
ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 09 January 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/6IU-DQ>

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 taking place on Monday, 9 January 2023, at 20:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will 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 do have listed apologies from Paul McGrady.

Statements of interest must be kept up-to-date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please email the GNSO secretariat.

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.

All documentation and information can be found on the public wiki space.

Please remember to state your name prior to speaking for the recording purposes.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior.

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

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you very much, Terri, and Happy New Year, everybody. Thank you for joining on what is for many people the first working day of the year. So I do appreciate the full attendance that we have so early in the year.

I also just wanted to welcome Maureen who has joined us from ALAC replacing the previous ALAC appointee. So, Maureen, thank you. I really appreciate you joining us. And thank you also, I have to acknowledge that Maureen has been reaching out to staff and myself up until now and has been extremely diligent in her follow-up. So, Maureen, thank you. And looking forward to your input and your valuable contribution.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Mike.

MIKE SILBER:

So, folks, I'm hoping that everybody has had an opportunity to have a look at the spreadsheet that Julie has shared and that sets out the basis of certainly what staff consider the framework and the way they have done the analysis of the council's expectations of us and the guidance that the council is looking for. So I think that's going to occupy a fair amount of time and effort, but maybe we can just take a short time to do a review of the task.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I can go ahead and take over the Agenda Item 2 then and start with the review of the task. Let me switch my screen and move over to the task overview document. Just one moment, please. All right, that should be it. All right, that looks like that's on the right one.

So as a reminder, we've gone through Tasks 1 and 2 already in this group. And for those such as Maureen who might be joining, Task 1 was really just a review of some background documents. The report, well, a couple of background documents. I won't get into them now since we've gone through Task 1, but it was a review of those documents.

And then Task 2 was the [consideration] of a letter to go to the SOs, ACs, SGs and Cs—the stakeholder groups and constituencies—asking if they had any subject matter experts that they wanted to put forward to join this group. And the homework for that item is for staff to get that to the secretariat to send out mid this month, so next week. And so we'll be getting that out then per the schedule.

So those two tasks, Task 1 and 2, are considered complete, and we are up-to-date with respect to our workplan and those two tasks as well. So the next items on the workplan are to begin the review of Tasks 3, 4, and 5. Tasks 3 and 4 are somewhat intertwined or interdependent, and then Task 5 really follows on from 3 and 4.

And so what we've done here and what you see in front of you is the text from the initiation request for the GGP. And just as a reminder, the GGP Initiation Request which really forms the charter for this working group is meant to be quite narrow. So Tasks 3, 4, and 5 all involve analysis of metrics: those that were identified and suggested in the SubPro PDP Final Report and Implementation Guidance 17.9, other metrics that the working group would identify, the prioritization of those metrics, and then proposals of how the data could be collected and measured and what represents success.

And then as noted—and I'm really reading off of the document that you see in front of you—then those are Tasks 3 and 4, and then Task 5 is suggesting how the education, outreach, business case development, an application evaluation elements of the Applicant Support Program may be impacted by the metrics that are identified and measures of success.

So those are the tasks before the working group, and those that we will undertake with this introduction today and introduction to a draft discussion framework document is what we're suggesting to call it. And then the working group will dig into these tasks. So I think we won't get too far on them today, but for the next couple of months that is the work that will occupy this working group.

And as you can see again, it is a fairly narrow focus. And if in the discussion of these tasks the working group identifies any other areas that they think that they should be looking at, any expansion of the scope would necessarily require a decision and approval by the GNSO Council since, again, the tasks are laid out as essentially the charter for this group. So any changes would have to go through the Council, but at a bare minimum the working group is expected to complete these tasks.

And then there is a Task 6 that's quite brief. We won't get to that now, but that one should not occupy a lot of the working group's time but would follow on from 3, 4, and 5.

So before I move to the discussion framework document, are there any questions from working group members concerning these three tasks and the work before us?

