

Nii Quaynor:primarily focusing on the support for applicants requesting new GTLDs. Just so that you get a settle – I’m one of those who’s been around this At-Large for a very long time, it traces back to the MAC, if some of you remember that, (inaudible 0:00:26) advisory community.

But that’s just to share with you that I maintain a fair and steady hand, and we have a very bonded time, and we have two major issues to deliberate, one of them is the working group activity that resulted from the resolution twenty; and the second one is our response, so that is roughly what we have. I also understand that the ground rules refer to that we are not going to discuss any particular string, so if you have interest in the strings, maybe I can offer you a different forum later, maybe in a bar or something to discuss with drinks.

So I think that concludes my opening remarks, but just to remind you resolution twenty, mentions the recognition for the importance of finding an inclusive new GTLDs program; inclusive, very important. And it formed the working group to develop a sustainable approach to providing support to applicants requiring assistance in applying for and operating new GTLDs. I think without going much further I’d like to ask Avri and Dave to lead us to a discussion on the work of the working group joint applicant support working group. Please.

Avri Doria: Thanks, my name is Avri Doria and I’m Co-Chair of the Joint SO-AC working group on what is actually our name – Reducing Barriers to new GTLDs creation in Developing Regions, and I’m Co-Chair with Evan who is also sitting there, and Tijani and [Alex] who are sitting here are also members of the group, as is [Rafik], but I don’t see him at the moment.

So as was said, the Board basically came up with a resolution, it came up with this resolution because the GAC has basically given them advice and many other people, ALAC and others had basically said something has to be done. So the group is basically looking at what can be done. We have a charter from the GNSO and from ALAC, it’s a joint charter, and I’ll just read out the bullets of the work we are supposed to do:

- Identify suitable criteria for applicants to qualify for dedicated support.

-
- Identify how fees can be reduced and/or subsidized to accommodate qualified applicants in keeping with cost recovery principles. One of the GNSO principles as part of the new GTLDs program is that the rest of ICANN couldn't support the program that the new GTLD program had to basically be cost recovery.
 - Identify appropriate kinds of support; for example, technical assistance, financial assistance, fee-reduction and timelines. So part of the work is not just looking at fees, but I'm sure that any of you who have read the draft applicant guide, there's a lot more difficulty in the guide than just fees. There are a lot of difficult issues that one has to meet, so part of what the group is also looking at is what other sorts of assistance might be needed in developing regions.
 - Identify potential providers and appropriate mechanisms to support provisioning.
 - Identify conditions and mechanisms required to minimize the risk of inappropriate access to support.

As many of you who have been around ICANN know, as soon as it's possible to define yourself in a certain way to get beneficial conditions, there will be people who define themselves in that way. So what the working group did - it's a working group that's composed of participants from both ALAC and the GNSO and I think actually other members of community. We divided into two basic work teams, but were working still in one group.

The one group, one work team, took that task of identifying how net cost to applicants that fulfill appropriate criteria can be reduced in keeping with the principle of cost recovery, and part of what the group has done is gone through and looked at the costs and started analyzing parts of the cost that are due to development costs, parts of the cost that are due to application evaluation costs, parts of the cost that are due to contingency fees. And looking at all of these, looking at how they could be treated differently. So in terms of the fee for applying for a new GTLD, I should point out that this is just a snapshot of where the group is at the moment.

We're still talking, we're still working, but we appear to have consensus on a couple of things, which is looking at waiving the cost of program development for selected entities qualified for financial assistance. There's

sort of a notion that if you're in a developing region, paying money for development costs in the fee perhaps wasn't totally reasonable. So it looks like that's one recommendation that we're close to receiving – getting to consensus on, you know obviously – and then the other thing's looking at a staggered payment, incrementally during the process. The way the process is designed now is you pay a big chunk of money up front, and then maybe you get a refund if you drop out.

What we were looking at as a proposal is possibly for those who are, who qualify from developing regions and meet other conditions, and I'll talk about that later, is to sort of pay step by step, so that you've made the first step, and that helps you raise the money for the second step, etc., so that you don't – I just noticed that I started talking faster – and you don't have to raise all of the money at the beginning. So that was one. There are still other things that we are talking about; for example, auction proceeds.

There's a strong group of us that think that auction proceeds need to go to development costs. Of course, we won't have any auction proceeds at the beginning of the first round, and so there, what we're looking at is possibly partial refunds for development applicants so that they have the money for sustaining the first couple of years of the TLD. There's lowering the registry fixed fees to ICANN, so these are in the sustainable costs, can those be lowered. There's looking at reconsidering the risk and contingency costs, there's reducing some of the fixed and variable costs.

As I said, we haven't reached agreement on those, but those are the kinds of things we are talking about. The other team is trying to look at who gets assistance and what kinds. So in the first round, we're proposing, and again the group is not finished, so we don't have consensus, is that it would only be to ethnic and linguistic communities. So it would need to be community applications and they would need to be language based or cultural, because we are trying to sort of understand this whole process.

So address support of other groups, for example NGOs, civil society organizations in the future, and not try to cover that in this first one, but to basically say that the whole notion of a program would need to expand at a later time, but trying to define who is a qualified NGO or who's a community that qualifies is much more difficult to do, would take a lot of time to do, is not something that we can get done without another one of the constraints on us, which is we have to be done by the time the new

GTLT round starts, and we can't do anything to slow down that round. And then a preference be given to those who are geographically located in emerging markets, developing countries, and especially in languages that aren't already present on the web. So those would be, those are the ways we're looking.

What we – who are not recommending in this first one, and again, this is the thought, this is the snapshot – is and if you've got enough money, even if you're from a developing region but you've got the financial resources we're not looking to include. Applications that are brands or companies that are basically, even from a developing country but applying for what's being called a brand -- so corporate presence.

Anything that is purely government or largely parastatal, that basically has to do with some part of a government or some organization within a government. And also looking at business plans and looking for sustainability in a business plan. Just like the new GTLDs process looks at business plans to see - is it viable? The people looking at providing support would also look to see if it is viable.

