ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 16 October 2023 at 16:00 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/DoFME

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 call taking place on Monday, 16th October 2023. I have no listed apologies for today's meeting. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand now.

Seeing or hearing no one, if I could remind everyone to please mute to a not speaking and to please state your name when you are speaking. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi stakeholder process are to comply the expected standards behavior. All documentation and information can be found on the public Wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. With this, I'll turn it back over to Mike Silber, please begin.

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.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you so, much, Terri. Before we kick off, I just wanted to apologize or my outburst on the previous call. I was extremely frustrated at the amount of time that we have spent on Rec 1. And I made some comments that I don't think were called for. I think we've tried to emphasize that the role of public comments is not to rehash arguments that are already taking place the working group, tut at the same time, the some of the comments made and were attributed to various people we're not warranted and I do apologize and I will try and just focus on not letting my frustrations get in the way of making some progress. And also thank you, Maureen, for pointing that out on a note to the list.

I was aware of it, but seeing it in black and white was very useful. So, thank you for that as well, Maureen.   Staff circulated an agenda and we've had some pushback from Lawrence and from Ross. In terms of trying to see if we can close out on Rec 1. So, can I make a suggestion?   Unless anybody disagrees, let's take up their request to continue with Rec 1, but I'm going to set a 15-minute time limit on it.

If we can close off in 15 minutes all good and well, if not, then let's park Rec 1 and let's move on to the rest of the recommendations because we are now getting significantly beyond time. We agreed to postpone last week, and I hope everybody had a wonderful time at the IGF and you accomplished amazing things. And it was very productive. And you did more than just talk, but now we've got work to do. And so, I'm going to unilaterally put a time limit on this. And if we don't close out in 15 minutes, let's move on. Is that acceptable?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sounds like a plan.

STEVE CHAN: Sounds good.

MIKE SILBER: Okay. Good. All right. So, in which case, Steve, can I hand over to you? Let's go back again to Rec 1. Let's see if we can close it out.

STEVE CHAN: Yes, sure we can. Thanks, Mike. One second. Trying to increase the size here. All right. If you all don't mind, I will actually try to summarize what I thought I heard at least from a staff perspective, during the last call on potentially, how to close out the potential amendments to this recommendation. From what we heard, at least, as I mentioned on the staff side, there was broad agreement to accept the suggestion from Cavalli. Which is essentially to make clear that no entities are excluded even if there is potential, targeting of a certain group.

So, like I said, this is what we thought we heard is that there was definitely agreement to include this and then the second part of that is, I believe a suggestion from Tom, which was to in this list of should not exclude entities to explicitly mention private sector direct sector entities in that statement. So, it's made clear that they should not be excluded. So, from our side, the staff side, that

EN

is what we thought we heard as a potential way to try to take into account the various concerns of the working group members. So, this is her suggestion as the starting point for this conversation. And maybe back to you, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Steve. Any comments, thoughts?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry. This is Lawrence about my jumping. I've been trying to look for the, button to raise my hand, and my think I finally found it. But I, I mean, recall that, we had language proposed by Tom I see he hasn't joined the call yet, but if staff can help pull up that. Pull up what's proposed. It looks like a good place to move forward in this. [00:05:51 -inaudible].

MIKE SILBER: Sorry Lawrence, we're losing you. Your sound is fading in and out.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. So, I was asking if it's possible to have a call at the last meeting. If we could review this, just in case there are edits that members might want to add to this. I think, but for me, I'm okay with what was proposed and I think it fits well into some extent, it accommodates what the GAC, DC, and other parties expect.

