ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 10 April 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/7AA5Dg

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

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Guidance Process, GDP, initiation request for applicants support call on Monday 10 April 2023. We do have apologies today from Rosalind KennyBirch. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any of these to share? Please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNS O Secretariat. Our documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call.

Please remember to say your name before speaking for the recording. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I turn it back over to the Chair, Mike Silber, please begin.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you very much, Devan, and thanks, everybody for joining. It's much appreciated for those who celebrate a Happy Easter, and if there is anybody who's also celebrating a joyous Ramadan, and also as well, it's nice to see the three Abrahamic religions coinciding their calendars for a change, but it does mean that many of us have been enjoying a long weekend. So your attendance is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

So folks, there's been a fair amount of contribution to the document and that really is appreciated. So I think the intention is that we should proceed with the review of the document. At the same time, I did notice that ICANN org had recommended or had suggested some clarification in terms of what we're trying to achieve. So it might be worthwhile Julie, looking at that first, but I see Rafik's hand is up.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mike. Just wanted to have a procedural question before we move to the substantial part of the agenda. So I just wanted clarification about the expected schedule for our calls, because I think the latest communication was confusing for me. And I raised some concern, but you didn't get any response. So I understand that we are trying to have weekly calls. And you keep the same time slot. I do have concern with that. Because I could accept that when we have bi-weekly that's something I can live with, but putting a burden in weekly basis, like between midnight and 5am calls, I think it's a little bit hard for just one person to go with that.

So I just wanted clarification how long that will last and I would have appreciated the response to my emails.

MIKE SILBER: I thought there was a response because there were two queries that you raised in your email. The first was that we alternate and the second that we changed the 20:00 UTC time, to a lighter time. I can't remember if it was 21:00 or 22:00 UTC. And that got some pushback. And Julie, I do recall you responding, or I thought you responded. So the idea is that we would have an alternating 15:00 and 20:00 UTC calls. Just the 21:00 was not accepted, as your request to consider 21:00 was not accepted. Would that work for you? Is alternating between 15:00 and 20:00 each week?

RAFIK DAMMAK: 20:00 and 15:00, it's just it's between midnight and 5am. I mean, I don't want to make big deal of this, but I already have appreciate response from Julie. I didn't get your response Julie. I sent you two emails. Just for clarification, I didn't get any response. I don't want to make any problem with that. It just I'm raising some concerns.

MIKE SILBER: Sure, noted. And apologies. Julie, if you want to just go back to your outbox and maybe just check that you did respond, but I do seem to recall a response, but I was out of office. So maybe I missed something. Julie, if you wouldn't mind just checking on that. But yes, the intent is to alternate. But yeah, unfortunately, the 21:00 UTC that you had requested got some pushback from

other members of the working group. So apologies for that. I don't think we could accept it. I personally don't have an issue. But that seems to have been rejected by a number of other people. But Julie, if you wouldn't mind following up, and we can move forward on that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, thanks, Mike. This is Julie headland from staff. And Rafik, my sincere apologies. I thought I responded to this, and I apologize if my response did not get to you. And at any rate, I will check on that. And also just let people know in the notes from this call that for the time being anyway, we are looking at varying the weekly calls from 15:00 to 20:00 each week, obviously 15:00 today 20:00 next week. Thanks so much.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Julie. On that basis, should we continue? Let's just look at that call descriptions and examples document that was circulated, because I do think it's quite helpful.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, this is Julie Hedlund again, from staff. I'll go ahead and switch sharing to that document. One moment, please. And then I wondered if, I know that Aaron Hickman is on the call, and would you be willing to speak to those slides otherwise, I could do so.