Now, in terms of what kind of assistance to provide, really there are three categories. The one is logistic outreach fee support. I already talked a little but about that. For example, translation of relevant documents – you know, that's a kind of 'in kind' assistance that may be needed that isn't giving money, but it's making it possible for people to do it. There's logistical and technical help with the application process.

Again, anybody who has read the new GTLD process knows that there's a lot of technical complexity in them, and answering all those questions or setting up the environment to properly technically support, may be difficult. There's just helping in awareness and outreach efforts, to help people know; to make sure they understand what's involved in an application, and helping in that. And then there's the fee reduction subsidization that I talked about earlier.

Another kind of help is technical support for applicants in operating or qualifying to operate. For example, helping people understand the infrastructure they need, and perhaps even finding help to create such an infrastructure, education, consulting. You know, looking at the possibility of technical waivers or what's being called 'step-ups'. Looking at that and

sort of saying, well for a very small new TLD in an area where there is no IPv6, is that needed in the first year? Is it enough to say that we'll have to get it by the second year? That's a step-up; so is there some way to basically look at the technical requirements, always keeping in mind ICANN's security and stability, but looking at whether anything is possible there and then perhaps helping to get groupings of people together and to basically be able to pull resources in terms of doing these. I hope I'm not spending too much time going through this.

And then the third one was support for build out in underserved languages and IDNs for new GTLDs. So looking at whether one could offer price discounts as an incentive for build out and scripts with limited presence. Bundled pricing to promote build out and multiple scripts if somebody is doing multiple scripts of a similar TLD, is there any way to help. And then one of the things that we always have to add is as I said, this is ICANN is clear tests to prevent gaming, to prevent someone who has the resources pretending that they are someone from a developing country, to prevent someone from a non-developing region establishing themselves in a developing region and thus getting the aid.

So, you know, I've identified the various types of support and other things principles that we are looking at in terms of this. There's a self financing responsibility, and as the group is not looking at providing 100% of financing, but looking at helping; we are still discussing what is an appropriate percentage; but some notion that there's a sunset period. That aid goes on for a certain amount of time, but it's not an ongoing. There has to be a notion of sustainability.

Transparency, I don't know that there's much to be said about it, but that everything is done in a program like this, from the applications on forward has to be open and transparent. That we're not limiting to – we talked about it a lot, but we're not going to recommend limiting to either non-profit or profit. Making those distinctions on something that is going on in a developing region, you know doesn't necessarily make sense, so that wasn't limited. There has to be limited government support.

If someone has government support, then we're looking that that's an area where it wouldn't necessarily be reasonable, and they're looking for some notion of repayment for those that are successful; perhaps it's repayment into a fund to help future applicants so that it carries on, but some notion

of giving back in that case. And I'm almost done – so basically one thing that we've done is send a letter to various registry service providers, sort of asking them if they'd be willing to offer any help and sort of, is there any help that the registry service providers – because there's an assumption that while it's hoped, and this is a personal statement on my part – that there will be the establishment of new registry service providers in development regions, but there's also an understanding that when a new registry operator starts, they may want to use the services of an existing registry service provider because setting up all of that infrastructure is expensive, is difficult, takes time.

But, so are there existing registry service providers that are willing to lend a hand and what kind of hand are they willing to lend? Would they consider providing support functions? Would they consider helping with the technology? If you're in an area that doesn't have IPv6, are they willing to give you the connectivity, a tunnel to a v6 so that you can have it even if you're in a place that doesn't? And so basically looking at the registries that exist and sort of saying “Is there any help that you can find?”

So that's where we've gotten to at the moments. Our next steps and these are steps that come up real soon. This snapshot is out and available, goes into more detail, obviously than I went into. The snapshot is available, it's out for comment, definitely would like to hear comments from people who might find this program useful or know the people that would find the program useful.

We'll get the comments back, we'll continue our discussions on the comments until the 10th of August, this is our schedule; and mid August, it's listed as 13th August, submit our recommendations to ALAC and to the GNSO Council at which point it's up to them to pass something on to the Board. And so I'm open to questions, I don't know if Evan wants to add anything to what I've said – no? No. Or [Alex] or Tijani want to add – open for questions.

Nii Quaynor: Let me do this. There are two other persons I would like to hear from, so if you'll allow me, I'll do that – but let me start with Cheryl, if you would like to say a few words.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And thank you so much, Nii, and thank you all. The drafting you've done, background work you've done, and the preparatory material that you have

gone through in preparing is quite the enormous task in a small amount of time. As the current Chair of the At-Large Advisory committee, and as Avri has said, this is a joint working group, it's something we all have a great deal of interest in; to look towards a regional consensus built conversation or set of solutions or options, coming into a process as well organized as I think you'll agree with me, that it looks like this room is going to be giving us is a rare and great privilege.

I see your statement is up there, I look forward to exploring it and reading through the detail; and of course as AFRALO is one of our At-Large structure regional groups, and is very much a partnership as I understand it, in this work – the region could ask for a specific endorsement by the At-Large Advisory Committee of your statement. Not knowing what your statement will be yet, and looking forward to the conversation we'll be having tonight, I have made provisional space on our first day agenda so should you wish us to discuss outputs from your valued and valuable work.

Please be assured I have made room for a discussion of the ALAC in any way that will help facilitate you and get the very best outcomes from this very important joint GNSO and At-Large Advisory committee working group. Other than that, I'd like very much to thank each and every one of you for inviting me, and to be able to speak. Thanks so much.

Nii Quaynor: Thank you, Cheryl. And I think we'll take you up on the first day offer. It's a real pleasure to introduce Katim. You know who he is, I won't introduce him at all, so Katim?

