
ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 23 January 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/6oU-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 the 23rd of January 2023 at 15:00 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? And Mike, I do believe—are you on telephone only?

MIKE SILBER:

I am on Zoom, but I will be getting into a car very shortly. So I will not be monitoring the room. Apologies, everybody. So I'm going to ask Julie, if you wouldn't mind kicking off with the agenda as I get into the car.

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.

JULIE HEDLUND: Absolutely, Mike, I'll take care of it.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. We do have listed apologies for Matt Sirlin. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share at this time? 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 wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space 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 multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards to behavior. With this. I'll turn the call back over to Julie Hedlund. Please begin.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks so much, Terri. And I want to welcome Paul McGrady too. Paul, just so you know, Mike is in a car. So he's a little bit indisposed. But I'll go ahead since it's very brief, and run through the agenda, if that's alright with you, and then turn things over to GDS for their presentation.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Julie. That's great. Sorry for the scare of showing up three minutes late. The life of a lawyer is a bit unpredictable. Mike, drive safely or ride safely. Julie, thanks for jumping in today and looking forward to hearing all about it.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Excellent. Thanks so much, Paul. Really appreciate it. So just before we get started to run through the agenda, we've covered the updates to Statements of Interest of which there were none. And just one thing to note under the agenda item one, is that Mike Silber and Paul McGrady both gave a very helpful brief update to the GNSO Council at its meeting on the 19th of January. This was related to agenda item five and updates from work that might have an impact on the SubPro—subsequent procedures—PDP. And anyway, there were no questions or concerns arising from that update. But just wanted to note that.

On to agenda item two just to read off what we have on screen here is that GDS staff, Aaron Hickman will provide an update relating to the applicant support and the ODA. And then there'll be time for Q&A. And then we'll move on to continuing our discussion of task three. And we've got a link there in the agenda to the Google Sheet. And thank you to those who've entered some comments in there, which we'll go through. So we'll review that framework, and then move quickly to go through the comments that people have entered into the document, and any other business. Does anybody have any other business they'd like to add for today? I'm seeing no hands. So at this point, I'm going to go ahead and stop sharing the screen. I'm bringing up the slides for the GDS presentation and switch things over to Aaron Hickman, please.

AARON HICKMAN:

Thanks, Julie. So while you're bringing that up, just real quickly, there's really only two things, two major agenda items. One is just responding to some of the questions that came up last time we presented about the pro bono resources. And then we have an overview of some aspects of the applicant support program that were proposed in the ODA. So we can go through that. Happy to take questions as we go. So feel free to throw put up your hand and we can take those as we work through the slides. So Julie, if we go to the next one, please. So here's a summary.

The question that was asked last time was sort of what was the size and scope of the pro bono resources that were available in the 2012 round. So we just went ahead and summarized sort of the entities and the different services that they offered. So you can see it, here's the breakdown, a total of 24. And then each of the little bullets there have a breakdown of the specific services that they offered.

To be clear, it wasn't that each one of these offered one service. The way the numbers work, obviously, there's a number of folks that offered a lot of those different services. So you have a pretty spread out group. Some certainly were more oriented around the technical aspects, because that was one of the bigger needs, I think most people weren't familiar with. But different services were available through legal and marketing, communications, and everything. So it was a fairly broad spectrum of folks participating.

And then the list of specifics there was is linked at the bottom. Let me just check there. See if there are any questions. This is the only slide on this this topic since it was a fairly straightforward question. If there aren't any questions—Mr. Barrett, I see your

question. These were the ones available on the list that we provided. So ICANN Org had gathered a list of folks who are offering pro bono services, and that was the list.

I do not believe there was any obligation for anyone to report back if they used those resources. And I'm not aware of any actual list or results of that. As we noted, last time, there were only three participant participants in the applicant support program. So definitely not all 24 could have been used, based on the way that the services were distributed. So hopefully that answers that question. I see a hand from Lawrence. Lawrence, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thanks for that brief information. So as a [writer to] this, I would like to have a brief idea around the depths of the services that were provided as pro bono. I will guess that a lot of applicants early in the process will have needed support in terms of putting together their proposals just before it's submitted to ICANN for evaluation and all that, be it the business or the technical proposals.

I would also like to have an insight to how this helped encourage applications, or if at all, the three entities had to wade through some particular hurdles before they could use the pro bono services. So those services, since they are voluntary, where they paid for in any way by ICANN in terms of the selection process now to those vendors? And then at what point were the applicants expected to approach or to use these resources?