AARON HICKMAN:	I actually missed a couple of the calls on this, Julie but happy to sort of weigh in if needed. I was out to the COVID after the meeting. So I'm still in catch up mode.
JULIE HEDLUND:	Oh, sorry, I certainly understand. I hope you're doing better. So I'm going to go ahead and speak just a little bit to the slides. They were sent ahead of time to all of you. They're pretty straightforward, and hopefully somewhat self-explanatory, but I will cover them a little bit very briefly, and then we'll dive back into the document.
	So these are some slides that our GDS colleagues, excuse me, have put together to help us to formulate, well, at least frame the discussion around the goals and metrics for reviewing tasks three, four, and five. Now, as you may recall, for task three, four and five, which were engaged in this working document, is to review the metrics that were suggested in the SubPro final report and to prioritize those metrics and also to analyze their impact on the applicant support program steps sorry, lifecycle steps. And so the intent behind the slides is to assist and provide guidance to the working group as we look at the goals and metrics to make sure that they're clear and implementable and that there's a clear correlation between the goals and the metrics.
	So as a suggestion, the first slide here that you see is an example of goals indicators and metrics in a hypothetical example of forestry components and descriptions. So the goal would be for example, what is the aim, what's the desired outcome to stop illegal deforestation as an example. The indicator might be then

what would indicate that the goal has been achieved, how will you know what is achieved? And the example is that say you would reduce illegal deforestation by 100 hectares to 10 or less than 10 per year within the next few years and measurable reductions of illegal deforestation of at least 30%. And the data source of the metric for that what data information should be collected and analyzed to determine if the goal was met. The metrics could be satellite images field reports, data collection, remote sensing reports from law enforcement, etc.

So that's an example. And so similarly, you'll see in this next slide, an example, based on the applicant support program. So a goal might be what is the desired outcome to widen and deepen the applicant pool to increase the number of qualified diverse applicants to the program? And then what's the indicator? How would you know that the goal is achieved? You can say that the number of applicants that qualify is greater than or equal to .5% of the total applications, or greater than 60% of support applicants from countries classified as emerging, developing, or at least developed, or greater than 50% of support applicants from civil society, social enterprise and or community organizations. And then if we were looking at what metrics should be collected, these could be registration and demographic information from participants and outreach and engagement efforts from ASP and gTLD applicants.

So some questions for the working group to consider now as we go back and look through our working document, and also taking consideration, the examples. So what future desired results are we seeking to achieve with the applicant support program? So

what are our goals? And taking into account the different aspects of the program, pro bono services application fee reduction, auction bid credit multiplier, what are the goals related to each of these? So outcomes, [00:11:56 -inaudible] results, goals.

And then how would you evaluate the achievement of these goals and outcomes? And I'm not sure that as just noting that this working group isn't really looking at necessarily how successful the program has been a few years, but at least on the short-term level, what will we be looking at to ensure that we are or we could say that we have a successful program, at least in the short term, or an unsuccessful program.

And so those slides, again, are to help as we look through the working document, to frame our goals, and make sure that they're appropriately connected to the indicators and the metrics. So I'm going to go back to the working document. And before I do just, I'll ask if anybody has any questions relating to the slides.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. Thanks, Julie. I think that's a good point. Let's just take a pause and see if there are any comments. Rafik, I can see your hand.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mike. Just kind of clarification. So what suggested here seems kind of a new framework and how we have to say, built out our goals and indicators or metrics. So I'm just wondering here is the intent just to help us in terms of review, or you are suggesting that maybe we need to rework what we did previously. So it's kind

of confusing me here. Because it's coming kind of at some later stage here after some work that we did.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, a valid comment. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I like the new format, and I sort of see that a lot of the work that we actually did before has been incorporated into it. I think it just gives us, like, a clear indication for us about what it is that we're doing, and I think that the comments that were made within the document that we'll be working on help to clarify that some of those things. And yeah, I mean, just to say I like the new view format. And, yeah, that's it.

MIKE SILBER: Julie, you wanted to respond to Rafik?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, thank you. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. And thank you Rafik for your question. So I should have made it more clear. We are not trying to redo or suggests that the work that the working group has already done in the comments that have been helpfully placed in the document should be revised or redone. The idea, though, is that perhaps at least in some instances, the goals indicators and metrics might be able to be refined, or further distilled from where they are currently. I don't think that's necessarily true for all of them, but the suggestion is that this

EN

could be a framework for further discussion as we look at the comments that are now in the document.

And the working group is free to determine that the goals, as they're stated, are already in sufficient form or clear form, or are already distilled as much as they can be, but there might be areas for improvement based on the examples. So these are just examples and guidance for the working group to consider. I don't want to suggest that we have to rework what we've done. And I think a lot of what we've done is in this format already. So I hope that's helpful Rafik and answers your concern. I see Maureen saying she's agreed a lot of the comments in the goal are clarification for ourselves. And each of the indicators. Yes.