Katim Touray: Thank you very much, Dr. Quaynor, my big brother and thanks very much to all of you and good afternoon. It's a pleasure to be here, I apologize for running a little bit late. We had a session that ran a little bit late. And I just wanted to come here if anything to just maybe say a few words to you, and sit in and listen. I was really more interested in particularly listening than talking, as a matter of fact. It gives me a really great joy to see that the community has taken the resolution that was passed by the ICANN Board in Nairobi and run with it.

It's a really wonderful feeling because it is not something that only serves the community, but indeed serves the very purpose and values of ICANN itself. If you go through the resolution, you will – the member of your core

resolution will remember it makes an explicit mention of the need for inclusiveness in the things that we do. And so that you are helping us achieve that is really something to be commended and I really have to thank you very much on behalf of both the Board and the organization for that.

You are doing quite a big service, quite an important service to the community. This also is presently important because it is at the heart of the bottom up grass roots multi-stake-holder approach, and this is what ICANN is all about, and it is a good thing that you are bringing your heads together and then coming up with the best possible solution for ideas, what we can do to move this forward. So I would like to say I am really looking forward to the end result of your endeavors. Again, thank you very much for having me, and I wish you all the very best in your deliberations.

Nii Quaynor: I think we should move on immediately to some questions and answers, just in case our presenters have some conflicting schedules over head and the one such as this, so I'd like to open the floor for about twenty minutes before moving into the next session of our statement. So the floor is – yes, Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Nii. First of all, I would like to thank you for having accepted the chair this session, and I would like to express my gratitude to Kathleen and to the members of the Board, to Sherry, the President of ALAC, and to Avri who is the Co-Chair of the working group. The essential aspect of this meeting, there are two essential things, first of all, the expression of the expectations of the African community concerning resolution twenty of the Board, and that we are going to do through the draft statement work we are going to introduce to you.

Now, the second expectation about this meeting and the second goal of this meeting is the attempt at including all this in the overall action of the working group which was set up with a view to taking into account resolution twenty of the Board. So I invite you all to participate tomorrow at 2 p.m. in the meeting of the Joint working group, the working group that was set up in the wake of the adoption of resolution twenty, so that you can express your views.

We are going to take our draft statement there for it to be read and for knowledge to be spread about it, and as region and as working group

because I'm also a part of the working group; we are going to try and encourage the other developing countries to do the same thing and try to truly express their expectations from the resolution. Thank you.

Nii Quaynor: Thank you. I guess we are interested in expectations from our region for now, so I'd like to find if there are some who would like to ask questions about the working group activity, how to spread it out in terms of net cost and into types of supports, and how far they go in sense of the examples that are being shared. So if you have any questions, I'll be glad to hear your comments. If at any time during the presentation, you should give something back. So I like to get something back. Yes, Pierre?

Pierre Dandjenou: Thank you very much, Nii, and thanks all for this presentation. (Inaudible 0:26:48) international as well, I don't have just two concerns here. I think one of my concerns is about the sort of registry fixed fees, not really the fees, but ; I think a suggestion into reading your document especially item 4, where the suggestion is to lower the registry fees with ICANN, and you are actually introducing ways in which one could do this. I didn't really get the rationale behind it, so I would like you to elaborate more on that please. Also, I wanted to know whether your group considered, I mean what; the issue of the relationship between registries and registrars. And to which extent this could be an avenue to consider why you really want to assist, because they might be interested in bidding. So these are my two concerns. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you, I'd actually like if on the rationale on fees, Evan and I split the group and I don't know if that puts him on the spot, perhaps if someone else from the group would actually go into the rationales on the fees. Is that – if you could, Evan, and then?

Evan Leibovitch: It is a bit of a tight situation, because we've still had to work under the mandate that ICANN has said about cost recovery. So at every turn where we try and come up with, well how is this fee justified, how is this fee justified, how is this fee justified, there's always an answer. And so what we've tried to do is come up with certain approaches in cases where for instance an application is coming from a community and would seem to be not infringing on any trademark, not high risk, something like that, then it would be possible to make a case that some of the risk fees that ICANN has built in perhaps could be waived if it was considered to be an easy to process TLD that was not going to run into any collisions or trademark

objections or anything like that. ICANN has built an awful lot of cushion into the fees, and yet until they've gone through their first round, they won't know if whether or not they've built in too much or too little; but for our purposes, they've not given much ground. So we have a challenge in trying to come up and address this. A couple of things, I don't know if I'm overstepping on the other working team, but one of the things that, for instance, is being considered is reducing the annual fee. Since this is not a risk issue, the cost of processing the fees, is it possible to waive or dramatically reduce the annual fee, and if that's the case, then we have an option to take that original amount of ; take the original starting amount, and to break that down to be paid over years instead of the annual fee that would do ICANN. So what we're trying to do is work around the fact that we've had very, very little cushion to work with in terms of reducing the fees based on the cost recovery model. They're not giving us much room to move there, so we're trying to be creative in terms of dealing with what they've given us, and try and reduce it where we can. The annual fees appear to be one area where there's significant area to move, because they haven't demonstrated the rationale on the cost recovery in the same way, so if we can deal with the annual fee and then take the original upfront costs, which they haven't given us any leeway, but perhaps to amortize that over multiple years, so for instance you may still be paying the same amount in annual fee, but that would be instead of all that upfront cost. So we're trying to come up with some creative ways to work around the fact that we're not being given much leeway on the cost recovery issues. Even where we can't prove ICANN that this cost is really needed in the fee, and they're saying 'we don't know because we haven't gone through the round yet'.

Avri Doria:

On the other issue, I'm not quite sure I understood the question in terms of registrars and the use – if it's the mandatory use of registrars question or that – that issue isn't one that's actually been touched too much in this group, partially because of the vertical integration working group is spending a lot of time talking about that sort of issue just in general, small applicant issue in terms of , or general IDN development issue; whether one really, for example; there's a ccTLD registrar that one can work with, or any of those issues.

