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**Key Points**

    Singapore – JAS WG and community should have as much interaction as possible.

    When can the JAS WG finalize the work?

    What kind of help does the JAS WG need to finalize the work?

    JAS WG needs feedback on the report to validate foundation and direction before it goes into implementation details.

    How will we reconcile the JAS WG proposal, the Board discussion about a potential fund and the GAC issues raised?

    JAS WG proposal is not only about money support, but a more comprehensive approach that includes other types of support.

    JAS WG does not want applicants for support to be competing one against another.

    Implementation - Should panel, process, structure be distanced from ICANN?

    Would the notion of another structure getting “seed funding” be a way to kick start the process, and make sure that the resources are ramping up with the actual needs fast enough so that there is no competition between the different potential requesters?

    There will be a need for some sort of evaluation panel. How could such an evaluation panel be formed in a way that would be sufficiently neutral and trustworthy?

   How can we put in place a structure that is efficient and timely?

   Demand for the Applicant Support. It is difficult to predict without the details about how this program will work, what it will offer, etc. There are too many variables. ICANN itself cannot predict overall applicants. More important than guessing demand, is to focus on *“How much of an outreach do we as ICANN want to make to make sure that we have treated this issue fairly in developing economies?”*

  What are the needs in the developing countries? How does having a top-level domain fit into meeting those needs? And that would be the basis for trying to organize a broader level of support, whether it’s funding or whether it’s expertise or whether it’s assistance in working through procedures or whatever.