MIKE SILBER: Maureen, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much, Mike and Julie. Just because there are some things about that I'm not quite sure on, but as a clarification, has the handbook been updated with this applicant support thing or are we doing this so that it actually goes into the handbook? I just wanted to get some clarification on that. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Maureen. That's an important clarifying question. And I think it's helpful to remind everybody what this process is because it's a new process. The GNSO Guidance Process is a process that was developed and approved by the council a few years ago. It has not been used yet. It's a process that the council can use to develop input for a number of different reasons. In this case, it's input to the [inaudible] the Implementation Review Team (IRT) for the SubPro PDP working group.

And so that's an important point because one thing that the GNSO Guidance Process does not do is it does not get involved in developing policy. So the policy relating to Applicant Support Program has already been developed and the recommendations in the implementation guidance from the SubPro PDP Final Report. So this group is not expected to augment or change any of the policy that has resulted from the outputs from the PDP.

What this group is tasked to do is to provide some very focused and narrow additional guidance to funnel back into the Implementation Review Team (IRT) for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures, and specifically just on the applicant support and specifically just on the metrics. And so with respect to the guidebook, changes to the guidebook would result from the work of the IRT not from the work directly from this working group.

Now that's not to say that the recommendations coming out of this working group couldn't provide guidance to what could go into the Applicant Guidebook relating to the Applicant Support Program, but that's not an output directly from this working group. So this is a group that is providing guidance into the IRT on a very specific

subject relating to the metrics on the Applicant Support Program. I hope that's helpful.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Julie, very helpful.

MIKE SILBER: And I think it's one thing that I'd like us to keep focused on which is we've got a somewhat limited scope and some discrete tasks. And I have the sense, certainly I've had reach out from a number of people who seem to be somewhat frustrated or be under the misapprehension in terms of what we're intended to do.

This is a very limited scope. So my suggestion is let's do it. Let's do it as quickly and efficiently as we can. And then if we think that we can provide value to the council or to the IRT or to anybody else, then we can continue the work and ask council for consent to expand the scope. But rather than asking them to expand the scope, let's do our task first. Let's do it well and efficiently. Then we can go back and say, "We think we can do more. We're working well. We've answered the questions. We'd like have a go at some of the more difficult topics potentially."

Because I've already seen in some of the discussion that people want to get into slightly meatier topics rather than the very limited scope that we have in terms of the council resolution.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you for that, Mike. Yes, so back to then the tasks at hand and what we're focused on now irrespective of whether or not there might be something else later the council decides is in scope. We're going to begin with Task 3, 4, and 5.

What I'd like to do is switch over to a different document that will lead us into the Google worksheet document. So let me just stop sharing this document here and switch to another Word document. One moment, please. I think that is up there. Yes, you can all see that.

All right, so moving right along, what staff is trying to do with this document and with the Google sheet is to help frame the discussion. So simply just organizing the tasks in a way that might make them a little bit easier to address or digest. They're not particularly complicated tasks, but we can break them down a little bit.

So let me just scroll down here through this document. So Task 3, just looking first at Task 3. Sorry, I'm just trying to—okay. So Task 3, analyze the set of suggested metrics in Implementation Guidance 17.9—and that is from the SubPro PDP working group's Final Report—and propose which one should be prioritized. Such a prioritized metrics is not limited to what is identified in 17.9, and that gets to Task 4 as well. So that then led the staff to think that the Google sheet might be helpful in listing the metrics that are identified in 17.9.

And then the other part of Task 3 is to prioritize the metrics and provide a rationale for those included, if any, and why and suggest the metrics and prioritize. And so you'll see in the Google

spreadsheet that we've pulled out those metrics and we've pulled out those questions as a basis for discussion.

So moving on to Task 4 which is very much intertwined with Task 3, that is to identify any other appropriate metrics and measures of success to help in identifying the necessary program elements and measuring program success after the fact. In identifying the suggested set of metrics, propose how data can be collected, how metrics can be measured. We can collect the data as well as what represents success.

