EN

ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 12 April 2023 at 20:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/7gA5Dg

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

JULIE HEDLUND: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the GGP Initiation Request for Applicant Support call on Monday, 17 April 2023. We did not receive any apologies for today's call.

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. All right, seeing no hands, if you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the public wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. And as a reminder, those who take part in the 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 will turn it over to our chair, Mike Silber. Please begin, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you very much, Julie. You would have seen that staff have been very busy, and I really appreciate the efforts that Steve and Julie have put in to try and revise the document that we've been working on based on the input and the discussion from last week. And I see Rafik has already jumped into the question of the differences between the documents. But, Julie, instead of speaking for you, I think other than to say that I'm very grateful for the effort and I think that you've managed to significantly streamline the document, I'd like to suggest that between you and Steve you present the revised document to try and explain what you're getting at. I've had the advantage of a little bit of time with Steve and Julie before this call, and I think they've done a fantastic job. But maybe you can take the rest of the working group through the document, and then we can see if this is something that actually helps us. And then we turn it over to staff to try and work their magic on the rest of the document.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike, for that introduction. Let me bring up the document [in the dialogue here]. All right, it looks like that's up. And let me take some time here to explain what staff have done with guidance from Mike and also from Paul McGrady. We did preview the document with them and go over it and got their input. And so now we'd like to do the same thing with you.

And you'll just note first of all that this is only a first step in the process of suggesting a streamlined version of the working document. So you'll probably note that it is quite a bit shorter than the original working document. That's just because, for one thing, it really is just a streamlining of the goals or recommendations as we're calling them for the first lifecycle element, and that's the outreach awareness element.

But let me back up a little bit and explain first of all at the end of last week's discussion it was suggested by staff that we take the comments and inputs received thus far on the working document, the original working document and see if we could distill those into a revised version. And rather than trying to do that with the entire document, we have done a treatment of just the first lifecycle element, as I explained. So that we could socialize this with you and get your input and see if the working group and the chair and liaison considered this a good basis to continue.

So what we did as far as our intent to streamline and revise the original working document was we went to the presentation that GDS provided us that we went over briefly last week. And if you may recall in the table there was a description of the various elements, the goal, the indicators of success, and the metrics. And really they were it's not so much descriptions as questions to consider. So it was considered helpful that in developing goals and indicators of success and metrics that one would take into consideration these keys questions.

What we did then in streamlining this first section of the document on outreach and awareness is we tried to answer these questions. So specifically with a goal, what is the aim, what is the desired

outcome. The goal should be able to answer those questions. The indicators of success should be able to address what would indicate the goal has been achieved and how will you know when it is achieved? And thirdly, the metrics should be able to answer the question what data information should be collected and analyzed to determine if the goal has been met?

So we took those three questions and we applied them to the first section, and in particular we looked at all of the goals that were listed under the first section of life cycle elements. The first thing we found is that the majority of what were listed as goals in the section of outreach and awareness did not answer the question of what is the aim or what is the desired outcome.

Several of those goals actually related to the success of an application. So it seemed to fall more logically under lifecycle element Number 2 which is on the business case. So those immediately went out.

And then of the rest of the goals many were related more to implementation or implementation guidance and not goals. They were more prescriptive about how the applicant support program should be designed without actually speaking to how the goals should be developed and how the goals should be achieved. So items relating to, for instance, the portal and portal services seemed to be more implementation elements than goals themselves.

So after scrutinizing all the comments that you have provided and the goals and indicators of success and the metrics, we were able to distill one recommendation or goal out of all that. And also, we

noted that the section that we called "approach" is probably in this case more akin to implementation guidance, and so we've reflected it that way.

So that's an explanation of why we did what we did, and then I'll get into the substance. But let me pause there, and I see Rafik has his hand up. Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Can you hear me?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, indeed.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Julie. Thanks for the explanation. I understand the [inaudible] and the purpose, but I just want first to comment. It seems even with the intention about had to kind of follow some order or some kind of format that we need to respond to this question, when I read or I see for the first time it seems quite a rewriting or kind of not clear connection to what we did before that. It's hard to see the link. So if it's possible to add kind of mapping or comparison of what we produced. I understand that those are just working documents. They are temporary in nature. It's not something that we have to stick with them forever. But just make a clear connection to comments or what we wrote before. It's really hard for me at least to see kind of the link and it makes it difficult to review. So I appreciate the effort, but it's just kind of [inaudible].