EN

MIKE SILBER:	Lawrence, sorry. I'm still not hearing what you're trying to ask. Maybe if you could type it in the chat.
STEVE CHAN:	Hey, Mike. This is Steve. I think I heard what Lawrence was asking for. If you don't mind.
MIKE SILBER:	Yeah. Please, Steve.
STEVE CHAN:	Sure. So, I think what Lawrence was asking was to actually be able to see the text that Tom had suggested and so, from what I recollect, this text box here, is intend to more or less collect what Tom had suggested which I verbally said was to try to capture this specific text right here, which is capturing private sector entities. I think that's the language that the GAC used, but essentially carving out and making sure that in the list of should not be excluded that this is specifically mentioned. So, I think Lawrence saying thanks. So, I think that's what he was asking for. Thanks.
MIKE SILBER:	Okay. I Personally don't see the need to carve out the private sector as a particular entity, but is that the general will of the group? Yes, Rosa.
STEVE CHAN:	Yes, for me.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah, thanks. No, I think this looks good to me. I think I'm happy with this compromise put forward. Yeah. So, no further comments to add, but thanks to everyone for the efforts to suggest the language. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Do we want to refine it further to say that those should be private sector entities from those areas, or is it all private sector entities? Rafik, I see your hand.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mike. To be honest, I still have concern that we are trying to push our private sector and we discussed them on length for that, but I don't want to kind of object here, but just to put my consent to record. I think that it's not really aligned with what we are trying to do, but anyway, I hope that we are not going to get stuck like this in the next recommendation review.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. No, terrific. Thank you. I think that's a very valid point and I think that aligns with my view. All right. I see Steve has tried to address my concern and Rose seems to agree with it as well. Okay, are we aligned? Hearing Rafik's concern, share that concern, but it seems that the majority is inclined to move forward. So, let's move forward.

STEVE CHAN: All right. Thanks, Mike. I think you're handing back to me and it looks like we came in under time on recommendation 1. Congratulations all. All right. So, we are now moving on to recognition.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry, Steve, and chair.

STEVE CHAN: Yes.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: So, just a question around clarity. So, with this, I believe that we will also need to put forward the response. The GGP team should also I mean, the column where we also going to be responding to the different contributors. Is this the point where we put our minds together on that language will be or it's going to be much later in the process?

MIKE SILBER: Steve, do you want to respond?

STEVE CHAN: Sure. I can take that. Thanks, Mike. This is Steve again. This is usually something that, staff will be happy to take the first cut out adding, to this column. I think you're talking about the GGP team response column. So, what we usually do is we try to capture the nature of the team's discussions and it's usually at a high level.

We don't get into the specifics of what's changing that goes more into the team actions. So, I guess what I would suggest here is that, so, your staff team will take away the conversations from this call as well as the past three calls and complete the column that you're referring to, which I think is column D. So, hopefully, that helps.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah.

STEVE CHAN: Okay. Thanks, Lawrence. Moving straight away to recommendation 2 then. So, the high level here is that, I think it's all 8. So, all 8 respondents support the recommendation with just the GAC supporting the intent of the recommendation with a wording change. So, that is the high level here, but nevertheless, three of the respondents that support the wording as intended, they'd still provided, thanks, Maureen.

They still provided some additional language to consider. So, I'll quickly summarize what at least the staff understanding is of the comments and then, of course, welcome any of the folks that understand it differently or definitely the parties that are taking part in this conversation that are being represented to also weigh in, if the reading isn't quite right. But just for the purpose of expediency, I'll do my best to try to summarize the reading of the comments here.

EN

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: All right. Thanks, Mike. So, firstly, and again, these are all commenters that support the language as written, but they still provided comments. So, I believe the comment from the BC is it's generally about, commentary about why the pro bono services are so important, but I don't believe there is actually session to make a change here, which I think makes sense because it's in the section that supports as written. Just pause for a moment to see if there's anyone that reads that differently. And hope you all you all've had a chance to read these on your own. It's hard to read on the fly.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Your position is correct, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thank you very much, Lawrence. Okay. See no other comments from others. The next one is from the NCUC and this is definitely something that we have talked about before. So, the NCUC's suggestion is to have the GGP address recommendations 17.2, which for those of you who are not familiar, that is one of the recommendations that the board did not adopt, they formally did not adopt that in their September board meeting.

