EN

ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 08 May 2023 at 20:00 UTC

Note: 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. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page https://community.icann.org/x/aYIXDg

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and welcome to the GNSO guidance process known as GGP, Initiation Request for Applicant Support, taking place on Monday, the 8th of May, 2023.

For today's meeting, we have no apologies listed.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please email the GNSO Secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the public wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording.

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.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to the chair. Mike Silber, please begin.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Terry, and good morning, afternoon, evening, depending on your time zone. Thank you for joining. Much appreciated. In particular, those who are joining on a bank holiday after a very eventful weekend. Thanks, Roz. That's appreciated.

I think the suggestion from Julie that I think is correct is let's keep the momentum going. Let's continue from section five, and let's see if we can wrap up five and six, and then we can go back to some of the additional comments that have come in in the intro. Julie, over to you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. So thank you all, and starting up with section five, just as a reminder, last Monday we went through sections one through four. We'll start up with section five, run through five and six to the end of the document, and then there are some new comments in the document back towards the beginning, so we'll go back to those. So not to worry. Those who may have put comments in earlier sections, we will indeed cover those as well.

So starting on section five, we have recommendation five, that of all successfully delegated gTLD applicants, the goal is that 5%, 0.5 of them were supported applicants. Indicators of success would be that 5% of all successfully delegated gTLD applicants

were supported applicants, and the data metrics to measure success would be that 5% of successfully delegated gTLD applications are supported applicants.

Note that this percentage is in relation to the number of strings applied for or the number of applicants. And I'm going to pause there to note that we do have one comment, and the comment is actually from ICANN Org, and that's from Leon. I'll read it. And then Leon is on the call, and if you want to add anything to that, otherwise I can open it up for comments and discussion from working group members based on the suggestion.

So Leon says, "I would suggest changing to 0.5%. If we expect around 2,000 applications to go through, then with 0.5%, we expect 10 supported applicants under the applicant support program. If we say 5%, then this would mean 100 supported applicants. Perhaps this is what was meant, and I'm wrong, but according to previous conversations, the 10 to 15 figure seemed more prevalent as a goal, and I know we've had trouble with this percentage, so I'm likely the one who got it wrong this time." So let me just pause there for any discussion. Looking for hands.

MIKE SILBER: I think Leon raises an interesting question, because we're not certain if ICANN's going to have the resources to support, given the numbers that Leon has suggested, which I think is a reasonable assumption at least to start working on. I'm not sure ICANN has the ability to support 5% of applications. And then I suppose the question comes in, what do we deem as support? Because if we're talking about somebody who has at any stage

gone through the applicant support program, then that's going to be very difficult. If we're talking about people who get specific financial support in the form of a fee waiver, fee reduction, either in terms of the application fee or ongoing fees, that's going to start getting really expensive. And it impacts then on the financial modeling of the application costs. So I think that 0.5% is a more appropriate mark. But I also know that we spoke last time about trying to shoot a little bit for something bigger than just a slight incremental increase on what we got last time. So I don't know what people think about that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. Comments from others? Comments from others are welcome. Maureen, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. I thought our original goal was 10-15. And whatever the 10-15 of 2000 is in the mathematical formula is really what we should be going for. And I thought we had this argument before. And maths was never my strongest point. But yeah, whatever comes out as the percentage sort of like goal that we put in there. For me personally, I thought that that was what we were aiming for anyway. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. And I just note in the chat, Roz has a comment. "I also thought our original range was 10-15." And I think that that is the case, that I perhaps put the incorrect number in. I think 10% of 2000 applications, 200 applications would really exceed the

EN

number of applicants that ICANN is likely to support. But Kristy's hand is up. And Maureen, I see your hand again. So maybe I'll go to Kristy and then back to Maureen.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Thank you, Julie. And yeah, this is an interesting question. So I guess maybe a threshold question for this group is whether you want to see a proportion of total applications as being supported applicants, right? So whether we get 2000 applications or 10,000 applications, is the aim to see some sort of percentage of those applications being supported? Or is the aim to see within a range, a sort of set number, like 10 to 20 or regardless of how many applications we get? So that would be kind of a threshold question for the group. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Kristy. And I'm glad you mentioned that because I do think that was one of the things that previously the working group has discussed, is does it make more sense to just pick a number regardless of the number of applications? Because frankly, and I think this is the other thing we mentioned, we don't know how many applications there will be. But we do have a sense of how many applicants we might want. And Paul's hand is up, please, Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. Yeah, this is sort of one of these things. And someone said we're not mathematicians, we're not economists either, right? And so I don't want to put a thumb on a scale because it's not my