So those issues actually haven't been explored in this group, they're being explored in the vertical integration – not just for financial advantage, but in general looking at it as a competition, from an ability to enter the

market perspective. So that – but that’s not really something that’s being worked on here. Here, we’re basically looking on what kind of assistance can we get from registries and registrars, what kind of – whether it’s financial assistance or discounts or technical aid, - but the vertical integration and what kind of registrar arrangement you need to have, that’s the vertical integration working group and we’re trying not to overlap with them on that.

Nii Quaynor: Do you have a follow on, or – yes?

Carlos Agira: Carlos Agira, from Malawi. I wanted to get clarification on two things Maybe you could clarify how you are working with the other regions other than the Africa region, and in your presentation I maybe had it wrongly, but you mentioned exceptions for governments. I’d like to get clarification on that, and why the exception came up for government and governmental institutions.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. On the first one, we have strong participation from a number of people from Latin America. I haven’t gone and spoken to any group of theirs, but basically there’s very strong representation there. Not too much from the Asian region at this point, so that’s the answer to that one. In terms of governments, I think basically the issue becomes much more complicated when we’re talking about someone subsidizing a government application, or offering that.

I think that the issue – one of the things we really tried to do is, we don’t have a lot of money yet, and among many of us there’s a notion that someday after the auctions, there’ll be lots of money and we can talk about an expanded program. Here, it’s what can we do here, on this first round. So that’s that. In terms of giving to governments, it becomes a political issue that we’re really not ready to cope with in terms of taking this first bite of ; let’s help linguistic, let’s help cultural, let’s do what we can. I think there’s also an assumption that frequently governments have access to resources beyond the little bit that we might be able to offer at this point.

Nii Quaynor: Yes, anymore?

Sami Bruchar: Thank you. My name is Sami Bruchar from Kenya. I just have gone through the statement and some of the documentation that has been

prepared and I just had a question; I remember when the first time that this proposal for the GTLD application fee was raised, we did set up and raise concerns about the cost, especially for developing regions like Africa, and we raised it in a position of being in the private sector because the entrepreneurs are the ones who have been driving the internet in attrition, and the first of the reasons that are given here for that consideration is the reality of Africa and the very small numbers that cannot justify a business case for that price.

And then again now, you go ahead and exclude those entrepreneurs from support and say that it has to be civil, (inaudible 0:37:16) and then governmental; I'm just wondering whether, unless I misunderstood it, whether that is actually going to leave out those people who have been struggling to bring internet to – and of course that may have very good ideas for benefitting their constituencies to be able to actually register GTLD, I'm a little bit concerned about that.

Avri Doria:

I'd like to quickly answer. I must have misspoken. Because what I was trying to say is that we're not making a differentiation on for-profit or not for profit. So we're saying it is open to the – I'm sorry, I'm having a terrible time talking to someone with my back to them, and I apologize for talking to you with my back to you – so I must have said it badly. We're talking about not giving it to governments at this point.

We're talking about not differentiating on whether it's a non-profit or profit, because we didn't think that differentiation made sense for the very reasons that you're suggesting, so the point is; yes, to support the entrepreneur. Now, that part of the thing is there still needs to be a business case that looks sustainable and they do need to raise some of the fund else wise in our proposals, but no, there is no exclusion, the exclusion of perhaps whoever it asks, exclusion of government, but not the exclusion of the entrepreneur. You have [Alex] wanting to say something.

[Alex]:

Thank you, my comment is actually also directed to the members of this community and I want to as a particular question about communities which are not English speaking, and I'm not talking about Arabic. And for the record, we know that Africa has the largest number of Arabic speaking people in the world, so the African continent carries the most Arabic speaking people in the world, but I'm not talking about the Arabic, I'm asking for all the communities throughout Africa.

The reason I'm asking this is also within our group to also identify other communities that may participate in the IDN, so I highly appreciate if you would have certain communities that in Africa who could participate in that, and the feedback would be welcome, of course we know that the Arabic domain has been registered, that's why I use that exclusion. So other regions, which are not already in the IDN program, it's an important parcel of this program.

Nii Quaynor: Does anyone have a response for him or something else? Yes, Pierre, go ahead.

Pierre Dandjenou: I have no response; I just wanted to come back to the earlier question and also the earlier response by Avri. I think on our recommendation you touched on this, but maybe what was not clear there for me, and also for the colleague that asked the question, was maybe there was a need to put a kind of specifically entrepreneurship or whatever.

What is the way to (inaudible 0:40:40) it's a recommendation, and it's 'D' I think; seems to me that the way to these formalities is that if this was geared toward only end use applicants, so maybe there should be some wording to make it clear that way, what you said, meaning that it's going to be included and of course some sort of entrepreneur might use it according to some criteria or something like that.

That's what I would suggest to you. There was one point where you mentioned that applicants who don't need the support have ample enough financing. How do you know that? This is D again, working team 2, it says a group is not recommending support at this time, especially applicant who don't need the support or have ample financing.

Avri Doria: Two questions. On the first one, I think you're right. We can certainly make the language clearer. While we say is that many groups would be NGOs they need not be non-profits, but certainly that's kind of a negative way of putting it, so I think that yes, I agree. It's a good comment. On the how do we know someone has enough money and has adequate financing, you're right. It is a difficult question, and some case – that's where we have this requirement to make sure we have clear tests to prevent gaming, to ensure that the limited amount of support that there will be reaches its target.

It's a really fine comment to say, but we haven't said how one does that. I don't know how anyone every does it, but it seems that there are methods of – you know, you look at the financial resources that someone presents you and then you either assume they are telling the truth and they have told you what they have, or they don't. I'm not someone that's been in the business of doing that kind of determination, so I don't know. I would assume, and assuming is bad, but if we put together a program like this, there needs to be someone managing it that understands how to do this. It's – I'm a technical person that became a policy person, and I've never been a banker.

Nii Quaynor: I want to make sure others who have not spoken, like these two guys. So Madam, then (inaudible 0:43:42).

Female: Thank you Mr. Chair. First of all I wanted to reinforce what Peter and Sami said that language used on the non profits and civil society it seemed like it's been echoed also on the African community statement, number four bullet. So maybe that could also be corrected, if we all agree.

