EN

BEIJING – At-Large New gTLD Working Group Meeting
Wednesday, April 10, 2013 – 11:00 to 12:30
ICANN – Beijing, People's Republic of China

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Okay. Welcome. Hopefully a few more people will show up, but welcome to this. I apologize up front if I'm flakier than normal. I've been on three panels already today and this is my last thing that I have to do during this week. Everything else I get to just listen, observe, and be obnoxious. If I'm worse than normal…

So anyhow, getting right to it, we have basically three things on our agenda. The first one is a SARP review. As most of you know, but just to put it on the record, the Joint Applicant Support Group was sort of the first part that put together the recommendations. It then had formed a small group that worked with the staff and the board when they were first implementing or coming up with the implementation – the Joint Applicant Support Group (or JAS as it's known). Although we were in another meeting earlier today that was being translated to the Chinese and we kept talking about JAS without ever having explained what JAS was. I can't imagine how they translated. But in any case, especially when we use acronyms that sound like real words.

This group basically is the inheritor. This group was formed largely out of people who had been members of the JAS group. So I've asked both Karla who was the predominant staff person on that group, but also Christine Willett who is now responsible for its results and whatever comes after to come.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

We had questions about how it worked. We had a person on the SARP who was there to sort of represent. The policy recommendation had gone through, but unfortunately she was either gagged or felt gagged – felt unable – to report on anything. We have been asking for a while as to, who was even on it? And we were told that we couldn't know that.

So I'm hoping that with this having ended now we can sort of find out who was on it, find out something about how it worked. Also, I think very important for us – and that discussion may continue beyond today – is we're hoping that we can build on this for the future so that next time we'll be able to advertise that we're having a Support Applicant Program before we even start to advertise that we're having the applications so that we can actually achieve the goals we had for JAS and Joint Applicant Support, which was to get a lot more developing economy applicants and to have people know about the fact that they can get financial aid early enough in the planning procedure to be able to actually apply.

So, Karla, if you can take those questions and tell us a story.

KARLA VALENTE: Oh, I have to remember the questions. Okay.

AVRI DORIA: I can repeat them.

KARLA VALENTE: My name is Karla Valente. I'm with ICANN staff. Thank you for having me here today. I was the staff person that supported the JAS Working

Group that was responsible for basically the foundation of what is today the Applicant Support Program.

We have only three applications. One was approved and two were not. I'm not able to speak details about approvals and non-approvals for these reasons. We did have a very qualified panel. We had about 80 applications, and for some time we waited to see how many applicants we would get. We didn't really get that many applicants. One of the issues that Avri and others have been talking about, which is outreach – how much more outreach in the future should we do and how can we improve that in order to really have a significant number of applicants taking advantage of the Applicant Support Program?

The outreach and all the communication activities for that program, they came to play very late. There were many reasons why this happened. It's not a place to rewind now. But there's obviously improvement that can happen on that side of the program.

We had a very good and qualified panel. One of the things that we told the community is that we would tell the names of the panelists after the Applicant Support Program results were communicated to the applicants, and later to the community, and we haven't done that yet. So sorry for that.

I can say the chair of that panel is one of the community members here and he's around, which is Zahid. But the names of the other panelists, I don't have right now with me all of the names and the titles. But we should make something public soon so you'll know exactly who they are. I think – I hope – that you will be as impressed as I was with the quality of the panelists that we had.

The way we structured the evaluation is that we had the panelists and the panelists had a chair. Then there was a company – a consulting company – that worked with us that kind of intermediated the work between ICANN and the panelists. Then we had also the community member representative – Cintra – that is unfortunately not here, and she was an observer in the process. She was not voting, but she was observing the process.

So we tried to make as robust as possible the process of the evaluation as we had. One of the things, Avri, you asked me yesterday is, "What are the things that we learned from this evaluation process and we can improve in the future?" I'm not quite prepared to tell you all of the things. I didn't come prepared for that, because I would like to have an opportunity to revisit some of the feedback we got from the consulting companies, some of the feedback we got from the chair and the SARP members and also gather some of the feedback from Cintra and have all of this together and present to you in a more comprehensive and organized way what kind of things could or should be done for this program to be improved.

There were some points that were made about having a clear evaluation criteria – some of the things that we have there that were really borrowed from or taken from the final report for the JAS Working Group. They were broad in terms of the way they were proposed. There was an explanation of some of those thoughts on the final report and previous reports, but maybe we should – there are some things that we could do to even further clarity that for the evaluators in the future.

It took the evaluators a bit longer than what we thought it would take, so this is one of the lessons learned, in my opinion, to be careful in the future when we have more applicants, how much time we're actually going to ask the evaluators to educate and how many evaluators or how many different panels we need to take into account because of the timing.

They did very comprehensive work in terms of discussing item by item and everything, but it took much longer than we originally anticipated. This is one of the things we have to look for in the future.

My suggestion, Avri, is to have another meeting when you can and have a more prepared feedback with more [inaudible], basically. Just more prepared for that.

AVRI DORIA: It's unfortunate that we couldn't have done that here, because there really is a lot of curiosity still and I think there's a little bit of not understanding, for example, why even after all the decision, we still can't know the names or don't know the names. I think a lot of people have come up – unfortunately, there's not that many here. But a lot of people have come up with that curiosity. Somehow it's ended up feeling a lot more secretive than we thought it would.

Certainly we knew that the details about the applicants would be kept confidential, but somehow the whole process seems to have been wrapped in very much a cloud of secrecy. So I'm wondering, how long would it take? Because I'm certainly willing to devote an entire one of

our meetings to a discussion and analysis of the SARP whenever you feel that it's time to do that.

KARLA VALENTE: So in relation to the release of the names, it took some time for the release of the results being given to the applicants and made public. We discussed that with the SARP members and discussed that internally. We all came to a consensus that it would be better to release the names only after the results were out just to prevent any kind of [lobbying] or any kind of issues with the SARP members.

It was more of a protection of the SARP members and protection of the program that it would be secrecy. There was not intent absolutely in terms of secrecy. Because if you look at the evaluators for the New gTLD program, the individuals are shielded by the companies. [inaudible]. This company is doing that. The individuals themselves that are doing the evaluation are shielded.

