
ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 06 February 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/xgSjDQ>

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

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Guidance Process (GGP) initiation request for applicant support call taking place on Monday the 6th of February 2023 at 20:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the telephone, could you please identify yourselves now? Hearing no one. We have listed apologies from Matt Serlin. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share at this time? Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Hi there. Hi. Yeah. This is Paul McGrady. I am the Council liaison to this GGP. And I have updated my SOI to reflect my new law firm. I have left my prior law firm and have opened a new one

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 an old buddy. So right now, we're at two lawyer shop, but it's an important change. So I just thought I would highlight it. If anybody wants to read my very fascinating SOI, I encourage you to do it. But thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much, Paul. Seeing no further comments on that. If you do need assistance updating your statement of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recording will be posted on the public Wiki space shortly after the end of this call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to Mike Silber. Please begin.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Terry. And greetings, everybody. Thanks for joining the call. It's much appreciated. Thanks, in particular, to everybody who's sent through inputs on the various documents. I'm very pleased to see that we're making some good progress. So thank you for that. Julie, do you want to share your screen so that we can start pulling together the summary.

JULIE HEDLUND: Sorry, it took me a moment to get off mute. This is Julie Hedland from staff. So I do have on screen a document that's a summary of the comments we've received so far on the GGP tasks 3 to 5,

indicators of success by applicant support lifecycle, lifecycle element, I should say. And essentially, what staff tried to do was provide a very high level summary of the thoughts that people have provided in the document. And in some cases, these comments were provided in the form of questions, in some case suggestions.

So we've tried to pull them together, where they had common elements, to use as a basis of discussion today. And so perhaps if you'd like Paul, I'm sorry, not Paul. Sorry. If you'd like Mike -- I was looking at chatting and got off track -- would you like to go to the first of the summary under outreach and awareness and talk through that? And then maybe we can go ahead and use that as a basis for discussion in each one of these and see if we can get some more comments.

MIKE SILBER: Absolutely, Julie. I think that'll be very useful.

JULIE HEDLUND: Excellent. Then I have the first item under outreach and awareness on the screen and a summary of what we saw. And of course, happy to make any changes to the summary if people may note. And additions, of course, are welcome. So over to you, Mike. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you. You know, I think we've got a slightly difficult task because there are two ways of looking at this. The first is to say,

this is what success in outreach, or these are the measures that we should apply in measuring success in outreach. And then staff will have a look at that and design outreach activities accordingly, hopefully. And then we will collect the metrics and then we will come back in couple of years' time and say, did we do a good job? So that's one way of looking at it, which is essentially defining a set of metrics around which a program can hopefully be defined so that we can assess it several years into the future.

The other option and I can see there's a little bit of tension in people's comment around this. The other option is that we should try and make suggestions now. Not just on metrics to assess success in several years, but some practical suggestions and recommendations that hopefully can influence the program positively and not wait for several years for an assessment as to whether they've been successful. And that's a bit of attention that I'm seeing between the two. And I think that if we just recognize it, we can try and achieve both.

But for example, in the first two comments over there, not in the purple summary, but rather in the main body. You know, those to me are items that we're looking at assessing now. And I'm just not sure, and I think we need to be more specific when we're making suggestions, recommendations or comments as to whether this is upfront or metrics to define success when we analyze it after the round has or after the applications are being submitted. I don't know if that makes sense. I don't know if anybody wants to comment on that. Maureen, I see your hand.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Mike. Maureen for the record. I think that, for example, when we talked about it with the CPWG, and I think what they wanted to do was just to describe some of their interests or their concerns with regards to what might be suitable to include, but we weren't quite sure. I mean, a big question is, how do we apply those to success measures as such? And so because we were unsure, we just to put them down as general comments.

But I think that that would be really, really good to actually get some guidance on how it is that we actually want to express these. How are we going to express them as guidance statements and some ideas so that when I'm presenting it to the CPWG, for example, who are very interested in this, of course, is that I can mean so that they can be thinking more around suggestions for metrics or suggestions for contributing to a guidance thing rather than just raising a particular concern or something. So just so I can actually select by this theme on how we might be able to support this. But I'm totally on board with what you're suggesting anyway. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Maureen. So my understanding, and people have raised this question several times, what does success look like? And my view is let's at least put together some sort of straw person. So in my view, success says that diversity of applications is a desired outcome. And diversity of applications has a number of criteria. The one would be geographic diversity. The second would be the inclusion of not for profit concerns as well as for

profit concerns. And then the third would be diversity of business model.

