EN

ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 10 July 2023 at 15:00 UTC

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

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 known as GGP, initiation request for applicant support taking place on the 10th of July, 2023.
	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. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, 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. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to Mike Silber. Please begin.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

MIKE SILBER:	Thanks, Terri, and greetings, everybody. Thanks for your patience, much appreciated, and thanks to Julie and Steve. We understand you're running back to back, so we're looking forward to your A-game as you continue. You know, you've obviously picked up momentum.

So we're in a situation where I think the document is in very good shape at the moment, and I'm very pleased with it. I have not seen a lot of comment coming through on it, but that doesn't mean that there won't be any few remaining comments. At the moment, if I'm not mistaken, there are a couple of comments from me. There are a couple of comments from Gabriela, which are appreciated, and I haven't seen anything from anybody else. I'm hoping that means everybody else is totally comfortable with the document as it stands. So on that basis, I think the best thing, Julie, is to move on and for you to take us through the document and those final comments. Let's see if we can close those out, and then we can discuss next steps.

JULIE HEDLUND:	Great. Thanks so much, Mike. This is Julie from staff. Let me go ahead and pull up the document, and I put the link in the chat for everyone to go to. What I did was I went to the first of the comments in the document, and let me just... Okay, so let me give us some context for this comment from Gabriela. Let me just show you where this is more succinctly in the document so you can see also. I'll just scroll up a little bit.

So this is the methodology description under task five, and talking about the methodology for task five, the last sentence says the member from CSG further pressed this point in a later meeting, but working group members again agreed that even if not listed specifically in the guidance and recommendation, commercial entities would not be excluded from communications less outreach efforts. And Gabriela's comment is, would it be possible with respect to commercial entities to add any entity in line with the last GAC communique section [inaudible], ensuring increased engagement with a diverse array of people and organizations and underrepresented underserved markets and regions? So if I'm understanding correctly, that would be changing commercial entities to any entity.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, Julie, I saw the comment, and as much as I appreciate what's being said, what we can't do is go back in time and rewrite history, because we're dealing with a GAC communique which came out after these discussions were held. So unless we're reopening discussions, which I'm extremely loathed to do, the best I can suggest is a footnote referencing the GAC communique and referencing that suggestion, but I'm not willing to rewrite history. Gabriela, I see you're on, would that work for you? It doesn't have to be a footnote, it could be a comment.

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes, good morning, afternoon. Yeah, the idea was to give the sense of what the GAC recommended on this regard. So thank you very much.

MIKE SILBER: Great, then I think what we need to do is we just need to reference, I said footnote, but it could be in the text. But I just think for us referring to the GAC communique is a worthwhile addition. But let's not try and rewrite anything. So yeah, that works for me.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Excuse I see in chat Maureen's agreement too and Gabriela. So I've noted that in some brackets, and staff will follow up with that suggested edit in the form of a footnote in reference to the GAC communique. Thank you. I don't see anything else on that one.

MIKE SILBER: This was me adding belts and braces. I don't know if this is necessary, but I thought it might be useful. I don't know if people think that this is superfluous.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. And I'm just scrolling up to see. This is under deliberations with respect to guidance recommendation number one. Yes. I'm not sure if people had a chance to read this. Let's scroll up again. Just reading it out here. There was further discussion regarding the potential targeting of for profit enterprises, which one working group member argued should be included in this list of targeted groups. However, this did not gain any support. Noting that for profit enterprises would not be excluded from the program, but rather would not be specifically

targeted for communications and outreach and awareness. Roz, please.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thanks. Yeah, just coming in here—and thanks, Mike, for putting this in. I do remember we had quite a long discussion about this back in Cancun actually. So I don't think "This didn't gain any support" was sort of strong. I think because we talked about the remit quite a bit and I know there was discussion later, there was a bit more nuanced on that regard. I think back in the May 17 meeting potentially. So, yeah, I don't know how reflective this is of this discussion. So I think maybe the best case here would be to leave this out. And I do know Lawrence made a good case and I think, yeah, I just don't know how reflective that is at the moment, but I don't know.

