oliver Crépin-Leblond, who is the current Chair of ALAC and a very active work group member here, has been liaising very closely with the tick team

and people in the ICANN staff who are building the tool for the GAC. I do know he has seen it and I do know he thinks as a discussion point for us at a future meeting, it will be on our agenda. But it's just one of those very different ways of approaching things, where with the system of how the GAC, as I understand it, is going to do it, you really will know at the end of the 60 days. Where here, in the process we have, Wiki based; absolutely open to anyone in the known universe, you will be able to track if indeed anything has been raised with relating to your name.

And I think that should give you a small measure of comfort. But it is the way At-Large and ALAC do things. We live in a goldfish bowl, and we're going to certainly walk the walk and talk the talk here. Not sure how much more filibusting I can do with this.

Avri Doria: Okay. It's coming up at the moment. I'd like to point out to anyone that is in the Adobe Connect, I won't ask you to try and read that, but basically you can…

[background conversation]

Avri Doria: So first of all, anybody that is on there, and perhaps somebody can turn that into a friendly URL as well. And then so sorry this is…actually you could almost pull it up that way. Oh goodie. Okay, so go to the figures.

Female:	Sorry, those participating remotely will just need to click on the link and look at the document at home; we've now brought it up on the screen here in the meeting room. Thank you.

Avri Doria:	So, as the index in the front shows, that first there's an introduction, there's a summary, explanatory notes, and then actually the figures. So at this point, I recommend going to the figures and just basically looking through them quickly; it's a few pages down. Stop! Okay. So Dev, if you'd like to basically talk people through this.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Okay, well figure one shows the summary of activities that happens before the start of the application comment period. The idea being that there is a New gTLD Review Group and that gTLD Review Group has a certain task. The gTLD Review Group is tasked with receiving comments from At-Large, either directly via email or by participating in various RALO conference calls, and we'll be updating the gTLD Wiki comment pages. And every week we'll be giving a status update, of comments received each week, to the various At-Large mailing list, and informing the RALOs of any upcoming deadlines. For example, the 60 application comment period.
	So this describes what happens at the start of the application comment period, meaning that the review group has to be formed and ready to go from day zero. So when it starts ICANN is going to publish all the applications on May 1st, and then the review group updates the Wiki with a list of all the applicant strengths and a link to the PDF of the application itself that ICANN has released. So that's how it happens in the first week.

Now, on figure two, which is up to week four of the application comment period, essentially comments are received from At-Large, the review group will then update the Wiki comment pages if it needs to. The idea being instead of trying to, well we don't know how many applications, but instead of creating possible dozens or even hundreds of application Wiki pages, the idea is that once somebody submits a comment for the first time a Wiki page is then created. And that's an ongoing process within those first four weeks.

So at the end of the fourth week there's going to be a conference call and the conference call will look at all of the comments received so far. So, figure three, which is week five of the application comment period, the review group gives an update again, and then a conference call takes place between the New gTLD Working Group and the review group and it's held to review the comments that have been received. And for each applied for gTLD string that has a comment page, the decision is taken whether to draft a formal comment for possible ALAC approval. And if that's the case, then a person or persons as assigned will then draft a comment. And then the gTLD Review Group will then update the status of the decision made, on the gTLD application dashboard.

The concept behind the dashboard is that it gives an overview of all the comments received on all the individual Wiki pages so that it will be like a snapshot showing which applied for string has received the most comments. So, next figure which is figure four, which is week six and seven of the application comment period, the persons responsible for drafting the formal comments updates the appropriate Wiki page with the draft comment and – sorry, I need to just zoom up here. Okay.

So the persons responsible for drafting formal comments will then update the appropriate Wiki page, and that happens during week six and seven. And of course, during that time still, the review group keeps updating the At-Large mailing list on any new comments received and so forth. So then the next figure which is figure five, which is the week eight of the application comment period, and that's the last week or the application comment period, the persons responsible for drafting formal comments will then update it with a final comment for ALAC review.

The ALAC then, well through a five day online vote, or maybe they have a conference call, depending on the number of comments it receives, could then have a conference call and then deal with it on the conference call. And for those statements approved, accepted by ALAC, ALAC will then submit it to the gTLD public comment forum. And if for some reason any comments are not approved by ALAC, the individual ALSes and/or RALOs can of course submit the comments directly themselves.