At the same time, just counting the number of applications is not necessarily a measure of success or failure of the program. Because if somebody assesses, reviews, analyzers, and decides not to apply, having thought the matter through and having fully understood, to me, that's actually an indicator of success rather than an indicator of failure. Because not every gTLD has a viable future. And on that basis, I think what we need to do is certainly count the number of applications from diverse backgrounds and count the number of applications that have gone through the applicant support process in some manner or form and then have resulted in an actual application.

But we should also be keeping track of those parties who we've made aware of the program, made aware of the options around the program, and have given the ability to fully assess whether an application makes sense for them in their organization at this particular time. So I do think that we need to recognize that it's not just applications they're seeking a one measure of success, but the number of people spoken to, engaged, and who are able to make an informed decision is certainly another measure of success. To me, number of events is an easy one to count, but not necessarily a really useful indicator of success. Rafik, please continue.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Mike. So I think I understood your comments. So what I'm thinking here is, like, the case of the number of events and so

on is about collecting enough data that can be used later to find some correlation. They are more I'd say as you say it, maybe outcomes, but they don't necessarily determine their success or not. It's just we are trying to find kind of correlation because it's not easy to find the causality.

I think that if we have x number of events so that we will have a y number of applicant and so on. So maybe we need just to try to have that categorization. Nobody said that creating metrics is easy task. Just to be sure that sometimes we are trying to find some proxy to how we quantify things. Because that's not always straight forward. I think that's just the case right now. But I'm not sure if I understood all this. That's how I got your explanation.

MIKE SILBER:

No, I think your spot on. Counting number of events is, and not disrespect intended, a lazy way of collecting metrics. Because all you need to do is run multiple numbers of events. It doesn't matter what the outcome is. You can flag people all around, you can spend lavishly or very frugally and you can run dozens of events. It doesn't mean that you're actually speaking to the right people and giving them the information that they need to make real decisions as to whether to participate in the program and make informed choices. So that's what I'm trying to get to. But, Sarah, maybe you want to clarify something further.

SARAH KIDEN:

Okay. I hope you can hear me well. Yeah, I guess so. So I wanted to raise comment that I raised a few meetings ago about

having some sort of number. Because If we just leave it open as number of events and number of applications, then when it comes to the time for measuring, it's not easy to say we've hit our target. So it could be nice to sort of say, last time we received 3 applications, if we received 10 applications this time, maybe that will mean something. So, like, just sort of putting numbers so that it's easy to measure would be my comment right now. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: It makes sense, do you want to hazard a guess as to what that number should be?

SARAH KIDEN: It's something we can think about, but judging from the applications we received last time, which was 3, I would think, I don't know, somewhere between 10 and 20 would be my number. I don't know if that's too small, but that's what I would think.

MIKE SILBER: Okay. Maureen, I see your hand. But can I just challenge you on one thing there, Sarah? And that is, is it not also a success when somebody considers the process, understands, analyzes, and makes a decision that this is not for them. And that ICANN through the process has enabled a potential applicant to fully understand and make an informed decision whether to participate or not. Because to me, and maybe I'm being naive, but to me that's sounds like success.

SARAH KIDEN: That's definitely success. But at least then we know that we have reached out to a number of people, and that comes back to a number of events and outreach activities that we had planned. So I agree with you that it's measure success definitely.

MIKE SILBER: Maureen, I see your hand is up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Sarah and, Mike. That is very much along the lines of what I was actually going to raise. Is that, events should not be just for imparting information from us about the thing. We need also to account for the feedback that we can get from those events. And that, I mean, assessing that feedback about whether it's actually helped them to make a decision about whether they're going to go ahead or not. You know, as you say, Mike, and this is actually like the time.

We should be using every opportunity and that we make contact with anybody not only to assess how many people we're actually making contact with, but the quality of the information that they feel they're actually receiving, if they're actually considering to go ahead. But also what has actually made them change their minds so that those sorts of things need to be considered as part of the analysis of the success of our outreach. And I think that's really, really important.