MIKE SILBER: So I think that, to me, is just a huge useful touchstone for us to go back to as we proceed in the review of the document and make sure that we're actually answering questions. Some of it may be, as Rafik was saying, the example given may have been wandering off a little bit into uncharted territory, but let's just use it as a touchstone rather than a specific item of work.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, thank you for that, Mike. And I've gone ahead and switch to the document. Let me go ahead and put that link into the chat as well. And let's see if I can do that here quickly. Yes, there. So you can view it yourself, it might be easier than being an on screen, although I will try to blow up the screen version to make it a little bit bigger. And what I thought might be useful, if you agree,

Mike, is just start from the top and to go to the comments. Because we've had quite a few comments now on the document. I think they quite helpfully build on what we've got here. And so it might be useful to go back to the comments. And some of them I think, have really advanced the document as far as the content, if that's acceptable to you and to the working group.

MIKE SILBER: That works for me. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Great. So all right, looking at the first of the lifecycle elements, the outreach and awareness, and this is one on potential applicants from underdeveloped underrepresented and developing regions as a target. Trying to manipulate the document here a little better. Oops, sorry. Apologies. A little bit clunky. Okay, moving up a little bit. So we have a comment from, I think this is, yeah, I'm looking at the first comment from Gabriella, suggest replacing the concept of underdeveloped by developing within the UN system distinction between developed regions and developing regions was introduced, and there's a link here. These groupings are intended solely for statistics.

Oh, and then I get to Thomas's comment in the chat. These comments are intended solely for statistics, not a judgment about stage development. Also I suggest not only the inclusive target of applicants from both regions for outreach but also recommend adding applicants from different developing undeveloped regions, which will reflect a goal of getting more equally geographic

distribution and taking into account the specificity and each regional and national contexts and circumstances center module development. And Thomas Tom Barrett in the chat is just saying that it's a redundant to include underdeveloped, underrepresented and developing that underrepresented would suffice. And then we're noticing that these terms should be defined. And we've got [CROSSTALK], please go ahead,

MIKE SILBER: Julie, can I suggest? People have had the opportunity of looking at comments. Maybe we should try and knock these off so that we can then pass over editorial control to you and Steve, you can make the changes as agreed or not, and then we move on, because if we're trying to go through all of the comments now, I think it's just a little too much.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, and I'm looking at this now, and I think you're right, because we've got a lot that are one on top of the other, and it's going to be, I think, too difficult to try to resolve all these. And I think we're getting to about the same place. If we look at the last of the comments, we're getting to agreement. Anything anybody wants to add with respect to this? Otherwise, I think we can resolve these comments.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I think let's take it from the top, and let's see if we can knock these off.

JULIE HEDLUND: All right. Very good. Thank you, Mike. It's Julie Hedlund again for the record. So just looking at the edits in the comments in this first item, and I'm just noticing Maureen's comment in the chat. I think all the categories are included in the goal. There has to be a glossary of somehow addressing the difference between the categories, rather than saying the broader list. And we'll take an action to include a glossary or definitions of terms. Is there anything anybody wants to add with respect to the language in this first goal? Otherwise we'll proceed.

MIKE SILBER: No, I think the point is well known and well made out of there. Let's define terms and then instead of having to use all the terms all the time, we can use a combined term. The one thing that I wanted to push back a little bit is Gabriella's suggestion that we then have to add and take into account the specificities in each region or country. Because I don't think the desire is or at least my thinking is that ICANN has to get involved in every country and look at specificities of each and every country.

JULIE HEDLUND: Is Gabriella on this call? Am wondering.

MIKE SILBER: Unfortunately, not.

JULIE HEDLUND: I will make a note of this. So your suggestion here.

MIKE SILBER: I'm just not sure what that comment adds. You know, the idea here is we're talking about, we're trying to give ICANN org focus, more so we're telling them that they must prioritize their outreach to these people from these regions. But then to tell them that they have to take into account the specifities of each regional country, to me just doesn't focus us any more than its just shotgun again, where they have to analyze every country and region.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm taking note of this, Mike. Does anybody have anything they want to add? I've got Maureen's hand up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Thank you, Julie. Yeah, I think that in this particular, I think probably is an example of the requirement of some kind of definitions list. Because I think that that is where we'll probably have to nerd out a little bit more. I think in this general goal, again, rather than having like being too specific in the goal probably isn't necessary. But I think that if we're ever actually explaining underdeveloped, developing and underrepresented categories, then that general statements about, not so much being specific for about each region but that they are acknowledging that there are going to be differences. And I think that that's important because I know that like, AP region, for example, need may be different from EU.