MIKE SILBER: Sorry, Rafik, I'm not quite following the ask.

RAFIK DAMMAK: The ask. Okay, so this is a totally new document [inaudible]. I understand the purpose and the idea behind. I have no problem with that. But since we did [the effort] before I cannot see the link between what we produced before and this. So I would appreciate for each section just kind of mapping to the previous working document or adding some [inaudible]. Otherwise, [it will be] hard to review and to see the difference every time. That's what I'm saying. [inaudible] group. Just it's kind of a little bit challenging to do a review with….

MIKE SILBER: Julie, is that feasible?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. And, Rafik, thank you very much for the question. So you put your finger on something that we realized right away when we tried to distill new content from the original working document. What we found was that it was just not possible to do the exercise that you are speaking of, this mapping between the old document and the new.

What we really had to do was we had to start over. And the reason we started over is because there were so many comments and so much content and so much text that didn't fit into this new

format as far as being able to identify goals or indicators or success or metrics according to these questions that it was impossible to take what was there and map it directly to what this new document is. But I can at least answer you as far as what you see on the screen and the genesis of what you see here.

So in the original document there was a goal related to awareness, and it talked about awareness in this sense. So it was more detailed as implementation guidance. It talked about increasing awareness and targeting potential applicants from the not-for-profit sector; social enterprises; community organizations from underdeveloped, underrepresented, and developing regions. And that was content that exists in the original document and that was commented on with respect to the use of these terms "underdeveloped," "underrepresented," and "developing."

But what we found was that this text here seemed much more like implementation guidance than an actual goal. The goal as we [distilled] it from this, so this was in the original document, is much simpler and higher level. We want to increase awareness. That's clear. This is the outreach and awareness section. And we want the awareness to be of…what are we increasing awareness of? It's of the next round of gTLD applications and the applicant support program.

And for whom do we want to increase awareness? We don't need to go in, in the goal, we don't need to go to the level of saying what types of organizations or developing or undeveloped. We want to increase awareness among those who may need and could qualify for support. And so that could actually be even beyond the implementation guidance here. It could conceivably be

anyone within a country or region who qualifies for support, whether they're in underdeveloped or not-for-profit or commercial or whether they're underrepresented, etc.

So the goal then becomes this higher level goal. We pulled it out of all of the different texts that you saw in the original document, but it would be some here and some there. And then this text was in the original document, but it was set up as a goal and not as implementation guidance. As implementation guidance, we don't have to go to the level of defining everything.

Although, looking at Gabriela's comment, we could still have, say, a footnote here or a definitions section where we define the terms underdeveloped and developing. And we can certainly do that and provide that clarification. We had that suggestion in the comments in the original document and we could pull that back in, in this implementation guidance. But our suggestion is it does not need to be included in the recommendation which is at a higher level.

So that's where that text came from. But then if I look at indicators of success, this is actually new text. And this is because we realized in looking at what would indicate success that we don't have to come up with some amorphous numbers or percentages that don't really represent anything.

We have many, many comments in the original document relating to whether or not we should use a percentage of applications or whether or not we should just pick a number. Somebody last week suggested 200 applications, but that wasn't really tied to anything. We suggested that a percentage wasn't really very useful because we didn't know how many applications there might be in total.

But we realized we don't need to rely on just picking a number. What we can do is look at what is commonly used for outreach and awareness in, say, marketing campaigns. And that is conversion rates, and there are industry standards for those. So we can say an indicator of success quantitatively could be the conversion rates proportionate with industry standards for online campaigns and in-person events.

And now ICANN Org can work with experts who can obtain that information and provide that as implementation guidance. But we don't have to provide that information here. We can say those would be indicators for success. We don't have to say what they are.

And qualitatively then that would be the survey results about quality and clarity of information that are also proportionate with industry standards. So both of these things are information that's out there that ICANN Org can access but that we don't have to get to the details of exactly how this needs to be done.