So that's what happens after week eight. So after that, figure six, which will be the third and fourth months of the objection period, that means there are five months left, the gTLD Review Group keeps giving status updates, and for the next two months nothing really happens. It's just accepting comments on possible objections that could be raised on community or limited public interest grounds. So figure seven, which is the fifth month, a conference call is then held between the gTLD Working Group and review group and they review all the objection comments for each applied for string that has a comment page on objection grounds. The decision is then taken whether to draft a formal objection statement for RALOs approval to give advice to ALAC. An ad hoc working group is then assigned.

Then figure eight, after updating the Wiki pages and so forth in figure eight, which is the sixth month, two months left, the ad hoc working group will then publish a first draft of the objection statement to comments and so forth. And then by the end of the sixth month, the ad hoc working group will then publish a final objection statement ready for RALOs to review. So in the last flowchart, yes there's an end to this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Like all good pregnancies really, it eventually comes to an end.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes. Figure nine, which is the seventh and last month for filing an objection, each of the RALOs then votes on the complete objection statements, and again, this is in a statement in a form ready to send to a dispute resolution service provider. So once three or more RALOs vote to send advice to ALAC to consider the objection statement to the gTLD applied for string or application, the ALAC then votes whether to accept the advice of the three RALOs, or more. And then if ALAC votes yes, then in coordination with ICANN, because the fee has to be paid, the objection statement is then filed with the appropriate dispute resolution service provider. That's it.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much, both for having done all the work to design this and for talking us through it yet again, something you've doen many times. So, it is not a nine month period, it's a seven month gestation for objection. Okay. But anyhow you wanted to make a comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I just wanted to draw, because we have an opportunity to talk to people who haven't been living and breathing this every week as we have every week for a very long time now, what you'll see is a number of opportunities there ensuring it is wide community base that brings such an objection through. And unlike other systems that may have been mooted or might be thought about, what we don't have in this model is a single objection getting carried through a process without an awful lot of due diligence. And it has to gain practically, well literally three out of the five regions support, that's a good piece of the globe, before it even gets up to the ALAC.
	So I think we need to keep that in mind, this is not knee-jerk reaction exercise; this is seriously, laboriously considered stuff. And there's a lot of opportunity for input along the way. Thank you Avri.
Avri Doria:	Thank you. And you all probably also noticed, with it all being very, very public, there will be many chances for people to communicate with others about "wait a second, why did you say that." So I'd like to open if there are any questions at the moment on this process and on its details; I've already gone beyond it on the schedule that I planned to, but that's okay because in some ways of the three issues we have, this is one of the two most important. So, any comments or questions before closing this section of the agenda. Please could you speak into the microphone simply for the people that are remote.
Male:	I just wanted to clarify, just so I understand, you need to object within four weeks of the opening, is that correct?

Avri Doria:	No. We need to file a comment within the first 60 days. We need the object within the first seven months.
Male:	So someone could object six months out on a gTLD app?
Avri Doria:	Theoretically, yes. I mean someone – using the word "objection" in two senses. One, there's an individual starting the objection process within At-Large and ALAC. the objection would only come from ALAC at the end of the seven months. But anyone could introduce an objection theme, as it were, into the system at four months. Propose an objection is probably a better way to put it. Thank you.
Male:	Thank you.
Evan Leibovitch:	But given the speed of the process going through ALAC, I don't think an external person or organization could come to ALAC with one month remaining saying "You've got to run this through," after it's six months in.
Avri Doria:	No. In fact, my expectation is that for the most part, the things objected too will have been commented on. There's not a strict rule saying it must be that way, but my expectation is that you're going to have commented early if you want to start the whole objection process. Any other questions? Yes, please. Give your name, please.

Hong Xue: My name is Hong Xue. I'm a member of APRALO and a member
                    of the working group. It just strikes me that new information
                    about independent objector. In the morning session we've been
                    learning from the staff that independent objector, the IO, will be
                    taking care of the defensive registration for trademark holders.
                    So in addition to community based objection and limited public
                    interest objection, there's a third category very interestingly
                    mentioned by staff in the morning. So I wonder, well first of all I
                    need a clarification of whether the OI objection and ALAC
                    objection are two different processes?

Avri Doria: Yes they are two different objection processes.

Hong Xue: Okay. Oh that's very good. So the second one is whether we're
                    going to take care of the third category as well? Of course I have
                    no preference for that.