But I also think too that the quality of information that we give, for example, plus possible access to pro bono experts, for example, what sort of advice might be offered. All that sort of information

really needs to be assessed with regards to what is helpful information and what they think it's just add on or additional sort of stuff. So I think that it's actually so like ensuring that any contact event that we have, it's the two way process, is actually like adding impacts, and as you said, allowing them to make informed decisions, and it's actually helping us to make informed decisions about the success or otherwise of our outreach. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Maureen. I think that's very useful. Tom?

TOM BARRETT:

Hey, Mike. Tom Barrett. And I think both Maureen and Sarah has some great comments. So I would support what both of them said. My comment is a little different, which is I know the exact date of the next ICANN rounded. I'm certain at this point. But I'm wondering if we can multitask a bit. And what I mean by that is, I think Maureen made a point that these events are an opportunity to get some feedback on the program itself. And so I'm involved in helping to develop a program, for example, for the Middle East DNS forum, which is in May of 2023. And I've suggested, well, why don't we introduce the Application Support Program just a few months from now?

I know it's early, I know we haven't defined all the details of the program, but there are events happening in 2023. I would hope that we don't wait until we get through this entire process before we start identifying possible events for outreach, and actually do some outreach this year even while these processes is ongoing.

So I don't know if that's even the remit of this group. If someone else is going to come up with a marketing calendar or event calendar. But I would hope that we perhaps identify some feedback questions that we might want us be asking people now that could feed into our process.

MIKE SILBER:

Tom, thank you. Again, fully agree with you. My understanding is the responsibility of developing materials will be a staff responsibility. My understanding is that we're here to provide guidance both to the GNSO and that should also assist staff in terms of what the material should contain, hard to approach it ,and hard to measure outcomes from this. And I think what we should be doing is that staff should start preparing materials as soon as possible and not wait for the final program. Because I think that there is the ability. And you're completely correct. Even without some of the details around the final process and some of the minutiae not being quite ready yet, I do think that there's enough known to start educating and informing people.

I also think that we need to learn from the past three years and to look at hybrid. So I think that we need a lot of online materials. I think we need a lot of FAQs that allow people to interact. I think we need a lot of webinar type arrangements, both interactive as well as non-interactive so that people who are not in bandwidth enhanced countries can benefit as well. But you're right. There is nothing that actually hits people in the guts like a physical meeting and like a physical event. It's just the number that can be done is somewhat limited, and we need the resources that go along with it

so that somebody whose interest is picked at an event can go back and do additional reading.

So I think we need to start giving both the Council as well as staff pointers in terms of what a program could look like, but they're going to be the ones who are actually going to be pulling that together. You know, if you, or Maureen, or myself, or anybody else is attending an event, it's going to be a little bit as a cheerleader to say, we're working on this. This is where you can go and look at materials rather than let us tell you about the program. At least that's my understanding. Julie, do you want to comment on that?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Yes. Thanks so much, Mike. This is Julie Hedland from staff. And just a reminder, we talked a little bit about the process during the last meeting. And as a result of that, staff had an action item to send around the section from the GGP process manual, and also the link to the session of the bylaws that talks about the Board activities relating to the GGP. And so as you may recall from last week's meeting, the last meeting, not last week, but two weeks ago, meeting of the GGP Working Group, and staff gave an overview of the Operational Design Assessment, the ODA and the recommendations relating to the Applicant Support Program.

So that report the ODA and recommendations is before the Board for the Board to decide on. And some of those recommendations are indicated as having dependencies relating to the work of this group, the GGP Working Group. Which also will produce recommendations report, and that will go before the Council and

then the Council will send those recommendations to the Board also for consideration.

So the Board will have the opportunity to decide if there are recommendations in the ODA that it can move forward on that perhaps do not have dependencies related to what this working group is doing that may deal with the other aspects of the applicant support program that are dependent on the work of this group. And the work of this group is tailored quite nearly to the identification of metrics, and in particular, those metrics that indicate or indicators of success and the process that we're going through right now.

Of course, this working group will produce its recommendations report as quickly as it can, but the Board will have the opportunity perhaps as early as ICANN76 to make a determination on recommendations relating to the Applicant Support Program and where it might be able to direct ICANN org to move forward. So we're a little bit in a chicken and the egg situation where things that are moving and maybe moving ahead while this group is continuing to work.