AARON HICKMAN: so I think the first question is, we really don't know how much they were used by anyone. And there were only three applicants who applied as an applicant support applicant. And we had just made these services available. The extent of what ICANN Org did was, here's a list of pro bono providers. And of course, you could use them or not, depending on whatever your particular needs were. So we don't really know the extent of how much they were used. That is something that we could perhaps speak into the next round, where we say, hey, if you used any of these folks, either have the folks on the pro bono list report that back or have the applicants note if they used any of their pro bono resources to see to what extent that that was helpful or not, because they may have not used any. They weren't required to. It was a completely voluntary state. And if there were contracts or MoU signed, we were not involved in that because that was fully between those parties. ICANN Org did not fund any of the pro bono providers. So that was sort of a completely separate thing. More for folks who really just wanted to offer resources in the public interest, which was sort of the idea behind the applicant support program. So I think I missed one of your questions, though, Lawrence, Did I cover them all? Or did I miss one?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Your response is clear to the point that since there wasn't any contractual agreement, so to say, between ICANN and they the companies providing the pro bono services, we weren't able to, I guess, from what you're saying, we weren't able to measure or track if any of those services were utilized. So that speaks to the second question, being able to try to know if the applicants

were able to use those pro bono services, to be able to get far into the application process itself. That's something that we should look at concerning the next rounds.

AARON HICKMAN:

Yep. And as a reminder, in the 2012 round, you had to come in as an applicant support. And if you didn't even qualify as an applicant support applicant, you weren't able to proceed through. So that prohibition has been removed in future rounds. Which means if you come in, you may still have been able to leverage pro bono resources, folks may still allow that or offer some smaller group of hours or something for those. So I think, going forward, at least, there'll be far more flexibility. But I agree, I think we would need to track that usage and utilization So forth to see if that's really changing things for folks or not, because I think that's helpful data.

Okay, very good. Any other questions on this information? Okay, I'm not seeing any, so we can probably move on. So here's just a couple of items that we wanted to sort of call out from the final report. And then, of course, the ODA. So a couple of areas here in Rec 17.2, the recommendation was to try to expand the financial support scope, so how much we offer. So it sort of takes that pro bono slide that we just looked at the next level.

However, the Board had noted in some of its comments on the draft final report, which included the similar recommendation that that could get tricky. Expanding financial support to cover fees that ICANN org is not responsible for may not be feasible or appropriate. However, as we talked through that in the OTA, we did say that it may be possible to look at perhaps a reduction of

other fees. And the key fees here would be the annual fee, because ICANN Org doesn't charge that many fees to registry operators, there's really sort of the annual fee, but they have to pay the fixed fee, and then the variable fee based on volume once they exceed—there's a formula in Article 6. So that might be the place that we could sort of follow the intent, or spirit of that recommendation. So that might be something we could work out in implementation.

And then in the second bullet, just wanted to note here that there was a suggestion to have a sort of a dedicated IRT. But we actually suggest to make that more of a subcommittee of the IRT so that it's all tied together. We didn't want to create silos in which ASP might be working—people focusing on IRT for ASP being separate from the rest of the group, because this is a very complicated, complex program. So it makes sense to sort of look at that holistically going forward.

We also noted that several of the implementation guidance and recs suggested that we do some research. So we have been looking at that and trying to determine what we could do internally versus externally. So there certainly may be other ways that we can come up with to expand the program through that research, because this is an area where other parties in the world are definitely involved in this sort of approach. So we probably can learn from some of the best practices that are out there.

For example, the reason we came up with the suggestion for looking at reduction of other fees is because other philanthropic sort of capacity development suggests that it's not just enough to sort of give folks a one-time waiver or reduction in fees, but that it

sort of takes some time to get through that. So perhaps providing a few-year reduction might sort of smooth the way for those folks to make it through to viability, that kind of thing.

Obviously, this GGP was not completed before we released the ODA. So we did not incorporate any of these discussions. So we do look forward to receiving the outputs from this group. So they're obviously not in the ODA, just that makes sort of logical sense. But just to make it clear, we weren't ignoring anything. We did note that the GGP was formed in there, and then sort of wanted to make sure we engage with you folks on this. I see a hand. Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks. I wanted to comment this part because I saw the slides a while ago and I think the presentation, the webinar to the GNSO Council, so what really clarification. So understand the point you are making here, that because the timing—so you are trying to deliver the ODA. And because the timing, we don't have yet an input from the GGP, but I want to be sure and kind of not going to say commitment that whatever we will end up, GGP, how the GDS will take that into account will be the ODA updated to take into consideration the deliverable from GGP or not? I find it problem, maybe it's more phrasing issue. But when I read it, it kind of raised an alarm for me, as from the GNSO standpoint, in terms of when we do a policy and then how the implementation is done. When I see like this, I have a lot of concern. So just more clarification on how the input—or I mean, the outcome or output from GGP will be taken into consideration and reflected in the ODA. Will the ODA be updated later on or not?