In the SARP, they were individual volunteers. We had them using the same code of conduct that all of the evaluators for the New gTLD program were required to use. So that was the only reason why the names were not given up to the time that the results were made public. After that it's just an internal delay that we need to just address.

AVRI DORIA: First of all, I'm supposed to remind myself and others that I'm supposed to say my name first. This is Avri Doria speaking. One other question I had was, when do you think it would be time to actually have the larger broader discussion? How soon do you think that would be possible?

KARLA VALENTE: I don't know. When do you have your next meeting?

AVRI DORIA: We have our next meeting probably within a month, and that would be good enough?

KARLA VALENTE: Yeah. I would need to talk to Cintra and Zahid to prepare with them, but I think one month looks like…

AVRI DORIA: We can try to invite the two of them to the meeting.

KARLA VALENTE: I think it would be [inaudible].

AVRI DORIA: I invited Cintra to this one. I didn't really know to invite Zahid to it.

KARLA VALENTE: And for the record, Cintra was not GAC, but she understood the rules in terms of the release of the names and everything.

AVRI DORIA: Whenever I spoke to her, she said, "I can't say anything. I'm not allowed to say anything. I musn't say anything." So I had the feeling she couldn't even really tell us how the process was going. So perhaps she didn't quite— I think it would be good to have a broader conversation.

EN

I had Izumi and then I had Olivier.

IZUMI AIZU: My name is Izumi Aizu. I have applied – well, volunteered – to be a member of the SARP and received some e-mails, "Sorry, you were not chosen." That's fine.

But in addition to the names of the selected or real SARP members, may I ask, first of all, how many have applied for and how many were chosen?

KARLA VALENTE: My recollection is about 80 applications. I will get back to you with the exact number. But it was about 80 individuals from all over the world, all different backgrounds within what we asked well-qualified backgrounds. We ended up only having five, because the number of applicants was not very high. But we were prepared to have a much higher number of SARP members if we had higher numbers of applicants.

IZUMI AIZU: If I may, I'm not too sure if other applicants who fail to be chosen were ready or not. But I'm ready to be exposed and I'd rather like to see when, say, someone applied for, "Would you like to be listed at the same time the result is revealed?" or something like that for the transparency. Of course you can opt out. It could be shameful if you're not selected or you're deemed unqualified.

But that's one item perhaps to discuss, because for the next round, I see a little bit [inaudible] to NomCom, for example, that is the real [inaudible] of the judgment could be kept confidential – that's fine to a certain degree – but all the rest could be as much as transparent. And I even cannot really understand the one month delay of announcing the name, because March 12, the result was announced. I think you've got to be very careful to make the result announcement, so that the same carefulness can be applied at the same time – not after – to reveal the names. That gives much more credential. Even the application was revealed, the succeeded ones.

I'm sorry to make one more question, then I stop. The other day I made [inaudible] remarks that there were only three applications from the developing countries to the whole gTLD, it sounded like. But it's only for this special program.

Is there any ballpark figures or any understanding how many actually came to the New gTLD application out of 1,900 from the developing countries? Is it [inaudible]?

AVRI DORIA: Probably not as part of this segment, but certainly as part of our whole outreach. Probably part of the other part, some of the other work we're doing, certainly.

I have Olivier, Tijani, Yaovi. And I wanted to mention that Cintra, who was the observer in the group, has joined us. Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Avri. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond for the transcript record. There was a mention of the SARP panel member identities being given out. What is the process with regards to any reconsideration requests? Would the SARP have to look at any reconsideration requests again now that their identities have been divulged or not?

AVRI DORIA: And I see that Christine is coming to the table.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So reconsideration requests for any aspect of the program are presented to the ICANN board. They don't go back to the original panel for decision-making.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Next I have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Thank you, Avri. Tijani speaking. I have already talked to Karla and expressed my disappointment regarding the result of this work of two years, having calls twice a week to give this result, this JAS Working Group recommendations, and then having only three applications while we had money to support 14. Then from those three applicants, we have only one who is supported. It is a big disappointment for me, and I think for the whole community.

I will say the same. I am asking about any appeal. And we need it, because we have first to know why the others weren't supported. What

are the criteria that they failed to fulfill? And since we had only three applications, if the criteria – failed criteria – are not very important, why don't support them if they will improve the presence of developing countries on the net? So, a lot of questions like this. Transparency, sure, I understand. I asked Karla already in Toronto and she told me that they want to protect the SARP members. I understood it. And they never spoke about it.

I am not curious, Avri. I don't want to know the names of those people, only because I am curious. No. If we had the three applicants supported, I will not ask about the names. I will ask about the procedure – how it is done – so that we can improve the system if we need to improve it.

But now that only one is supported, I need to see those people and ask them. You don't imagine – I am from developing countries. You remember, Karla; and you remember, Avri, how strongly I fought to have this program for the developing countries succeed. So if at the end we have only one supported, it's a big, big disappointment.

So please give us as soon as possible the composition of the SARP, how the evaluation was done, what are the criteria that make those people fail so that we can understand. We can perhaps appeal the decision and we can improve the system after that. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Would you like to…?

KARLA VALENTE: Thank you for your comments, Tijani. I am also from a developing country and I share your disappointment on the number of applications we received. It's my personal view that one of the issues was the timing and the amount of outreach done. And this is something that is tangible and I believe it can be addressed in the future.

This program, like everything and anything that we do in operations, has room for improvement. Yes, we can improve some of the criteria. We can improve some of the process. When we make the names of the SARP members available, you will see that we – it's my personal opinion.

Again, I trust we had very qualified individuals that did a good job. And within the overall process, we do have a reconsideration process that can be used. So I would just be cautious to ask for any additional appeal or any kind of process at this point in time. If this is something that we want to take into account in the next phase and revisit something in the program, it's fine. But at this time, I'm not sure if it would serve the integrity of the program.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Yaovi, please.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Me, I'm not personally disappointed about the number of applications from developing countries, but I'm surprised, because when the JAS group was working, JAS wanted more funding to support more people, and at the end, only three applications. [inaudible] one decision could be [inaudible] let's give support to [inaudible] application. It was not the

case because I think it was a good decision to have equality, because doing the registry business is not something that's maybe easy.

