
ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 01 May 2023 at 15:00 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/8AA5Dg>

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, and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Guidance Process, known as GGP, Initiation Request for Applicant Support taking place on Monday, the 1st of May 2023.

For today's call, we do have listed apologies from Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. 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 e-mail the GNSO secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior.

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.

With this, I'll now turn it over to the chair, Mike Silber. Please begin.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you, Terri. Good morning, afternoon, evening, everybody. Thank you for those who celebrate Worker's Day or whatever the local permutation is in your particular country, for joining on what is for most of us a holiday. So thank you for that.

Thank you, Julie, for circulating the revised document. I'm very impressed. And thank you also to everybody who's already started putting in some comment on that, and we've got some significant comment. So if everybody's comfortable, I think I'd like to turn it over to Julie and get her to start taking us through the document. Any comments, before we do that? Any thoughts that people want to share before we actually start engaging with the document? Seeing no hands, Julie, I'll hand over to you.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Mike. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Welcome, everyone, and thanks so much for joining. Again, as Mike said, for a holiday for many of you, we do appreciate it. Thanks to those who've put some comments into the document already. We do appreciate that as well. Given that there are comments starting from the beginning of the document, even though we did go through some of the content at the start of the document on the last call, I'll go ahead and start again from the top just to make sure that we cover all the comments. I also had sent around a link to the redlined version of the document. That is

really for everybody's reference to see where we arrived or how we arrived at the clean version and indicate the changes that we made—

MIKE SILBER: Sorry to interject, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Sorry. Go ahead, please. Yes, please.

MIKE SILBER: I'm struggling with your connection. I don't know if it's on my side or on yours. But I just wanted to check that so that we can try and fix that if it's an issue.

TERRI AGNEW: Julie, it is cutting in and out.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, now you are too. Let me try without my headphones. Just one minute. Let me try this. Is this any better?

TERRI AGNEW: Currently, it is better. Yes.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. Maybe the cat's got to my headphones and chewed the cord. I'll try to proceed like this and see if it works better. Otherwise, I'll have to pause and dial in, I suppose.

MIKE SILBER: Well, so far, so good. So let's continue.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. All right. Good. Well, sorry about that. Okay. Let's hope that I will be able to continue without any issues. Thank you all for your patience. As I was saying, I would like us to begin with the clean version of the document and that's where the newest comments have been left as well, and the redline version is for your reference. So, starting at the beginning of the life cycle elements in Outreach and Awareness, what we tried to do, as mentioned in the last call as well, is really try to look at the high-level goals. Here we're calling them recommendations because the terminology follows the format of the Recommendations Guidance report, which is the output that we're now starting to compile for that will ultimately be sent to the GNSO Council. So we're going to use the terminology of recommendations. But essentially, these are stated as goals. In some cases, we may have Implementation Guidance, mostly not. And then we have indicators of the status and metrics as we're following the task three, four, and five set for this group.

What we'll do, what staff will do, is we will be capturing these discussions on this document, in particular, to formulate the rationale for the Recommendations report, and also the

assumptions that we're going to capture during the last call, for those who are there and those who may not have been in the last call. It was suggested that we also capture assumptions. So we'll do that as we go along in the discussions and deliberations of the working group here on this document, both the rationale as well as the assumptions. So they're meant to be high-level goals and they're meant to be following these questions here in red that you see in front of you, the questions to consider. What is the aim, the desired outcome? What is the indicator of success? How and when will it be achieved? What are the metrics that should be collected?

So looking at the comments on the Recommendation 1 under Outreach and Awareness, we have some comments. There's a comment from Gabriela. First comment is from Gabriela. Thank you. She says, "Is it possible to include public sector?" So we have not-for-profit sector, social enterprises and/or community organizations. Does anybody have any objection to including public sector also in that list under the Implementation Guidance?