role as the council liaison. But I'm just thinking about supply and demand and a certain a number feels like it could be arbitrary. On the other hand, a percentage could also be arbitrary. There may be factors that are driving demand for non-applicant supported TLD applications. And we could have a bumper crop of applicant supported applications, but still not meet some number. So, for example, after 12, 13, 14 years, there may be demand in the marketplace for dot brands and we may get hundreds or thousands of those. But that demand doesn't really have anything to do with the demand from those who might be seeking applicant support and based on those kinds of TLD applications and registries.

So I would just hate for us to get a good crop of applicant support applications, but feel we failed because the demand was so much higher because of market forces that have nothing to do with applicant support for what it's worth. And if it's not worth anything, cast it aside. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Paul. Mike, please.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you. And I think, Paul, you raise an important question. I think we should see if we can possibly shoot for both and try and get the best of both where we'd want to see no less than, let's say, 10 supported applications with an objective of insert suitable percentage, so is that 0.5% or 1% or we can debate that. But I think we can try and capture both items, because I do get the

point, if we've got loads of dot brands and not that many generics and the supported applicants are not dot brands or generics, at least we should have 10 supported applicants with a stretch goal of 0.5% of all applications. I don't know if that makes sense.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. Any comments on Mike's suggestion? Maureen says stick to something safe like a number of these 10 supported applicants. You could say no fewer than 10 supported applicants is a goal. And also capture the percentage. If there are no objections to that, then staff can make that change in the document. I don't see any further hands up on that. I see a thumbs up from Kristy. Thanks, Kristy.

Then I will move to the next section. And that's section six on the ongoing operations of the gTLD. And recommendation six, ICANN Org to investigate the extent to which supported applicants that were awarded a gTLD are still in business as a registry operator after two years. I'll come back to the comments after I read through all of this. Implementation guidance, if supported applicants that were awarded a gTLD are not still in business as a registry operator after two years, ICANN Org to investigate barriers/challenges that failed registry operators experienced to help inform future aspects of the applicant support program and/or other capacity development new registry programs.

Indicators of success are a number of supported applications that resulted in delegated gTLD and tracked operations over a designated period of time. For example, two years. And the measures of success—and these are pulled directly from the

SubPro new gTLD subsequent procedures final report. The number of registrants or domain names registered in quote-unquote regional TLDs, e.g. TLDs focusing mainly on a local limited market. Keep in mind that there are other barriers to registrants in developing countries to access domain names, such as inability to access online payment services and a lack of new registrars, local registrars.

And second bullet point, the number of domain names registered in regional quote-unquote new gTLDs compared to the number of Internet users in such regions. These numbers could be compared with the same numbers for Internet users and quote-unquote regional new gTLDs in developed regions such as Europe and North America.

And then back up to the comments. On two years, we have a comment from Sarah from ALAC. We're proposing that we adjust this period from two to three years. Please comment below. Three years after launch might be a better option as the second year is the junk dump for new TLDs when undeveloped/speculated domain names are dropped. By year three, the patterns of a new gTLD start to emerge.

So let's talk about that comment. Any thoughts about Sarah's suggestion from ALAC?

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I don't think there's a major issue. I suppose it takes a little longer to get results because we're tracking over three years. But if it's going to give us better results, why not?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Anyone have any objections to changing this to three years? All right, then. The next comment was from Roz, and it was picked up from an earlier version of the document, which is why it isn't labeled as Roz's comment, but I have picked it up as her comment from the previous document. Under the word program, under new registry program, I think there's something still about collecting data which needs to be captured. I'm not sure I quite understand the comment. Roz, do you mind speaking to it?

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah, absolutely. So we had a sentence originally, and it was captured in the old redline document, I think, about tracking data on how well things were going sort of as it developed in the first two to three years. And I noted that was taken out, and so I just wasn't really sure why because I thought part of what we agreed that we were going to do is try to track different aspects to see if, for example, the successful applicant still felt supported or to record any challenges they were having in order to have a collection of data.