So this brings us also to the general question, something that the Working Group is working on. That something is not working somewhere. Then the Working Group is working on it. You already answered my question that it is possible to have reconsideration.

What I [inaudible] reconsideration from – a request from – the applicant. If the answer is yes, well, that is what I wanted to know. Then the question is: was the criteria very clearly defined and then people applied? Did they understand clearly the criteria? Because it's very surprising.

Again, maybe the committee wanted to do good work. There are funds. There is money. But the point is not just to give people to run business, but to do a good business. My point is are people very, very well aware of the criteria before the application? If not the case, I think that needs to be considered for the future. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

KARLA VALENTE: Thank you for this. This is Karla Valente. We have – I forgot the name – financial handbook for the Applicant Support Program. In this financial handbook, you will have outlined all of the criteria that is used, and also you have a view of the forms that need to be filled out. And applicants

had a chance to ask. If they had some kind of a question, they had a chance to ask.

So everything was posted in advance. The same way is for the applicants that we have the applicant guidebook outlining the criteria and everything that was needed. We had the same for the Applicant Support Program.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. We have a question from the remote. Susie was going to read.

SUSIE JOHNSON: This is Susie Johnson. We have a question from Winfrey Yim and she states, "How can we obtain this updated mandate copy? Thanks."

AVRI DORIA: I'm not sure. By the mandate, does she mean the application instructions, which were indeed published and I think can be found on the applicant support Wiki pages or web pages.

KARLA VALENTE: Yeah. And for the record, the Applicant Support Program – the information about the program – is within the New gTLD micro-site. So even if you look at the search, you go to icann.org and search for "applicant support program", it will give you results that lead to that page.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I wanted to ask if Cintra would like to talk to us about her experiences and make any other comment.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: Thanks, Avri. Apologies for my late arrival. I have been pretty silent on this topic and strict adherence to the nondisclosure agreement.

AVRI DORIA: Can I interrupt one second?

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: Sure.

AVRI DORIA: Karla came to us for only 20 minutes and I just wanted to – so that she didn't get up and walk out and identified while you were speaking. Thank you.

KARLA VALENTE: Thank you for having me here, and I'm looking forward to talking to you in about a month.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Please, Cintra.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: I just want to share that I understand Tijani's concern, and in my opinion, the SARP panel itself was disappointed by the results and they

wanted to approve more of the applications, but they had strict guidelines to adhere to, and those guidelines, yes, it came from staff but it also came out of the JAS. We put in those protections to prevent [gaming] as well.

There were instances where maybe there would have been a vague criteria, so how to define certain terms and what threshold to use. And in those instances, they did request my input. I do believe I did serve the JAS in bringing in the spirit of our discussion over that two-year period.

I know it seems quite disappointing that only one of the applications were in fact approved, but in all fairness to the process, I do feel that they did act in the best interest of the procedure.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I have question for Izumi. But you just mentioned that they came to you for clarifications a lot. From your view, did that happen a lot? Were the instructions not very clear? And did you believe that it was a workable program that you were answering questions about while it was going on?

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: For the most part, I do think our criteria were clear, but some instances – for example, public interest. What is a public interest company, not-for-profit? That is something that is subjective and really something that required discussion and, really, they wanted to know what was the spirit of the JAS in putting those criteria in? So they didn't just rely on their opinion of what it should be.

So in my opinion, I would say there was – I mean, I do believe that the applications were dealt with efficiently. So I don't think that there was too much time discussing and going back to me. I do think that they did interpret the criteria along the lines we had hoped. And in the instances that they hadn't, I gave my opinion and they determined.

AVRI DORIA: Avri again. Thank you. I had Izumi. Anyone else that wants to speak to this, we also have a microphone for any of you that are participating from the white seats. But please, Izumi.

IZUMI AIZU: Thank you, Avri. I have two questions. First one is, as you said, SARP itself has been – or was – disappointed. Is there any plan for them to make a report or reflection of their own conduct? The NomCom is doing that. And of course, this is a first trial, so it can't be complete. Of course we can criticize you guys, but that's not fairly constructive unless the members who volunteered also seriously make good review of its own program. Whether they stay or not, it doesn't really matter and they may change. But I think in the spirit of whole [inaudible], I'd really like to encourage all these. I think they have a duty to do so as well.

The second one is a bit nitty-gritty. But there were two versions of the announcement on March 12th and March 20th as an update. The latter contains the criterias – four criteras – or [inaudible] which met this kind of breakdown of. Is there any explanation why it's a twofold announcement, if appropriate?

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Izumi. On the first question, I will certainly take an action item to go talk to Zahid, since we at least know his name on it at the moment and ask for such a report. I don't think we created any obligation to report. I understand the sort of normative feeling that there ought to be one, and I'll certainly go and talk to Zahid and ask for one.

I guess on the second one, I'd go to Christine.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you, Avri. Christine Willett here. Yes. I will also take back to Karla and the team the request for a summary report from the panel. There may already be documentations, so let me see if we have anything that the panel's already prepared.

In terms of the publication of the results, I took ownership of the program late in the game, but my team and I were responsible for publishing results. And the first publication had limited information about the criteria on which the applications were passed or did not meet the criteria of eligibility for the SARP panel.

We got requests. My team got requests from board members and from GAC members for more information about the rationale and results, and rather than publish information specifically to individual board members or GAC members, we wanted to put that additional information out for all to be available. So that was why the secondary updated announcement was posted, so that everyone had the same set of information.