And as you may know, staff also participate from the GDS in this working group. So they're certainly well aware of the discussions we're having now and can and may be influenced by them. So there are a number of moving parts, but ultimately, this working group will make recommendations that will be considered by the Board, and the Board is also considering recommendations relating to the ODA and some of which may be able to move forward while this group is still doing its work. Thanks, and I hope that's helpful.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Julie. That's useful, Gabriela.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes. Hello. Thank you very much. I just like to make a short comment on the events. Because maybe it's not only important to do an event, but also the information you provide in this event in line with the topics that the potential applicants will be interested in knowing in order to apply. And for that, is that I had the report that was done already in the first round. And there the AM global, the report that I had in the comment, it was because we have already few reasons why the potential applicants did not apply in the previous round. And there, I was thinking of making the link with this event, not only to do an event, but also to have the information that the potential applicants will need to know to add in this first bullet that is written there. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you. It makes sense. Julie, coming back to your point, do you think, for example, I suppose [00:28:54 -inaudible] are already going to be preparing materials. But do you think, as you're saying, some of these things are going ahead while we're still doing our work. Do you think that it's worthwhile us trying to get to some of the easy questions?

You know, a recommendation, for example, that staff should prepare materials that these should be in at least the UN languages with the possibility of community translations beyond

that. That they should be made available online and that ICANN org should participate in as many regional forum as possible? Is that too obvious? Is that really just sounding like repeating something that everybody already knows? Or do you think it's worthwhile trying to put something short, and useful and interim in front of everybody before events get ahead of us.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. This is Julie Hedland from staff. And I invite my colleagues from GDS who are maybe on this call, if they would like to comment as well. Because I'm not as familiar with all of the details in the ODA with respect to the applicant support program, but it's possible that there might be recommendations in the ODA that are of that nature that you described that could proceed without pausing for the recommendations coming out of this GGP because the focus of this GGP is quite narrow.

And there are a number of aspects of the program that such as how outreach might be structured, as you mentioned, producing materials that would make them more accessible, etc. Some of those details may already be in the ODA. Is separate from anything that this working group may produce.

And if you'd like, we can get back together with our colleagues and see if we can identify areas where there are recommendations that could indeed move forward based on a Board's decision that are not dependent on the work of this working group. In which case, it wouldn't make much sense for the working group to ask the GNSO Council to expand its remit beyond its task, which it would have to do in order to take on

anything that's out of its current scope. If indeed those recommendations have already been taken up by ICANN org and put before the Board for consideration without dependencies on this working group. And I see Leon Grundmann has his hand up. Leon, if you had a comment, that'd be very helpful.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Thanks, Julie. And that's true what you say. I would agree with that. I'll be hesitant to make any sort of definitive declarations here because I will have to be a group of GDS and see what the situation is. But I think we are attending towards wanting to hear as much as possible from the GGP, especially on tasks 3, 4, and 5, and especially on what represents success because that would be very helpful for us, would help us to guide our work.

And I think also ICANN76, if there is any Board decision there on certain recommendations which are still pending, that will, of course, help us to move our work forward. But as soon as we have guidance from this GGP, that would be very helpful for us as well, especially as it is about outreach awareness. But then, of course, it goes also to what the Board will decide more broadly on the ODA and about how the next round will begin, when the next round will begin, those things will, of course, inform us as well as to when and how we will ramp up this process. So I hope that's helpful, and I can also reach out to my colleagues to give a more definitive answer on that. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Leon, thank you. That is helpful. And if you wouldn't mind reaching out to colleagues. I'm very conscious that we are all standing in a circle pointing a finger at each other, saying, we're waiting for you. And I don't want this group to give you guidance that is not useful. I also don't want you to be waiting for us when you've got work to do and you're busy with it. So at some stage, I think we need to start developing a straw proposal to start analyzing so that this team is comfortable, but staff also looks at and says this is useful actionable guidance. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Mike. In fact, you're preempting exactly what I was going to ask. I mean, like Sarah and I are going and discussing what we've been talking about here today with regards to the comments and stuff that they were made, I really think that what we need is some guidance ourselves on what it is would be helpful. What would be really helpful for all to be, like, with regards to feedback from us.