I don't know if—the redline document, I can dig out, but there was definitely some language on the initial version that I just wondered, I guess, why it had been taken out. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Roz. I think we took out the language about tracking the registry operators in other respects. I think it was maybe at the

suggestion from ICANN Org, but I'm not sure that I remember that correctly. Kristy, do you recall? Not to put you on the spot.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah, I think—Well, in general, and on this one, I think we want to acknowledge that there is value in looking at the data long-term of the awarded applicants and whether and how they were successful and if they weren't successful, why not? But I'm not sure. I guess my question would be, in looking at that data, is that an indication of whether the applicant support program was successful? And if so, should that also maybe entail looking at some of the other elements of support? As it stands right now, the applicant support program is really just focused on a fee reduction program for the application process and cultivating some pro bono services.

There is some research that ICANN Org did on other globally recognized programs per the request of the SubPro final report to see what other programs do. And one of the findings from that research was that a lot of other global programs that would be sort of similar in nature to applicant support do provide some ongoing support for three to four years after the initial decision or evaluation process. And that seems to be something that this recommendation and implementation guidance is sort of hinting at, but we haven't discussed explicitly whether and how ICANN Org would provide that kind of ongoing support. So I guess that's another question for me that's tied to this recommendation and the other outputs underneath it. I don't know if that answers your question, Julie, but that's my take on it. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Kristy. And that's very helpful. Roz has also helpfully pulled out the previous language. It's following completion of a new gTLD round, ICANN Org should collect data on the number of supported applications that resulted in a delegated TLD by region and those that did not. Track operations of those delegated TLDs for two years and conduct a survey of the successful and unsuccessful supported applicants to determine which elements of the program they found useful or not.

So it may be that the concern was that there were a number of reasons beyond the applicant support program that a delegated TLD was unsuccessful. I'm not sure if it was that element that we were concerned about. Otherwise—would it be useful to have that language put back in? Roz, please.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thanks, Julie. I think it's just for me—and as always, if no one else feels this way, happy to go with what the majority think, but I just feel the language was a lot more specific about what could be done. And now I appreciate in the interest of summarizing it, it's been cut down, but I think it is important to note. And I think it's fine to say should collect data without over specifying what kinds of data, because it might be as we go along, we see what's relevant or reconvene on that. But I just think it's important to have specific deliverables in there would help to keep us accountable on how things go after the applicants are successful. And even those that are unsuccessful, sort of like what happens afterwards, I guess. I guess I would just question at the end of the day, does

anyone see harm in including that original language? You know, is there an issue with it that's unclear? Because right now I think the new language just seems quite different to me, but maybe that's just me. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Roz. And Steve Chan, please.

STEVE CHAN: Yeah. Thanks, Julie. I'm going to entertain an attempt at trying to figure out why that language might have dropped. And I think it's possibly because there's a bit of a disconnect between trying to get data about why the program is not successful, because the way that this part of the report is actually drafted is it's looking at what represents that success, and then also the data that helps us indicate that the program is indeed successful.

I think part of what was dropped from the language before is actually looking at the survey data to see about, to try to determine what doesn't work. That doesn't make that data not valuable. It just might not fit in the structure that we have in front of us. So maybe if we actually separate those two components, the elements that indicate success, and then this is sort of bonus data that we think should be collected in surveying applicants that may not have been successful after the two years or three years, that might just be an important data point that is not directly correlated to the goal. I hope that made some sense. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:	Thank you, Steve. And thank you for jogging my memory, because I think that is indeed why we deleted that language, because it didn't fit with what was indicating success and what was being measured for success. And yet it is, as Roz notes, useful information to have nonetheless. So I think there's a way we can include it, and noting also that we're putting this into implementation guidance, which is, as it stands, guidance.

So we just have to make it clear where the connections are. Yes, Steve notes in the chat, it's now a measure of not being successful. Correct, exactly. Thank you. And thanks for that comment, Roz, appreciate it. And thanks for finding the original language as well.

I don't think there are any more comments on that section. No. So what I'd suggest is going back up to the top of the document, because I think there are some comments that were added since last Monday. And we can go ahead and go back to those.