AVRI DORIA:	Thank you. Izumi, [inaudible] follow up?
IZUMI AIZU:	Yeah.
AVRI DORIA:	Please.
IZUMI AIZU:	It would have been better for you and us if you could [inaudible] that kind of background information why you updated, because there's no real mention about that. Correct me if I'm wrong.
AVRI DORIA:	Thank you, Izumi. Olivier, please.
OLIVIER CRPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Avri. I wanted to echo the disappointment of my colleague, Tijani Ben Jemaa with regards to the uptake of the Applicant Support Program. I really don't believe it's an actual criticism of the program itself, nor of the SARP and the SARP's decision. It really has to do with the publicity and promotion of the program prior to it being – and during it being – in effect. But I also do realize that times are changing at ICANN. So I am looking forward to several things.
	First, in any future round, that there would be a lot more publicity for an Applicant Support Program. Second, I would also hope that both the Applicant Support Program itself, but also the way the SARP, as

operator, would be provided with a full review to see how we can do things better. Because obviously, if we do it again, let's do it better. There's always room for improvement. So that's all. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking. I don't see anyone else on it. Okay, please, come to the microphone, introduce yourself.

RENEE CHENG: Hi. This is Renee Cheng. I'm from Hong Kong. Actually, when I was reading this application, Applicant Support Handbook, I find that the scoring criterias – there are lots of point that requires a lot of clarification.

One of these was that there are three components that you use to measure whether this application is worthy of support or not. In the first component, which concerns with public interest. The fourth criteria has to do with measuring if you are from and benefitting a developing economy. You mentioned a list called the UN [Data] List of Developing Countries.

Actually I went to the UN Statistical Department official website, and it stated expressively that within the UN system, there is no such convention or any list that defines what is a developing country, and there are no hyperlinked PDF file or whatever that is contained in this document. So I'm really confused. Does that list really exist? And if it does, where it is.

AVRI DORIA: I know that, at a time, we did see the list. I'd have to check now and I don't know whether someone else can – there is such a list, but I don't have at my fingertips the URL and I haven't gone to the website in a long time to see whether it is actually linked properly. So it's probably something we should check on and confirm, because when the group was making the recommendations, it was one of the things we pointed to and did look at. We both had that list and we discussed the indigenous populations issue at the same time and a description.

I think that's something to be hunted down to find out why the link doesn't work and why the list isn't there. I assumed that we would have – is this something you're just seeing now or is this something you saw at the beginning when applications were being filed? Basically, what I'm asking is: is this something that, for example, stopped you from applying because you couldn't find such a list, or is this something that, looking in retrospect, you're going back and can't find it? I'm trying to understand whether it blocked you or whether it's just making it difficult to do follow-up research or something?

RENEE CHENG: Actually the reason why I'm concerned with this Applicant Support Program isn't because I'm trying to apply for any new gTLD string, but that we are actually on a program here in ICANN and we are a bunch of youth ambassadors and we'll be having a youth mock meeting on this issue, per se.

And therefore we are looking very closely into this handbook and we're trying to see things from our perspective and imagine what it would be like if we were actually trying to apply. And so far we find it very difficult

to actually get the list, first of all, because I know that it doesn't exist. Or if there is a list of developing countries, it is not within the UN system for sure.

Also, we actually tried with a lot of names that we imagined. We find that it's very difficult for an applicant to get anywhere near a high mark, if not just pass. In some criterias, if you get that one point, you will immediately lose another one point. I don't know if I would be safe to say that I personally think that this time you have only three applications, therefore you don't need to do a great deal of gradation. But imagine if you have like 100 applications and all of them scores barely pass and you cannot really compare them. You don't have very high mark, you don't have – I mean, the gradation cannot be achieved with this existing scoring criteria. That's the second point I would like to point out.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I really appreciate you adding all of that information, because in some sense, you answered my question. It is as if you were applying and I can't wait to see what comes out of this. I do think that – I really do believe that the list was there and I know you're certain that it's not, so therefore I'm really going to both look myself and ask someone from staff who was responsible for that to check further. And I see a hand up, so perhaps…

JAY WESTERDAL: Hi. Jay Westerdal. I just Googled for UN Developing Country List. It's the third link in Google. It's a PDF file on UN.org, so you're free to check it out. It's there. If you want to come up, you can look at it.

AVRI DORIA: So perhaps we need to fix the link in wherever it is linked wrong so that it can – just because people will be looking at this. We are putting out reports. We are saying we did this, we checked that, we had a program, so I think it's important that whoever can fix such links do fix such links. But thank you for the URL. But I still can't wait to see the – yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hi, everyone. [inaudible] from Hong Kong. I'm also the [inaudible], same as Renee. We are going to hold an ICANN meeting tomorrow on these issues. So my question is we found that there are only three applications on the first round of New gTLD programs, which is quite a low number. I just wonder, would it be possible that the reason is that the developing countries is not capable of handling our gTLD [inaudible] so they do not apply that? If so, would it be possible for us or should we refine the whole program, because it's just not the main focus, not about the [inaudible] you had mentioned before. It's about because developing countries are not capable of handling a gTLD top level domain. So that's my question.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. This is Avri speaking again. You're actually starting to lead into one of the other projects we have going on. Now, I would never let

myself be quoted as saying that a developing country could not handle a new gTLD and I don't think that's at all the case.

But this other project that we've got going in this group – The Outreach Evaluation and Recommendations – we're looking at the various reasons for why not only why there weren't more applications from developing countries and why there weren't more applications for applicant support.

Among the reasons that people have suggested was that they hadn't been an opportunity or an assistance in creating the necessary infrastructure so that people would have thought to apply or that there wasn't sufficient lead in for the bits of capacity increases that would've made people realize that this was something they could do and could want to do.

So there are a lot of reasons being explored. None of them are that. But perhaps as we go on in this project – and in this other project, the outreach evaluation and recommendation is something that we're just starting. And in fact, I'll be very curious to sort of bring in the output from your exercise later this week as part of the thought process behind that project. So you all may want to look at getting involved in that.

But I would never say it's because they couldn't. But perhaps the capacity, knowledge, interest, and time – all those things together – formed a complex that made it very difficult for someone to make that decision. Yes, Cintra. And then Rafik.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: I'd just like to extend what Avri is saying. Maybe there are auxiliary circumstances that make it difficult for an applicant. For instance, in some developing countries, it's difficult to register a not-for-profit company. So because of that, some applicants may not have gotten that point simply because the environment is not structured for the criteria that would have been set.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Avri. It's quite strange to be in this side. Can you hear me okay?