And so, that is now taking, there's now kicking off ICANN bylaws mandated process, that is essentially the council and the board working to potentially develop supplemental recommendations

and trying to develop something that the board can adopt. So, what this group has talked about is that recommendation 17.2 is out of scope. So, the NCUC suggesting that this recognition considered by the GGP, this group has consistently talked about it being out of scope. I'll pause here again and see if there's anyone that disagrees with that.

MIKE SILBER: No, Steve. I think that it's out of scope. We're not going to now reopen that, we are working on a mandate given to us by council.

STEVE CHAN: Thank you, Mike. And moving on to the last comment in this section, which again is support as written. There's a comment from the NCSG and they have a question about whether or not the very last sentence in the guidance recommendation is more of an indicator of success. And so, it took me a moment to try to look through the structure of how this group actually words its recommendations.

And generally, what this group is doing is that in the recommendation itself, it talks about what the goal is of the group and what is intended to be achieved. And then it talks about an implementation guidance and or the metrics of success about how that is supposed to be done. And so, the way that the last sentence of the guidance recommendation is worded, it talks about the goal essentially that the information services offered by the pro bono providers, is useful, and that is the goal and what is

intended to be achieved. And then the indicator of success here would be the level of satisfaction.

So, moderate, potentially high satisfaction is what is actually written in the think it's the indicator success, not the implementation guidance. So, long story short is that I believe the way that these recommendations currently worded actually matches the essentially, the structure that the GGP has followed, which is in the recommendation itself, it is the goal, what is intended to be achieved. And then secondarily, the indicators of success are captured separately. So, I guess to summarize, does the group [CROSSTALK]?

MIKE SILBER: Steve, that are caught with my understanding, but I see Rafik has got his hand up. So, let's get some feedback from Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I was just going to ask you, Steve, if you can, I mean, if you can draft this response? Just to explain with regard to the comment from NCSG, so as to clarify, I think that's the whole point here maybe. There's more about clarification, if there is any misunderstandings.

MIKE SILBER: Excellent. Steve, we will need to take that on.

EN

STEVE CHAN: Sure thing. I think we can add to probably the column about the GGP response. So, we'll expand upon this language. I think we'll probably do that for all of these ones where there's comments added even if the wording is supported as is.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you.

STEVE CHAN: So, thanks for that comment, Rafik. All right. So, lastly, we are now moving to the section where it is supporting the intent of the recommendation with wording change. And, actually, just to take one quick step back, what you'll notice is we've tried to make it clear about what the most such parts of the comments are, and we've tried to highlight those to help in facilitating these calls. So, just a quick aside. So, here, I believe what the GAC is suggesting.

I definitely welcome Ross and Tracy to intervene if I don't get it quite right is, they support the intent, but what they would like to do is adding a few other elements. And so, they talk about, trying to add an element about recruiting and vetting pro bono providers, making it clear that is part of the ICANN process and not that just any pro bono provider can be a part of the program.

They also suggest that ICANN help play a matchmaker role between the pro bono providers and potential applicants. And they also provide specific guidance on how to set up the pro bono services, which I guess from the staff perspective might be actually an appropriate thing to tackle during the implementation

EN

phase itself. So, I believe that is, at least our understanding on the south side, but again, I welcome Ross and actually, definitely Ross did weigh in, if I didn't quite summarize that correctly.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Steve. And I see Ross Black clockwork has a hand up, please go for it.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thanks, both. Yeah. I think that was a really great summary. I think just to represent the GAC's comment here, I think it was just to add a little bit of language really to demonstrate that ICANN does have a role beyond just sending out perhaps a list of names of pro bono services to go a bit beyond that to help facilitate, for example, working together with the particular applicant to make a successful application.

I think it just probably looks to instill a bit more proactivity from ICANN org to make sure that, the onus isn't on just to go through, for example, a huge list of pro bono service providers and whatnot, but make sure that actually the requirements of the applicant are provided by the relevant pro bono service. So, I think that's the intent behind this just to add a little bit more of proactivity to this and make sure that applicants can most easily access the pro bono services available to them. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Rose, thank you. Useful to get that color. So, in terms of adding in a word like recruit, to me, it's to some extent, a synonym for

cultivate, but I don't think that's any harm. The problem comes in, is when you're starting to talk about facilitating. And when you're starting to talk about mentoring programs, does ICANN have responsibility for us? Because if ICANN has responsibility, it needs to vet them. It needs to run through that, and that's not what was previously contemplated.