So I think that's where I think that there should be a little note, a footnote, the thing, or something to say refer to the glossary. Because that's, I think, where most of our discussion will happen as to how we actually define and acknowledge you support those regions specific, like, examples that Gabrielle may have been thinking about.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I like Paul's comment. And I'm also relooking seeing that this is my initial draft. I'm not sure if it's actually necessary to say, over regions that are really well represented. You know, and it was a point that was made also in Cancun, is doesn't really help us to downgrade somebody. So maybe that would be useful.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. And I just noted what Paul has in the chat. It's Julie Hedlund, again, for the record. It says, "How about region specific events, communication channels and publications?" And Maureen says, "Plus one, Paul". What do you think about that suggestion, Mike?

MIKE SILBER: Again, I don't want to be overly prescriptive to ICANN org. That's my thought. Because what if they do want to the national rather than regional?

JULIE HEDLUND: Correct. I have Maureen hand's up and Steve Chan's hand up.
Maybe we can hear from Steve first, Maureen, if that's okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That's fine. Thanks, Steve.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Maureen. Thanks, Julie. This is Steve from staff. I see
this a little bit hesitantly, but I just wanted to maybe take us back
to the first part of what we went through in the agenda, which is
the document that was shared from our colleagues in GDS, which
I think all it was intended to do is to help us frame things for how
we want to consider things. And I think that was in the context of
how some of the things we've captured in our document, how
they're being presented.

And so some of the concerns that our GDS colleagues had was
that some of the indicator success are really more about indicators
of activity. So saying you do a certain number of events doesn't
reflect whether or not it was done well, or whether or not it was
effective in achieving their goal. And the other thing that they had
a concern about was actually delving into the approach, which is
really about how you go about and do things or are trying to
accomplish your goal.

So I just raised this to make sure we're, I guess, looking at what we're trying to accomplish in the right way, making sure we're focusing on the right things and not overextending and going beyond what we should be doing. So if you think of in the context of the GDS document, it would be looking at the goal in the indicator's success and the data metrics to measure success. And so looking directly at the indicators of success, that one I'd be curious if that one is formulated well or if it needs to be more measurable in some way like i.e., using numbers for instance. I'm not sure that's the right thing for this particular indicator of success, but like I said, I just want to take us back and see if the GDS framing is held for us to look at each of these points in our document. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Steve. Very useful comment. Good morning. Please continue.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, yeah. Just following on that. Thank you, Mike. This one that we're actually, like this box that we're actually looking at the moment is like an introductory box, but we're not actually getting into specific. I thought it was the more general kind of explanatory kind of introduction to the others which do go into and I think that are important that in the indicators of success, the approach that we use and some of those sorts of things is actually like an indicator of success. And I think that's where we were like the bullet point, perhaps like, for the specific goal itself that's where-- But this particular box, I don't think that we need to. If we put in

the idea of reading specific events communications and publications that Paul suggested we can delete the concern that Gabriella had, because I think it's covered in that. This is just introductory so I don't think that we need to spend too much time on this one, this overview. Is that what we're doing?

JULIE HEDLUND: Sorry. I think that's an interesting point. It does seem like this is more reframing or introductory set of elements. Mike, any comments or any more suggestions?

MIKE SILBER: I think, Maureen's comment is very valid. I'm just re-looking at that statement, and my original intent with it was just to try and give ICANN org something to aim at.

JULIE HEDLUND: I wonder if we should set this one aside for the moment and move along?

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, can be. Yeah.

JULIE HEDLUND: We can note in the next for this call that that first box, it seems to be more of an overarching type of goal from which others might flow.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, not a bad comment, but I also do think it touches on the weakness of the instructions from GNSO accounts, because to some extent, asking us what metrics should be used for outreach and awareness, they're pushing us towards effort rather than outcome-based metrics.