So that information is new. But then metrics to measure success is information that was actually listed in the metrics. And that is click-throughs, inquiries, registration to get more information, etc. And then qualitatively the results of surveys about the quality of the information.

And again, you'll see that each of these connects with their associated indicators of success. So quantitatively you have conversion rates and quantitatively you have metrics that have click-throughs, inquiries, and so on. And then you can look at the conversion rates resulting from those metrics.

EN

And then qualitatively you have the metric that matches with the qualitative indicators of success, and that is the results of the surveys and whether the participant understood the information and made an informed decision to apply or to walk away.

And so we tried to keep this quite simple and high level and did try to tie it back to the text in the original document. But it would be impossible, I would say, to complete a mapping exercise. But you can see where we pulled this information.

So I'm going to pause there, and I see that Maureen has a comment in the chat. And then I'll open it up for questions and discussion. Maureen says, "Why is there a multistakeholder group looking at indicators of success and metrics from our own communities that really are not required? There's still some lack of understanding about what is it that we're are being asked. For that staff are not just distilling it into a high level that precludes the details of what are coming from each of the communities." I'm not sure, Maureen, are you speaking of the…which group are you speaking of?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Julie. I just wanted to…I mean, I'm just listening to what you're saying, and this box that you've actually just presented to us. Is that the format which you want to actually pass over to the GNSO Council for each of the different recommendations?

JULIE HEDLUND:	It is the skeleton of the report. So the report will have these elements. And really there is actually no particular report template, so to an extent we're having to create it. But it's not too dissimilar from what a PDP initial report would look like in that there would be recommendations and then sometimes implementation guidance. The indicators of success and metrics are, of course, associated particularly with this task. They wouldn't be associated with, say, Task 6 and the recommendations associated with that in the report.
	But the report would have recommendations, guidance, and a rationale. The rationale is the distillation, or I should say a capturing, of these discussions that this group has been having. And staff has been taking notes and will also go back to recordings and transcripts to ensure that we're capturing accurately the discussions so that they're reflected in the rationale and the deliberations. So this is a skeleton really, just a very high level of what the report will look like. It will be more complete than this.
MAUREEN HILYARD:	Right. Okay, and just to add to that, so therefore like for example there are certain things like definitions and those sorts of things that have actually been seen to be quite important. So they'll be included in a high level for each of the recommendations in this format but there is going to be discussion and other sorts of the other inputs that have actually come from the communities. I think that's important, but I see other hands are up. Thank you, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: You're welcome.

MIKE SILBER: Let's take them in the order that I see. Gabriela?

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes, hello. Thank you very much. Thank you, Julie, for the explanation and for this clear version. I do like to ask because I think we need to link more clearly the outreach, exactly the Recommendation 1 with implementation guidance and the indicators and metrics. I don't see a clear relationship between these three.

For example, the Recommendation 1 states that we need to have an increased awareness first of the next round and second awareness specifically on the application support program. So we have two things that we need to increase awareness, and this is not reflected in the indicators that these two things that we need to increase awareness.

And also, in the implementation guidance I'm still not clear about the difference between underdeveloped and developing. Because for me, underdeveloped is not used at all in the international [inaudible]. In the ITU we use developing countries or regions because this does not stress the fact that we are not developed. On the opposite, we are stressing that we are emerging countries or developing in the process of, and this is an important point for developing countries.

MIKE SILBER: Gabriela, sorry, can I stop you there for a second?

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes.

MIKE SILBER: Because I think your comment is very valid, but I think what we need to do is we need to get comfortable with the revised format.

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Ah, okay, okay. Perfect, yeah.

MIKE SILBER: And if we're comfortable with the revised format…

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Add the comments.

MIKE SILBER: …then we need to drill into the content of it and start looking at some of the important edits. And the one that you raised is an important edit, but I'd like to just get the working group comfortable with the revised format first.

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Okay.

EN

MIKE SILBER: And if they are, then we take the specific comment as to the content of the document.

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Perfect. On the format then, I have one observation or question.

MIKE SILBER: Please.

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Most of the time in the developed projects we work with assumptions that maybe not for this first recommendation but for the other ones it's important to add assumptions regarding a specific fact. Maybe this is another item that we can add. Thank you very much.