MIKE SILBER: So, Roz, I went back to the minutes of the Cancun meeting, and the suggestion from Anne Aikman Scalese was to simply delete the language that we had in previously which excluded commercial entities, and rather to be silent. In our call last week, Lawrence was suggesting that it should be added in. And that I'm saying did not get any traction, that commercial entities need to be called out as a target group. And my recall and having a look at the notes from Cancun or the transcript from Cancun, I think it's pretty accurate that it gained no traction. Because Lawrence gave an impassioned—

EN

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah, and I remember at the time as well but I thought we did come back to it. I mean, I don't know, I'd be a little uncomfortable with that going in because I do think broader discussion since—I think it reads right now as if that—it just reads very strong. Even if others didn't necessarily want to make that a priority. Again, others feel free to come in. But Lawrence, I know isn't on the call, which is kind of the reason I'm a little uncomfortable. I don't know if he would read it that way.

MIKE SILBER: Roz, other than Lawrence, I'm not aware of any—Sorry, Maureen, I see your hand. Roz, were you done?

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Sorry, Mike, the last point you made just on the comment, I was going to suggest what we could do is keep this reference in but maybe delete out, "However, this did not gain any support," because I think we can all agree it's definitely factual to say one more working group member argued, like advanced the argument that they should be included in the list of targeted groups. I don't think that necessarily if people didn't verbalize at the time—I don't know. It just reads a bit strong to me. Sorry, Maureen, go ahead. And I just wanted to finish.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, no, Roz, you just said exactly what I was going to say. I think that it's a little harsh to sort of like to have that "However, this did not gain any support." Because I think that in the discussion that we had, I think that the argument went towards that like what

you've actually noted here that for-profit enterprises would not be excluded from the program but rather would not be specifically targeted—and I think that that was what we agreed on, rather than—I think deleting that section that Julie sort of like highlighted, in the brackets, if that was deleted, it would actually probably be more positive and express probably a little bit more the support that Lawrence got for what he was trying to achieve, which you've said in that particular statement there. So if that section was removed, I'm good with that. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Right. I'm comfortable with that. Let's move on. So I see a comment from Gabriela, which Julie has now highlighted. Anyone from staff want to hazard a response on that?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. My first thought was that I think it's important. I'm glad Gabriela called this out because I think it is important where we might be not going against but may not be embracing all the aspects of the implementation guidance in section 17, that we might need to call out why we aren't. Now this is only implementation guidance so it's not that this group has to adopt the guidance itself, but it still is something we should probably address, having thought of. Gabriela says, so, how can we reconcile this paragraph with implementation guidance 17.9, awareness and education, diversity and distribution of the applicant pool, geographic diversity, languages and scripts?

I think I can suggest that the working group considered the various metrics in the implementation guidance. I think I'm just trying to think. Go ahead, please help me out.

MIKE SILBER: To my mind, the two are not—I don't see a contradiction. And I think it's some implementation guidance and reconciliation, but I don't see a contradiction over there. But if Gabriela is seeing it, then I do think that we need to just consider that language quite carefully. And let's make sure we're totally comfortable with it because otherwise, there's a huge likelihood that it's going to be raised in the public comments. So, if we can finesse the language to address that question, fantastic. Otherwise we're going to have to push it to public comment, knowing that there is some uncertainty over there. Gabriela, would that address your concern, which I think is a valid one?

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes. Thank you, Mike and Julie. I think it's important to work on the language, to be very clear on this regard. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: So this is Julie. Mike, might I suggest that—and we'll mention this to a little bit further on when we talk about the public comment proceeding, but each of the recommendations will be specifically called out for comment in the public comments so they'll be listed in a type of tool that people can use to register their comments. And so people will be able to register comments with respect to each of the recommendations and each of those will be called out

EN

specifically in the public comment form for people to review and comment on. So in that respect, we could list obviously the recommendation in the public comment tool, we could also list, ask a question as to whether or not there is any need to reconcile the language of the recommendation with the implementation guidance of 17.9 if you wanted to call that out specifically. But I see Maureen has her hand up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Julie. Maureen for the record. My sort of feeling is before it goes to public comment that we should put in like the language that we as a group sort of feel is important to be there, and public comment can remove it. But I think that because this is sort of seen to be important to at least give a little bit more clarification on sort of like the sorts of things. Is it mentioned elsewhere how—because these sorts of issues arose during our discussions earlier. So it's just that I'd rather it was in rather than out before the public comment. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: You know, Maureen, I think my only response there is that the reference that Gabriela made to diversity and distribution of the applicant pool doesn't necessarily have anything to do with applicant support. That geographic diversity, languages and scripts is not necessarily—it's not mutually exclusive to applicant support and there is a possibility that people will require support and they may come from those different groupings. But at the same time, you could find that there are people who are incredibly well resourced in terms of different geographies, languages and