AARON HICKMAN: No, there's no plan to update the ODA. The ODA was a deliverable to the Board. If the Board were to so direct us to update that, then certainly we would. But I think the key thing that folks have been sort of told that when they've asked that question is the Board is just looking at the ODA now, and if there's concerns from the community, that they be sure to inform the Board of what they have, and I think there's been some letters being drafted or sent along the way. Any output of the GGP, I assume—I'm not sure, I'm not the policy person, but I assume would go in front of the Board. Julie, can you maybe speak to that?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks for the question, Rafik. So, the GGP, that process is actually such that the working group will produce a draft recommendations report that will go out for public comment, then those comments will be considered and then folded into or addressed in the final recommendations report, which will go to the GNSO Council.

And then the Council, the idea that the recommendations would use to inform and guide the implementation review team for the SubPro PDP with respect to specifically applicant support. So there's no plan, as Aaron points out, for the ODA to be updated based on his output. But this output does indeed inform the steps that the implementation review team will take with respect to applicant support. And it will be then funneled to that group via the Council. The Council has the opportunity of course to review the

recommendations and can indicate whether it has any concerns about those recommendations or if the GGP has to revisit them or if there's any changes to scope. But ultimately, the intent is for the recommendations to help inform the implementation of the applicant portion of the implementation review of the PDP. But I see your hand is back up. Please go ahead, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks for the explanation. Just missing here, I'm not sure about the GNSO position on this matter. So maybe one request. I know I cannot ask directly, but something maybe to consider, if possible, that our GNSO Council liaison can bring this back to the GNSO Council and asking for clarification, what the Council is thinking.

I don't want really to fall into all this procedural part of the GNSO. Just want more clarification. And if the ODA can also make it clear, because I think all those—what is considered [a source,] that's fine, of course, but I guess the caveat that it's missing the GGP that was initiated by GNSO Council to respond to several equations. So if it's missing from this, it can I think be a problem for the Board to consider. But I would stop here, just I want to see if it's possible to seek clarification from GNSO Council, and just to be sure about procedure. I cannot as individual ask directly our liaison [to the Council to do that,] but that should be coming from the working group. So thanks.

MIKE SILBER: I think that's a reasonable request, subject to any pushback from Org. I think it's a reasonable request to come back with clarification. At the same time, I think it's a little dangerous to start talking about missing pieces and anything needing to be redone. Because [inaudible] don't think that it in any way invalidates the ODA or in any way negates the current ODA. I think what we're trying to do is enhance and improve and provide additional guidance and metrics. But I think we just need to be very careful in our communications, whether it's with GNSO Council or within our own communities that we don't try and create the impression that there's a missing piece somehow, and just see if we can be careful about that language.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you for that, Mike. And I see Paul had his hand up.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. This is actually in the GGP process itself. So I don't think it's a novel question to take that back to Council. So section nine on page five of the GGP document makes it pretty clear that the only thing that the Council needs to do—hopefully before but it's at least after—a Council vote adopting recommendations from the GGP working group is to send a recommendations report to the Board. It's not for the Board to vote on, it's just the report.

So the GGP process is not a PDP. This is actually the process by which the Council gives feedback on processes that have already been through the PDP process and are in the business of being implemented. So I mean, I'm happy to tell Council that people

were asking about Section nine of the document, but this is already done. So maybe I could recommend everybody taking a look at Section nine of the GGP manual. And if we still have questions about it, talk about it on our next call. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Paul. That's very helpful clarification. I'll take the action item from staff to go ahead and send around section nine of the GGP for additional clarity and we can have further discussion on the next call. Thanks so much. Aaron, back to you.