And again, this is what we've tried to pull out in the Google spreadsheet, and you'll see that when I pull that document up. So the list of metrics and a column for prioritization and then a column to suggest how to collect the data, the measurement techniques, who would collect the data and what represents success per metric.

And then Task 5 really follows on from those two tasks, and that is once the metrics are identified and prioritized consider, and to the extent feasible, suggest how outreach, education, business case development, and application evaluation elements of the Applicant Support Program may be impacted by the identified metrics and measures of success.

For example, based on the success metrics for awareness and education, this may impact the approach for performing outreach and education. To the extent feasible, suggest an approach to outreach, education, business case development, and application evaluation assistance.

And again, what staff has done to help with organizing this work, laid out these elements as columns in the Google spreadsheet. I'm just noting what Rubens Kuhl has put in the chat. He says, "There is a set of information that was not available to the council at the GGP initiation time, the SubPro ODA. One very unfortunate GDS staff decision regarding applicant support came in the ODA, so there is a basis for amending the charter." Thank you for pointing that out, Rubens.

So I did want to mention that relating to the ODA we had hoped to be able to have GDS speak to the ODA in the session on applicant support at today's meeting, but there was a conflict and that wasn't possible. But someone from GDS will be speaking to the ODA at next week's meeting, and so that would be an opportunity for Rubens and others to raise any issues or questions that they may have during that presentation. Thanks very much for that.

What I'd like to do next is before I switch to the Google spreadsheet, let me just pause and see if there are any questions. And then I'll move next to the Google sheet. Not seeing any hands up, not seeing anything in chat. Let me move to that document. I see a new message [by Tom].

And Steve Chan notes, "There is a small team reviewing the SubPro ODA. It might be helpful to share that concern with your relevant councilor as well so it gets integrated into the review process. Small team at the council, I should clarify." Thank you, Steve.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Steve. Thanks, Julie. I think, Rubens, I don't know if you want to discuss it any further, but to some extent what I was suggesting is we may need to consider expanding scope or revising scope. But in the meantime, let's focus on what we have and get it done quickly and efficiently so that if scope does expand, we have the bandwidth to address it.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. And I see there's another message. Okay, Rubens says, "I'm all for going forward with the current scope." Thanks, Rubens. And I think I should note that regardless of whether or not the scope is expanded for this working group, I think that the council will still expect the working group to at the very least complete these tasks. So that is as good a place as any to start.

So I have now switched to the GGP Appointment Support framework for discussion spreadsheet. And I should note that we hadn't really talked about this yet, so I'm going to take some time to introduce it. And we have also changed the settings in the document so that people will be able to add comments. And so we'll ask you all to take a little bit more time with it after this meeting and add your comments that we can then go over at the next meeting. And that can be on structure, content, any aspects that you think would be useful to comment on. We do appreciate your feedback on it since this is just a draft.

The suggestion is to lay out the metrics as they were identified by the SubPro PDP Final Report in Implementation Guidance 17.9, and that's what you see in Column A.

And, Thomas, they should be in the doc. Let me see. They should. Let's see where they show up. They should be. I saw them added as you were adding them. Ah, here they are. Yeah, I see them. It's a little bit tricky. You'll note when there's a comment there's a little triangle here. I don't know if you can see this little yellow triangle at the top right corner of this column. If you move over, mouse over the column, then you can see Tom's comment. And as I scroll down, I can definitely touch on your comments as well, Thomas. Thank you.

In this column to start with are the metrics that were identified in 17.9. And as this working group identifies, if any, other metrics they can also be added to this column. So let me go through the layout of this first, and then we can go down through the metrics.

This is a column for where we can prioritize. And what staff will do, I haven't done it yet, is add a dropdown menu where you can select say 1, 2, or 3. I think probably that would be sufficient for number items, prioritizing items. So we'll do that.

Then the questions to consider relating to the metrics are how to collect—oh, and thank you, Steve. Please note the link in chat to the document. It might be easier for you to see that way.