The other concern that we've seen from the previous round and that may be repeated here now, I'd appreciate any input from staff, is whether that in any way compromises, ICANN Org's objectivity to the extent that there may be a competing applicant or the same string when it's opened up for general availability or after the applicant support program somebody's put in an application and suddenly there are two competing applications. One from a supported and one from a non-supported applicant. Does that create a potential conflict? Does that potentially compromise ICANN going forward? So, I hear what you're saying. I think it's great in theory, but I think we did discuss this to not get ICANN in the middle of the pro bono support because of the potential impact on ICANN and the potential compromise that it could have for the overall process. I don't know if Leon, you'd maybe have any thoughts on that or pull from what you're seeing from the council side if you have any thoughts of that?

LEON GRUNDMANN: Just to jump in there quickly, Thanks for the for the question, Mike. It's something that I'd have to go back to the team for, but on the face of it, does seem to relate to recommendations 17.2, which was mentioned, just earlier as well. Thank you.

EN

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. Thanks, Leon. That was my concern. So, Maureen, I agree with you completely. Mentoring is fantastic, and I suspect many of the Pro bono providers would provide exactly that. The key question is to what extent ICANN can get involved in vetting. So, this is not something that I can support unless, sorry, that I personally would support let me rephrase, unless and until staff can come back to us and tell us if they think that these fits, within the scope and is not captured by the 17.2, issue that has been raised. Ross?

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah. No. Thanks all for that explanation. I think in that case, would we be happy to support the small additional wording, but remove the end mentoring programs on that basis?

MIKE SILBER: I think that could work. I think that the key issue though is to facilitate the matchmaking and the reference to vetted service providers. So, there are quite a few things in the GAC commentary, which are very useful and are generally very positive, but I'm just worried, start painting ICANN into a corner and are going to get us into trouble. Sorry. I'm not sure who was intervening.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Its Lawrence. I just wanted to indicate I would love to be on the queue. I'm still trying to find how to raise my hand up.

EN

MIKE SILBER: Okay. Well, then please proceed. I'm sure we're off it. We'll get to you next.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you very much chair. So, on a different program and initiative, I know that in the past there have been a program of some sort where ICANN basically match registrars from developing regions with those who were better developed, you know, so, that they could learn and hone their skins. I also see a lot of value, in this. I understand the concern about the risk involved, but where this falls on the pro bono services, it could very well remove the risk factor or reduce it to a very variable minimum.

But hearing Steve say, you know, he can come back. He can come back to the working group with some information around this from staff. Seeing what was done in the past. I think this can also be replicated with the applicant support program where people offering pro bono service or anyone in the contracted who currently is a contracted party, might choose to allow others possibly under study them and all the works. But since this has been done with registrars in the past, I think there could be a way around this without exposing ICANN to a lot of risk. My thoughts anyway.

MIKE SILBER: Okay. Rafik?

EN

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. First, it's a question for clarification since to be mentioned about the recommendation 17.2, but my understanding for that recommendation is related roughly that, ICANN would pay for some legal service and so on. So, I don't think it really linked to the case here of pro bono service. And the second point, I'm not sure. I mean, adding recruiting or recruited.

It seems here it's, implicitly expect ICANN to take an active role in term of funding and getting some provider for pro bono service. So, that's kind of maybe different level. And the last time there was, I think, several entities that they wanted to join by themselves without any really involvement from ICANN, but it seems here we expect I can to do an active role in getting the pro bono service. I'm not sure if it's really up to us here or something that should have been more discussed at the SubPro, but, yeah.

MIKE SILBER: That's a very valid comment. I don't know Leon if you want to respond on the 17.2. That is something that you'd rather look at and revert to the group on our next call.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Thanks, Mike. Yes, I think it's something to discuss in the in the group, and then we can come back with a more coherent answer. I think that makes sense.