All right. Here we are in Recommendation 1, Section 1. And we do have some comments, again, relating to underdeveloped, underrepresented, or underserved and developing regions. So there's comments from Gabriela, and also from Roz, and I'll speak to those. And I think also we have, I know that ICANN has looked at this as well, and given it some more thought. So I think they have some guidance also. But let me start with what we have here from Gabriela.

"The concept of underrepresented, quote, unquote, can be confusing, as it is primarily used to describe a lack of political representation in multilateral contexts. However, when considering

EN

the concept of underserved, it becomes more comprehensive encompassing both physical and nonphysical infrastructure in some regions. The broader understanding in line with the perspective of the International Telecommunications Union extends beyond solely addressing the needs of the least developed countries. Then we would be encompassing a wider range of potential applicants while also contributing to SDG 9, which focuses on expanding internet infrastructure, including nonphysical infrastructure."

And Roz says, "Underserved is great. I agree that if that is kept, underrepresented can go."

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I think that's correct. I had made one comment. I'm not sure if it's come through. But I've got a concern about the reference to the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group. Because that's a somewhat extensive and not fully relevant document. And I think it's confusing using that as a reference to what we define as underserved. In particular, because the definition there of underserved also then refers to governments not engaged in the GAC, which I don't think is what we're after. So my suggestion is that we just extract the specific definition in that document, which is an underserved region is one that does not have a well-developed DNS and/or associated industry or economy.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. And Gabriela says in the chat, yes, we can include definition. Thanks. Okay, very good. Great suggestion.

Kristy Buckley from ICANN Org has just in here that we might propose a clarification that the targets are particular audience segments, e.g. nonprofit, social enterprises, community, with emphasis on under, asterisk, regions, but not limited to those regions. The reference to the GAC definition of underserved is geographically based, and the SubPro final report explicitly said that they did not want to limit to geographic regions or national level economic classifications. So perhaps a rewrite like target potential applicants from the not-for-profit sector, social enterprises, and or community organizations with emphasis on developing underrepresented and/or underserved regions or something along those lines. The point being is that we don't want to limit comms and outreach to particular regions for ASP, but it's about finding potential applicants that could qualify from all regions while emphasizing that more attention should be paid to under dash asterisk regions.

MIKE SILBER: Yes, I think Kristy is spot on. And I think that's what we're going with. But we may just need to refine the language. So I think you're just capturing what we kind of already agreed and always appreciated. So I think if we change that language now that we've settled that we're not going to use underrepresented, that we're going to use underserved with a specific definition, then I think we're good to go.

JULIE HEDLUND: So we're not using—yes, underrepresented, let's just take that out right now.

MIKE SILBER: And we're not using underdeveloped either.

JULIE HEDLUND: Right. Let's take that out. Underserved and developing regions. Correct. Sarah has her hand up. Sarah, please.

MIKE SILBER: According to Gabriela, it should be developing regions and countries. Sorry to interject.

JULIE HEDLUND: Not a problem.

MIKE SILBER: Go ahead.

SARAH KIDEN: Okay, so I wanted to ask about, I think I added a comment about, for example, indigenous communities and groups like that, because during the ALAC call last week, we spent a bit of time discussing that. And I feel that if you remove underrepresented, for example, then it removes like that provision for communities like indigenous communities in developing countries. Yeah, thank you.

MIKE SILBER: I take the point, but at the same time, I think the concern that Gabriela has expressed, at least to me, outweighs the benefit. And I do think that, for example, indigenous communities would be catered for in the definition of underserved, which is does not have a well-developed DNS and or associated industry or economy. Because it's not limited on a national level, it could be—and we're using the term region, which could mean either a region being a group of countries or an area within national boundaries, which would encompass then a specific indigenous language group, for example.

Now, if we look at one of the successfully delegated TLDs from the previous round, we look at .cat, that is a region within national boundaries, or we could be looking at a region which is transnational. But I think that the underserved definition is adequate, because if we start looking at underrepresented, that starts having political connotations, which makes it very subjective.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. And I see Kristy is noting in the chat, let me just read this out for the record, "underserved being comprehensive and inclusive of indigenous communities. It's a broader term that is not limited to geographic area or economic status, e.g. developing." And I was going to say something similar in that in the US, I think it's more accurate to use underserved when trying to capture the indigenous communities, because they aren't necessarily regionally oriented. They're scattered throughout the United States, and their sort of defining feature is that they're

underserved, not necessarily that they're underrepresented or representing a particular or captured in a particular region.