scripts. And so simply because somebody is not a Latin script user doesn't mean that they actually need or will receive applicant support. So I don't think the two are irreconcilable. I think the two hang together very nicely. But we may just want to put in language that says, maybe just at the end, having regards to the context of 17.9 of the implementation guidance.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Mike. Jumping in here, that would be perfect. I think that like it is part of the discussion. And I think because this bit here is actually talking about the sorts of things that actually arose out of our discussion. I mean, they can be either taken be considered by the IRT or whoever, but I think that this should reflect the discussions that actually took place as within our thing. So putting that little addition would be perfect for me. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. Thanks, Maureen. So, just to be clear, we're talking about adding language here in the deliberations to reference that implementation guidance 17.9, not in the recommendation itself.

MIKE SILBER: That's my understanding.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That's what I'm proposing.

JULIE HEDLUND: Good. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: That is noted. We'll add that.

MIKE SILBER: Because I think we've all agreed, it would be ideal if we can get everything done. But if not, then we prioritize.

JULIE HEDLUND: Noted. Thank you, Mike. So a couple of comments from Gabriela. This is, let me move this up a little bit for context. This is recommendation guidance recommendation number two, under indicators of success. And the first is for majority. For clarification, majority means more than 60%. And then, with respect to the second comment, indicate moderate to high satisfaction. Just for clarification, how to measure satisfaction, would it be possible to indicate that the account was sufficient information provided to make a choice regarding the service?

MIKE SILBER: Well, let's deal with the first one. I think the first one is majority in my mind is 50 plus one. I don't know if we want to use a different measure.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Does that mean then that we want to—I'm not sure that we need to be that specific unless we want to put it in a footnote.

MIKE SILBER: I don't think it's necessary. But that's just me.

JULIE HEDLUND: That would be my understanding of a majority also. Anybody else have comments about majority? And then the second comment. I see Maureen has your hand up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I just wanted to say that I'm happy with majority being the general consensus of 50 plus one. I don't think we need to like specify anything more. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: And Gabriela, I'm not sure I fully understand the comment. I don't know if you want to speak to it. The second comment. If you want to just explain that before we discuss and try and finalize.

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Okay, thank you very much. I'm sorry for the late comments that I made. Just for me for my notes regarding the text, so just wanted to clarify.

EN

MIKE SILBER: That's appreciated, that you're engaged with the document. Thank you.

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: The second comment on this was indicate moderate to high satisfaction. And I was not clear on satisfaction, how to measure it. Satisfaction will be defined by to acquire all the information needed. This is the definition of it. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: In normal practice, the satisfaction rates are generally like on a one to five scale or something like that. So I think that that can actually be measured. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: I don't know if anybody from staff, maybe picking on Kristy or Leon, if you have a thought, because my thinking there and my understanding is that we would use survey results and we'd ask people to describe their satisfaction. Do we need or want to, to get into more detail than that?

JULIE HEDLUND: Excuse me, Mike, I just want to note that I think perhaps Gabriela's concern is addressed below in the data/metrics to measure success because that's where the measurement piece

EN

comes in. So, how we would determine this moderate to high status of section has to do with, as you noted, the surveys about the services. And then that information gathered from them that the services were useful to informing their gTLD application or assisting them through the application process. So these things go together. So we need to call out the measurement aspect under the quantitative statement.

MIKE SILBER: Good point. Gabriela, do you think that addresses your question? Okay. Gabriela's responded yes in the chat.

JULIE HEDLUND: So here we have under guidance recommendation fouur a comment from Gabriela on the word timely. And I think we had a discussion last week concerning this as well, but I'll bring this one up. Just for clarification, what does timely mean? Since the ASP should be open 18 months before the standard window of application,. Should the material be available 20 months before the round opens?

And I'll just note in our discussion of timelines, last week, we determined that we didn't want to specifically speak to speak to specific times or prescribe specific times, leaving that up to the implementation review team. Over to Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I think that's my recall from the previous discussion. So I'm just hesitant to reopen this discussion. I thought we'd closed it.

And it's very difficult for us to now suggest what time you should be. I think that needs to be—by referring to timely, we're calling out that it needs to be addressed.

JULIE HEDLUND: Exactly. And that, then we leave that up to the IRT, and as Marie noted as well. Pe

MIKE SILBER: Please, Gabriela.