EN

MIKE SILBER: Thank you. Now, I know that I'll put you on the spot. Very happy for you to consider it and review it. I think we went through this before. Pro bono services can be very valuable to both supported applicants as those who are contemplating applying and contemplating requesting support. At the same time, we can't put an ICANN in the middle. And respectfully, what happens at a registrar level is not comparable to happen at a registry level. You know, registrars compete.

Registries are to some extent natural monopolies and therefore, it's a generally very different situation where you may get some registries who are willing to collaborate, but it's not something where ICANN can get in the middle of it. Other than making a suggestion going and recruiting. And again, I Rafik, I hear your comment, but, you know, I think recruiting could be as simple as at an ICANN meeting going to the contracted party's house and going to some of the technical organizations and saying, guys, this is the program and it would be fantastic if you could offer your expertise.

I know that there are a number of registries and technical service providers who are very keen to do this, some of them because it will bring them work. So, I don't think recruiting is going to be the difficult one. I think to me the real difficulty is what role do we expect our ICANN to play other than providing a place for pro bono service providers to indicate what services they're willing to offer and potential applicants to be able to contact them.

More than that, if this is tender or supported applicants and provider service providers, is it the ICANN's responsibility to actually identity check and verify people before they actually get

onto the platform. And I'm very hesitant to now started asking for ICANN to be put in that position when it's something that we discussed and we didn't agree was ICANN's role. But let's let Leon go and have a look at it and come back to us. I don't think that we're going to be in a position to close off on this one just yet. Steve, can we move on to rec 3, unless there are any other comments on rec 2?

STEVE CHAN: No further hand. Sure thing. Oh, see your hand from Maureen.

MIKE SILBER: Yes, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thanks, Steve and Mike. I Just been a little bit worried about my very shaky sort of communication sort of like connection here. I hope I can be heard, but I think that what this does, this discussion is sort of like outlines is a little bit perhaps a little bit of concern about how ICANN actually communicate the needs of the applicants. I mean, if we want applicants to make use of the Pro bono Services, how does ICANN actually communicate what their needs might be in relation to the role that a lot of applicants might have with regards to becoming a registrar and to facilitate their whole familiarity with the actual processes.

I mean, what is the process that ICANN use this to actually recruit. I'm using the words and the thing, but to actually recruit Pro bono services to make sure that the services are going to be useful for

the applicants. So, I think that this is probably where, from my perspective, it's where the GAC is coming from because they want to make sure that pro bono services are going to be provided that actually are going to meet the needs of the applicants.

MIKE SILBER: Maureen, thank you. I think that's a very useful comment. I think we then, it's not something that we discussed significantly previously. And I think there's value in that, but it's almost a question to staff of how do we find out from applicants what they need and then find people to address those needs as opposed to simply as I said, putting up profiles on applicant tinder and hoping people meet each other and actually find each other useful. That's an interesting one. I'm just wondering how we address that because I think that you're highlighting a very interesting GAC. And I'm just, trying to work out how we deal with this situation of where exactly the horse is versus where the cart is. Steve, do you have any insights?

STEVE CHAN: I can try. This is Steve. So, I don't want to speak for my colleagues, Christine and Leon who are working on the applicant support program from an implantation standpoint, but I think they would have a pretty good sense of the nature of support that an applicant generally would need in order to prepare for considering to put an application to the process as well as getting through the evaluation itself. So, I would imagine that this might be something that Leon can take back as well to just ask about whether or not. You know we're not just looking for any pro bono services, we're

looking for pro bono services in in certain areas because we know that these are areas of need for applicants. So, I think that's what Maureen is getting at.

MIKE SILBER: So, thank you. If we can do this between Steve and Leon, if we can just try and get an update, but I think the way to address that might be to put language along the lines of that the applicant support program has identified areas where potential applicants may need pro bono services, comma has cultivated pro bono services, and so on and so forth. But I think let's understand what's been done so far and where staff feel that can go, and then we can start wordsmithing to try and capture that. So, that would work for everybody. Okay. I think there's some support for that one. So, let's see. Rafik, sorry. I'll see your hand is back up.

