

ICANN San Francisco Meeting
JAS
TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 12 March 2011 at 14:00 local

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Woman: Okay.

Man: Okay, so you hand out presentations, good. And, yes, sorry to try and keep you brief but please do try and keep it as short as you can so that you can get back on schedule and do try so that we can also try and take some questions at the end, otherwise we won't have time. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, (unintelligible) we got how you are interested in the work, just working group. Anyway, so our (unintelligible) will be really short. I will try to cover what happened since Cartagena Meeting. And then the issues (unintelligible) and what - the ongoing work on the working group. And then (Cala) will tell us about the work page for the (unintelligible) resolution and then we go to the next steps.

Next slide please. So what we had at close of public comment for the minutes can record is the final record regarding the original charter that we had before. And then the (unintelligible) applicant support issues. And I think it was even a topic for the GAAC and the Board meeting in Brussels. The GNSO (unintelligible) charter up some discussion.

There are some difference between the (unintelligible) and we need to fix that as the existing bylaws don't address such issues. Hopefully the Jazz Working Group continue to the work based in the previous scope and also in the union of the two charters.

So about the issue raised by the GAAC about the cost consideration of the - about the fees, about the language diversity and how to support - how to provide support for technical and logistic. And also to - (unintelligible) divide up into countries but for the more specific issues raised by the GAAC is the last point about applications for government on national authorities. They want more special consideration for developing countries.

Next slide. So to first to the work - this working group tried to not delay initiative of the program. So we divided to work between five subgroups regarding the union of the charter between the GNSO and (unintelligible). So the first working - work team is about how to prioritize criteria for financial needs. So we need to define the mechanism to find who is a needy applicant. The second working group is about the funding and foundations to find us the new applicants who are (unintelligible) the program. The third subgroup is how about - to provide assistance for applicants and to coordinate assistance.

The fourth subgroup, it's about how to face the fees and waiving the fees. And the last subgroup is about ideas.

Okay, that's it, thanks.

(Cala): Hi, this is (Cala) (unintelligible). The Board has issued few resolution in relation to the stock. One of the resolutions is the one from September 25 that you see in front of you. We are particularly focused on the second paragraph that says, staff may publish at least organizations that request assistance in organizational (unintelligible) an interest in assisting with additional program development, for example pro bono consulting advice, pro bono in kind support, or financial assistances so that those needing assistance and those willing to provide assistance can find each other and work together.

So this is a specific task for staff. We took that task and we are working on a plan to have a webpage that would probably be accessible from the new GTO program pages. And in the webpage you see the applicant support. Under that you continue to have an area describing what this is with all of the disclaimers.

And then if there is an applicant that is seeking support, this applicant would click and fill out a form. This form would be sent to staff and the applicant would have also received an email at this point saying, you know, you have submitted this request. You have to click on a link to confirm that. Then at this point we're going to check if indeed this is a company or an applicant that you can, you know, reach out.

And then you will see below two different groups, one listing the applicants seeking support and the other one are the organizations offering assistance. We also plan on having some kind of a category upfront to make it easier for people, you know, up front to say what is it that they want. Here is a draft of the form that we are still developing.

Now as Council well know, implementing something like that is easier said than done and definitely in the details, right. So we still need to look at, you know, some terms and conditions for the user. We need to take a look at some disclaimers.

And we also need to develop processes for people that want to obtain this information or maybe remove themselves from the list and how do we try to prevent, as much as possible, that this list is well represented or at least try to prevent misrepresentation in this list, which is kind of tricky because we are not going to be doing background check for everyone that signs up for this list. We at least will see if there is really a human being or there's an organization behind it.

So this is the plan at this point. We are thinking some time in May to launch this assuming, you know, all the internal resources and everything are in there to finalize the work at hand. Thank you.

Man: Thanks, all right. Is there more or can we ask questions? No, in general. Can we ask questions on this page or have you got more and then we'll let you finish and come back?

(Cala): Yes, you can ask questions.

Man: Okay.

Tim Ruiz: So that particular process where you're, you know, those who need assistance, those who are willing to provide it, kind of marrying those together, that's what you intend to do for this first round? And then potentially Jazz recommendations would take effect further down the road. Is that kind of what I'm getting here?

(Cala): So I'm only going to speak about that page. So that page that you're speaking on, that was very specific to this Board resolutions, that task have to do that. Now there's a working group work and there's other deliverables that are related to this work. By the way, this model for implementing this Board resolution is open for suggestions. If you have any suggestions to better implement that specific resolution, you know, I'm welcome.

Tim Ruiz: Right, I just think it's significant to understand that because if there is work that Jazz needs to do in order for the applicant guidebook to be complete, I mean that's important. Or if it's going to be complete with what you have there, then that's, you know, all I'm asking.

Rafik Dammak: It will be complete. There won't be any delay. The working group is committed to finishing in May.