Avri Doria: No. In terms of the application guidebook, while in the first 60
                    days of comment At-Large and everybody else in the world can
                    comment on absolutely anything. In the objection process, ALAC
                    has only been given charge to comment on two areas, at least two
                    areas they've been given standing where ICANN will pay. I am
                    sure that ALAC could decide to file on another objection on its
                    own if it came up with its own money, but that's not been defined
                    as within At-Large and it certainly out of scope for this process.
                    Any other questions?

EN

Alex Stamos:	Excuse me, maybe it's clear and I'm missing it…
Avri Doria:	Could you give your name again for the record?
Alex Stamos:	Alex Stamos. What is the mechanism by which the gTLD applicant responds to the objections? Is that via the Wiki or is there an out of band mechanism for that?
Avri Doria:	That, responding to objections is defined in the application guidebook once all the objections have been filed, ICANN publishes all the objections, then each of the objection providers will come to the applicant saying "An objection has been filed on your application. Here's the stuff of the application. You have 30 days to respond."
Alex Stamos:	So it's all through the TAS then, there's no mechanism for the gTLD applicant to then participate before the objection makes it through all that?
Avri Doria:	Formally, no. Informally, everything is published. Everything is available. So as opposed to you not knowing that an objection is wending its way towards you, you'll be able to watch its process all the way through and basically interact. But there's no formal mechanism.
Alex Stamos:	Assuming you watch every At-Large group.

EN

Avri Doria: You can just watch the dashboard. But yes, if I were in a company I might assign somebody to look at it once a week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry Avri, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. It's a technical point. I just wanted to make it very clear to people who are unfamiliar with Wiki's, it is a simple system of selecting the page and it will auto email you any update time at any time.

Alex Stamos: I know how a Wiki works, I'm just saying like the interesting thing is that you have this big process by which you could start all this conversation over perhaps even just a misunderstanding of what somebody wrote. There seems to be no formal notification mechanism that you've been targeted and I think you want to make sure you have a system here where you don't have an arms race where people applying for the same thing go to put their friends and cronies and such into the At-Larges to make problems, because it should be for real objections from independent folks, not for you know.

Avri Doria: I think you're going to have that issue with just about every objection. I'm assuming that the At-Large group, this group when it's looking at them, will take those kinds of things into account. I'm assuming on the Wiki you'll be able to comment on things you see and say "Wait a second, this…." So there's going to be information. The scaling of this whole process is mind boggling to all of us. Okay so I had yes, make sure you give your…

EN

Andrew Mack: Sure, Andrew Mack for the record. So the question that I'm hearing actually that you're saying is "okay so what happens if there is an objection" or "if there looks as if there will be an objection; it's starting to go through that process"; I think once is gets all the way through then you have to respond, per the terms of the guidebook. But in the interim stages while it's wending its way through, do we have a mechanism for you to respond that's more than informal, and would it be possible for someone who's made an objection, as part of this process to withdraw it then, assuming that you've had a good conversation with them and sorted out anything that might be a misunderstanding. Do we have that?

Avri Doria: The whole thing is very open and interactive, so that information would be captured; that information would be brought into the conversations with the working group and they would take that into account.

Andrew Mack: I guess my point is, my question is, I hope that we have enough flexibility in our system such that if you've actually resolved the question that got the objection started, that it doesn't continue to lurk in the system. Make sense?

Avri Doria: Well but I don't think that there's a – and I don't really want to go too far down this road, but if for example, and I would not think of accusing anyone of anything, if I get you to withdraw your objection by giving you a big chunk of money, but the people who are judging the objections decide that there's merit to it, the fact that you put it in the system, it's in the system. It's there then for the At-Large group to look at and say "does this have merit," it

doesn't matter who it came from within the At-Large system; it's there. So getting that person to say "I don't care anymore," that probably is significant, but not necessarily. Yes Alan.

Alan Greenberg: A couple of points. I'm assuming that once a formal objection is launched, whether it's from ALAC or an individual company who thinks you're violating their rights or whatever, you will be notified. I'm assuming the ICANN process allows for that.

Avri Doria: As soon as they're filed. There's two notifications, as soon as they're filed they're notified and once ICANN has collated them all, then you get a formal notification, but they might be batched into groups, but yes.

Alan Greenberg: ALAC was granted the right to make objections. We were asked to document the process; we are in the process of doing that. We are under no obligation to do this in a birdcage with everything visible at every step along the way, we have chosen to. So it's about as visible as any of the objection processes you can imagine. Clearly if you chose to interact with us and give some reason why the objection is not valid, we have set a very high target for putting an objection through. It has to be deemed to be objectionable, if that's the right word, by I believe three of our five RALOs, and that's a pretty hard target because they're each going to look at it independently.