I see Gabriela, actually, just in the waiting room and just joined us. As soon as she's on, maybe I can let her know that we're dealing with her first comment. She wouldn't have heard that. Let's see. Gabriela, just to let you know, we're in Outreach and Awareness Recommendation 1 and to your [inaudible] Public Sectors Working Group members, if there's any objections to include in that text. I'm looking for hands.

MIKE SILBER: Julie, your voice is cutting in and out again. So I think it might be worthwhile for you to rejoin.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, let me do that. I'll rejoin.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Julie. While we're waiting for that, do we have ... Gabriela I see is on the call. Gabriela, maybe you can just explain what you meant by public sector.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes. Hello. I was wondering if the public sector—because in many developing countries, the manager of the ccTLDs are public sector entities. So I was wondering if this is included in the in the targeting potential applicants. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: So you're talking about government entities getting support?

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes, that's right.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I'm not sure that that is what we're after. Olga, you have your hand up.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes. Thank you. Good morning, everyone. I think that what Gabriela is trying to explain is that it may be the case that an applicant could be an organization from the government, it could be a governmental company, I mean, a company owned by the government or the government itself that would be interested in an application. So this is what I think she means by public sector. If it is not the case, Gabriela, please correct me.

MIKE SILBER: Okay. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Mike. I have to agree here because I think one of the things—and going back to the suggested definition where you're giving for underdeveloped, it was where governments didn't have that background and knowledge and skills and capacity, even to support a domain name industry that might be a startup or something. It's Applicant Support that we're actually looking at guidance, and there may be other types of support that we might be able to give. I just think that, as Olga said, they might not be the governments themselves, there may be a section or some kind of entity that might need support. I guess it goes back to what we use as our definition, which we haven't spoken about for a while, about our definition of some of those underdeveloped. If we put all of those categories of regions, like what are we using to define those categories? Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Sure. Thanks, Maureen. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mike. Thanks for the explanation. I'm not sure I'm in the same page like Maureen. But I have a concern with this because I guess it can open the door to—it's quite broad here. I'm not sure we will be able to kind of put some limit. Even in the context of developing countries, governmental entity, state-owned entity or linked to state, they still have some resources or way to get resources. If we go even in the case like ccTLD operator, if they apply for a gTLD, they can also get Applicant Support here. I'm really kind of concerned. I understand the intention, but this can open the door and it might breed a lot of issues that I'm not sure we can deal with in our case.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Rafik. Julie, I see your hand. Before you do that, maybe just one clarification and I think people keep getting confused about this. We're not excluding anybody. So by indicating the target applicants, we're putting a set of priorities on them. We're not excluding anybody. But what we're saying is we need to aim at something. I'm very concerned about continuously trying to add to the target without a clear and very precise justification for doing that.

I've pushed back on some of the suggestions from Lawrence around entrepreneurs and small businesses and growing businesses, not because they would be in any way excluded, but because I don't think that we're holding them up as a target. In my view, they may very well be deserving and they should never be excluded from the project and the process. But I don't want to now

have to go to every government IT conference around the world when I think we've got a very good target. And if these people are deserving and if they weren't support, then they'll make their application. They will reach out to those people offering in kind support and they will get it, and they will put in an application for, for example, fee waivers or an application fee waiver or ongoing fee waivers, and if they warrant it and deserve it, they'll get it. But I don't want to hold up those types of entities as target entities, but we're not excluding them in the slightest. So that's just my personal view.

Julie, looking forward to your comment, but I'd like to see if we really want to start adding more targets. Because then how do I go back to Lawrence who previously said we should include for-profit entities and add them, and then we're going to be adding and adding and adding every special interest group that feels that they should be added to the list of targets until we have too many targets to actually focus on. Personal view. Julie, let me hand it back to you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Mike. Terri, may I ask, is my audio clear? Hello?