So how to collect the data. So if we look at Awareness and Education as an example, let's look at that one first. Number of outreach events and follow-up communication with potential applicants. What is the priority for that? How to collect the data for these number of outreach events and any follow-up communications. Measurement techniques for that particular

datapoint. Who would collect that data? Is this an indicator of success? What represents success, if applicable?

And then approach for impact on outreach, education, business case development, and application evaluation. That last item is Task 5. So we don't necessarily have to...we can probably answer these other questions first and prioritize and then come back to Task 5 for each of the metrics.

So that's the layout of the document. These are the metrics, and these are the Other Elements of Program Implementation. These are also as suggested by 17.9. And then Success of Launched gTLD, two key metrics there. And then the various questions to answer. So that's the layout of the document. Let me just pause there and see if there are any questions concerning the organization.

MIKE SILBER:

I personally think that this is a very good start. I know that we're going to want at some stage to turn this into something a little bit more descriptive. But for now at least, I think this is a very good way of capturing input. Julie, the one thing that might be worthwhile is we may want to consider people actually, instead of adding comments, we may want to consider people individually completing the form and submitting it so that we can then start mapping across the different participants in this guidance process rather than simply adding comments. I don't know what people think about that. I see Maureen has a hand.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Mike. I just put in a comment that I think that suggestion is probably a good idea because we're all coming from different perspectives and how we see each of those things is a bit different. In fact, I had actually started doing that. But I think that this meeting gives me a better idea too of what those expectations are, and that's great.

One of the things that I actually wanted to raise with regards to Awareness and Education is I just [noted then] who are we going to be targeting. The criteria was limited to they needed to be from [inaudible] that weren't recognized by the UN. And I just wanted to note that recognized by the UN may not be an appropriate criteria, but is that the only criteria? If we're going to be, especially in light of what we're probably going to come up with and the range of people who may wish to apply, do we need to list down some criteria for applicants so that when we're actually doing outreach or raising awareness or whatever that it's actually targeting those people who would be appropriate for applicant support? Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Maureen, I think you raise a very important point. It's something that we must definitely include is are we going to rely on an external standard, as you said, a UN standard or some other standard or are we going to leave it up to the IRT to look at a broader definition?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, I'm happy with that as long as there is a definition somewhere so that when we're actually developing our own metrics and that sort of stuff, developing them, that we're all actually focusing on the people who are actually going to be getting applicant support.

MIKE SILBER: Makes sense. Tom? Tom, I see a hand.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, can you hear me, guys?

MIKE SILBER: Yes, you're off mute.

TOM BARRETT: All right, thanks, guys. So I guess one suggestion I have, I'm obviously looking at Column A which is the metrics and I notice that the first section Awareness and Education, that makes perfect sense. But then I guess it would be nice for my mind to see like phases of application support. And so the first one [inaudible] talks about the first phase which is outreach and education, but then I wonder if we need a section called business case development which is really the next phase. Once you've done your outreach then that requires one set of experts. When you get into business case development or simply application completion there's another set of experts. And then you get into the application evaluation phase which requires yet another set of experts, and

then of course ongoing operations which might even be another set of experts. So I wonder if we've clearly identified. I'm just concerned we're going to miss some metrics if we don't think about the entire lifecycle of what an applicant goes through. Does that make sense?

MIKE SILBER: It makes sense to me.

TOM BARRETT: So we've got the first step of the lifecycle. We don't have the other steps of the lifecycle in Column A.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Tom.

MIKE SILBER: [inaudible] add that?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. I'm just going to take a note of this, but I think getting back to Maureen and Mike's point about adding or providing input, people providing input individually into the Google doc rather than just commenting on it. So the reason that we had at first set this up for commenting is more to get comments on the structure as opposed to editing the content. But I think that if people want to dig into this, and I think we certainly encourage that, then if people want to individually edit the document and then we can bring those edits

back together into a consolidated document for discussion, I think that could be helpful. And so breaking out the outreach into phases in the way that you mentioned, Tom, I think could be helpful information to have. And I think that if you look at the document, what you could do is conceivably have—we have outreach events and awareness and education, so on—conceivably we could set up another column for, say, subgroupings within these main elements. So the phased outreach, for example, business model development, etc.