JULIE HEDLUND: That's an interesting point.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. I think we can all move on, Julie, because I don't think we can solve it, no.

JULIE HEDLUND: No, I don't think so but I think it does point out something. And I see your hand, Paul. Just one moment. I think it's something that we need to recognize that we've been given metrics to analyze and prioritize that were stated in the SUB-PRO final record. That's not to say that we can't question them. So it's something to consider that maybe there we are prioritizing and analyzing them so we can decide whether or no that they're right metrics, or whether or not some other metrics should apply, because otherwise, if you look at the metrics, they do tend to steer us in a certain direction. I think that's a good point, Mike. Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY:	Thanks. Paul McGrady here. And one thing to keep in mind too, is that we can admit, unless Julie and Steve tell us we can't. I know we're not a working group, but we can do what working groups do, which is we can state the goals, and then we can put in some implementation advice like, for example, that if enough people believe that region-specific events and communications and things like that are a good thing. We can put in for under implementation advice, for example, the GGP said that one thing that could be done, doesn't have to be done, is this data would be everything, right?
	So I think we can put in one of the firm things the goals that Mike is talking about, and then on some things that feel more like implementation details to us, so we don't want to get into the weeds. We can capture those, but in a non-binding way. I hope that's helpful. Thanks.
JULIE HEDLUND:	Thanks, Paul. And I'll just note, as I put in the chat, this is essentially a working group. It operates quite similarly and we can indeed frame recommendations and recommendation and implementation guidance. So I think it's a very useful point. Thanks. Mike, I'll go ahead to the next item on the screen.
MIKE SILBER:	Please do.

JULIE HEDLUND: That potential applicants from the not-for-profit sector, social enterprise in our community organization should be a priority target ofevent in communication channels and publications over those with a more commercial technical focus. And, as you may recall, we had some comments related to the priority of certain sectors over the commercial and technical focus with some language to clarify that. It's not to say that there couldn't be a commercial or technical focus, just there would be a priority for certain sectors. Is there anything that anybody wants to say further on this goal and associated approaches, indicators and metrics?

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. So I think that the suggestion that was made in Cancun that we delete the subjugation of commercial or technical focus is a good one, and we should proceed with that. I don't agree that we need to add the caveat about groups with a more commercial focus should also remain a key focus, because again, we're trying to give focus here. Now, what we may want to do is change the data matrix from targeted to not-for-profit social enterprise and community and just remove it.

JULIE HEDLUND: Give mic to Maureen.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, sorry. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Julie. I agree with actually removing it even from the goal. I think that that by putting that in it actually focuses it. By leaving it in the goal, it focuses on the fact that they are not our main focus. I think the goal should actually focus on who it actually is, like what the actual goal is for. But I think like, for example, when we're talking about indicators of success, as Mike mentioned, that an indication of success is that like, for example, that commercial and technical focus, applicants will get recognition.

There'll be some kind of recognition in there, which is an indicator of success that we're actually still dealing with applicants who may, potential applicants who may come from those areas. But I just think that it confuses that by even leaving that last section of that goal that takes the focus away from the real potential applicants that we're looking for, for the ISP. But I welcome to hear from other people. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Maureen. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, I think I agree with what was said and suggested. The whole idea is really to support a specific community here as we are trying to add more kind of deleting the intent of what we are trying to do. And at the end like in terms how of the whole activity of ICANN for a promotion down is regarding, you have to correct it, I'm not sure, utility program. It will cover those cases. We are trying here to help those kinds of fracases specific community. So

yeah, if we can simplify and remove, yeah, it will be helpful, and we'll make it simple for implementation.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Rafik.   Mike, any comments on those suggestions? Mike, if you are speaking, we can't hear you.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I'm sorry. I just lost for a second there.

JULIE HEDLUND: Should we move along?

MIKE SILBER: Yes, please.

JULIE HEDLUND: All right. The next goal is awareness. More parties are aware of the program engaged with the program are well informed, and creating awareness, the gTLD applications and availability of evidence support. And then the approaches for, well, there's various details of activities for ICANN org and indicators of success quite a list here, and then levels of awareness. So we've got some comments relating to the percentages and level of awareness, and I think we've had some questions about how to gauge levels awareness.