TERRI AGNEW: It still cuts out, Julie. But yeah, I'm agreeing, everybody. It's not the best, but it still cuts out. But we get every now. Let me know if a dial out to a telephone would be helpful.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah. I think it'd be best if we dialed out because if I'm going to be talking, it's going to be important for people to be able to hear what I've said. I've captured that conversation about public sector. I'll just note, Mike. Also, this is Implementation Guidance. We could also consider whether or not it even needs to be captured. Because in most of these recommendations, we're not capturing Implementation Guidance, and so we can take that under advisement as well. If you want to start talking about the next comment which is on the definition for underdeveloped, I'm going to go ahead and leave and try to get dial out.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Julie. I'm happy with that. So, in terms of the next comment from Gabriela—and it also ties in with some of the comments from Ros—is I think we need to agree a single definition or a set of definitions, and then stick with them. We can't be in a situation and I fully agree. So do people want to leave that to start to pull together? Or are we going to work on Gabriela's suggestion, which is you're looking at the UN definitions? All right, Olga. Yes, please.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Mike. I think that using United Nations definitions gives us a good background for having that text in the document, because if not, any other participant could challenge that. But if you use international agreed language, it's usually better.

MIKE SILBER: I'm totally comfortable with it. The suggestion then adding underserved, I think that's been largely agreed. The suggestion of using the GAC definition of underserved, I don't know if people have had the opportunity of looking at that if they have a view. So I must confess, I haven't reviewed that, but it seems like a reasonable place to start. I don't know if you can maybe just share the definition in the chat or people will look it up and confirm if they're comfortable with that or not. Maureen, please continue.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Mike. Gabriela mentioned that the GAC definition focuses on underserved by the DNS industry. I'm looking at it from that perspective. I'm from a small island in the Pacific, and honestly, our government really—despite [inaudible] efforts, the government really still doesn't have a very—and I would say, it's general across the Pacific where the governments really don't have a very strong understanding of it. There's so many things that they have to do, and so the DNS is probably just one and domain names really aren't a priority. So when you do have a group that probably need that kind of support, they won't get it if they wanted to do something, and I think that that's where I feel that it needs to be incorporated, that definition. I agree, it needs to be our definition, too. I mean, it's not like it's using the models, but looking at it from the perspective of how we can support people who actually are interested enough to want to apply for a domain name and just don't have that wherewithal with regards to capacity within their own countries to do that, whether they're public or private, whatever sector they may come from, there needs to be some access that they have. There's a lot of mention

in the chat like, as long as everybody knows what for ICANN's, for this particular program, exactly what the criteria are for actually getting applicant support. Just that that's clear. So that everyone knows. Thanks,

MIKE SILBER:

Maureen, I think you're getting a little beyond yourself, though. Here we're talking about Outreach and Awareness criteria for support. But yes, it's useful to get these definitions, these elements resolved up front because they will be used when it comes to qualification as well. But for now, we're talking about Outreach and Awareness. So I think I'm in agreement, but let's hear what Gabriela has to say.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Thank you. I have to make a comment regarding the spirit of this program. We should bear in mind that the intention is to get as many as applicants as possible. In the last round, we got only three applications. And with this in mind, I think it's a good idea to keep it broad, the concept of developing countries. Is it broader and more inclusive than underserved regions? Because in the definition we have from the GAC, it is focusing on least developed economies in small islands. And also, this concept, this definition leaves out many other regions also underserved. So maybe if we think of the intention to get more applications than the last round, it's a good idea to keep the concept broad as developing economies of regions. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Julie, you wanted to respond? Julie, I see your hand is up. I'm not sure if we're able to hear you on the phone.

TERRI AGNEW: Just as a reminder, since you're now connected via telephone, you have to unmute on your telephone as well. A double mute, I believe.

MIKE SILBER: Okay. We're struggling here.