And I see that Maureen is saying, "Would Kristy's explanation, re: indigenous groups, be included in any text?" Maureen, I think the idea—and Mike, correct me if I'm wrong, I think the idea is that the text of the term underserved would be capturing the indigenous groups.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, so I had suggested that we simply take the definition from the GAC document, but if you feel that that's inadequate and we want to expand a bit, subject to our colleagues from the GAC who made the very useful suggestion of referring to that definition, allowing us to stretch it a little bit, I have no issue at all. I think the more clarity we get to definitions, the better we would be served.

JULIE HEDLUND: So, Mike, is the suggestion then to extract the definition from the document that we see there where I've highlighted and add to it? I'm not sure I understand. Or supplement it somehow?

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. For some reason, my comment doesn't come through, so let me just pop it into the chat.

JULIE HEDLUND: That'd be great, thanks. And I see that Kristy is saying the SubPro final report called for the applicant support program to focus on

supporting struggling regions to get away from the geographic and socioeconomic development status. However, we were challenged to define what a struggling region was in the ODA, so we suggested the ASP not be limited to particular geographies, but rather be based upon financial need and work in the public interest. And Mike has in the chat, "Does not have a well-developed DNS and/or associated industry or economy." That's the definition from the GAC document. I'm going to copy that.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, so I think we can use that, but I think the suggestion that's being made by Maureen and Sarah and to some extent echoed by Kristy's intervention is that we may want to just stretch that a little bit.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Anybody have anything else they want to add with respect to—

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I want to move away, Maureen, if you don't mind, from struggling. I don't think that it's helpful because that becomes an incredibly subjective test. I think when you're talking about underserved, you can at least look in terms of comparative statistics, where struggling becomes very subjective.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. And I'll note also how Kristy had said in the chat that that ICANN Org was challenged to define what a struggling region was in the operational design analysis document. And so they moved away from that particular term. So we're not going to use the term struggling, just to confirm.

All right, moving along to Section 2, Business Case. And we have on the indicators of success and qualitative, we have a majority of supported applicants that access pro bono services and indicate moderate to high satisfaction with those pro bono services and the information. And Maureen's question is, " I know we are trying to keep things high level, but these indicators of success seem overly simplistic. Is that it? Especially taking into account the range of expertise that is required to make a successful business case." Anything you want to add to that, Maureen? Or other suggestions of the language?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, I just sort of like felt that where these are pro bono services of volunteers, so how do we ensure that they are of a capacity level that will actually meet the business needs of people who are actually trying, wanting to apply, and just need additional information about like how do we assess the quality of information that's going to be given.

JULIE HEDLUND: Do you have other language you'd like to suggest? Mike, please.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, wearing a lawyer hat for a second. If ICANN starts assessing the quality of pro bono services being offered, then ICANN starts getting involved in accepting responsibility for that quality, then ICANN is seen, to use Paul's phrase of putting its thumb on the scale in terms of what services are given to potential applicants. And that creates the potential for favoring supported applicants over non-supported applicants in certain circumstances. So it becomes really difficult. So I hear what you're saying, Maureen. How do we make sure that this is actually useful and usable? I think the information that ICANN makes available, we can hold ICANN to a specific standard that they must provide useful, usable information. But in terms of the pro bono services, if we don't get good quality, then we need to go back and say the program wasn't useful to applicants and potential applicants. But I think that's all we can say. Then we need to go back and redesign the program. But what we're looking at here is what are the metrics to allow us to assess success rather than designing the program.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Maureen, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to ask, at one stage I saw that applicants would be advised about pro bono services. So who advises them as to who would be—how do they get assigned services?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. I don't think actually we have that language in here anymore. I'm just looking. I think we're we steered away from that language, but I see Kristy has her hand up. Kristy, please.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Thanks, Julie. Yeah, I don't recall if that language was in there or not, but in general, I think that would pose risks to ICANN sort of inserting itself between the pro bono service provider and those that are seeking pro bono services. And I think the intent is to cultivate and recruit pro bono service providers and will probably entail some sort of background screening and due diligence to ensure that those are legitimate pro bono service providers. But then it would be up to those service providers and supported applicants to sort of find each other and determine whether and how they're going to work together. Because ICANN sort of providing that connection or sort of facilitating actively those relationships kind of puts the Org in the middle of those relationships rather than creating a space for those relationships to happen on their own.