I mean, I think that some of the comments that people were making were really highlighted issues that I think really needed guidance. But I just think if there was some straw person that was created so that we had a better idea of what it is that we're going to be working towards developing, that would be really helpful for us. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks Maureen. Julie, please continue.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Yes. Thank you so much. This is Julie Hedland from staff. So two things I'd like to mention. With respect to what this worker group is working towards, we have, of course, the three tasks related to metrics and the sixth task is related to finance or funding. And, of course, what we're expected to do is provide a recommendations report. What staff can do is give you a sense of what that report could look like. We've never produced such a report before, but there are some guidelines in the GGP manual to help us understand what this group will be producing.

And it is an important question. I'm glad you asked, Maureen and also Mike, because we do want to, the working group does and should give recommendations based on what it's been tasked to do. But also, it can provide the context and rationale for those recommendations. And it likely can provide implementation guidance as well. There's probably a couple of different types of input that can be in such a report.

And also, I think it would be helpful for our GDS colleagues to come back with what they think might be helpful to them as they're looking at, well, they've developed recommendations that were in the ODA, but as they are looking at the practical implementation task that the implementation team will need to address and what would be helpful for them in that respect.

So what staff can do is provide some guidance as far as the output of this working group. And in fact, what we'd like to do is start building a template document in the background and plugging into that document the recommendations as they arise from this working group, as well as the rationale and maybe any

implementation guidance and be filling that in the report as we go so that we're not trying to build this report at the very end.

And I think it's important to know that while we are nearly tasked to provide input on metrics and prioritization of those metrics, and particularly the metrics that will be indicators of success, in doing so, we very may well be providing guidance also on what we think are the elements of this successful program. If we are indeed looking at indicators of success, what those indicators are could then help ICANN org understand the elements of a successful program, especially in the lifecycle of the applicant support program.

And that gets us back to the tasks that we've been dealing with here, which is try to collect as much information as we can on what those indicators of success might be. So I hope that's helpful. I'll take back a couple of action items from this conversation that I hope we'll provide guidance to you all as you continue to work on this. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Julie. When do you think that template will be available? And again, sorry to put you on the spot.

JULIE HEDLUND: Oh, sure. No. I could say possibly by the next meeting because actually is a heads up to everyone, this is going to be AOB at the end of this meeting, but there's no reason we can't mention it now. There is actually a US holiday on the 20th of this month, which would otherwise be the date of the next meeting. So we're having

to shift the meeting to the following week, which is the 27th. But that gives us staff a little bit more time to prepare materials for that meeting. So I think we can safely as staff take an action item to have a template put together of what a recommendations report might look like and the various elements that we'll need to fill in to provide to all of you as a guiding point for discussion.

MIKE SILBER:

Excellent. And I'm going to take it up on myself to actually start at least on the outreach and awareness to start putting a straw person proposal together. Just depending on how quickly we get the template in place that may be very rough and it may need to be panel beaten significantly to fit in with your template. But I'd like to have something, because I feel for a very small group, we're walking around each other a little bit and they're very useful inputs, but I don't feel like people are putting their necks out just yet. And so let me put a proposal in front of people that they can actually say no, Mike, this is rubbish, or yes, this is good, but the numbers you've put in here are not aggressive enough or are way too aggressive.

And, please, I'm trying very much as chair here not to have any skin in the game. So if I put a number in there, please feel free to reject it, amend it, and rip it to shreds. Because it will simply be there to try and encourage debate and discussion, not because that's what I think the ideal outcome is. So I will undertake by the next meeting as well to have at least on this topic some sort of proposal so that people can actually start engaging on the detail.

And likewise, if anybody wants to prepare, suggest, recommend, draft, you're absolutely welcome to do it. Either you can work with me on it or prepare your own and throw it onto the mailing list. But we're all in violent agreement and we're nudging forward quite slowly. I'd like to have a little bit more disagreement so that we can understand where people stand and we can make progress a little faster if possible.

Maureen comfortable. I'm happy to put something together and, yeah, happy for it to be improved on or rip to shreds as it might be. And Leon, to the point again, it's really helpful for staff. Please no need to be overly polite. You know, tell us if the input you're getting is useful and the type of input you're looking, or give us a little bit of direction and guidance if you feel like we're going off peace and telling you stuff that you already know. Julie, please go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND: So, Mike, yeah, I was wondering if- this is Julie Hedland from staff- if I should move ahead on the next item in the summary document for discussion.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, please.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. We'll do so. Thanks. Mike, did you want me to read this, or?