RAFIK DAMMAK: No problem. So, if I understood the view of the ideas, we kind of try to know what maybe applicant might need in term of support. But I think here, the pre-request or what's needed first is that the public know about the program first so they can identify what they need, I guess. I'm not sure how we can do that. It's a little bit tricky, maybe. It's because I guess I cannot identify for place what they need if they don't know what the program is about. Not sure it will be circular, but just here, I guess maybe we are kind of going in some rabbit hole, just trying to understand what I'll try to assure you. But, anyway, if there is follow-up, that that would be helpful later.

EN

MIKE SILBER: All right. Good. So, not quite closed out, but let's get some input from staff and let me see if we can close it out on our next call. I'm desperately hoping we can get on to rec 3.

STEVE CHAN: I think we can. Just a quick comment to Rafik's question or query, which is that, I would imagine that the outreach in recognition 1 would also help potential applicants in understanding where their weak spots and where they might need additional information that might help in drawn out the lines of where they need the help and where they maybe feel more comfortable. So, just in the side.

All right. So, moving on to recommendation 3. This one, I don't want to jinx it, but it should be pretty quick. So, in this case, all 8 respondents support the recommendation. And then there's the GAC that supports the intent, but with a wording change. I think to just quickly summarize what they mean is, what they're suggesting to do is clarify what is meant by resources for the program and so, what I think this is specific things that you're talking about adding are financial backing and human resources. So, it seems to be a clarification and adding on, what is meant by resources for the program.

MIKE SILBER: Any thoughts, comments? You know, I'm not sure that we want to necessarily be overly prescriptive, but, I don't see any major issue with putting a set of parentheses after necessary resources and

saying including financial and human resources, but, Steve I see your hand is up.

STEVE CHAN: Yeah. Thanks, Mike. Just a suggestion on a potential other way that generally speaking, these sorts of comments can be addressed is, this one I think is talking more about the how rather than what is this precisely trying to be accomplished by the group and so, in that sense, it if it's about the how that's often about basically implementation guidance. And so, this group used the implementation guidance technique, I guess or mechanism into inconvenience thoughts for recommendation 1, it could be something that is used for other recommendations where the group wants to convey some thoughts about how the recommendation could be implemented, but does not necessarily want to make it prescriptive. So, just generally speaking, if there are things like this where the group wants to share thoughts, but doesn't want to lock ICANN org into the specific way that it's being described, that is a potential way to convey this fast. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Good point, Steve. Any objections to doing it that way? Ross, suspects speaking on behalf of the GAC supports that I think we can move ahead or at least, Ross, if not speaking on behalf of at least channeling some of the comments from the GAC is in support. So, therefore, I think we can move on.

EN

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Mike.   Moving on to recommendation 4.   And I just realized I probably should have been doing something along the way, which was introducing the recommendation itself.   So, guidance recommendation 4 is about the application materials and making application materials and the process timely and accessible at a high level. And in this case, there is support from all 8 respondents.   And it's supporting as written.   So, there is some commentary from both the NCUC and the GAC, but I don't believe either of them actually are suggesting any change which again makes sense because they're both in the category of support recommendation as written.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Steve. But I do think that it could be useful to follow that same technique to note that languages should be considered and that ensuring timely delivery is important. I'm not crazy about the very firm way in which the GAC recommended that everything that anybody could ever hope to know needs to be done ahead of time, but I do think there is validity in there highlighting that notion of timeliness. So, maybe we need to just put an implementation guidance in there as well. No hands up, so, I think we can move on to Rec 5.

STEVE CHAN: I guess just to clarify, is that a were there any objections to what Mike suggested should the potential multiple language support as well as the timeliness of the materials being provided should those be captured as implementation guidance? It seems like there's no objections to that.   Okay.   Thanks, Ross.   Okay.   Thank you.

Moving on to recommendation 5 and this recommendation is about the percentage that are supported essentially.