TERRI AGNEW: Let's see. You shouldn't press *6. Sorry, Julie. I see that. You should just be able to hit unmute on your telephone itself. On your telephone, if you go to your keypad icon, so hit your telephone icon, and then hit your keypad, it should show the unmute option. Julie, I see you're unmuted now via telephone. It shows unmuted on the Zoom side. But we're still not hearing you.

MIKE SILBER: Terri, I'm just wondering if we should try joining Julie by phone again. It wouldn't even be worthwhile for her to stay unmuted throughout the call, just muting and unmuting. Sorry about the technical difficulties.

TERRI AGNEW: Mike, while we're getting Julie back, I do show Gabriela has her hand up. Do you want to wait until Julie back or should we go ahead and move on to Gabriela with her hand up?

MIKE SILBER: I would prefer just to get Julie back, if you don't mind, given the Julie's taking notes.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay, not a problem at all. So I do have Julie back on. Let's see if she can get the telephone to unmute and get audio properly.

MIKE SILBER: I'm seeing Julie is muted. Julie's telephone is muted.

TERRI AGNEW: I concur. Oh, it's unmuted. Julie?

JULIE HEDLUND: Can you hear me?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, success. You're on, Julie. Go for it.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. Sorry about this. I don't know why we're having all these problems here. But anyway, apologies. Let me get the document

back up. Terri, let me just ask you quickly, it's asking if I want to join audio, but I'm already on audio.

TERRI AGNEW: Correct.

JULIE HEDLUND: Do I have to join audio again?

TERRI AGNEW: No. No.

JULIE HEDLUND: So I can just continue without?

TERRI AGNEW: Correct.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. All right. Okay. Many apologies. I'm glad to hear at least there's been some conversation here.

The point I was going to make—and I think this goes back to what Maureen was saying before, so apologies if this has been overtaken by events. So we have to be careful that this group should not actually be trying to set up the criteria for the Applicant Support Program. I think, Mike, you were making this point as well. So really, in this recommendation, we're just talking about

Outreach and Awareness and not talking about what would be possible criteria for the program. I just wanted to make that point.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Julie. All right. However, I think that the suggestion of looking at the GAC definition is a worthwhile one. So let's take that as homework for the next call, just to go review that and see if that can work as the suggested definition.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike, and I've noted that too as well. I'll make sure to look back at the Zoom transcript and the audio for the call as well for whatever I've missed.

MIKE SILBER: Perfect. Thank you. All right, so moving along, we have got industry standards. Ros, your comment I think is the correct one in terms of can we define those? Julie, I hear you say leave it to implementation. But I do think it would be worthwhile to actually put something specific over there. I think just saying "industry standards for online campaigns" is a little weak. So I'm certainly not an expert here but I do think that it would be worthwhile for us to actually put a target here. So I don't know, Julie, within the GDD team, if there is somebody who can help us suggest an initial thought, broad brushstrokes of what that could be.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. I did talk a little bit with GDS staff about this item. Kristy Buckley is also on the call as well if she wants to comment. But this is a situation where we would need to consult with probably outside experts as well here. I'm sorry. Kristy has got this in the chat as well. We could ask our Communications team for help and how they would typically measure this.

I see that Paul said, "Do we have any expertise in online campaigns?" I'd say probably. Kristy, do you want to answer Paul's question? Or would that be something we're going to turn to the Communications team about as well?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Thanks, Julie. Yeah, I think both we could ask global communications. As most of you are probably aware, we also have a contract with [inaudible] for general awareness raising and the campaign for the next round, including the Applicant Support Program. So I think both of those can be good resources here to get some input on how to frame this metric appropriately for the context. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Kristy, thank you. I think we're in a bit of a tightrope over here. Because I think Maureen has suggested this as well. I think we need a little more detail but we also don't want to constrain ourselves by putting in too much detail over here, which would hamstring potentially the development of the program. So if we can walk that tightrope, I think it would be appreciated by this group. I've seen—and I'm no expert conversion rates at a certain

percentage. Yeah. Julie, Kristy, thank you. I think you've hit the nail on the head, framing rather than prescription. Let's put a little bit more because I just felt a little uncomfortable with the current formulation at the top, that we were suggesting a metric which was still to be defined. It was kind of an agreement to agree rather than anything really specific. So if we can try get a little more detail there, I think that would be helpful.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Mike, and thank you, Kristy, very helpful suggestion. I'll make sure to capture that from the chat and also in the document. Can I go to the next comment, Mike?