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes, thank you very much. Just to ask because for us, maybe it to be in a timely manner, the program to be available timely, I mean reflects that very important point regarding success. So, if we cannot say exactly timeframe, at least to reflect in the discussion of clarification or methodology that this should be taken as an important factor for the success of the program. I'm not sure, but I recall that in the first application support program, the time was one of the biggest concern. So, just to be clear that we worked on this and we discussed this, and we are worried or concerned about the timeframe being accurate. This is only my comment. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: I think the comment is very well taken. And that's why we're calling it out. I don't think we need to say anything more though because we're not going to make that determination ourselves. Julie, I

EN

agree with your suggestion, and the deliberations, let's just call it out. I don't think we need to refer to specific timelines but rather that the time sensitivity of applicant support is absolutely critical to its potential success or failure.

JULIE HEDLUND: I see that Gabrielle is saying yes, thank you in the chat. So we'll do that. Just to note also. Although there is a public comment form that people can follow, they can comment on any aspect of the report, whether we've called it out or not. So it could be something that we've raised in deliberations that someone might think that we should reconsider, and it'd be possible for them to make comments on that. So they're not limited to what the working group has put forward just as recommendations, but really anything that's in the report is up for comment.

Okay, so, again, calling out guidance recommendation five. And some suggested changes. These were suggested in the discussion at ICANN 77. And specifically, in each case where we talked about delegated utility applicants, suggestion made from Lawrence and discussed briefly in that meeting, was to change applicants to applications in each instance. But pertaining the language from supported applicants. Later in each of those sentences. So the suggested language is in brackets for you all to consider.

MIKE SILBER: I don't know if people had an opportunity to look at my notes on this issue. And I've been giving it a lot of thought because it is

something that had been disturbing me because I think it's a very valid concern. The problem comes in in terms of portfolio applicants potentially skewing. If it's one applicant one application per applicant, then it should be less of an issue, but given—and again, we haven't discussed this, and so I'm a little hesitant to start putting my thinking in when it hasn't been discussed and it was raised to kind of the last minute, but still requires consideration. And that is how many applications per supported applicants is the program going to address? We didn't discuss or debate it. My assumption, and it's a very personal assumption, is that we're only going to support a very limited number of applications per applicant, most likely a single application. Potentially a single application in multiple scripts, which would then lead to multiple applications. So if somebody chooses a certain string and then wants that same string in a couple of different scripts, they could potentially apply for additional support for each of those applications. But generally, I don't think that we're going to be supporting portfolio applicants in terms of the applicant support program.

Now, I don't want to insert my assumption as a finding by the working group when we haven't discussed it. So, having thought around it several times, my feeling was let's leave it as it is and let's get it out in public comment, because I'm not sure that we have the time and the luxury of being able to debate this with the level of detail that's required to come to a conclusion. Maybe to just call out that in the deliberations as to whether it should be applications or applicants.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, we can certainly call that out in deliberations. Rafik in chat says, the fee is per string, right? And we are working in the first place about fee reduction task six. Using string would make sense. Maureen says, I agree with Rafik. That's what I had assumed. And Roz says, plus one, Rafik.

MIKE SILBER: Okay. So, I think, and Lawrence who raised this is unfortunately not on the call, but my suggestion is let's leave it as applications and not applicants.

JULIE HEDLUND: Excuse me, Mike. It was originally applicants. And the suggestion is applications.

MIKE SILBER: So, sorry, you're right. Now, how do we take this forward? Because then if the working group needs to discuss this to arrive at a conclusion, we need to have a full discussion.

JULIE HEDLUND: Excuse me, Mike. I think it might be that it's actually that applications—it might actually be clearer in this instance, that might be more of a clarification. I mean, delegated gTLD applications. I mean, I'm not sure we delegate gTLD applicants, but the applications would be from supported applicants. I think Kristy is on the call. I'm just wondering if somebody from ICANN

EN

can shed a little light on this question as well. Kristy, you have your hand up, please.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sure. Thank you, Julie. Yeah. So, the point that you made earlier, and this is Kristy Buckley for the record, Mike, about portfolio applicants sort of overshadowing that percentage, right? If you're looking at the total number of supported applicants out of the total number of applications, it's going to be very small, presumably because there'll be a lot of portfolio applicants, which are one applicant applying for many gTLDs. And I think you have a decent assumption that supported applicants are most likely only going to be applying for one. So, it's a choice, but I would guess that if you say we're going to look at a percentage of supported applicants out of a total number of gTLD applications, it's going to be a very small percentage as compared to a percentage of supported applicants out of the total number of gTLD applicants. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Kristy.