MIKE SILBER: Gabriela, I think that's an excellent suggestion. And to Maureen's question as well, Maureen, absolutely. So the idea was to see if we can get the working group comfortable with this structure, and then we can get staff to put in some more effort in terms of getting the definitions that we all agreed were essential, the assumptions that Gabriela is raising. I think those are all important sections that we will need to insert. But given the pace of work that we've managed so far, I'm going to ask staff if they can attend to that if we're comfortable with the revised format. But I see Rafik's hand is up. So, Rafik, do you want to make a comment.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, thanks, Mike. Thanks again to Julie for the explanation. So one of my [thoughts] here is that since we are trying to respond to the question as suggested by GDS and I understand that it's a lot about implementation, but I would take another standpoint here. But what about responding to the question of GNSO Council? Do you have a way to say that we are responding to that? Because I can see that maybe we went in some direction just focusing on what we want the metrics, and now we are trying to respond to the question asked by GDS. But can we do also the same with GNSO Council to assess [everything down] that we are responding to what we were tasked to do?

MIKE SILBER: So, Rafik, we have a liaison from Council. So, Paul, maybe I put you on the spot.

PAUL MCGRADY: Sure thing but, Rafik, could you re-ask the question so I am sure that I have it.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. What I was saying is just here it seems that we are trying to respond to the question from GDS, but I was just wondering if we need something very similar to [assert] that we are responding [in the first place] to the question [or request] from GNSO Council.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah, Rafik, I'm sorry. I hate to do this, but I'm actually having trouble following your question. So we have questions from GDS and questions from Council, and the question is are we responding to Council? I'm sorry, I'm not sure. And Steve's hand came up, so maybe Steve can help me.

STEVE CHAN: I'm happy to try unless Julie wants to do it instead. I see your hand up.

MIKE SILBER: Well, I see both of you.

STEVE CHAN: Okay, I'm sorry.

MIKE SILBER: But let's take you in turn, Steve and then Julie.

STEVE CHAN: Sure. I can keep it brief and Julie can come in and clean up anything I might have missed. So the way that the questions are laid out from GDS, they were drafted with the task of this group in mind, so they should be consistent with those tasks. So specifically the tasks talk about identifying indicators of success and then also the metrics and data that would be needed to be able to determine whether or not that success has been met.

And so one of the things that is not specifically called out but you kind of can't do…you can't really understand what success looks like without knowing what you're trying to achieve is the goals. And that's the one element that's been added here in the three pieces. So at least by the staff read, the questions that GDS asked are directly intended to try to guide us to be able to answer Tasks 3, 4, and 5. So hopefully that helps Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Steve. That's more clear. Just because [inaudible] something else. So I have no problem with the format, but since it's also quite a big change I'm just wondering how we will proceed here. Are we going to review from the beginning or how will we do it? I'm just wondering about the work ahead of us.

MIKE SILBER: Yep. Julie, your thoughts?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, thank you, Rafik. You have anticipated the next issue that we were going to address and the suggestion that we were going to make. So first, we know this is…you didn't have much chance to see this before this meeting, so we understand if you want to take a little more time.

But what we'd like to suggest is to give you some more, another example, some more text to consider. And that is to look at, at least the next lifecycle element, the business case, and develop that in this format.

And try to make it as possible again how we have selected the text and distilled it from the original document. But undoubtedly will not be able to a direct mapping because the number of comments in the original document are voluminous and some comments really build on each other and tend to obscure the intent of the original text. So we're trying to really get back to the original intent. And again, to the questions that GDS has suggested and getting to, as you point out, answering and addressing Tasks 3-5.

And actually, just a note to what Steve said and explained so well. What we found is that in the original document with the number of comments and details and implementation details in particular, it was hard to discern how we were addressing Tasks 3-5. So what we've tried to do is to get back to that and make it very clear, first of all, that we've identified goals which the tasks don't really address. But also that we've clearly mapped out the indicators of success and clearly delineated from those the metrics.

And as you may recall, one of the tasks is to prioritize and organize the metrics as suggested by the SubPro PDP working group in its final report. And one of the things that in addition to being very clear which metrics apply and don't apply to the goals that we've identified and the indicators of success we will include, of course for the working group to review, in the rationale of the document why we did not include some metrics that were suggested by the final report and included others. So we'll have to be very clear about. And so we will still cover that part of the task.