AVRI DORIA: And introduce yourself, even though I did call you Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Rafik Dammak from Tunisia. I was the co-chair in the JAS Working Group with my friend and colleague. I'm not active in your Working Group. Unfortunately I joined later. I want to ask about the timeline of your [inaudible]. I know that you are working on the evaluation of the outreach. I'm also just wondering if you are going to work in kind of a JAS recommendation. [inaudible] if you want to extend the recommendation or to evaluate.

Also the implementation of that program is not just what the JAS Working Group recommended. What you are planning exactly is not just about the outreach, because we had that discussion about the

limitation. It didn't work. So just to get ideas of what you are planning is not just to evaluate the outreach but to evaluate what was done as a recommendation in the JAS Working Group but also how it was implemented.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. Avri speaking again. I actually don't know the answer to your question. Certainly within the outreach evaluation and recommendations, I don't think actually evaluating the work of the JAS or the work of the SARP was included. SARP was certainly one of the things Applicant Support issues, is one of the things that's in our scope, and certainly we can talk about doing an evaluation. Is JAS, as a group, still open? And perhaps it's the JAS group itself that should be looking at the program and doing an evaluation between the GNSO and the ALAC in that joint group.

RAFIK DAMMAK: That's a good question, because it's not [disbanded] and it's up to the ALAC and GNSO to decide about the fate of the JAS Working Group. It's [inaudible] Working Group, but it would be good to know if it will extend its [mandate] or just we will do this evaluation. So maybe Olivier can reply to that.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking again. I personally think – and then I'm going to turn the microphone over to Evan – but I really think it is something for your group to consider whether you do want to continue and do the analysis. I would think it was in scope, but Evan, please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I honestly thought that that particular Working Group was sort of shut down after it did its job. I mean, that may not be the case, but since it was dual chartered, then we have the onerous issue of going back to the two groups that did the chartering and figuring out if they still both believed it was alive, and I probably think it would be a little less onerous if we just took it on here.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, Carlton, please.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you. Carlton Samuels for the record. I was co-chair of the JAS Working Group. What I can tell you is that the Working Group has [inaudible], as they say. It's not totally done, but to do an assessment of what the Working Group did would mean that the charter would have to be adjusted, and that is the issue. As you know, it's a joint working group, cross-community working group, between the GNSO and the ALAC and in order for us to do what co-chair Rafik Dammak is suggesting, it would require an adjustment in the charter. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I've got a person standing at the microphone. I've got then Cintra and then I've got a remote. So please, person at the microphone, please introduce yourself.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. I'm [inaudible]. I'm from [inaudible] .asia. I am from Hong Kong. I have a question about the section regarding the disqualification of

candidates. I'm aware that if they are disqualified, meaning that they did not meet some criteria, then they would be excluded from the new gTLD application.

And in my opinion, I feel that this is very discouraging for many of the developing countries, because if they enter the program and there's a high chance that they're disqualified and they can't even continue the application. Maybe they were willing to pay the full fee and they would not need the subsidy.

So I'm aware that this decision was to avoid gaming. I'm not sure if that actually exists, but I do feel that there is a possibility. But this level of discouragement, I feel that there should be other means to substitute. So I'm just wondering if there are alternatives to avoid gaming. Is that of the current practice? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I think that that would be a really good question for the review that either the JAS group would do or this group would do in terms of that. I think that was a very big issue we had in terms of how to prevent gaming. I remember that on that specific point, there was a very large difference of opinion in the community as to whether the staff on implementation had been an appropriate method. It was certainly not unanimous community support for the process as it was run. There was a mixed view.

So I think that that would be – obviously we can't do anything about any appeal s or what happened. But I think in terms of looking at what we

do next, I think that's a very important point for us to discuss further. We needed to stop gaming, but we didn't need to be punitive about it.

Sorry, I didn't get a chance to thank Christine Willett who came and spent her time. She had to go off to, I guess it was a board meeting, and I didn't want to interrupt the speaker to say goodbye to her and to thank her for having been here, but I just want to get that on our recording that I'm very appreciative of the time she gave us.

Then I had Cintra and then I had Tijani.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: Thank you. Cintra Sooknanan. I just wanted to say in particular to staff that the JAS recommendations, just one aspect of it was the SARP and the criteria. The JAS also recommended follow-up action in ensuring that applicants that were approved of financial support still maintained their status so as to continue to be beneficiaries of that support, so that a not-for-profit organization, for instance, would maintain not-for-profit status, not switch to for-profit once supported. This is an ongoing process, and in this respect, I do think the JAS still has a role to play.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Avri. I don't think that we can speak now about assessing or evaluating the work of the SARP or the evaluation process since we don't have any information about it. We know only the name of the

chair of the SARP and we know that only one applicant have been supported – have been approved for support.

So when we have all the information, then we can speak about [inaudible]. I think that we can do this evaluation through this Working Group through a [revised] and rechartered JAS Working Group through a cross-community Working Group where all the members of the JAS would be in, plus people from ccNSO, etc. So the most important thing is, first, have the information.

AVRI DORIA: I agree. I think I'm going to come close, unless there's someone that wants to speak to bringing this one to a close at the moment. I've talked to Karla. She's basically going to come back with a report. Oh, I've got a hand up. Okay. Let me finish what I'm saying and I'll go to the bottle waving.

One of the things is to extend the invitation to the members of the JAS group to attend that call, even though a lot of those are already in this group, but just to extend an invitation to the JAS group to participate when we do have that reporting. Yes, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Avri. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond for the transcript record. And I will accuse you of having tunnel vision, which is something that a participant develops usually on a Wednesday of an ICANN meeting, and it has happened to me on several occasions today as well. Before the [inaudible], there was a hand. Before the hand there was just… anyway.

I just wanted to be clear on the charter of the Joint Applicant Support Working Group. As my colleague, Carlton Samuels, who was a co-chair of the working group mentioned, the charter itself does not include any follow up on the work. So even though the JAS report might have stipulated that there should be a follow up, the working group itself is not chartered to pursue that follow up, and therefore both the ALAC and the GNSO Council, if they wish to do so, would have to either amend the charter or re-charter a new group. That's something which will probably have to be undertaken soon. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking again. I therefore request that the co-chairs of JAS, the two leaders of ALAC and GNSO, the liaison to this group and I'll even participate too, have a discussion about – I think it's apparent that somebody needs to do a follow up. So I think that's a discussion we need to have to figure out how that follow up is best done, etc.