MIKE SILBER: Yes. Please do.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. So, summary was some metrics track correlation between access to services, pro bono and others, and successive applications. Emphasis on gathering data on and where the services encouraged applications and diversity of applications including whether some types of services were more successful than others. And again, this is just an approximate summary from staff. But happy to hear other suggestions from folks who've made comments or other comments in general. Thanks. Mike, I'm not seeing any hands or hearing any comments.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, likewise. I'm not getting much feedback.

JULIE HEDLUND: Maybe I'll go to the next item.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, let's do that.

JULIE HEDLUND: That had some more comments. So this is related to ICANN org set up of Applicant Support Programs for success, operationally speaking. And here, people had some suggestions for operational

metrics to indicate success. These could include for the ODA measure of increased global diversity and representation across regions with the new gTLD program through the applicant support program.

The applicant support program assists potential new gTLD applicants seeking both financial and non-financial support. Metrics to success including global diversity, distribution of applicants for region, and successful applications by criteria, number of supported applicants that represent the global public interest, and then just noting there that we would need criteria as to what is the global public interest in this case. And again, just a rough summary of comments received.

MIKE SILBER:

I'm not sure if people have had an opportunity of looking at the summary, but I think if we're not giving comments and feedback here, then please feel free to go through on the list and we can have a look at it.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Yes. Excellent idea, Mike. This is Julie Hedland, again from staff. We could leave it as homework for people to review the summary and add comments to it or additional suggestions to the summary. Because in some cases, the comments received were in the form of questions or fragments if you like. And so, staff has tried to distill those various comments into something a little bit more concrete. And hopefully, that will provide an example for others to provide comments into this document.

MIKE SILBER: That's perfect.

JULIE HEDLUND: Then I'll move ahead. Again, Julie Hedland from staff. Item four. Application submission and evaluation. And under this item, measure a number of applications from underserved regions need to set criteria as to a number that would be considered successful or looking at quality of applications, collect feedback on the evaluation process, what worked and what didn't, number of successful applicants by region, underserved diversity by element, essentially. Again, just a summary suggestion. I see a hand up from Maureen. Please, Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Julie. Yeah, I think that this was something that generated a little bit of interest. And I think too within my own community that application from underserved regions, I mean, it's that there was some interest in the sort of criteria that would, whether the application work what the application process might involve as opposed to organizational, what registrars apply. And I know with one particular area, they're having to establish a registry in preparation. So I just wanted to know what kind is the information or the application process. What it involve for regions. That was just a personal query. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. Any other comments?

MIKE SILBER: Well, I think Lawrence has raised any interesting question in the chat around an internal team reviewing forms of pro bono services. And Lawrence, I don't know if you want to maybe speak to it. If there's anything further from what you had put in the chat.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry. Thank you, chair. It's a bit noisy where I am. That's why I went with the chat. But do you hear me okay?

MIKE SILBER: Yes. I can hear you perfectly. I'm sorry to put you on the spot.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: No, no. It's okay. Thank you. So I was just thinking, I just gave some thoughts to this while Julie was speaking to this subject matter. And like, right now, we have rather, before the last rounds, we didn't have all this privacy laws that we now have in place, the GDPR and there's NIS2. And I'm just wondering that for region to region, I mean, registries might have to upgrade with certain laws in mind. So the GDPR definitely will have a lot of impact in the door globally, but more in the European region than it might have back home for me in, say, Africa.

So I'm not sure. I mean, if one firm, for instance, providing one blanket service might do well than maybe finding a firm that can provide advice in terms of on different subject matters. For instance, maybe in terms of bookkeeping, accounting, and all that,

or something that has to do with exposure of data. It might serve better, just of my mind, it might serve better if those advices are coming from organizations, firms, consultancies, that might also be able to put some regional or local context to the kind of support that they will be given to the applicants. I'm not sure if any work is ongoing in this regards--

MIKE SILBER:

Laurence, let me let me stop you there. So no, work is not ongoing in this regard. And if we believe that work needs to be done in this regard, then it's to us to make a recommendation. It needs to go into the ODA, and it needs to be assessed and analyzed in terms of whether it's practical. What you're talking about sounds like an ICANN mandated pro bono services. And that's not what we had in the previous round, and it hasn't been what's been discussed, not directly, but indirectly over the last number of calls.