MIKE SILBER: Roz, last time, those who applied for support only applied for a single spring. And that's why I made the assumption that I did, is that we're likely to see a similar situation. But again, do we want to actually raise this question? Because in my mind, there are two options here. Well, actually, there are multiple options, but option one is for us to look at this question of applicants versus applications and decide if the numbers we've given there can be

EN

transposed without any impact. So, is it no fewer than 10 or 0.5% of applicants or applications, or is the number different? And then the second is, do we want to call out somewhere that the applicant support program, we don't believe should be used for portfolio applications, but should be used for a single string, possibly, with some script variants of a single string? But Rafik, please, I see your hand is up.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mike. Maybe, again, task six will help us here because we are suggesting a fair, equitable split for applicants. And that can only work if it's by string. So we cannot have someone with two or more strings like portfolio. It's not going to work. It's not going to be fair.

So I assume here we should use the string and just application. I can see case, again, maybe for someone like they want to apply like for something on the Latin script and other language for diversity, but seems maybe, how to say, minority, I'm not sure the right word here, but I don't expect it to happen often. And I'm not sure how it will work in this case. I'm not familiar, but basically, because task six and what we are suggesting about fairness, it cannot work if we are thinking that we might have portfolio applicants.

MIKE SILBER: No, Rafik, I think that's an excellent suggestion, is let's put that into task six. Kristy, from your perspective, do you see any issue with the numbers we've given if we refer to applications?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Whether I see an issue with it, Mike, is it's more just what do you want to measure, right? And so if you want to measure the number of supported applicants against the number of total applications, that's going to give you a different percentage as compared to number of supported applicants against the total number of applicants. So it just depends on what you think is the best metric to assess the success of the program.

MIKE SILBER: I think the general impression—and I've simply proceeded on the basis of applicants up until it was raised by Lawrence in Washington. And the general feeling seems to be that actually applications makes more sense. And if you think about it, what caught the headlines last time? It was the number of applications, not the number of applicants. And if we're going to be not measured by our own esoteric internal measurements, but rather in the more general public opinion, I think then actually applications does make more sense.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Rafik. Thank you, Mike. And thank you, Maureen also, and comments in chat. So at this point, it seems that there's some agreement to include applications, in the phrase, delegated gTLD applications.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, but I think that seems to be the general preference, and I'm comfortable with that. I just wanted to respond to Maureen's comment in chat, which is applications of single strings. I don't think we need to go into that level of detail. If you apply for variations, then those are each a separate application. Certainly, last time around, unless the implementation review changes things, you don't get an opportunity to apply once for three strings, just because they're variations. But Satish, you had a comment?

SATISH BABU: Yeah, thanks. So although it's not final, the discussions in the EPDP on INMs, what has been proposed is that a primary string plus all its variants form a particular application, a single application with a single fee. So that's the direction in which the discussions are happening there. So I don't know whether we should consider it, but that's the way it is going to be most probably. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Satish, that's very useful input. So I think we follow Rafik's suggestion. And in task six, we cross-refer to that discussion in terms of one applicant, single string, plus potentially variants, depending on the outcome of that deliberation. And again, I don't think we're going to be prescriptive, but rather it's a general view from our discussions that it wouldn't be equitable to support an applicant for more than a single string plus variants.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. So for now, it seems that there's support for applications versus applicants.

MIKE SILBER: Correct. So let's do applications. And I think it's worthwhile in the deliberation section, just mentioning the discussion we've had as to whether there should be applications or applicants.

JULIE HEDLUND: Absolutely. We'll definitely do that. And we can make that cross-reference to section six as well. Thank you. That was a very helpful discussion. Just checking to see if there's any other hands. I don't see any.

MIKE SILBER: So, Julie, what I think we do need to put in is in task six, as per Rafik's suggestion, is that we need to put in there something in the rationale and deliberation that we're looking towards one string plus potentially variants per supported applicant. Otherwise, it would be inequitable.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. Thank you for that. That's all very helpful discussion. I don't think there are any further comments in the document to review.

MIKE SILBER: No, that's it. So, Julie, can I suggest—there's a little bit more work—if you can circulate that. I'm not sure we need another call,

EN

but let's circulate and let's see if there is any further feedback. Gabriela, I see your hand.