I see Gabriela is saying, “Thank you for the matrix. Agree we need to also see the business model.” And Lawrence is saying also helpful to have this record that way. So I think that that’s something that we can have people do when they’re editing the sheets themselves and/or we can, of course, give people edit rights to this document. But then we can’t prevent people from overwriting what’s there or overwriting what somebody else may have put in, so that makes it a little bit trickier. Probably better to have people work separately. Go ahead, Mike. Sorry.

MIKE SILBER:

Julie, so we may not be able to do it as a Google sheet. We may then need to do it almost as a survey and to actually run it as a survey and get people to fill in. Because I also think that will be much easier in terms of collating notes and collating scores. Because in some of these we’re asking people to rank, and it will just be arithmetically simpler if you’re running this as a survey rather than you and Steve trying to match everything together.

We obviously need some freeform fields for people to insert comments which we can add up, but I think we just need to look at how we do it because I do take your point. I think that maybe a Google sheet is not the best way of doing it. So either people need to save a local version and then submit it or we need to use a survey or similar technique to get that through.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. That's a very interesting thought. I'm trying to think about how we would set this up as a survey, and I think I need to put my thinking cap on and be a little creative as far as developing it in a survey format. But I think that should be possible. And I see there's support for that. Sarah is saying, "Agree with the idea to have a survey and have people rank," and also Maureen. Let me take that back as an action item for staff. Because what I could do is develop a prototype and see how it could work that we could test before we fill in all the information. So let me take a note of that.

MIKE SILBER:

But can I ask? We've had one very good input from Tom. If I can ask people please very carefully consider the proposed worksheet as it stands at the moment and if they've got any suggested edits to the way that it's structured or the content rather than the input that we are seeking. So let's design the form first and make sure that it captures everything we're after. And then we need to push everybody to actually complete it. So if you can please review and make sure that the form as it stands actually addresses the tasks that we're after, that will be a very important first step.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Tom?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, please go ahead, Tom.

MIKE SILBER: Can I ask you to [inaudible] consensus on the lifecycle steps, maybe you want to just explain it.

TOM BARRETT: Yes, what I mean is, so Awareness and Education, I would think is a first step in the lifecycle. And then we have some business case development, which is really part of filling out the application, is really step two of the lifecycle. And then the question is, what comes after that? Is application evaluation a phase of the lifecycle that would call for unique applicant support? Then of course, there's ongoing operations. So we just need to agree on the four or five steps that might call for different metrics and experts.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Tom. I was trying to get those down. I've got awareness and education as the first step. Then we have the

business case development (the filling out of the application), the application evaluation. I'm sorry, what was the last step?

TOM BARRETT: The last one is production where they go [with live] operations, that also probably requires applicant support.

JULIE HEDLUND: I see.

MIKE SILBER: So I think that sounds about right, but maybe others have got additional input. I see we've got hands from Rafik and Lawrence, so let's allow the new father to join us. Rafik, hopefully you're getting some sleep these days.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mike. [inaudible]. I just want to have some clarification about what you said. So first, if I understand correctly, we will keep using this worksheet just to agree I think [said about the form]. But then we will use the survey, if I'm correct, just kind of maybe only for getting the input or suggestion. And so I was just wondering if, for example, we will get some input or comment about the [column] or that's just something already set.