I know Tijani recommended perhaps we go to a broader across community and start bringing in ccNSOs and everything else. Yeah, maybe. We need to talk about – I think it's obvious we need a follow up. How we do that follow up, who does that follow up, I think needs to be discussed. Yes, Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: And I've been making the point repeatedly that this can't be done in a vacuum, that we can take this along with the limited success of the objection procedure that received so few community objections. I think that there's an overall thing. I don't think doing it in a vacuum. This is

not just a matter of applicant support. It's not just a matter of how few objections we receive for consideration. There is a massive problem in either getting the word out where the people who are getting the word don't care. Both are problematic.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Though, I admit, I'm starting to worry about trying to boil the ocean. Yes, Izumi.

IZUMI AIZU: Thank you. In addition to my previous suggestion of asking [inaudible] the reflection of the evaluation team members, another perhaps suggestion is purely voluntary, not obligating or pressuring [inaudible] at all of their participation to this follow-up process, such as maybe we'll have another round of meeting like this, and either the chair plus anybody who wants to join the meeting in a very frank, candid manner. I do trust them [inaudible]. And if they are to stand to that – if I were chosen, for example, I'm ready to go and explain what we've done, what we cannot do and things like that. So that is perhaps a benefit [inaudible] I'd really suggest. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: So you're suggesting that I extend an invitation as we start to talk about this more to Zahid and that group? If I understand correctly. Okay, I will do that.

I will take the token of going around and trying to get people to work on how we do this follow up. I will look at it, as Evan suggests, in its

relationship to the outreach evaluation and recommendation and perhaps we'll have to change the name of that to something, because it's going beyond the issue of outreach, which means we would have to go back to the ALAC to have our charter reworked, but that's all good stuff that chairs and stuff are supposed to do. So that's fine. So I guess we'll follow up on that.

Just to get through the rest of the things on the agenda here. I think this was a great conversation. I appreciate all the things – and I really do look forward to seeing what you all do with it, because I think that will be fascinating. And I hope that after you've done that, you'll be willing to join us in conversations in terms of using what you've learned as contribution to what we do.

One of the things I see as most important in all this evaluation and review and whatever is what are we going to do for remediation. That word's not written anywhere, but that to me is really what this is all about. We had great intentions. We did a lot of work and it didn't come out in a way that makes anybody happy, so remediation for me is what this is all about in the long run. So I really look forward to it.

Okay. In terms of the outreach evaluation and recommendation – and who knows? Maybe we're in a good place because we're still at the beginning of that process. We talked about it. We had some initial work done in terms of trying to form theories about why there had been so few applicants from developing economies, why there had been so few applicants for applicant support. And then Evan brought in the additional issue, which expanded the notion which was – although I'm still not sure that ALAC has approved that expansion of why were there

so few objections brought through the At-Large process, that again was a process that we spent about a year putting together a process and then it didn't get used?

So there's many years of many people's work that went into these issues, went into these things, as Evan as said; and one of our projects has been looking at why these things didn't work and what were the issues? That project started out with a thing of doing some theory formation. I'm just trying to collect the ideas people had about why and then such, and then doing a review. That group is ongoing. That work is ongoing. We had a whole meeting this week to talk about that.

What I'd like to now do is actually turn the meeting to Dev, who basically was responsible as the leader of that review group, of the objection process, and ask him to do a little bit of a recap. And sort of similar to the discussion we've had on SARP, to sort of give us a firsthand analysis on that program. Was it workable? Did we have it right? And what do we do for the future?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you very much, Avri. Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. Well, there was a lot of activity towards the end of the deadlines for At-Large comments for consideration by the review group. First, since the Toronto meeting, the original deadline for comments was around mid-November 2012. At that time, though, ICANN was considering extending the objection period from January to March. This was undergoing a public comment period at the time having been announced just before the ICANN meeting in Toronto. It was undergoing a 30-day public comment period.

So the original deadline was extended, because at the Toronto meeting, we decided, okay, instead of having one month for us to review and analyze comments, we'll cut it down to two weeks to just give as much time as possible to anyone who wanted to raise any comments on objection grounds either on limited public interest or community objection grounds.

That deadline passed with no comments. The actual formal announcement from ICANN that the objection period was extended occurred around mid-December 2012. So the timeline was adjusted again, and a call for comment was reissued. The second call was reissued at just the beginning of the year in January 2013. The deadline for comments was the 15th or 16th of January.

Only at that time of January, there was only one person who requested that we keep the [inaudible] regarding .nyc – the application for .nyc. That page was created immediately. But he did not initially follow up.

However, coming to the deadline of the 15th or 16th of January 2013, we received several single comments. There were comments regarding .amazon. There were comments regarding – let me just pull up the list. There were comments regarding .patagona, there were comments regarding .cba, there was a comment on multiple strings by [inaudible] and there was a comment on .africa in addition to follow up comments on .nyc.

So when we first started to look at the comments, the comment regarding .africa was more of a comment of expressing support for an applicant. So there was no real objection concerns really raised, so that was taken care of. [inaudible] the comment on multiple strings by

[inaudible]. It was a comment regarding the New gTLD program as a whole, and it was referred to this working group.

In regards to .cba, which was an application by the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, the comment against that was regarding that the letters "CBA" is a well-known acronym for Córdoba in Argentina. The review group determined that given that the letters "CBA" is an acronym and that acronym had multiple meanings in many countries – we did a search and there were things like Canadian Bar Association, Chicago Basketball Association and so forth – then there was really no [limited] public interest or community objection grounds, and therefore no further consideration was taken.