So, trying to track how many actually are make it through the program and are approved more or less. So, in this case, the high-level summary is that 8 of 9 respondents supported the recommendation. Cavalli supported the intent with the wording change and then there's one that was from the GAC where they suggest that there's significant change required. So, firstly, of the 7 respondents that support recommendation is written. In this case, there is no additional commentary from any commenters.

The comment from Cavalli after reminding myself what they are saying here. What they seem to be suggesting is, adding in additional nuance to the recommendation. So, in summary, I think it's saying that looking at just the delegation rates is insufficient and that you might need to look at the comparison of supported applications and unsupported applications throughout the life cycle of the program. So, basically, seeing how well supported applications do throughout the various elements of the program and seeing if it's comparable to a standard application. So, I think it's just suggesting doing a deeper analysis and tracking of metrics for support applications versus you quote unquote regular applications.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. Steve, thank you. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks to you, Mike. First, this matter was quite detailed and getting a little bit complex. I might understand the intent here to be maybe more specific and consider several cases, but I think when we start using work like statistically significant or insignificant, I think we are going here an area that's maybe are not all, I'd say, stat issue, that the scientist or something that we can get what we mean here.

I think it might maybe rise more question than trying to respond to them. And also, here I think what we are trying to achieve is to set some medical KPI just to measure if we are reaching them or not while when we all start to talk about statistically significant is for it has, I think different users. It's not my area of expertise, but I might have here some concerns how we will add it and how it will be used. I can see the intent here that to take maybe kind of each case and to take it to account, they'll have different phases and so, we need to be aware, but maybe it will make things more complicated than it's required, but I'm looking to hear from other and see how it can work out this.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Rafik. So, my understanding of the comment and again, I'm not in any way advocating for them is, I think they've slightly misunderstood the guidance recommendation and they've talked about rates of delegation as opposed to a pure percentage of delegation. That being said, I think they raise a very important point, which is, what is the effect on receiving support versus non-applicants not receiving support? Is there any real value that's added in the support program in terms of the overall success of an application in the longer term?

We looked at it as a relatively superficial measure which is, we're trying to get supported applicants through the first hurdle. They're saying, then we need to start looking at how they do in the overall scheme of things and I think it's a valid comment, but I think that it's not what we were suggesting or, sorry. it's not mutually exclusive, and I don't think that the language that they're suggesting actually assists. What they're talking about is almost an additional recommendation, which is doing a long-term evaluation of the viability of supported applicants versus non-supported applicants. I don't know if anybody else is reading it that way. Yes, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Yes. So, this is exactly how I read it, Mike. In terms of providing maybe to the community at certain points additional information on how each TLD or applicant supported perform benchmarking them against others who paved their way through or who also got gTLDs in this particular round, but not through the applicant support program. I believe that ICANN I mean, I believe that Org would have different ways of measuring how applicants, whether through the applicant support or through the traditional means of applying without applicant support.

I believe that there will be different metrics that staff use internally to justify the funding and the support and the continuity of programs of this nature while this is not covered in the original or rather in the concept about thinking in terms of this particular recommendation. For me, it is a nice to have, if it's going to require additional expenses on the side Org to implement, then it might be nice to have that understanding or if there's already a

system that captures such metrics, I believe what might just be required is making some of the out goods public. So, for me, it's something that depends on to a large extent, yes, it depends on the outcomes of how we think about this. It's definitely nice to have that kind of comparison even though that wasn't the initial thought process that we had around this so to call it a recommendation. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Lawrence. Any other comments? Leone, is this something that I can throw into your court as well, because I suspect this is something that we would like to track longer term, but it actually may need a little bit more thought in the process.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Yes. Absolutely. It's something that we've looked at as well. We looked at all the comments and this one raises questions of; would it be possible really to separate and measure each of these each of these metrics individually. And if not, would that then represent failure? So, those kinds of questions are coming up, but this is something I'll go back to the team and we'll talk about it as well because indeed, it raises some questions.