And then regarding some of those [inaudible] [of the columns], so I guess if some maybe will have some pre-prepared lists of values because, I'm not sure, maybe like who collects the data, I don't think that we will have many options. So just we can agree some

of the available options to be selected or the measurement techniques and so on. I think in some cases that it will be quite a small subset of options to be chosen or something like that. So it's just some clarification [in] understanding for [whether I'm] getting it right or not. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER:

Yeah, so to pick up, I think you've got it completely correct. So we're looking at getting a form that allows us to capture data from this grouping and maybe even beyond it. As you say, some of these would be ranked 1 to 5 or 1 to X, however many items there are. Some of these as you say, for example, who to collect, it would be a very limited set of options. So we'd use dropdown menu and maybe with a "none of the above" and a freeform answer if you have an alternative suggestion compared to the three or four or ten options that we may put into the survey. So that would then allow us to actually pull together and at least come back with a set of results.

Now those results don't mean that we've done our work, but it at least allows us to capture a first blush of where this group is looking and allows us to hone in where we are close to consensus and may need just a little bit of work as opposed to those areas where we are far away.

What Tom is suggesting is that at the moment we've got Awareness and Education as a standalone item, and it makes sense. Then we've got Other Elements of Program Implementation, but it seems very scant in terms of what's there and we may need to flesh that out a bit. And then the last is the

Success of Launched gTLD. Again, seems a little bit scant from what I'm understanding from Tom's point which is it talks about some very specific items as opposed to a more general is the TLD in operation and is it sustainable going forward. Tom, am I paraphrasing you correctly?

TOM BARRETT: Yes, Mike, you're right. I did ask it seemed like a very narrow success measure. [This early] have more generic ones that we could come up with.

MIKE SILBER: Tom, would you mind maybe just jotting down a few thoughts on the list. I know that Julie's taken some notes, but maybe you can put some thoughts on the list and people can interact and engage on that just to see if we have consensus on that. And then Julie, Steve, and I will look at that and work out how best to integrate that into the sheet. Lawrence, your hand is up.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thanks, Chair. So I am also aligned with the thinking that at this point while we're trying to gauge and rank these individual items, it would be interesting to see if as much as possible we can have this aligned with the thoughts that Tom has brought forward so that in that way we are able to at least take a stab at, take a look at the application process from start to finish.

I guess what we have structured before us now is looking this way because we are looking at the tasks from as have been outlined in

the framework. But in order not to have to repeat this process I think that we can still take a stab at fitting all that we have in this Google sheet in front of us and trying to benchmark this into the lifecycle of an application. And aside from covering every aspect it could also open up some areas or get some thinking around some areas that we need some further insights too.

But aside from that I also feel that it might be nice for staff to talk us through some of the thinking in the individual metrics so that we are comparing apples to apples. For instance, if you look at Awareness and Education at Number 9 on the Google sheet, talking about applications based on preexisting trademarks, I would like to have some better insight. For instance, before going ahead to fill this to know what we are talking about, I mean, what we are actually trying to track here. Is it trademarks that [rather] TLDs that are very close variants to trademarks? Because trademarks are [off] entirely. So what are the thoughts that we...? It might be nice to just have a run through generally before we now split individually into working, I mean, before we now split into working individually so that whatever it is we are putting together is aligned around the same thinking. I hope I have not succeeded in confusing anyone.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Lawrence. So I am just looking here.

MIKE SILBER: I think maybe....

JULIE HEDLUND: Go ahead, Mike, please.

MIKE SILBER: Maybe let me jump in over there because I think Lawrence raises some useful thoughts. But as Julie has mentioned in the chat, we're not dealing with staff here. We're dealing with the SubPro Final Report and we're dealing with the council, and they have set up the tasks. So staff is in the same position as we are which is trying to understand and analyze the SubPro Final Report and the council resolution in terms of what they're expecting from us. Now [if we are looking] for further input, then we need to go back to the SubPro PDP or we need to go to the council. Staff's in the same position as we are which is trying to do the analysis here.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. What I would suggest is, well, there's something to add to what Mike just said and that is that the working group uses as a starting point the metrics identified in the SubPro PDP Final Report and Implementation Guidance Section 17.9, but the working group can suggest other metrics as well.