So let me just open it up for comments on this section, and I see a comment in the chat from Tom Barrett. "Are these calls supposed to be in priority order? This goal was seemed to be more important than the previous two." That's a really good question, Tom. This group is supposed to be prioritizing metrics, and one would assume perhaps in prioritizing goals. I think we should have an overarching plan. Maybe after we will refine these and we can feel comfortable with the way they're stated, we can then put them in priority order. So comments on this box and goals, yeah, and what we have here.?

MIKE SILBER: Let me tell you my thinking. That was not in any priority order, but rather it to me, was kind of a logical sequential order. Now my whole logic and my sequencing may not be accurate but if people would prefer to put it in priority order, then we certainly can do that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. Any other thoughts? Shall I move on? Sarah, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

SARAH KIDEN: Yeah, this is Sarah for the record. If you could just please scroll back to the indicators of success. Yeah, that place that says at least 0. 5. I don't know if it was meant to be 0.5 or 0.05. Because 0.5 feels a bit high. For example, if you go by 1,900 applicants, then 0.5 would be 1,900 or something. So I'm not sure if it was

0.5 or 0.05. Maybe my math is not that good. So just seeking clarification. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Sarah. So looking at your comment, I think the discussion was around 0.5, but you're suggesting 0.05? Just to clarify.

SARAH KIDEN: Yeah. According to my calculation, if we're saying 0. 5, then if we receive 1,900 applications, that means 950 should be supported. And by Rafik's comment-

MIKE SILBER: No, Sarah, I think your math is wrong. That would be 50%, not 0. 5%.

SARAH KIDEN: Oh, okay. Oh, okay. I get it. I get it now. Okay. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Right. And I see Steve has in chat it's 0.5% versus 50% which, yes, that would then result in about 950 applications, so quite a much smaller percentage. Any further comments? I see a couple of hands up. Steve, and then Rafik.

STEVE CHAN: I'll let Rafik go first. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Steve. Yeah. I don't think it's really about the kind of end up specific number, but seems kind of it's so low target. And if we do that math that we are expected, if we hope for, like 2,000 application, that's something we don't know. And maybe it will be much lower.   So I was just wondering if we can put like that percentage or some specific number, whatever it's possible, just to avoid also in depth with really low-- I mean, to not go skewing the, I'd say here, the target.

Let's say if okay, 0.5 it's we have high number of applications, let's give it maybe like 10, which is to say we hope like for 10 or 20 applicant support, something like this.   So either we can give some number, which will be independent of how many applications at the end or just a presentation, see whatever can work for us. I'm not sure if it will help at least to avoid the situation that we will try to do some calculation on something that we don't know, nobody knows how many applications will be at the end of this program.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Rafik. So if we're trying to avoid doing any calculation because, as you pointed out rightly, we don't know how many applications they'll be. I mean, it's putting in a percentage sort of gets you to the same problem, right? If you don't know how you don't know 0.5% would be a good number.   If there were two

applications, maybe we want a higher percentage. So do we want a range? Is that what you're suggesting? I'm not sure I understand.

MIKE SILBER: I think I think Rafik is making a slightly different point. But let's maybe get Steve and Lawrence and then we can see if we can wrap it up.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, sir. You can hear me okay?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Okay. Sorry. I'm also of the view is 0.5 might be quite a low target. Looking at the last rounds where about 1,500 applications came in and just about three applicants were supported or rather, yeah, supported, so to say, that's very close to the region of the numbers we are just setting. And our general belief is that the last round wasn't really much of a success. At a 1,500, 0.5 was also about a bit over the numbers that were the realities of the last round. So I will want to also chip in to say, in terms of percentage, we should definitely look at higher figure. And where we want to go the route of Rafik's suggestion, we should be looking at some 10, 15 or maybe possibly 20

applications being supported, successfully supported in the next round.

MIKE SILBER: Steve, you wanted to provide some input?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Mike. This is Steve from Staff.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah. So in terms of percentage, maybe a 5% would work of the benchmarking against the successful applications that go to the next round. That's really a high target based on the last round, but it gives us room to stretch and grow.

MIKE SILBER: Lawrence, are you done?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I'm done.