MIKE SILBER: Yes, please.

JULIE HEDLUND: Here we have a comment in the qualitative measurements and the results of the survey. Ros has noted, "Can we be more specific here written survey result or something to indicate that the survey should provide boxes for written feedback input?" So my suggestion was that we probably don't need to get to that level of detail. But I'd like to leave the floor open for others and see if there's support for the suggestion or for adding just some extra level of detail here. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Yes. Julie, let me agree with you over there, because we've said there must be surveys. Maybe, again, it's worthwhile speaking with Kristy and the Communications team. Can we be more specific about the type of survey that is done? But I tend to agree, I don't think we need to put in there that there's got to be boxes for written feedback. I think you can do it very well through a variety of mechanisms. We may want to actually have in-person calls with people who have expressed significant unhappiness, for example. So I don't think we want to be too prescriptive about how we do it. But maybe, again, we can frame it with a little bit more particularity.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Good suggestion. Maureen says in the chat, "Thanks for that about a balance with regards to the level of detail we make, especially when we look at the information it needs for our target group."

Shall I move on to Recommendation 2?

MIKE SILBER: Yes, please do.

JULIE HEDLUND: Very good. All right, you should be able to see that on the screen. We had some adjusted text from GDS. We have some comments from Ros. Capture the initial intent of the sentence to go beyond just pro bono services. He's asking if others think we should focus

beyond pro bono services. So let me leave that comment out for discussion.

MIKE SILBER: Could I possibly ask Ros, if you wouldn't mind, just explaining because I'm not sure I fully understood your comment there.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah. [Inaudible] noise in the background. I'm actually traveling today. So I'm throwing the ball [inaudible]. Potentially, I'm just wondering. Yeah. I don't know. I mean, perhaps pro bono is very clear that I thought about in the conversation with [inaudible] someone before about getting into other resources [inaudible]. Maybe it's not appropriate here. Yeah, just a comment I wanted to bring up. [Inaudible].

MIKE SILBER: Ros, unfortunately, I and I think most participants—most of that I think you're struggling with the same audio issues that Julie is having. I don't know if we want to try that again or if you maybe want to just type it in the chat. Because I think the point to be made ... I get your point about pro bono services. Other resources as deemed required. I don't like words like "deemed" because somebody has to do the deeming. But the idea here is that ICANN is going to put together, for lack of a better term, a marketplace where willing providers and needy applicants are able to get together. At the same time, ICANN doesn't want to be in a situation where it's going to be putting together entities who are going to be offering feed generative services, because that then

implicates ICANN as, to some extent, taking responsibility for the level of services being offered. So the idea was that we limit it to pro bono, because then there is at least an expectation that potential applicants can make use of these resources at no cost. And if they get comfortable with the party, they could move into a commercial arrangement, because I don't think everybody who's going to provide pro bono services will provide pro bono services at unlimited extent, but it's going to be within whatever measure they find appropriate. So I'm a little hesitant about us creating a commercial marketplace where ICANN is involved. Kristy, I see your hand is up.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Thank you, Mike. So, Ros, I did have trouble hearing you. But I think I might understand your point, if you don't mind me taking a stab at interpreting that.