And second, Avri – hi Avri, I didn't see you for awhile – you mentioned something about support for registry/registrar for the new GTLDs and I'm not sure if I've read all the guidelines, the new guidelines, but somehow there does seem to be a non entry point for investors, or the registries not investing, or registrars not investing in registries, so I'm trying to delineate that; for example, if it is an African registry that is supporting new GTLDs in Africa, for example in the case of Africa versus a foreign registry, that's a little unclear, so maybe you can clarify on that please.

Avri Doria: Yes, and thank you again for the language, and we'll definitely fix that one. Good to see you again. What I was indicating there is you're right; in the current draft applicant guidebook there's a very strict separation; the Board had done its motion at a zero percent, and then the implementation team had decided that 0 percent is totally impossible, so they upped it to a demonizes of 2%. But what this is, is basically the Board saying to the GNSO to the vertical integration working group, that if you do not come to consensus on a proper way.

For example on a registrar to be able to fund or to be able to bring about a new registry and a new registry service provider, then this is the rule. So

that rule that you're finding very restrictive, which indeed everyone is finding prohibitively restrictive, is the pressure that the Board has put on the community, especially the GNSO, to come to some sort of consensus, and the reason is is that there has been a difference of opinion between registries and registrars on this issue since before either of us got involved in ICANN, and basically the Board has kind of said, 'okay, enough.

You go to your separate sides. You can't have co-ownership unless you figure out who to do it'. And so that's the vertical integration working group, has a very tight schedule and is supposed to come up with an answer for that. But it's not something that this group is working on, is what I'm saying because if we tried to work on that problem separately from the VI working group, we would make a mess.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may, just as another member of the Vertical Integration working group, we've done a lot of forward work in this current ICANN meeting, and I've heard a lot of talk, not results yet, but a lot of talk about how the exceptions policy on these things would work. So I think it's a 'watch this space', no outcomes yet, but I'm hearing movement on that, at least.

Male: I just have a comment. They probably are talking about technical assistance, they mention raising the issue of (inaudible 0:47:44) some development countries, such as IPv6; so I suggest maybe we don't need to put that in there, that statement that we have there. There's not a history of who's in charge of IP addresses issues, so maybe it's not good to put this one in there, the statement.

Male: [Yovi] was speaking about the draft statement. We are discussing now this snapshot.

Avri Doria: One thing I'd like to add on that is I'm glad that's the case for Africa, that may not be the case for all development regions, and so – I'm not getting into specifics, it was just an example that I used and IPv6 isn't everywhere. Now I know a lot of people are trying to get it everywhere, but some of us just wanted to make sure that if someone happened to be in a region where IPv6 was not being offered by their service providers, or by the ISPS in their local region, that they wouldn't be stopped.

Nii Quaynor: I'm itching to go to the next step, but I'll take two more questions, if they are asked. Yes, ma'am?

-
- Female: Thank you Mr. Chair, to clarifications. I apologize for arriving late, maybe you dealt with this previously. Firstly I would like to know whether this draft declaration was designed for all the regions, or if it's the first draft declaration for the African region. And secondly, on the website, I could see a letter of support from the African Union directed to Africa; but in this letter there is mention of the European Commission and there is also a mention of the authority of the African Union, but isn't there an overlap in terminology here?
- Nii Quaynor: I think the first person will go, but the second one on the string I will have to suppress, because in the ground rules I said we will not discuss on a string., So I understand your question very well, but I plead with you to take this outside. And I guess the first part of your question, so if that is okay.
- Avri Doria: I'm not sure I understand the first question as applying to our snapshot, or if it applies to your document. I didn't understand the question, I guess I'm saying.
- Female: Is this a first draft declaration that you are doing with the African region? Or is such a declaration planned for every region as well?
- Male: Avri is talking on behalf of the working group set up by the Board, what we are doing as African region is something that could be added to what they are doing. They work at global level, this working group was set up by the Board, and we wanted to express the African point of view; it is our initiative, we invited them to present us with the results of their work.
- Nii Quaynor: We are anxious to hear what it is they have drafted, so I shouldn't hold you back any further. I think – well, let me give the full length preamble. I think it's good that AFRALO/AfrICANN have made these efforts to come out with statement. It's one of the few cases I think where the African community seems to be on time, so I think it's a very good thing, so I want us to embrace, and I use that as a verb, embracing the statement and looking to see how much better we can improve it. So to do that I will ask Dave, who is the moderator here, to read out a statement and also lead us through the discussion.

Dave Kissondoyal: Yes I just want to give a small history of how we proceeded before we come to this statement. In fact, following Resolution 20 of the ICANN Board, we set up a committee between AfrICANN and AFRALO and that working committee, we split the working committee in two to set up a drafting committee, and the result we have here is the result of the drafting committee. I would like to stress that this statement can be modified, can be altered, can be put aside, because what we want, we want the African voice, so we are free to discuss it over here, and if we need to re-write it, we are free to re-write it. So I start with the statement:

“The members of the ICANN AfrICANN community consisting of the AFRALO and the AfrICANN attending the 38th ICANN meeting in Brussels, after discussing with the possible support to be given to the new African GTLD applicants that need assistance in applying for and operating the GTLD as per resolution twenty of the ICANN Board; firstly, welcome the Board resolution twenty related to the support for applicants requesting assistance in applying for and operating new GTLDs.

Express their gratitude to the Board members for their consideration of the community concerns about the course of applying for new GTLDs that might hinder applicants requiring assistance, especially those from developing countries. Strongly believe that Africans from developing countries where the market is not wide enough for a reasonable profit making industry are eligible for support.”

The fourth one, after the discussion I think, we have to alter it because we initially came with a declaration that only civil society NGO and not for profit organizations are deemed for support, but now after this discussion we think that the civil or the business society also should be included. So after the amendment I think it will be deemed that the civil society, NGO, and not for profit organizations in Africa on one side, and the business community within Africa on the other side; both are in need of such support, because both have deepened back in the African society.