MIKE SILBER: Kristy, can I suggest that maybe we need to just add some additional wording over there which says that we will then communicate the availability of pro bono services and the parameters in which they're offered to potential supported applicants?

JULIE HEDLUND:	Thanks, Mike. Where would you suggest we add that? In recommendation two?

MIKE SILBER:	Yes. So it has, one, cultivated pro bono services, informed as well as ICANN provided information, two, that the ASP has communicated the availability of those pro bono services and the supported applications reported they found those useful.

JULIE HEDLUND:	Thanks.

MIKE SILBER:	But Maureen, am I correct? You're saying let's actually just indicate somewhere that it's communicated. It's not a lot of help if it's hidden away on a website somewhere and people don't get to be aware of it.

MAUREEN HILYARD:	Yeah, that is sort of my point, and I realize that it must be difficult, as you sort of mentioned, that ICANN—because I just sort of like seem to remember the wording, and of course, it's probably been deleted by now, but that there would be some sort of like advisory service matching them up, some kind of matching up kind of process.
	But as long as the details are there, and that they know where they can find that information, and that they make those choices, that makes sense to me. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, Maureen, if I recall correctly, the idea of matching was raised and rejected, because that puts ICANN in the middle of a relationship in a position which creates massive legal risk for ICANN as well as for applicants.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, and I'll pull that language from the transcript when it's up and incorporate it into the document. But we're really talking about making sure that that the pro bono services and other information and services is communicated to the potential supported applicants. And Kristy, I'm just looking to see if you have any concerns about adding in language about communicating that information, but we're not actually trying to set up some kind of matching or advisement.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah, no concerns about adding the communication. We certainly want to do a good job at communicating that those services are there and recruiting service providers and doing everything we can to help people find each other in that space, but we just don't want to be in the middle. That's the small technical piece that we want to avoid. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks. That's very helpful, Kristy. And thanks, Maureen, for the suggestion, and thank you, Mike, for the suggested language. And Paul in chat notes, recruiting pro bono service providers is going

to be the hard part. Indeed. Under qualitative, Maureen has a comment on the word application. Are we setting criteria on volunteers of pro bono services so that we at least ensure minimum degree of quality and usefulness of services? I do not believe that that is something that ICANN Org is planning to do, but I'm looking at you, Kristy, if you have any thoughts on that. Not to target you again.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: No, no worries. So, what we've done in the ODA to this question is we've estimated the number of hours needed for pro bono services based upon interviewing a couple of applicants from the previous round, and we put a table in the ODA that basically estimates the cost and the number of pro bono service hours. I think it was 500 or so per applicant for like legal services, technical services, application writing consultants, etc.

And so that is going to inform the recruitment strategy for pro bono services, but I don't know that we've set any number that we're looking for in terms of number of providers or volunteers, if that answers your question, Maureen.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Kristy. And Maureen is noting that we have discussed that already, I think. And if we did, it's quite possible we did go over this last week, and my communication issues prevented me from catching that. Thank you, though.

Just moving along then to Section three. We have surveys about quality, accessibility, and usefulness. And now if we've done this

comment already, please let me know. When would this survey be administered? I'm assuming they would only be able to gauge the usefulness of the ASP and its resources at the end of the application process, and whether their application has been successful or not. I don't know that we need to specify when the survey would happen, but I would guess that that is logical. Mike, I see your microphone is open.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I think that we actually need to test this on multiple occasions. And I'm going to leave it to people who are more expert at this. But there are going to be inflection points where we want to check. When somebody drops out, when somebody hasn't logged into the applicant support portal for a month, there are going to be certain key inflection points where—and yes, I agree with Maureen—one of the key inflection points is going to be once they've actually submitted an application.