The discussion then looked at the remaining strings: .amazon, .patagonia, and .nyc. Now, in the following week, which was around the 26th of January, there was a comment submitted by IMIA, the International Medical Informatics Association, regarding applicants for .health. The [inaudible] five applicants for .health. Four were applicants for the ASCII version of "health" and one was an IDN called [inaudible] – I don't know if I'm pronouncing it right. It was an IDN that was considered to be a translation to health or healthy according to the original comment. Given that that comment was submitted just before the review group conference call on that day, it was decided, okay, let's take on that comment and then let's evaluate for limited public interest or community objection grounds.

We determined that really there was no limited public interest grounds on either .patagonia, .amazon, .nyc, and .health. The concerns really came about regarding trying to figure out, well, what is a community in

terms of the community objection grounds? Just a reminder, that there's four. The community objection grounds have four tests for which a community objection can be sustained. There were community substantial oppositions targeting and detriment. The key thing was that all four tests had to be passed. If there's one test that could not be proven, then the application would not be sustained.

So there was a lot of discussion over two or three conference calls about is there a community for .amazon, is there a community for .patagonia, and what exactly [inaudible] substantial opposition? And the fact that given that there was only one comment regarding .amazon and .patagonia, and it was literally only a three-line comment, it was kind of very hard to figure out what to do.

So we reissued a call again to please submit comments on this, and we got more additional comments, on especially .patagonia. The person objecting to .nyc provided, I will say, a wealth of information regarding why – and he was trying to justify why a community objection could be sustained on those four grounds.

So we decided to rank. The way to move forward was to rank each of the four factors and the four criterion as specified in the Applicant Guidebook. So a table was put up and all review group members had to either pass or fail or say unknown for each of those four factors based on the information we had received – based on the discussions that we had on those calls.

And ultimately, just before the final submission, the .nyc stated that the applicant – the person objecting to .nyc, they had communicated with the applicant and the applicant had proposed a community board which

satisfied the objector's concerns. So that was no longer ranked or considered.

So when we finally ranked all the remaining strings – .amazon, .patagonia and the five application strings for .health – .amazon and .patagonia would pass the community and [inaudible] opposition. But in terms of the detriment for .amazon and .patagonia did not pass.

This also came into the discussion of what exactly was detriment. Is there a potential future detriment denying the string for the potential community there? Again, it was a lot of difficulty determining what was the "material" detriment. So in that case, .amazon and .patagonia were not passed.

Regarding the four applications for .health, the majority of the review group that filled out the form passed all four of the factors and four criteria, and therefore the decision was then taken to, okay, we'll now begin to draft the objection statement – five objection statements for all five applicants.

So once that started happened, it was a pretty intense schedule. It was about 9-10 meetings within a month. Sometimes two meetings, twice a week. We began drafting the objection statements on the four factors. This was eventually approved by the review group. Just to say, we used Google Docs and [inaudible] were picked based on their legal experience: Adela Danciu, Justine Chew, and Seth Reiss. And I have to say they really performed an outstanding job in trying to come up with that objection statement in such a short time. I believe it was literally done within 7-9 days and it was really tough, watching the clock

because we were running out of time because it was mid-February and the deadline for the objection was March 13th.

So once the objection statements were considered to be okay by the review group, it was then posted for the five RALOs. There was a conference call with the RALOs held. The RALOs had some substantial discussions, especially in the RALO. Well, APRALO. I should say some of the concerns – there were several concerns raised while these objection statements were being drafted. Once the announcement came out that objection statements would be drafted, we started receiving lots of e-mails from the applicants, and also several concerns were raised.

For example, why did [inaudible] object to .health and not other terms like health care and so forth, which potentially was seen as falling under that community potentially being targeted. All those questions were asked and the objector responded, and all of this community was all added to the Wiki near real-time, literally within several hours of it being received, in order to try to keep up with the information flow.

There was also a concern then raised regarding the IDN [inaudible] as to whether – well, if it is really a translation to healthy, then perhaps it should not have really been considered or grouped with these five objections, because healthy is a state of mind and state of body and not really something dealing with the health field, per se.

Now, but this is also disputed in that the characters for [inaudible] could also be looked at as a noun which is health, or as healthy. So there was a potential end user confusion in that regard.

In the end, what we did was that before the statements were released, we separated the – we didn't group them anymore. We said there was four objections against .health and then one objection statement against [inaudible].

So the RALOs all reviewed as per the process. It required three RALOs to approve the objection statement as is for the ALAC to then consider. The three RALOs passed the objection statements against the ASCII .health, and did not pass the – there was not enough support by the RALOs to support the objection statement for the IDN [inaudible], and therefore that was no longer considered by the ALAC.

Now, during all that time as well, I should mention that there was also a new concept introduced regarding the public interest commitments. But the review group did not really look at this information, and indeed, what the review group had to do – because the information was coming in so quickly around that – it was ultimately decided that, look, we could not really take into account all the information here because we would then have to go back and re-decide and re-decide.

So the decision that was done on February 8th, we have to stick to that and then let the RALOs decide based on the decision, based on the information we had as of February 8th. So the RALOs would have all the information the applicant said clarifying what the application was about and so forth, and the RALOs can then decide that.

So the ALAC then had all of this information including the PICs which was published I think literally as the RALOs finished their considerations, and then the ALAC then had a vote. There was also a special quote for the ALAC to review all the information, and the vote was taken and

three of the applications for .health received enough votes by the ALAC for the objection to be filed. Well, and then the statement was put together and then the statements have been filed.

Well, I think that's a summary. I can take a break and open for questions.

AVRI DORIA: Right. Yes, catch your breath. Thank you very much. Not only was it a complete report, it was an incredible amount of work that you led and that your team did. Thank you for that. There were questions. Did you have a question? Please, go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: For the record, Susan Chalmers, policy lead Internet New Zealand. Not so much a question, but a comment relating to Dev Anand's recent report. So Internet [inaudible] submitted a comment on [.book] which focused more generally on the question of closed generics. The point of my intervention is to compliment and to thank the [ANGWGE] for how it handled the comment. It was very helpful for us.

So for example, when we submitted the comment, we were able to see how the community was reacting in the public forum. That is actually very beneficial for somebody who is developing a position to see it kind of being pushed and pulled and prodded. So we appreciate that.