The next one, *“believe that support is of utmost importance for geographic cultural, linguistic, and more generally community based applications. Believe that the support to be provided to applicants of new GTLDs include but are not limited to the following aspects: financial, by reducing the application and the ongoing fees; linguistic, by translating all the application documents, especially the application guidebook in the*

necessarily languages, either six UN languages; legal, by assisting the applicants in preparing the applications properly; and technical, by helping the applicants to define the right platform and to explore the possibility of sharing one platform with other registries; addressing the issue of infrastructure problems in some developing countries, and the next one, we strongly support that cost reduction is the key element of fulfilling the goals of the ICANN Board resolution twenty within the principles of the recovery of the application and ongoing cost.

We demand that the following be entertained to achieve cost reduction. We want the waiving of the cost of program development, which is \$26,000 USD; waiving the risk contingency cost which is \$60,000 USD, lowering the application cost \$100,000 USD to the minimum actual cost. Waiving the registration fees due to ICANN, that is the \$25,000 USD per calendar year; we want these fees to be waived and charge the minimum registry level transaction fee only. We propose that the register cost to be paid incrementally which will give the applicant more time to raise money.

We believe that African communities should apply for new GTLDs according to an appropriate business model, taking into consideration the realities of the African region. ICANN's commitment towards elaboration of such a business model for GTLD applicants in Africa will be a milestone to the development of the overall internet community.

We strongly urge that ICANN practice a policy of positive discrimination towards Africa, since Africa is lagging behind in terms of digital revolution. One reason for achieving this positive discrimination is to provide some supplementary support and additional cost reduction for GTLDs applications from African regions. ICANN can thus help to bridge the digital divide.”

There was one question about the IDNs. I think if you read the resolution twenty, it mentions only for new GTLD programs, so I don't think we can include IDNs as well. Thank you, chair.

Nii Quaynor:

On this question of IDNs, it's not that excluding an application or a string which is in another language is a new GTLD, presented – but I do think so. Okay. Okay, I think we should just note it and then raise it in another session that will be fine. I think we have barely fifteen minutes to wrap up this show, so I like to drive you very hard by asking for comments in this

way for the next hour, first this way, and then that way, please; so that we can take all the comments (inaudible 1:00:54).

At this point, please I would prefer that you African-centric and less developing country-centric because I really with this would be a committee document we own, that we are comfortable with, so I just want to take the one side and then left side. Any comments here or going to the other side? Yes, okay, then you're losing the chance here, yes, please. Yes, go ahead.

Female:

Thank you Mr. Chair. I hope my comments are going to be Africentric. So one two three, I'm going to – I have a few comments; I'm part of the drafting committee, as well as the organizing committee, so I hope I have a little elaborated comments on some of the points here, so I'm just going to go one, two, three, four, five as bullet items, so as I see it, one, two, three, four – on number five believe that support is of utmost importance for geographical, linguistic, and more generally community based applications, so here I would see that most of it is the language.

I see it as specialized, underprivileged communities accommodating applications. Because there could be community applications that are specialized, so if we can – want to comment on that that is number one. And then the second one is, going to the next bullet, believe that the support should be provided to applicants of new GTLDs include but are not limited to the following aspects, so there are one, two, three, four aspects on the technical side; the first bullet reads – helping the applicant to define the right platforms.

So this implies that ICANN is defining the right platform. I suggest it should say helping the applicants to understand the available platforms and various business models that can be adopted. That should be the way ICANN can advise, not define it for the applicant. And then the next bullet item, addressing the issue infrastructure problems in some developing countries such as, I think that was already mentioned, I doubt that should be a necessity to even include in the sentence.

And then the next item, strongly support the cost reduction as the key element in fulfilling the role of ICANNs Board resolution twenty; within the principles of recovery of ongoing cost. That last sentence, within the principles of cost recovery, that's already on the draft of the resolution

twenty; so it's repetitive so we can eliminate that. And then the next bullet item says, demand that the following be entertained to achieve cost reduction. I suggest the work propose, instead of demand, for ICANN.

Nii Quaynor: I think, let's go slow here. This – we should have done this drafting work before getting here. Here I'm looking for fundamental concepts. I don't want to do drafting here.

Female: Mr. Chair? Earlier we got together and agreed, the drafting committee, that we can make comments, elaborate on this.

Nii Quaynor: Yes, but I am accepting the comment, but it is going on and on and to me it is beginning to feel like –

Female: I will quickly.

Nii Quaynor: Okay, yes. Please.

Female: So propose – so then the next sentence proposes that the reduced cost be paid incrementally, I guess that's clarified, sorry. Let's skip that. And then the next one says believe that African communities should apply for new GTLDs according to an appropriate business model; I suggest we change that to apply to propose or submit instead of an appropriate business model, taking into consideration the realities of the African region. So I cannot – ICANN cannot define an appropriate business model for African region, we should be proposing, or submitting the proposal for ICANN, so, that's the last comment. Yes, thank you.

Nii Quaynor: I think it's worth going through some of them and asking for your concurrence, and the first one that comes as the fifth bullet is looking to qualify the generosity of man on community based applications. Do you see a need for that qualification? Asking for specialized community based applications? And I'd like to hear from you. This is supposed to be your document, so I only ask questions. So if you can just take a look at that portion, it may be changing the meaning of what was intended. And David, I think why don't you weigh in on this? How do you feel about this?

Dave Kissondoyal: When you say more generally, because community based applications are not only special applications, I think it has to be general instead of

specialized, because when it says specialized you are limiting it, whereas in general it's broad.

Male: I think that the wording here is the most optimum. Because we gave as an example the geographical, the cultural, the linguistic – there is other community based applications. That's why we say more generally the community based application.

Nii Quaynor: Another reaction – yes, Pierre.