But what we'd like to do with the working group's approval is provide yet another section—at least one other section but if we

have time before next Monday's meeting, even more than that—and present that to you for discussion and review ahead of time, at least maybe a few days before Monday's meeting and then talk through that at next meeting and see if you continue to be comfortable with the format and if the new text, the further text illustrates better the intent here and how we're trying to make sure that we're answering these questions.

And I'm noticing that Rafik has a question in the chat. He is saying, "A rationale would include the assumptions?" Yes, it can. And actually I'm sorry. I missed the chat above that. Yeah, Maureen is happy with the revised format and structure, but I also agree with Gabriela's recommendation [inaudible] assumptions [inaudible] on what indicators the assessed metrics are based. So we can tease those out and include those. And the logical place to include those would be in the rationale, yes. Thank you, Rafik.

So anyway, with the indulgence of the chair and the liaison and the working group, staff would like to continue this exercise and present to you for review at least one more section if not two or more depending on how the work goes with distillation, I guess.

MIKE SILBER: So, Julie, let me make a suggestion. Because I think there is a sense that I'm getting from the people on this call that the structure is good. The clarify is useful. The fact that it's been significantly distilled and refocused is appreciated by everybody.

But there is a concern that people may not have had sufficient time to fully review it because it's essentially a clean review.

Maybe what we do is we take a raincheck on next week's call and instead of putting you and Steve under pressure to get a document out to us in sufficient time for us to review before next week's call, we give you a week's break. You try and get a document to us as early as possible next week so we have got as close as possible to a full week to review it before the call in two weeks' time. I don't know if that makes sense to everybody.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. That's a really helpful suggestion. And in doing so, I would suggest that we could try to make a more direct line between the content in the old document and the content in the new document to as much extent as we can.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. Because if we give you, let's say, Monday/Tuesday next week to do the review, that still gives us approximately a week to review before the call the following week. But it gives you a little bit more breathing room to actually draw that mapping.

I don't know. Is that acceptable to the rest of the working group? I personally think that it warrants missing a call one week just to give staff the time to actually do the work. Okay, so I've got support from Maureen. If anybody else wants to put a thumbs-up reaction, that will be appreciated. Great. So I think we've got enough support for us to postpone next week's call, give you and Steve some time. Obviously, if people do want to continue….

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Hello, [inaudible]. I'm sorry to interject.

MIKE SILBER: Yes.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I'm on the audio bridge only. I actually support this.

MIKE SILBER: Excellent. Thanks, Lawrence. So on that basis then, I think we've got a good way forward. And I think the slight delay is justified because the document is looking a lot more streamlined and distilled and polished. So fully supported, great.

Does that then warrant us going through the document as it currently stands, or should we give everybody 20 or 19 minutes back in their day and let Steve and Julie continue? Or do people want to actually start engaging with the content of the document? I know Gabriela has already made one useful comment. I don't know if we want to take the 19 minutes we've got left to continue engaging with the document.

Okay, Maureen says, "Let's take a breather and let's pick it up once we've got a fuller document." I think that's a reasonable way forward. So on that basis, let me give you back 18 minutes in your day, and we can then engage more fully once Steve and Julie have had time to look at the document.

EN

Just to confirm, Steve/Julie, what do you think is a reasonable time? Do you think next week Monday or Tuesday is feasible to circulate a draft? Do you think you need a day or two more?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. So I think Monday or Tuesday of next week could be feasible. Are we talking about then a distillation of all of the text in the original document into the new document? Not just the next section, right, but really…?

MIKE SILBER: So, Julie, my view subject to any violent disagreement from anybody else is get as far as you can by close of business on Tuesday and circulate. If you manage to get the full document, that's fantastic. If you need another day or two to do the rest, then give us what you have and then take an extra few days to distill the rest. But try and give us a sizeable chunk of the document by close of business Tuesday next week so that we then have six days to engage with it before Monday.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. That's well understood and very helpful, and we will proceed accordingly. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Excellent. Thank you, everybody. Have a good morning, afternoon, evening, or very early morning, depending on where you are.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]