So, if something gets to the point where you have not been able to convince at least three of the RALOs that there is no reason for objection then the objection may well go through. I don't think within the ICANN process there is any mechanism for withdrawing

EN

an objection once it's there. Clearly you can present more documentation to it or whatever. And clearly if it's an objection over trademark rights and the two of you come to a deal to split the proceeds, no one is going to stop you from doing that.

Avri Doria: I've got Cintra and then I want to cut this discussion at this point because we are getting closer and closer to the weeds and details. You had one more? Okay, so then you'll be last after Cintra, because I wanted to give at least 10 minutes to the other topic.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, thank you Avri. This is Cintra Sooknanan. Certainly this process is just based on the applicant guidebook and nothing is stopping any TLD applicant from building in their own systems to ask the community to flag objections and also to kind of reach some kind of agreement or start their own investigations. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And the last word on this?

Hong Xue: Okay, since we're talking about responses.

Avri Doria: Hong, give your name again please, for the record.

Hong Xue: Oh, Hong Xue. Since we're talking about responses it seems we're not talking about the same things. Actually we need to separate the two different processes. Once an objection has been raised

we will enter it into the objection and dispute resolution procedure. In that case, ALAC is the complainant and the other party is respondent. Of course in that procedure there's a very detailed procedural requirement for information communication. Of course the respondent will be notified and they should file a defense. The issue here is that before an objection was filed, as I said, is there any procedure currently in our flowchart for the potential respondent to respond to the comments raised from At-Large community? That will be interesting.

Avri Doria: The Wiki is going to be open to comments and they'll be able to respond to whatever has been put into the Wiki and other comments with their own comments. Okay, so I'm sure – and we'll be continuing to discuss this forever. We will. The group will have to do it. Okay, I want to move on to the other one, I already am going to apologize to Cintra at first, because we're probably not going to get to the third item on the list. The second item on the list is the Applicant Support Program. And basically I want to get to this one for two reasons.

One is, one of the issues that we've had with the applicant support is a real fear that outreach to the edges, outreach to the people who aren't here, outreach to your communities around the world is not happening. And there are only four weeks left, all things being equal, there are only four weeks left in the application process. And the application support process and the fee reductions for people in that process are a rather good opportunity for communities, so I basically want to make sure that people know about it and they actually do outreach.

And it may even be for some of you who are aggregators of many applications to look at some of the people that you've maybe thought of and they can't really afford it to realize that perhaps

there is a way that they can afford it using the Application Support Program, as long as they meet all the criteria that have been phased. So that and of course, if you happen to be from a community or know a community or know a small community that deserves to go for it, to please make sure they have it.

The other thing is the work is being set up for the SARP, which is the Support Applicant Review Panel, which is basically looking for experienced community members. When we're looking for experienced community member, we're looking for experienced members that understand the economics of both developing economies and of running a TLD. We're looking for experienced community members who know how to game the system and recognize when somebody is gaming the system. Because who else understand gaming the system in ICANN better than us? So we need to be on the panel to sort of say "Hey good idea, but no."

And the SARP is looking for many skills – for economic skills, for technical skills, for people that are willing to put a little bit of their time into helping review the applicants. Obviously if you're helping an applicant apply for one, well then that's probably not appropriate. But if you've got a lot of experience, and you must because you're here, you must because you're applying for a TLD, and if you've got development region experience, all the better. Please be sure that you apply for the SARP by March 31st so that there's a wide pool.

I understand that the pool at the moment is not as big, and especially since most of us that were in the JAS that came up with the processes are not applying for it because there's sort of "Well you don't establish a process and then become the one to administer it." So we're staying away. We're obviously the ones that were most interested. We spent a year or so trying to create the thing. So I just wanted to get that on. I've got a few minutes

for people to ask questions or comment on that. Oh, something else?

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Sorry, Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the transcript and sorry I missed most of the meeting, but I was busy in another room. Just a question for the process with regards to the objections procedure, which report you have actually supplied. I asked you by email of the actual timeline. I understand the timeline is in the document itself, however, what I needed to know was the timeline of the ALAC vote that you needed, when was the latest time you would be able to get an ALAC vote in order to be able to follow our timeline in time?

Avri Doria: This week? Basically we submitted it to you with the understanding that if we got it in by the beginning of this week we might be able to get a vote. The sooner we start the better.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So it's on the record, so the vote will take place in our wrap-up session.