Pierre Dandjenou: I'm not reacting specifically on this, but you said we only have fifteen minutes here, right? So of course I would like to see us (inaudible 1:07:31) on sensitive issues, and the committee (inaudible 1:07:33). And whoever has any comments or any drafting whatever paragraph, just send to the committee. That's all.

Nii Quaynor: That's fine. Let me go on, I guess. Some questions were raised about who defines platforms. So now I've gone to the technical side of things where we said believe that the support would be provided to applicants of new GTLDs include but are not limited to the following aspects, and then we go to the technical side and we have stated help the applicants to find the right platform and explore the possibility of sharing one platform with other registries. And the question is being raised to try and adapt that to talk in terms of understanding what it is required. What available platforms is this, is how it was put. Here the focus is on definition, and then proposal is information.

Female: My take is how could ICANN define a platform?

Male: Nowhere in the document ICANN is defining. Like if you take the paragraph where it says 'believe that African communities should apply for new GTLDs according to an appropriate business model' it's appropriate to the applicant, not to ICANN.

Female: No, no. We're asking support from ICANN on this document. Correct? It's going to the Board, so the technical says helping the applicant to define; who is supposed to be defining that for the applicant?

Male: Which paragraph you are telling? ICANN is helping the applicants, which is defining. But it's technical –

-
- Female: We're just saying let's just be clear on that. It reads as is ICANN is defining the platform, versus the applicants. So, it's just the language.
- Male: No, ICANN cannot define the platform for the applicant. Why should ICANN –
- Female: But that's how it reads, though. It seems like it's reading that.
- Male: No. It's to help somebody to do a job, and do to the job itself, they are two different things. Thanks.
- Female: It says here clearly, helping the applicant to define the right platform.
- Male: Yes. You help me to do the job, but you're not doing the job for me.
- Nii Quaynor: Okay. I think there's a slight different in opinion. [Ravi], next point.
- [Ravi]: I just want to maybe redefine my selection, I just know to select maybe, instead of using define, select. I don't know if it will be okay.
- Nii Quaynor: Okay, going on the wisdom of Pierre, let's give all the input and you guys go figure it out. Any more comments? Okay, while you are waiting, let me ask the question. Why do we keep referring to developing countries, instead of African countries?
- A question is I see the term developing countries mentioned in no more places, so I'm asking, since this is an AFRALO statement, why is AFRALO not talking about African conditions as the target, but going from all around the world and saying developing countries. It tends to lighten your statement. Yes, Tijani, even that, addressing the issue of infrastructure, developing countries. If you (inaudible 1:11:41), developing countries. And I'm saying, no. This is Africa.
- Female: I agree with that, to define it as Africa.
- Nii Quaynor: I'm just trying to say narrow down the needs to us as much as possible. I mean, I heard your point. Maybe the idea might be to have a portion that's

defines typical characteristics of the African countries, and then you can move on from there. Yes, sir?

Male: I'm (inaudible) Islam from Qumor's telecom; I share the view of the chair, because if we speak about developing countries, then we also refer to part of Asia, but it's not really Africa, of course, it would be much better to specify African countries.

Male: I think I tend to agree with the fact that (inaudible 1:12:48) general, because I think is a declaration we are sending to the Board of ICANN and we are not the only developing country that ICANN will be looking at. By the time they look at our statement after the general applicable situation, then to Africa, would specify that. I don't think it is improper or is out of place to mention developing countries because we have common situations, and I think that will even better our cost.

Nii Quaynor: Okay, we have barely a few minutes to lose the translation, so if you have something to say that requires translation, please let's say that now, priority, so only French speaking for the next five minutes.

Male: I'm sorry, excuse me – one, two, three, four, though I didn't come in on time when you were discussing this, toward the four bullet point and I think we are trying to restrict a business people should be in the forefront. The other ones are – yesterday when we have the business meeting, business reception with the Board, with the GAC, find out our business people are not here, they are not in ICANN they don't know where there's business there, so I think we should bring them actually into that. They did not just be NGOs and let's look at the business people.

Nii Quaynor: Is very good. This is reassuring, it has already been addressed, but is very good point. Yes, Madam?

Female: Thank you – point four. In my opinion point four should be removed from the document because indeed we should not exclude African businessmen.

Male: I mentioned the amended draft and I said –

Male: And the business community in Africa on the other side, both in need of such support, because both have a deepened impact in the African community.

Nii Quaynor: Okay, I think that's being waived by the drafting community, so we can leave that and move on to the next - I think we've lost translation. I propose we continue for another five or ten minutes and then close it, so if you have some burning issues – Yes, Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Just a specification, if you notice it in point three, four, five, no!! There is a translation! We're still translating, no. We're still working. I think that points three four and five speak about three different kinds of applicants, GTLD applicants that should be supported.

First of all, we say here that applicants from developing countries are eligible for support, we say in the statement that applicants from developing countries are eligible for support, so that includes the business users, everybody. And the next point speaks about civil society NGOs and not for profit organizations and so on, and the last point speaks about a community based applications, so everything is included, they are all covered. The fourth one doesn't exclude the others, it's not exclusive.

Nii Quaynor: The feeling being communicated is if it's coming from At-Large, it's a good reach out to be sure that business is not excluded,. And even though it's not excluded, it's good for it to have it highlighted that they are included. I think that is the message people are giving us. Yes?

Male: Thank you very much, Nii. I just wanted to make a quick reminder to people; I was just looking at the program of presentations. On Thursday from 9:30 to 10:30 in level 0 they have a workshop on the framework for the fiscal year 2011 operating plan and budget. We always frequently complain about lack of us doing what we want to do, this is an opportunity for us to really make a good case for why we think it's important for why budget and allocations for the issues that are important to us, so what I encourage you to do first is go through the budget; it's posted on the web, secondly make sure that you are there on Thursday and really let our voices be heard. Thank you.

Nii Quaynor: I guess I'm going to start to wind it down. [Alex]?