So what I'm seeing here and number two in that black box is kind of the broader fostering understanding among applicants about what the opportunity is, and making sure that they're making an informed decision about whether and how to apply, of which a part of that in terms of the resources available would be pro bono services and that sort of marketplace that Mike had mentioned. But the other piece of that may be other resources that ICANN Org provides. So, for example, we talked about a portal of resources, there was even discussion around like training or ICANN Learn modules that Applicant Support folks go through. So maybe the surveys are also a measure of how well those resources landed, how understandable and accessible those were so that applicants can make an informed decision in their

application process, in addition to the pro bono services and not limited to the pro bono services. So I don't know if that's a helpful clarification, but that was what I thought maybe Ros was trying to hit there. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER:

Kristy, I like what you're saying, and I think that makes complete sense that some of this is provided by ICANN, not just through the pro bono services, but actually ICANN itself. Ros, maybe we can go back to you and just check if that's the correct interpretation of your comment. Okay. I'm not hearing Ros. You'll obviously come in. But I like Kristy's interpretation. I think if we may need to massage the language slightly that it's cultivated pro bono services, as well as ICANN provided information and resources. Okay. Thanks, Ros, for that. Thanks for confirming. Yeah. Then I think you're spot on. I was obviously going in a direction which was not intended. So thank you. I think that's useful. So we'll just massage the language there so that the resources or ICANN provided resources and information. Again, I don't think the idea is to exclude even non-supported applicants. This is going to be part of the overall ICANN provided information. But as GDS develops the program, they may put a bit more emphasis on this for applicants who potentially require support. I think we're all in violent agreement. We can move on, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Yeah. So I'll move on just momentarily. No other comments on that section at all on Recommendation 2?

MIKE SILBER: No. I think we're good.

JULIE HEDLUND: There's no comments in the documents, there are no comments from other people on the call.

MIKE SILBER: I think other than Ros's point with some additional clarification, and then we'll obviously need to massage it as we go through it because the qualitative, the quantitative, needs to speak not just to the pro bono, but also to the resources made available.

JULIE HEDLUND: Exactly. And I did capture that. I'll make sure to review the audio again to augment my notes. Actually, there was one more comment from Ros under the data metrics and stat, saying that "I still think we need a metric on conversion rates here for the language above. Conversion rates of applicants who applied, who determined that an application was not appropriate for them." Do others agree that we need to add the conversion rate language to this metric section?

MIKE SILBER: Any thoughts from anyone? My personal view, I don't think that conversion rate is the correct metric. I personally think that that is a degree of satisfaction with that element of the program, which doesn't necessarily translate into specific conversion of applicants

who apply. Success is also taking somebody through the journey and they decide not to apply because they realize they don't have a compelling business case.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. I see some thumbs up in the chat. Oh, that was from earlier, but thank you for that. Shall I move on to Recommendation 3? I'm not seeing any comments in the section, but I'll open it up for discussion. Looking for hands or chat.

I'll just note here GDS provided some, I think, very helpful suggestions relating to the Applicant Support Program having the necessary resources with some details about event attendees and applicants indicating their understanding of the program, and so forth. I see Kristy says in the chat "Note that we did consult comms on the metrics here." Thank you, Kristy.

MIKE SILBER:

It made complete sense to me. I don't know if everybody's had a chance to review it. But if you haven't, please do. Because, to me, it made sense now. I like the way that it's framed. Can I also ask if anyone wants to go back, if they haven't had the opportunity of doing a full review and they want to go back in to anything? Instead of just making comments in the document and expecting all of us to go back to elements that we thought were closed, would you mind just highlighting it and then mail to the group just to say, "I've gone back and I've also looked," assuming that we've completed item three and maybe item four on this call. So pop them out to the list saying, "I went back to two and made some

changes. Please have a look at it.” I think it makes it easier for everybody.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks, Mike. I see a bit of a comment in the chat from Maureen. “We need to get as much info as possible from applicants probably through, e.g., the survey about the degree of helpfulness about all the support that is given.” I think that’s the intent of the comments from GDS as well.