Avri Doria: Sorry, I didn't know that that's what you meant by timeline. I thought you were talking about the whole timeline of this thing.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: No, no it was just to make sure this is on record and we know where we're going. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Avri. Tijani, for the record. Avri? Okay so, Avri spoke about the outreach; it's a very, very important point and I am afraid we are losing the point because time is almost out; it's finished. But we need the outreach. We need it for two main reasons. The first one is to anchorage the possible applicants from developing economies to apply them to apply for New gTLDs because there is this possibility of support, and to make them aware of this program to make use of it.

The second main reason is that on the SARP, we have all the interest to have people from those regions to be on the SARP. And they will not be on the SARP if they don't know about it. So the outreach is something which is very important. What is done now is more or less online outreach. It is not enough for those countries, for those regions. We need events there where we have people from ICANN, high level people from ICANN who advertise more or less this program and those opportunities. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Cintra you had something that you were – I was divided in too many places and didn't understand what you wanted to say, so please.

[background conversation]

Avri Doria:	Okay, yes please.

Andrew Mack:	This is Andrew for the record. I want to go on record as having said something that's come up in our conversations many, many times which is that I found the outreach efforts by ICANN as a whole pretty disappointing considering how important this issue is and how difficult it is to reach this population. We know that this is a group of people that is going to be harder to reach, they're not going to be coming here and yet this is in many ways for me, a real testament to how serious ICANN is about reaching out to emerging markets and how serious they are about reaching out to underserved languages and communities. So I hope that we will continue to stand strong on that and push them. This issue is not going to go away. There will hopefully be additional efforts and ongoing efforts in other rounds even. So that's item number one.

On a very practical basis, let's say we got someone tomorrow, is there enough time for them to make use of the services to get an application in? I don't know. But I do think that we, as members of this group and as members of the JAS, have to think long and hard about what we're going to say when the application window closes. Because we put in a lot of real serious lot of time and a lot of good honest effort, and to see so little come up and see so little of it in the press is very disappointing, I'll be honest.

Avri Doria:	Two points on that. One is, yes. I think because if you look at the other part of the JAS proposal, which is "There are people" and there are people who are willing to help them write applications. Among the people in this room I'm sure there are people who

have written enough applications and have answered questions 18, 20, 28, and 29 which are the ones that are really individual, enough times to be able to help somebody put one together quickly.

On the outreach, I just want to add one extra point was outreach on the program in general, not just the JAS part, was horrible. If there had been good global outreach on the program…

Andrew Mack: Especially in emerging markets.

Avri Doria: Especially in emerging markets on the program in general telling them about this extra feature and this extra program would have been relatively easy. I'll come back to you as probably among the last comments.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you Avri. I just wanted to say that outreach has been poor in this program, but ICANN staff have come up with a lapel pin, which Avri is wearing at the moment.

Avri Doria: That's what you were trying to say!

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes. As well as you've seen these QR codes around the venue. If you scan that it will send you straight to the applicant support program page. So that's a mechanism of outreach.

Male: It's a combat medal.

Avri Doria: And are there more of them?

Female: Absolutely, let me go get some.

Avri Doria: So perhaps everybody in this room…

Male: Cintra it's not a pin it's a combat medal.

Avri Doria: Can get one and point people to the websites, point people to whatever. And those of you that are experienced at applications, please help. Anything else before this meeting closes, and I apologize, the third item on the thing really is much more going to be, it's Cintra's point, but it's much more going to be part as the rollout really begins. At the moment there was sort of looking forward to problems, but haven't really, because this objection process and the applicant support are really far more important to get done at this point than worrying about what went right, what went wrong and what's not going right in the rollout. Yes, you wanted to…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Only to finish this to say that this work group continues its work, and like all ALAC work groups everything is transparent, everything is transcribed – three languages, audio, you can turn

up to the meetings. It's up to the Chair whether you get to speak, but there is a lot of opportunity to be engaged.

Avri Doria: Oh yeah there was one other thing for the working group members that was on our agenda that we didn't get to, which is figuring out the time of the meetings we've been rotating. It's not comfortable. It is comfortable. We have to talk about times, but we'll do that on the list. It was on the agenda, but we're not getting there. Anyway, anyone else have anything? I thank you all for coming. I thank you all for dealing with my confusions at the beginning and everything else. I thank the members of the working group for keeping me on line. And thank you and good luck both to the applicants and to those who aren't quite applicants yet but need to be. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]