MIKE SILBER: Well could I ask, instead of waiting for the next call, maybe if we can try and get this done on the list. Because I think the list is the perfect place for procedural debates and discussions. So if we can try and get it done on the list before the next call, that would be ideal. Because [inaudible] so maybe we need to refine the request in the light of Section nine. And hopefully we can get that done before the next call.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you for that, Mike, and staff will take the action after this call to include that in the notes and send around that section, ask people to provide comments. And also, Rafik, if you could include further details on the request that you're suggesting, and I see Steve Chan's hand is up.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Julie. This is Steve from staff. And just real quickly, there is also an anchor for the GGP in the ICANN bylaws. So if you go to that section, I don't remember exactly what it is, Annex A-2, one of the steps involved there is after the submission of the Board report that Paul just talked about, there's also a Board approval process. So the process around GGPs is pretty equivalent to a PDP actually. So if there's further clarifications that we need to provide, of course, we're willing to do that. But I guess just to reinforce that there are procedural steps around GGP that are more or less equivalent to a PDP. So Council approval is required. Board recommendations report is required from the Council to the Board. And then also Board approval is needed too, in which case, if they are approved by the Board, then the most logical outcome there is that they would direct ICANN Org to implement the recommendations of the GGP. Thanks.

AARON HICKMAN: Thanks, Steve. Very helpful. Over to Aaron. Paul, I missed your hand. Please go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY: So I guess I stand corrected. And I guess it further supports Rafik's question about this, because I think something as important as a Board approval process probably should be spelled out in the document. And maybe it is, I just didn't see it. But I don't see it in Section nine or any of the sections around it. So I think maybe to take away isn't the question that Rafik asked, because the answer to that appears to be yes, there is a Board approval process that was in the bylaws. It's not in the documents. Didn't

mean to mislead anybody. But I think maybe the thing to send back to Council is that it looks like section nine of our operating document's incomplete because it's left out the ultimate step. So maybe that's the thing I should be taking you back to Council. And if somebody can help me remember that, that will be fabulous. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Paul. Just looking for any of their hands. Seeing none at this point. Aaron, over to you.

AARON HICKMAN: Thanks, Julie. If we could go to the next slide. The next slide is simply we're just talking about some elements that are very specific to our proposal in the ODA. The key thing here is that we're suggesting that the applicant support program actually have a separate application submission period. And it's not for the full gTLD application, but merely the aspects of the evaluation. And as we did in 2012, it was sort of based on some financial, both capability and financial need, which is an interesting confluence there. And then also that folks are working in the public interest. We think by opening it up earlier, it would allow folks more time to develop their application when they do get approved, because the intent would be that by opening up 18 months, we'd be able to at least let them know six months prior to the main application window opening. So they get more time to develop their applications, work with pro bono providers or folks that they're going to need to pay.

Along with this timeline, WE expect the RSP pre-evaluation program to run. So that also wasn't intending to come out with the final list about six months prior to the application submission period for the gTLD. So sort of matches up that ASPs would get approved and they know they need to work with RSPs and so forth kind of at the same time.

Additionally, if applicants don't receive support, they may be able to look for additional funding from their providers or foundations or what have you. It also would give the organization some time to judge how many applicants are requesting support, and if needed, seek additional funds to support them going forwards. There obviously would be an amount set aside by the Board, if we follow 2012, with some amount saying this is the amount we're really not going to take in. So that would be set. And then if we get demand that exceeds that amount, then obviously the Board could look at that and determine what to do.

And then we just noted there at the bottom that of course, even a discounted application fee could still be quite a bit of money for an applicant. So to the extent we can offer those pro bono services, that should really help. Any questions on this slide?

Okay, not seeing any. Julie, can I get the next one then please? Okay, so just some highlights, I already talked a little bit about the first bullet, the recommendation was for a dedicated implementation review team, but we think there should be a tighter link between the main IRT and any sort of subcommittee that might work on some of the specific aspects just to make sure that the complexity of the program is understood by everyone so we don't have any sort of misses of one side expecting to deliver

something and there's a gap that gets created or something like that.

Additionally, while we would intend, as per the recommendations, to publish the funding amount available, as I just mentioned, by starting this program a little bit early, we would have the ability to seek additional funding, should we get more demand. Applicant support, we thought we would do it in percentage volume. So once the final fee is set, allow a discount across all the fees that we offer. So you may not know this, but when an applicant has already applied and then needs to, for example, change something, whether it's updated financials or different technical providers or something, they have to submit a technical change request, which also has fees associated with that. Those also could be subject to discount using that percentage method.

And then the last bullet there is just that struggling regions is a difficult definition. And there's been other phrases used for applicant support. And that's really hard to define. So we do suggest that we really look at individual entities and their own specific financial need and plans versus specific geographic location. That is to say, we don't suggest limiting it, but rather focusing on the specific applicant and what they're trying to do.