MIKE SILBER: Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Mike. This is Steve from Staff. I think the conversation that just took place is valuable, but I'm looking in the context of this goal and I'm wondering whether or not this is actually the right

sort of indicator of success for this goal that the group has identified. I mean, as a reminder, we're in the awareness section, and this metric is about successful applications.   And I think potentially these things do not line up properly for this particular goal. And I'm just curious if anyone else sees it that way. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Steve, I think that's a very good point. And I think that we should change that to a metric relating to people seeking support, bearing in mind that support is not necessarily financial support. Any other thoughts?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Thank you, everyone. Should I move along? We could look at one more quickly.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah.   Well, can I just see if there's anybody who wants to respond, because I think Steve is very correctly thrown a curveball at this?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. Yes, that's a very good point.

MIKE SILBER: So I'd like to see. We've had a lot of discussion of what the right number is and Steve is saying that's the wrong place.

JULIE HEDLUND: Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, I get what Steve is saying, but maybe if we see it from another viewpoint here. I think what we're trying to say here is we want to correlate between all the effort we will do about awareness and how that will be translated at the end by the number of applicants.

MIKE SILBER: Yes, but that comes in a pool, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, I get that, but I think we're just trying here also to coordinate because I guess we don't want just to make kind of separate. So just we will do some awareness and own things for the sake of doing that. And we want to kind of find a way to see if that was successful. It makes sense, but the idea I guess that was the intent here. So maybe before jumping to remove or something, just you can think carefully or, at least later on, to just make it more clear in terms of outcome here. Yeah.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. I personally would prefer that we put a definitive number of parties seeking information. To me, instead of putting supported applications, I would rather suggest a minimum of 50 parties seeking support, or engaging with the support material, 100

parties. I think that's a true indicator of success. Julie, if you wouldn't mind, scrolling down to number four? You'll see there's the goal.

JULIE HEDLUND: Mike, I see some comments in support of your suggestion from Sarah and from Marie.

MIKE SILBER: Okay, so let's think about it. I'll add some comments in the section as well, is that maybe we put in there that there are at least, I don't know what's a reasonable number, 100 parties 200 parties who register for the different levels of support. So Rafik, in terms of repeating the suggestion, my suggestion was that instead of putting an indicator of success here in terms of supported applications, rather, we put the number of registrations for access to resources and various elements of support. And again, we might need a glossary to actually define what we mean by support. But to say 100 or 200 people actually making use of the program would be an indicator of support, because it means they're aware, and they're engaging.

JULIE HEDLUND: I see Rafik says that's fine. Mike, we have one minute before top of the hour.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. Does anybody want to try and get on to the next topic or do people want to keep time? I can stick around for a few more minutes.

JULIE HEDLUND: The item then the self-service resources. And then we have some questions about how to measure the applications. I see Paul needs to drop. There not a lot of comments on this. I think most of them were addressed. I think we could probably start with number two at the next meeting, Mike. Oh, I see Maureen's hand is up.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you both of you. I put it in that question about measuring the self-services, and I assume that that's for pro bono, etc.? Julie, just to clarify that for a start.

JULIE HEDLUND: So Maureen, this was intended to be the portal rather than—

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Yeah, that's cool. Yeah. So it was like, how do we meet the expectations of their making use of it? How do we identify how well they're using the portal? Because I think it's important that if we provide it because we think it's important, the metrics

need to be there. But I also just wanted to just to mention that pro bono services, for example, I know it's later on somewhere, but the fact that there was no, because there was no MOU or whatever, with the pro bono service providers, we couldn't get metrics. But I think that and this time, we really do need to know how helpful those services are. So there needs to be some way in which we can gather some data. You know, if we're going to probably be opening up that service, we just need to be able to provide the data somehow, so that needs to be incorporated. I just wanted to throw that in before we finish the meeting. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Maureen, I think it's a very useful comment. And I think it's a very useful way to end off the call.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Thanks, everyone. I've got two minutes after the top of the hour. Should we go ahead and adjourn?

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I think we can adjourn, but I think Maureen's comment is a very valuable one for us to bear in mind.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'll make sure to capture it. Thanks, Mike.

MIKE SILBER:	Thank you, everybody. Have a Good morning, afternoon or evening, wherever you may be.
JULIE HEDLUND:	Thank you, Mike, so much for sharing today. Thanks, everyone, for joining this meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]