But if somebody decides not to submit at some stage after a period of inactivity, that should be noticed, and they should be sent a survey link to say, we notice you haven't logged in for a while. Can you tell us why? And if they say, because I'm no longer interested, then that's an inflection point at which we say, well, tell us. Is it because you didn't feel supported, you didn't have the information you needed to make the right decision, or because you did actually get the support and information you needed, and you then made a decision, which was an informed and supported decision, that a new gTLD is not for you? It doesn't keep you warm at night. It doesn't fill an empty belly. It has a specific use case, and it's not for everyone.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Any further comments on that, Maureen, or anybody else?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I just had made a comment, but I was agreeing with Mike. I think that there needs to be some kind of—and perhaps as part of the process, of the applicant process, that people need to be aware that there is going to be sort of ongoing assessments made as to how people are progressing, and to provide us with feedback in an ongoing way, so that they're actually—if we get lots of responses from people to say something isn't working, or something is working, it would be good to know, as we were going through the process, rather than, I don't know, however long we're going to take to do this, one or two years, to find that something wasn't working, and we'd just been persisting with it. Waste of time. So, it's just that they just need to know that they're going to be— agreeing to be part of the process will also mean that there will be ongoing assessment. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. And I've noted that I'll try to incorporate that language into this text. And just noting your comment in the chat, too, "I agree there needs to be surveying taking place throughout the process, because every applicant is going to be able to make a decision about progressing at different stages." Thank you.

Then on to four. I'm conscious of the time, and I think we can cover this last comment. And that's under indicators of success,

EN

ICANN Learn module, and a comment from Maureen. "Has an ICANN Learn module 101 been produced already that details everything that an ASP applicant would need to know in order to make a successful application? Especially if your indicator of success is a strong understanding. Several modules may be required to cover the different areas of knowledge that an ASP applicant may need in order to be successful."

JULIE HEDLUND: And I don't know the answer to that question. Kristy, do you know? Kristy, your hand is up, please.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sure. Thanks, Julie. So, we do not already have an ICANN Learn module on this. We have been in discussions with ICANN Learn and Account Services on whether and how to do that, and also it's pending the outcomes of the GGP to see what it is that the community is looking for here. One of the things that we've talked about with them is sort of a 101 on what it takes to be a registry operator might be helpful, because then it's really clear what someone is signing up for if they're applying for a gTLD.

But I think that if there are other aspects to your comment, Maureen, that you would like to see as learning objectives, it would be really helpful to the ICANN Learn team to understand what those learning objectives and learning outcomes are so that they can be sure that the ICANN Learn module is crafted accordingly and how those learning objectives differ from something that we could just put on a website, right? So, why

would it need to be an ICANN Learn training course as opposed to just information available on a website or in a document or the AGB or something else? So, if the GGP has more guidance on what it is that it's looking for there in terms of learning objectives, that would help ICANN Org determine the best resources to put together to meet that. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Kristy. And to that end, I'm wondering if it would be helpful if you've got some suggestions, Maureen, too, along the lines of Kristy's suggestion, if we added some implementation guidance here with respect to what the ICANN Learn module would contain.

MAUREEN HILYARD: If I could just step in here very briefly, Julie. I think that it's important that, for example, if we're going to do an ICANN Learn module on the applicant support, that these recommendations, for example, because they're important to the applicant, to the ASP, then they should be the key learning points for a learning module. I mean, they need to understand every aspect of the process. But it just depends on… I mean, I'm all for ICANN Learn modules. The courses are great. And I do agree that a mandatory one should be the Registry/Registrar course, that kind of thing. Like, if they're applying for support, there is obviously a need in that area. That should actually be sort of like a course that they have to do, for example. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. I see that Kristy's put in the chat, what would be most helpful to articulate are the learning objectives and learning outcomes that will help Org to determine what resources to deploy. I'm going to add that here in the document, too, as a suggestion. So, if the working group has any language they can add there, that would be helpful as well.

And I'm seeing we're just a minute from the top of the hour. Mike, perhaps I could suggest that staff makes these changes, but that we also put in the rationale sections from the discussions that the working group has had on these sections. And then the working group could help fill in the assumptions. I don't know that that's something—I don't think that's something staff should try to guess at. But in the meantime, we could tee up task six for discussion starting next week.

MIKE SILBER: Well, I think that's an excellent idea. Fully support that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Because adding the rationale in will take some time, more than the week we have, I think. But we don't want to lose any momentum here, and we could start up on task six. Excellent. Well, thank you, everyone. We're at the top of the hour. I want to thank Mike very much for doing such an excellent job of chairing. And thank you all for joining. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]