MARIA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes, thank you very much. I suggested to include the word predictability on any of the discussions that we had on the task six. Because I think it's really important to have a language related to the SubPro recommendation on predictability. I know that we were discussing on flexibility and the problem not being so rigid, but actually in the word predictability is also I suggest to include in any of the task six guidance. I'm not sure [where it went], but I already mentioned the previous session and I remember that it was on the discussion on flexibility and we are transparent. But I don't think I see the word predictability as an important factor because related to the fact that if we are going to reduce the support, it's important for the potential applicants to know how much they're going to be benefiting from the program. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: So I think that's already covered in guidance recommendation eight.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think also to an extent in guidance recommendation number nine.

MIKE SILBER: But I have no objection, potentially in nine, to insert the word predictable there as well.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think we can look at how we can insert that, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I've got no objection to adding the words predictable in there. Any objections? Because it was discussed and I think we all agreed we need to try and get that fine balancing act and fortunately we can throw that to staff and then criticize them for how they do it.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. We'll take that on as an action.

MIKE SILBER: Perfect. Thanks, Julie. So on that basis, I think we are done with the document. So, Julie, you will clean up, add those few additions and then you will circulate to us. Please tell us about next steps.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Just to very quickly show you, and I'm going to suggest we put in next Monday as a placeholder meeting. I'd like everybody to have a chance to look at the final report. And this is what it's going to look like. And there's some boilerplate language in it. And then the sections that we've been discussing will be

placed in here as well. So the recommendations will be placed in this report.

But I think what we'll do is, early this week, insert the finalized text that we've just discussed into the report, and all the boilerplate language will in the report, so the report is final. And just give everybody a chance to see it. We're not putting it out there for comment, because we've already talked about the substantive aspects of the report. But I think it's important for everybody to see what it looks like before it goes out for public comment. So that's my suggestion.

And then, if you don't mind, I'll just quickly switch over to the timeline and our suggestion for the public comment. So there is a little bit of time needed to prepare materials for the public comment. And so that's why we're shooting for end of July. So some of the things that need to be taken care of is, of course, the report needs to be finalized. And that's what we're suggesting we get out to all of you this week. With a placeholder meeting next Monday, in case there are any questions. And then also, there's a comment tool type of survey form that's used for people to provide their comments, which would list the recommendations and basically allow people to comment on each recommendation. It means that we get more targeted comments and it means that they're easier to address when we're analyzing comments. And that needs to be prepared and created and reviewed. And the creation of that is done by other staff, so we'll have to initiate that process.

But we will be within our time frame here if we put the report out for public comment at the end of July. And if we put it out for the

requisite 40 days, which is the standard time, that would bring us to the 9th of September. And that would be within the public comment review time period. And then continuing to develop the final report is October through December. We don't believe that we'll need that much time, but it does depend on how many comments are received. So that's the proposal for the for the public comment process and how that fits into the timeline. And I see we've got two minutes remaining. Let me just see if we have hands. I see there's something in the chat, too.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, so when do you think we will get this out?

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm saying, sorry, no later than the 31st of July. We're going to need a couple of weeks for preparation of the various—

MIKE SILBER: [inaudible] Julie. My mistake. You had mentioned circulating a draft to the working group and then a placeholder for Monday.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes.

MIKE SILBER: Do you think you'll get the document out to us Thursday, Friday?

JULIE HEDLUND: I should think by tomorrow. I mean, the changes are not extensive. So I'm hoping to get the notes out today and following up with the report and that includes putting the text in the final report format, or I should say the initial report format, and also with the various boilerplate elements in place as well.

MIKE SILBER: Well, Maureen is very happy with tomorrow. I would be very happy with tomorrow, but an understanding if it's not tomorrow, if you can try and get it to us Wednesday, Thursday at the latest. And let's see what comment there is. And if we need a call on Monday.

JULIE HEDLUND: Very good. Well, I'd certainly say Wednesday would be the latest.

MIKE SILBER: Brilliant. So everybody happy? We'll get a document by Wednesday at the latest. We can then engage with it. Please, I'm on my knees. Let's engage on the list or interact with it online if it's made available as an editable document. Let's get our comments in so that we can go through and get it done effectively. You've seen how effective today was because of Gabriela's notes and input. But please, let's get that. Because if there are no comments on the document, I'm going to assume that everybody's comfortable and we can cancel next week, Monday.

JULIE HEDLUND:	Thank you, Mike. And thank you so much for chairing today. We've got the top of the hour. So this meeting is adjourned. Thank you all for joining.
MIKE SILBER:	Thanks, everybody.
TERRI AGNEW:	Thank you, everyone. I will stop recording and disconnect all remaining lines since the meeting has been adjourned. Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]