(Cala): I'm sorry to, so, Tim, if I understand the question correctly, there is the work of the working group that the working group plans to finish in May. You're asking about what work of this working group is going to be incorporated into the guidebook?

Tim Ruiz: I'm not asking what. I'm asking is - I mean is that work going to be incorporated because if it is, you know, we're talking about another significant potential delay here. I mean if that's to be considered for future rounds that's another - and I'm not trying to debate Jazz whether it's right and - I'm just saying, trying to get the lay of the land here as far as what we can expect.

Rafik Dammak: As I repeated, (Tim), there won't be any delay. We would finish so it will be ready before the first.

Tim Ruiz: You will finish but if what you finish has to then be taken and incorporated into the guidebook that's not finished. I mean that's like a whole other round and public comments and who knows what the GAAC is going to think and blah, blah, blah, right?

Man: So just to leave for five minutes and - so we had Avri next I think and then Andre and then (Jeff). Is that correct? Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, as far as I know, nothing that the Jazz group is doing has been specifically defined by staff as gating their work for this, some of the stuff is similar.

The Jazz, as I understand it, is continuing to work on all its objectives to the deadlines that Rafik has mentioned, bearing in mind there's still open discussion between the GAAC and the Board on many of the issues and so therefore, as far as I understand it, the Jazz group is working to get everything done as possible. But nothing has been specifically defined by staff as far as I know from the Jazz group as gating their work.

Man: Can I just ask? How much more of this presentation do you have? Do you want to finish first and then go into questions? It's finished? Okay, I'm sorry. Sorry? Hang on, what? It's finished, okay, fine. Andre?

Andre Phillip: Yes, just a question, (unintelligible) receive any preliminary demands or applications or questions from the potential user groups, communities, or countries who might be interested in this program and this help?

(Cala): I'm sorry, the working group or staff?

Andre Phillip: Any, working group or staff, do you consider any particular applicants, potential applicants or it's a virtualization of all sorts? Like, is there any real demand, any real applicants who you talked to who actually defined what they need and how they need to be supported?

Man: I don't know, some guys from (unintelligible) or whatever.

Rafik Dammak: I think as we have the support from the GAAC they express an interest for the application for - at least it shows us some real interest, right. There are applicants from - maybe from community to try this, yes. I don't have names.

Andre Phillip: No, no, I'm not asking the names. I'm asking if there are any. Yes or no?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Man: Okay, who do we have next? (Jeff) and Avri, did you want to come back? That's a follow-up to his, do you want to make it now?

Avri Doria: Yes, I think two things. I think, yes, there have been various groups that have come talked. I think the Board asked the GAAC that same specific question and the GAAC came back in saying, can't get to that degree of specificity, various stages of planning.

The fear of opening up their plans to people when there still is no social support that basically of a sudden then somebody else grabs their ideas and runs with it. So the whole notion of getting public about such possible requests, you know, the GAAC responded to that's not possible but, yes, there have been background requests, you know, etc.

(Jeff): Can you go back, like, two slides, next? I mean I have some questions but I want to hear what the next steps were. I think we kind of skipped that. Can you just do that part and then I'll ask the question?

Right, the next step by the Jazz, not by ICANN staff. By the Jazz group, what's your next step and - you said there are timelines. Can you just go over that with other - yes?

Rafik Dammak: That's what we will finish for - commit to finish in May because we divided the work between five subgroups and then to finish in May for that.

(Jeff): In May?

Rafik Dammak: May.

(Jeff): So what part of that actually has Jazz coming back to the GNSO for the GNSO's consideration?

Rafik Dammak: I think when we finish we will send our (unintelligible) to our (unintelligible) organization, the GNSO and to ALAC.

(Jeff): Sorry, and ALAC. So it's not going to the Board, it's coming to us, right?

Rafik Dammak: I think we will follow the normal process.

(Jeff): Okay.

Man: Let me just ask what the normal process is because you said on your first slide, there's something that said there's no bylaws for - can you tell that - can you just go back to the first slide, please?

Rafik Dammak: There is no bylaws to manage that we have two - beginning to have two different (unintelligible) charters.

Man: Right, that - it says, no precedent, no bylaws exist to address issue. Okay, I understand that. Where does it say in the bylaws that we have community working groups?

Rafik Dammak: The issue is to have two different charters, different objectives from our charting organizations. Solution best - we tried to make a union of the charter and now we have a new version approved by ALAC so it's close to the GNSO.

Man: So just to make sure, your intent, the group's intent, sorry, is to go back to the GNSO with one report and to ALAC with another?

Rafik Dammak: We will differentiate between the objectives asked by the GNSO and asked by ALAC.

Woman: Maybe my memory's faulty but I think we talked about this briefly in a Council meeting recently and I think we didn't prescribe the format or the form of the working group's report but I think it was made clear and I think the working group agreed that whatever the report looks like, it be very clear which parts are addressed to the GNSO charter and which parts to the ALAC charter.