And I think that sort of covers this slide as well. So we can move on if there aren't any questions. Okay, not seeing any, I will continue. And then here is just some considerations about implementation. So just to be clear, there are a whole pile of dependencies and prerequisites noted in the ODA, which actually—this is one of them, the GGP, we'd want to be able to incorporate the outputs of this into that. So this, as we've noted,

planned is a key dependency to begin the next round. So this would actually be sort of the first point at which we're processing any elements for the next round, along with the RSP pre-evaluation. So we obviously would incorporate that in that sub-bullet, try to incorporate these outputs from this group.

All those elements that this group and all the other recommendations provide need to be clearly described in the AGB and the ASP handbook. The handbook, I don't know if we've discussed that earlier, but there was a separate sort of handbook for applicants who were involved in applicant support. So we would carry that through sort of—split that out and have that duplicated there for ease of consumption.

And then, just to note that we realize that of course, the communication was not the greatest in the 2012 round, a lot of it was a lack of time in some cases. So we realize that we need to effectively communicate the aspects of the program, the timing, even what it means to be a registry operator, that kind of thing to build global awareness and allow people to figure out how they might be able to extend their public interest commitments into this sort of model. So again, I'll pause there, see if there's any questions on any of these elements.

Okay, seeing none, we have other slides in the deck, if people have specific questions about timelines and so forth. The last thing I just want to note, as I mentioned earlier, that we have looked at research, as noted in the implementation guidance and outputs. So we have been looking to see what we can do internally and also to figure out what kind of parties we would ask for assistance in determining other ways to assess applicant

eligibility. So looking at other programs that are out there that have similar sort of goals and objectives will be helpful to inform implementation. So we hope to have some more detail on that. And that might be something we could share in the future going forward. So there's obviously more to come, the work is just beginning in this area. So we're happy to share as we move along the way.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, that would be greatly appreciated.

AARON HICKMAN: Oh, and I see Gabriela's question. Right, we sort of move away from a specific region as a limiter, and really look at applicants who can show that they have a public interest mission, and they would implement that through a TLD in some way and that can't necessarily do it on their own. So they have both the ability to have financial need there and then also have a demonstrative approach to—we can use this to be self-sustaining and move forward. And that's all part of the final report sort of thing.

MIKE SILBER: Could I ask Julie, if you wouldn't mind, just sharing—because judging from some of the questions we've had, I'm not sure if everybody's read the final report, maybe just post a link to that as well, whether it's in the chat or on the list.

AARON HICKMAN: Julie says, "Will do that," Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you.

AARON HICKMAN: Okay, well, I think that wraps up my section. We'll be here to answer any other questions that might come up along the way. Hopefully, this was helpful. And certainly if there's other things this group would like to be briefed on, we're happy to do that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Aaron, very much for your presentation, that's extremely helpful. I'm going to go ahead and stop sharing that document now. We'll send the slides along with the notes. So you will have them. And if you do think of any other questions, you can always send them to the list as well. And we're always happy to send them on to Aaron and his colleagues. Thanks again, Aaron, for joining, and for the great presentation. Really appreciate it.

AARON HICKMAN: Thanks for having me.

AARON HICKMAN: So Mike, back to that agenda, and the next item is to continue the discussion on task three. And in particular, the Google Doc that we sent around for people to enter comments into, and several of you did. And I'll note that Ros also put in the chat a link to a

document she had sent that she had produced separately, and we can discuss that as well. And I'll go ahead and pull that up when we do.

What I might suggest here is that we go ahead and go to the Google Doc and start up some discussion on the comments that we've received from people so far, and we can continue that discussion at the next meeting. So if you give me just a moment, I'll go ahead and pull up the Google doc.

All right, I think everyone can see that, as far as I can tell. And what I'd like to suggest is that we can go through the comments on each of the cells here and see if people have any questions about them, and see if those who make comments want to add anything to them. If that would be okay with you, Mike, as a way to proceed.