MIKE SILBER: No. I think there are some interesting points I'm not sure if it's what we want to put in here as a guidance recommendation. I'm not even sure if it falls under implementation recommendation, but rather an interesting point that was raised and would be useful to capture some way, but whether it's practical, is another question.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Yes. Exactly.

MIKE SILBER: Okay. Let see how we can find a way to capture that. Rafik, I see your hand.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mike. To be honest, I confess that I tried to read the comment and also to understand the explanation. I'm still confused about the comment and my concern here is how we can respond to that. I get that it's not really about maybe setting a metric here, but maybe assessing on the long term, like about delegation of supported applicant. Is it possible to get more clarification? That will be really helpful to be sure that we are responding appropriately. Maybe it's too late here and I'm starting to shut down, but I'm not sure to get it correctly and I guess there is nothing missing.

MIKE SILBER: Rafik, valid comments, Steve, if you wanted to respond and I also see we have two minutes left.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah. Thanks, Mike.

EN

MIKE SILBER: The code isn't.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I'm sorry. There's a gardening going on the outside. It was quite loud. So, I will admit I also had, I had to read this several times to try and figure out what the intention of the comment was and my understanding is that they're suggesting that looking only at delegation rates is perhaps insufficient. So, I think they're trying to understand the impact of being a supported applicant or unsupported throughout the life cycle and that could be positive or negative. So, for instants the rates of supported versus the unsupported that make it through and show up for evaluation or objection or string contention or all of these elements within the new gTLD program.

I believe what they're trying to understand is if whether or not that actually has an impact on you as an applicant, either being supported or unsupported in making it through all these elements. So, one way that if the group wanted to add an element like this, they could potentially add in a more general question or, I guess suggestion on capturing additional metrics like this about the impact of being supported or unsupported. And then maybe leave out the prescriptive part that's included in the table that Cavalli included. So, that could be a way to add in this nuance without getting into quite so, much of the detail. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Steve, thank you. Just conscious of time if I can bother people just for another minute or two. So, I don't think that we're here to

EN

go back to Kamlada and ask them to explain their comments. I think go and reread their comments if you're uncertain. And if they're still opaque and I suspect they will be, then it indicates that their comments were not as clear as they could be, but we don't have the time to go back to everybody and ask them to clarify I think what we need to do is take the positive from what they're saying, which is we've chosen a relatively simplistic metric.

And it would be very useful to collect more metrics and for staff to actually take a longer-term review of what impact being a supported applicant has on the life cycle of the TLD and I think that's what they're asking for in general terms, and I think that's generally a good thing, but Leon, if you wouldn't mind relooking at that, I will go and reread it. I'd welcome everybody else go and reread it and we can pick it up, and see if we've managed to pierce the opaque veil that they have cost over their comment or not, or otherwise you can go and speak to them next week when we're in Hamburg and see if you can get more clarity. Speaking of which, Steve, do you want to talk about the plan going forward. We don't have scheduled time during the Hamburg meeting, but we do have a call taking place on the 30th, anything else that we need to know from a logistics perspective?

STEVE CHAN: This is Steve. Thanks, Mike. I don't believe so, I think you captured it. Essentially, the goal the singular goal of this group is to get through these comments make changes that may be determined to be needed and then wrap up the final report and deliver to the council in a timely manner, but no later than December of this year. So, as Mike noted, there is no call at

ICANN send yet because the nature of this work is really not conducive for commute engagement. It's really about this group working through its comments and determine what changes are needed. So, I think you summed it up pretty well, Mike. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Steve, thank you for your support and for standing in while Julie's on leave. Much appreciated. I see Julie is back, but she's letting you do the heavy lifting while she gets her feet back under the desk. So, thank you for that, Steve. Thank you, everybody. Let's engage informally next week. Those of us who will be there in person, and we look forward to the next call on the 30th.

TERRI AGNEW: All right. I do.

MIKE SILBER: Terri, you can stop the recording.

TERRI AGNEW: Perfect. That's what I was waiting for. Thank you very much, Mike. Thank you, everyone. I will stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines since the meeting has been adjourned. Take care and safe travels to those that are traveling and see everybody else online. Bye.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Terri.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]