Also I just wanted to note that the reasons for why the working group elected not to take the comment further were then explained, and this was posted publicly. When ICANN later opened up the consultation for

closed generics, for us, we were very grateful to have that explanation posted just as a register to see that we had been participating in the process and had raised this. So that was of extreme value. So we thank you very much for how that was handled.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you for the Facebook. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: By the way, did you have a chance to read the ALAC statement on closed generics? Not specifically to do with the .book issue, but we actually considered the entire issue of how to deal with closed generics at the time that it was really, really heating up. And while there were other communities that had a really hard time reconciling different approaches to it, we actually came up with something that acknowledged the difficulties with it, but also saw that in closed generics, because of the way that ICANN had sort of shoehorned the way that you could either do things a certain way with registrars or not, that if registry wanted to try something such as create a TLD and give away the second levels but hold on to ownership, they would have to in fact come in as a closed generic in that way.

And so one of the things we saw was that there was a potential for actually stifling innovation in how TLDs wanted to do this by forcing everything to either be called a closed generic or wide open. We really grappled with this, and it wasn't really clear cut. We saw the danger potential in the way some companies wanted to do closed generics, but also thought by doing a blanket statement against it that it was going to

siphon off the potential that there could be some really interesting things done off the beaten path with this stuff.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Cintra?

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: Thank you. Cintra Sooknanan. Dev Anand, again, thank you for your work you have done on this subgroup. Having come to this point, can you tell me if there are any tweaks or any changes in the definitions or the procedure that you would've made the next time around?

AVRI DORIA: Before you start, I just want to point out that there's five more minutes, and one of the things I was going to ask you for is, at another time, a written wrap-up that goes largely into what Cintra said. But if you have a quick comment.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, thanks. Well, yes. I think there was some – I guess some of the things that had problems was that, one, there seems to be a really lack of understanding about the objection process by the At-Large community. I think the concept that people think, "Well, all I need to do is say I object," and that was it. They don't really understand that, look, there was a very strict threshold.

And I think when people were looking at, say, the GAC advice – and I think people felt, well, we have the same ability and we really do not

have that ability. The GAC has an ability to give advice on a variety of things. They could say they don't like the applicant, they don't like the business model, all sorts of things. We had a very limited mandate to look at objection grounds, and I think most persons did not really understand that. So unfortunately the quality of the dialogue didn't really take that into account.

That leads to the second problem is that the comments came really literally two hours before the deadline. I mean, I was mentally going to say, "Well, all right, well, that was it. No more comments." Then suddenly all the comments suddenly came in at the last two hours here.

And of course the conference call immediately after was a bit difficult because we just got the comments so we couldn't really decide on anything. So that put a lot – a lot – of pressure I think for the review group to really handle.

A possible way to tweak it might have been to set some sort of threshold so that if there were several comments, like say two or three comments instead of just one comment on a particular topic or particular issue, then at least there's more discussion on the matter.

But I'll address a point, though, that if we had done that, then literally there would have been zero comments under this process. So somehow by the education, although we went through this in excruciating detail – flow charts were translated, a one-page document was done. So I'm not sure what exactly it needs to communicate that to the At-Large community.

So the second thing is the threshold of comments. Is there any other possible tweaks? Hard to say at this point.

One final thing I must say, though. I must say I must really comment the review group for really working under pressure. I have to say I was very impressed with how the review group handled itself. They took the job seriously. And at one point, when I asked, "Hey, do you want to stop? Because we can't do it in this time," all of them said, "No, we've got to do this," and they fought very hard to produce the statement and comment actively on it and ask questions. It was really a huge positive in that aspect for the At-Large community and ALAC.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Olivier, you pretty much get the last question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Avri. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond for the transcript record. It was actually just a couple of notes of thanks. The first one to the GAC for having actually been able to share some of their knowledge and tools that they were going to use, and then IT staff – ICANN IT staff – to have provided us with tools to be able to track the applications. That was done in a very fast time. So the Wiki pages and so on really helped – from an observer's point of view – really helped with the transparency of the process itself.

I also wanted to thank the Review Team itself. They've done an amazing job. You have to remember, this is the first time At-Large – or the ALAC – has been provided with a mission to have an operational concern rather than just an advisory concern. So it was a case where it was really

a step into the unknown and definitely a step that I think the community managed to do pretty well. So that's something to note. And that's, of course, thanks to the shepherding of the chair of that review group. So I do have to thank you and I'd like just a quick round of applause for your work.

[applause]

AVRI DORIA: And there's nothing so sure as to bring somebody up to the microphone as to say that someone else had the last word. So, please. Please give your name.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My name is [inaudible]. I'm French. I'm a lawyer. One question about objection you made about the community objections. Just to understand – just say yes – there are many few objections, like five or [inaudible] .amazon, .patagonia, .book?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, the At-Large had an opportunity to file objections on community grounds or limited public interest, and we received comments on .patagonia, .amazon, .nyc and applications for .health. But ultimately the objection statement, we felt that after review of the comments received and the information we had that the community objections could not be sustained against .amazon, .patagona, and .nyc. The applicant kind of withdrew his comments because the dispute was

resolved. So it was [inaudible] the applications on the .health as well as the IDN for health or healthy [inaudible]. That was put forward.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. And no application had been rejected or blocked because of the comments or objections?

AVRI DORIA: That process is still ongoing. The objections were filed and now they're in the objection process and the evaluators. So we don't know yet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And we will get information?

AVRI DORIA: I don't know. It's in its process. They've got 30 days to answer and then there's a process. A couple months. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to follow up, I believe the New gTLD update earlier this week, ICANN is intending to announce the formal list of objections filed, and that will trigger the 30-day response by the applicants. So the process will then stop.

AVRI DORIA: But that's a 30-day response for the applicants, and then there's a certain amount of time during which they evaluate. So we really don't know when we'll know the answer, which is I think what I said. Okay.

We had one more item here. How we continue to work on the rollout stuff. We'll talk about that on our next phone call as our hour-and-a-half is done. I thank you all. I think it was a really great conversation on the two issues we did cover. Talk to you all on the phone. Thank you, everyone. It's over.

[applause]