Secondly, if the working group members have questions about what is meant by particular metrics, so for example applications based on preexisting trademarks, if you need more information there, staff is happy to look at that section of the Final Report on application support and see if there's guidance there. And if not, we can go back to the PDP working group, particularly the chairs I would think would be able to provide us guidance if needed on if there are specific questions on what is meant by certain metrics.

So there's flexibility first of all in the working group selecting additional metrics to expanding on the list that we have here in the framework. And then as Mike notes, this isn't a staff generated list of tasks or metrics. It comes directly out of the SubPro Final Report. But if further guidance is needed as to what's being provided here, we're happy to get that guidance from the SubPro PDP working group.

And in that regard, it would be helpful if, for instance, Lawrence, if you had specific questions that you would like us to bring back to the PDP working group, we're happy to do so. Thank you.

And I'm just noticing we have six minutes left in the meeting today. Might I suggest, Mike, that we ask working group members to provide any further comments such as Tom Barrett has done that we could relating to both the content but also the format of this form since this will help us to develop the survey. So we want to make sure we get the format and content of this form correct before staff turns it into a survey since that will be, I think, probably a fairly extensive task.

MIKE SILBER: Yep.

JULIE HEDLUND: So I want to make sure we get it right.

MIKE SILBER: I completely agree with you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, please go ahead.

MIKE SILBER: I see we've got a couple of hands, and noting the limited time maybe let's just do a quick run through. Maureen, I see you've put your hand down. Lawrence, I think your hand is down. So we've got Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Somehow I [inaudible] to the top of the list. Imagine that. I had a couple comments. One is that Julie and I supported the SubPro [filing] group so we do have a little bit of context and institutional knowledge I suppose about how some of these came about. And so I guess the one comment I'd make about the example that was identified, Line 9, is that some of these may not be based on necessarily signs of success of the program but they're rather just datapoints to be collected that may or may not tell a story or not. So I think that's important context that not all of these are necessarily signs or reflections of success or failure of the program. It's just datapoints that the working group thought might be useful to collect.

Another important part of potential context is that the SubPro Final Report, I guess actually more like the working group, one of the things they recognized is that the nature of something like this of financial support for parties that need it is that you could have a program that is set up perfectly in terms of awareness, in terms of the funding opportunities, in terms of the structure of it and

nevertheless the case may be that potential applicants may determine that [inaudible] gTLD is not a priority for them at this stage of their lifecycle.

And the point of raising that is you'll see a heavy emphasis on awareness and education and then about the program implementation. So it's about awareness and making sure that the program is set up effectively. And then the emphasis on applications that get delegated into the root, you'll see that there's just a couple of datapoints captured at the bottom. So that's sort of the recognition of the PDP noting that even if everything is set up perfectly, you may not still get a ton of applications.

And then the last part I've run out of time and I actually have to run to another meeting is I was going to try to summarize and maybe just sort of refine the lifecycle part, what Tom mentioned. And maybe I'll share that on email to just try to get my reflection on what I thought I heard. Because I think at least from a staff perspective it does make sense for completeness to look at things in a lifecycle fashion. But like I said, I have to run to another meeting, so maybe I can share it on the list. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Steve. That's appreciated. We're [hitting with] two minutes to go so, yeah, I think that's perfectly acceptable if you share it on the list.

Folks, to Julie's point, let's get this right. Let's not rush things because we're under time pressure. We're not yet under time pressure. Let's get it right because I think this is an important way

to actually collate views instead of just relying on these biweekly calls. So I think that will be very useful if we get it right. So all inputs are welcomed. Please engage with the form as it is. If there's anything that you think is missing, please let us know on the list or in the Google sheet itself so that we can try and address it.

Let me do a quick call for any final comments before we close off. Hearing none, let me thank everybody for their attendance and participation. Happy New Year. All of the best for 2023 and looking forward to a productive working group and coming up with the guidance that is being expected from us. Thank you all.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you, Mike. Thank you, everyone. Thanks so much for chairing this call, Mike. And Happy New Year to all. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]