Moving along to item four, and there’s a comment here from Ros, “The original text, before we had input from GDS, was facilitate successful applications in the Applicant Support Program among those who may need and could qualify for support.” The suggestion was to adjust this to say, “Make application materials and application process successful to the first potential applicants.” So Rosa said, “I think it’s important to keep this language to facilitate successful applications among those who need could qualify for support.”

I think my discussion with GDS and with Kristy in particular is that the concern is that we can’t truly say that the we can facilitate successful applications because there are so many elements that are outside of our control. We can do everything correct and have a wonderful Applicant Support Program and it’s possible that every applicant isn’t qualified and can’t cross the line no matter what we do. So we’re not sure that that’s really an accurate goal. I’m wondering if I could ask—oh, thank you, Kristy. I was just going to ask if you could comment. Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sure. I'm happy to. Thanks, Julie. I think we want to be careful that we're maintaining the fidelity of the evaluation process for applications for support. So to Julie's point, we will do everything we can to help support applicants through that process, to help them, give them the resources and tools that they need so that they have every chance of success, and then making that information as accessible as we can to diverse applicants. At the end of the day, once they submit their applications and they go to the Support Applicant Review panel, which is a independent evaluator, we can't tip the scales in terms of whether that application is successful. They either meet the criteria or they don't. There will be a mechanism for limited challenger appeals if they do not qualify and they want to appeal that decision. But we can't, as ICANN Org, intervene and kind of tip the scales, make sure that they are successful. Just that. So that's the clarification that we're seeking here. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Rosa, I don't know if you want to talk to your comment because I hear what Julie and Kristy are saying. But I would almost suggest that we add similar language back but at the end of the sentence, because it's fantastic that we make application materials and the application process accessible—I think it's accessible in a timely manner, we can debate the grammar—to diverse potential applicants. I think we need to say with the aim of facilitating successful applications amongst those who may need and could qualify for support.

So I completely agree with you. We're not suggesting in any way that ICANN should put its finger on the scale for any supported application. But I'm saying making the application materials and the application process accessible with a clear objective in mind is to get more successful applications from those who need support through the process. I would hate to lose that element but I agree with you the way that it's currently framed does look like ICANN's obligation is to put its thumb on the scale and weigh the scale in favor of those applicants.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks, Mike. I see that Kristy says in the chat that seemed like a helpful clarification. Ros says, "Yes, I think adding with the aim of facilitating several applications will be a big boost to the sentence."

MIKE SILBER:

Ros, thanks for or pulling that language back. We'll need to adjust it slightly. Maureen, do you want to just talk to your comment? Because I think I understand what you're saying. But maybe, it'll be helpful to clarify.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yeah. I was writing it and sent it and agreeing with you. It's the rewording of it to make it actually more—I like the way you said the aim of the program is to facilitate. Because the recommendation, that's come from the SubPro, hasn't it? Is it possible for us to add any bits and pieces to that or, as Kristy says, it might need to just be reworded a bit.

MIKE SILBER: Okay. Thanks, Maureen. That's appreciated. Let's look at that one. So yes, we maintain integrity. But we also keep in top of mind while we're doing this. I think all of our communities would want to see a clear recommendation that we're trying to do everything possible to get more supported applications through without in any way interfering with the integrity of the process.

That being said, we've got two minutes left. Let me instead of us getting on to item number five, and I ask if there are any other comments or interventions, and we can then pick up next week on item five. So seeing no hands, I'm assuming that everybody is comfortable. As I said, if any of you haven't gone through items one to four to date and you would like to make additional comments, please feel free. But just as a courtesy, let us know that you're doing that so people can go back and look. Otherwise, I think we're in pretty good shape. Let's keep it going for next week. Thanks, everybody, for your interventions and assistance. I think it was very productive. Julie, any final remarks?

JULIE HEDLUND: No. No comments for me. Thank you, everybody. Thank you, Mike, so much for taking over and managing the meeting so well with my audio difficulties. Thanks all for joining. This meeting is adjourned.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]