Man: (Jeff), are you next?

(Jeff): Yes, so I'm just kind of interesting, when you say - there were a couple of slides back, you said the GAAC has asked for a few things. Can you just clarify when the GAAC has asked for these things? I mean I'm just a little

confused and this is getting into the whole cross working group. I think the instructions to the working group should come from the GNSO or whoever's chartering the group as opposed to from the GAAC. It's not that that work shouldn't be done but I'm just trying to get - understanding issues raised by the GAAC.

Man: (Jeff), it's more the support from the GAAC.

(Cala): Can I just clarify one thing? Issued raised by the GAAC was something that was in the GAAC scorecard, that's part of what has been discussed with the initiative of the program. They talked about that (unintelligible) support.

(Jeff): No, no, sorry, I understand that, but is that now in the charter of the Jazz group?

Rafik Dammak: No.

(Jeff): I'm just confused. I'm not trying to be - I'm just very confused.

Rafik Dammak: We are working in the objectives given by our charting organization.

Man: I think what we're trying to understand, I hope I'm not speaking for others but just to clarify things so that you can possibly help, is are we doing this because the GAAC's raised a concern? Are we doing this because - you know, I think that's the issue that's being discussed here if that helps in anyway.

Rafik Dammak: Can you repeat your question please?

(Edward): Just to be clear, the ALAC's version of the charter, which is a clear superset of the GNSO one, that is includes the GNSO one and a few other items, was sufficiently broad but the item the GAAC has expressed some interest in are already included in that charter. So the GAAC has simply said, we are

interested in the work the group is doing. It is inline with what we think needs to be done. It is not a charter from a GAAC.

Man: Thanks, (Edward).

Avri Doria: And I'd like to go one step further. In the conversations between the GAAC and the Board the Jazz working group has been brought up often and there have been Board statements saying, and we want to see this work, you know, completed as soon as possible. So there are the charting organizations and there are the Board directives and there are the GAAC requests.

And so I think as a community working group there will be many people interested in the report. And the GNSO will look at the parts it's interested in and either endorse it or not. The ALAC will look at the parts that it is interested in and endorse it or not. The Board and the GAAC will look at the report and see if it's at all useful for them to solve their problems and they'll take into account whether you guys endorse it or not.

And really hard to predict but I think everybody's going to look at it and everybody's going to make their conclusions on whether it's worth having or not.

Man: Sorry, (Jeff), carry on.

(Jeff): Yes, so I guess initially for the whole discussion of the role of cross working groups I think we helped charter this and it's taken a life of its own. And I think for me that's a problem. It's a problem because of what I said three meetings ago or whenever it was which is there's a perception that when we create a cross working group the working group actually speaks for the community which actually chartered it.

And I don't think that's an accurate statement. I think it has taken a life of its own. I think there were some meetings directly between the Jazz and the

Board in Columbia. I think the Board has given some emphasis to it. I think it's kind of spiraled because the GAAC now is referring to it - and this is part of the discussion I'd like to actually have with the GAAC too and with the Board, which is just clarifying the role of these cross working groups because there's a Board resolution which should have never happened because the Board resolution misinterprets the cross working group.

And these are some of the concerns that we've all expressed about what we - why we have these cross working groups. They were not intended to do this. They were not intended to be a superset or above the Council or the community.

Just as a - you know, I tried to - and I asked (Glen) and (Glen) sent me a list of the Jazz members and I'm sure she'll send it to, you know, to anyone to the list but these are people for the most part, and there's a lot of ICANN staffers on there, but aside from that it's for the most part individuals - and even the ones that are not individuals that are members of companies, they're there as individuals.

If I run a cross work group or any working group, when I'm there I'm there as an individual. I work for New Star but I make it very clear that I don't represent New Star unless I express and say so, nor do I represent my stakeholder group unless I'm allowed to expressly state so. And the problem is that when a working group reports directly to the Board or to the GAAC or any external organization there's a presumption that the communities or that the people - the organizations behind the people actually support you.

And here, I don't want to take away any of the good work that's done by this group but I just want to make sure there's a formal process to make sure that the community actually does support the statements and the concepts in the report.

And I'm afraid that there's deadlines set - I know we got the answer that they're going to send it back to the chartering organizations but I didn't get a feel of - which the question wasn't answered is is this also going to go to the Board at the same time it goes to the organizations?

And if so, that usurps the charting organization's ability to comment on it because now the Board's already got it and they're going to do what they're going to do in separate meetings with the GAAC. I mean it's just spiraled. And it already has spiraled. Sorry.

Man: Yes, thanks, (Jeff). Can I suggest - this is obviously something we need to carry on talking about and it leads so elegantly into the next session that we have. Can we just merge those two? And if so, do you guys over there need us to stop and start again? Okay, can we just do that for five seconds while they reset the mic and we'll just pick this straight up. You know, what I mean, thank you.

END