So if the view of this group is that ICANN should be providing pro bono services, and ICANN should be collecting, collating, vetting, verifying, pro bone service providers, then we need to make a strong recommendation that that is what we believe is required. Otherwise, the view seems to be a far looser arrangement similar to what happened in the previous round and certainly, we can tighten up with some reporting. But where ICANN provides a marketplace of willing pro bono providers and people who would like to make their services and those parties then through an ICANN mediated process can find each other.

But ICANN takes no responsibility. ICANN has no liability for the quality of the advice provided. We're simply providing a matchmaking service to say these people are providing this sort of information, and if you're interested, you can talk to them. With, and I think this is the input that we got last time with a little bit more detail in terms of who's requested how many meetings, what assistance they got so that we can actually collect some metrics as opposed to completely hands off. I'm seeing hands. So hopefully, that provide some discussion. Paul, I think, you were first.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Tom McGrady here. And just so everybody knows and maybe staff can provide some additional information if people like, but I believe that this issue of how involved ICANN needed to be in the pro bono process was discussed significantly in the SubPro PDP, and I'm pretty sure that what we came up with was what is reflected in the report, which is that it's to be lightweight, not heavyweight. Of course, I say, I believe in all that because it's been a couple of years since we talked about that subject. But so if we're going to go down a path that is towards a more heavy duty approach to pro bono, we really do need to look back at SubPro to see what those discussions were because I don't know that our mandate is to rewrite the PDP. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Paul. Julie, if you wouldn't mind, let me take Maureen first.

JULIE HEDLUND: Of course, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Mike. Thank you, Julie. I think that this was an interesting discussion that we actually had with CPWG about that matchmaking, is that just so it felt that in the next round the services are brought to the attention of potential applicants, and that org might have a role in making sure that we're actually matching pro bono services up with people who actually need that support. So I don't know how we aim to do this and just making sure that people are aware of what those services are and how people can access them. So I think, yes, that was an issue last time, and we're set. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Yes, useful comments all. Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. This is Julie Hedland from staff and mindful of the time that we're at the top of the hour. I don't want to hold us up. But staff would take action to take look again at what is in the ODA with respect to recommendations around pro bono services, and just noting again that this working group right now is narrowly tasked to identifying metrics and in particular those that may be indicators of success.

That being said, metrics relating to pro bono services and how those metrics are collected and what they could indicate with respect to success, could help provide guidance for how those services are provided and how the information about those services is collected. So there could be dependencies there as well. Anyway, we'll take an action item relating to this. And back to Mike. I think maybe perhaps we can suggest that we get some more comments into this document and pick up where we left off at the next meeting.

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Julie. I think there's one last AOB item that I'd like to cover, and that is whether we are going to try and make use of the presence of some of us at ICANN76 to try and arrange an informal get together. I'm not sure that staff would forgive me if I try to suggest something more formal, but an informal, what in the RR communities is known as the birds of a feather gathering, where we could possibly get together and check through some of these items face-to-face if that would be useful.

JULIE HEDLUND:

I will just note that I'm assuming that would be in addition to the regularly scheduled working group meeting.

MIKE SILBER:

Correct.

JULIE HEDLUND: Certainly, there's nothing to prevent this group from gathering informally. On the verges, it's just that as staff, we wouldn't be able to provide any support for that, unfortunately. But there'll be, I'm sure, plenty of pleasant places for people to gather in Cancun.

MIKE SILBER: Well, Julie, let you and I chat in terms of what we can do around logistics. As you say, recognizing we're not going to get staff support, we're not going to get translation, recording, any of that. It could be a gathering in the ball or it could be something slightly less lubricated. But I think given that there are going to be a number of us who will be there, it might be useful to at least try and smooth some of the rough edges off.

JULIE HEDLUND: Oh, thank you for that, Mike. Just noting the schedule itself is actually booked at this point. So there is usually the option of last minute signups for informal gatherings in rooms, and we might be able to take advantage of that, and certainly, we'll take it offline with you for some other if there are other options.

MIKE SILBER: Excellent. Thank you, Julie, and thanks, everybody. I appreciate those who've been able to stay on a few minutes past the hour. I appreciate the good intervention and discussion, and looking forward to further engagement on the 27th, where you will be most welcome to rip to shreds my attempts at straw person on the engagement topic.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Mike. Thank you all for joining. And we will adjourn this meeting. Bye-bye and see you in a bit.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]