-
- [Alex]: I think I just have a quick comment, brief really, but in view of the two Chairs not being there (inaudible 1:19:07) is that yes, we make all the recommendations we want in the context of AFRALO and Africa region, but ALAC team is global, so some of the things may remain because we apply globally so in case somebody saw something being (inaudible 1:19:19) because we have a global outreach that we are doing. Thank you.
- Nii Quaynor: I am very global, but I work locally.
- Narelle Clark: Hello, Narelle Clark, Vice-President of the Australian chapter of the Internet Society, and now member of the Internet Society Board of Trustees. I'd just like, on behalf of my Pacific colleagues to encourage you to not just restrict it to Africa, if I may. I hope you indulge me in the request, because I would suggest that the Pacific nations may also be facing some of the same sorts of struggles, and I suggest they may, Cheryl may correct me, but I suggest that some of these financial models that you're suggesting could be very beneficial there also. Thank you.
- Nii Quaynor: Actually, what we are saying is that you first must think about your situation. And what you come up with may benefit the whole world. But you start by thinking about other person's problem, it won't solve yours.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nii, if I may, it's very important that Narelle, as a visitor to us, realizes this is Africa talking about Africa, making very important consensus and developing statements for Africa. To win their points will win for us all, and that is going to be a good thing. Should we encourage the equivalent grouping in Asia-Pacific to do that same? Absolutely but we operate as five regions. There is strength in diversity as well as in uniformity. A win on any region on this is going to do us all a lot of good, but we'll get divided and conquered in nuances, I fear, if we don't focus on the big issue, which are the needs of Africa.
- Nii Quaynor: I believe that the joint assistance or support group or whatever it is called, application support group, will make use of generosity (inaudible)1:21:30 of developing countries, but I will coordinate with Asia-Pacific to help them make their statements, in unison with the statements we will get from LAC and also from Africa. I think that's really – yes, Pierre?
- Pierre Dandjenou: That's fine, I just wanted to bring us back to the reason we are sitting here and we really think about (inaudible 1:21:52) now. I also comment that also maybe we should just broaden the scope, and then post this on the list.

The question is do we have time for that? So depending on the timeline, maybe the issue is actually what is available for us. So, maybe as of tomorrow we want to have a text, and post it on other lists. (Inaudible 01:22:13)

Nii Quaynor: Okay, don't.

Male: Theoretically tonight we should adopt this statement, and as we said that the beginning, it's going to be sent out to the Board and to the joint working group to include our work in the global work as the lady requested, and then I would like to ask you all please to take part in tomorrow's meeting at 2 o'clock. It will be the joint working group meeting. It is the global group that Avri explained the preliminary results. That is the plan for our work.

Nii Quaynor: Can you at least give me a general sense that the substance of your statement is one that you can live with? So I want to test it. If you believe that the general substance of the statement you have drafted, excluding the drafting work we've assigned to them, is acceptable, then please we need to tell them. So please tell me so by saying "Aye", so is this draft sufficiently close to what you are looking for and you can live with it? I'd like to say Aye. I mean, let's show by hands so that we know that at least the people here (whispers...please, count! count them, it's very important count) . On last count we have 17. What I'll do is say Nay. Okay. Look. It seems like we think this tells the story but there are some few things you want to have looked at again, and – no. You're getting out of order. I am concluding. You have the floor.

Dave Kissondoyal: I think there are some strong words that we need to turn down, the drafting committee should look at that. Some words like demand. They are too strong for a global something you present to the Board, so we look at that again, about the substance, fine. But the language we should do something about. What I propose is that why is we can't enlarge the drafting committee? If we have volunteers, people who want to contribute to the drafting committee, we can send the list and by tomorrow – we are going to send the original version and then volunteers, you can edit, modify as you wish, and then send it back to the list, and then we can finally come with a version that is acceptable to everybody.

Nii Quaynor: Just as a complimentary comment as to what Dave has just said. I 'm not suggesting that it should be sent to a group, I suggest that the volunteers, those who volunteered to support the drafting process, as we agree on the substance, it is a drafting issue now. So those who have a good English level and want to take part in that drafting process and we can do it at once tomorrow morning. Because this statement tomorrow should be submitted to the Joint working group meeting and then it should go to the Board so we should do it tonight or tomorrow morning, so the volunteers please express yourselves and let's do it after the meeting, Tijani and Dave. I think I'd like to conclude by asking Cheryl, if you can give some closing comments, and then (inaudible) and then we'll finish.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: My statements are very simple. The energy, the enthusiasm and the forward productivity I've seen from this effort for very important reasons is exactly why regional work is so important. Anything that the at large advisory committee can do to support you in these very, very useful exercises, we are here to help. At-Large Advisory Committee is your tool. Use it wisely. Remember, the words you will be putting to us to seek endorsement will be being judged by all the other regions. You may be setting a template, do it well. And I like more carefully planned language and less demands, at least to get something from me. Thank you one and all.

Male: Again, Thank you very much for having me, I've really enjoyed being here and listening to the dialogue and the debate. It can only get better I think, with more of us coming together and really sharing our ideas and opinions and sharing ideas, and like I was saying earlier, this is something here we are doing for all of us, you are really helping ICANN itself also accomplish its objective of being an inclusive multi-stake-holder bottom up organization. Again, finally to remind you that on Thursday from 9:30 there will be the discussion on the budget and I really implore you to take a look at the budget and then come to the meeting with your ideas and suggestions so that we will not be left out or behind. Again, thank you very much, and best wishes.

Nii Quaynor: I guess thanks very much for putting up with us, sometimes we can be you know, very confusing, but I think we also need to extend thanks to Avri and Evan for coming to share the Joint working group results with us. I think it was very useful and it added value to our discussions. I think with that I also like to thank all of you for the active participation, and I hope

next time we call you will be equally enthusiastic, and just to do some marketing, please remember every year around May, June the African technical community meets in a different country. We are just coming from Kigali and it was very exciting, so I encourage you to keep that in your calendar and join us the next time we are meeting elsewhere. Thank you very much.

--End of recorded material--