MIKE SILBER: Yes, please, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: So I'm going to start with the first of the fields here. And let me just bring up the first of the comments. I hope you can see them here. So the first of the comments is from Maureen Hilyard. Thank you, Maureen. So under awareness and education and the first metric number of outreach events and follow-up communications with potential applicants, Maureen asked what kind of events would be considered as appropriate for outreach about the new gTLD program? Who would organize them? How would be they'd be funded? Who would speak with authority about them at such

events? How would know we were talking to those who needed to be targeted? What are the criteria for whom we're targeting? So those are some additional sub bullets, I guess. Anything you want to add to that, Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, I guess it's sort of like—and apologies as to sort of like my rambling in those questions. It was the sorts of things that from our perspective, like, for example, when we have outreach, we have different types of outreach within At-Large, and I understand the purpose of this particular outreach, but is it just specifically for the specific—is there anything that our community can actually become more aware of, or what sort of information they might be able to have so that when they actually run in their community at a very low level within communities about how they might be able to convey the appropriate information that is I mean, at the level that who may not be able to get to one of the formal presentations that are actually—this is the—when we're looking at your type of outreach event and what might be available in smaller communities that our ALSes and individual members get to.

So it was a sort of like saying what is being proposed or what could we propose from the GGP perspective and how might we be able to transfer some of that information across down into another level of communication.

JULIE HEDLUND: Does anybody have any question for Maureen? That was a helpful clarification. Tom, please go ahead.

TOM BARRETT: I think it's a great question, Maureen. And yeah, my gut tells me that most of the applicants looking for financial support will probably be nonprofit in nature. And certainly, I don't think we want to schedule any outreach events where we are the purpose of the outreach event, it'd be very difficult to get enough people to attend. So I suggest we identify existing events that perhaps nonprofits attend on a regular basis throughout the world and we attend those events. So basically, they do the job of getting people to attend their event. And we just need to communicate to them the options here.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Tom. Thanks, Maureen. All right, going now to that same column, moving on to Rafik's comments. I think that should be compared against any events described as official outreach by ICANN Org. There might be events organized separately, but we shouldn't aggregate them with the rest as we need to evaluate the success of program as was designed by ICANN. Any questions for Rafik or anything you want to add, Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: So just want to make the point here. If we want to measure for the outreach event, if you want to measure all, is maybe to split, if needed, into separate those organized or planned by ICANN and those maybe the community itself or other entities, because just we want kind of the way to get some metric that will be helpful for

us to measure and see the impact, and so on. So that's why I thought maybe just to make that clear.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Rafik. Maureen, I see your hand is up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just in response to that. I can quite appreciate that there will be official outreach, of course. But I think that one of the things about the At-Large community is that it's actually raising awareness—and it comes in later on—is that we actually are really keen that the wider community is really aware of what ICANN is doing, and why it's doing it, and to get those messages out to other non-official, very community-based meetings and things like that, so that there is greater awareness of what ICANN is doing and why, but also that there is sort of the networks that people are in within that At-Large community lend themselves towards some of those not for profits. If they're informed, they can actually support—and again, getting back to that capacity building and awareness raising that we are trying to build within the within our community.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks. Very helpful. Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Sorry, Julie and Maureen, I'm not sure to understand really the point here, but just maybe to give background why I shared the comment, is we know that the program in the first round failed,

and people argued that may because there was no outreach. So if you want, in the second iteration, to be sure and to have kind of some metric that will help us to evaluate in an objective way. I think that's why I suggested [inaudible].

The community can help. We can use all the network, we can also ourselves as many individual try to our earnest. But honestly, I want to see what ICANN Org that is managing this program is doing, what is planning, and how much effort was done. And that's why we have the metric. And in terms of implementation, I don't see any issues. We can measure [both.] Not sure why we are arguing here. So maybe I'm missing the point, but I just want to share the background.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Rafik. That's very helpful. Maureen, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I guess it's sort of one of the things that I raise, is that—and I don't know if anyone—the document that after the CPWG meeting that we had within At-Large, but one of the greatest sort discussion points was, how do we measure success? And when we're talking about successes, definitely the formal outreach that you're proposing from ICANN Org, and there's a level of measurement of success at that level, but within our community itself too, we're actually also looking at evaluating success from the viewpoint of our communities as well. So I hope that that just clarifies that a little bit more. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Maureen. That was a good discussion. Thank you so much for your comments. Let me just move on to the next cell. And this is about the level of awareness about the new gTLD program applicants support program. And we have comments from Maureen and from Rafik also, and with the comments from Maureen, “This metric would be associated with metric number seven, awareness needs would depend on prior knowledge and experience, would have to give their own source of information, those who participated in last round would want to know what has changed and will assess if the change is positive or negative in relation to their previous experience.” And I'll just go ahead and I'll read Rafik's comment and then we can have a little discussion. We've got about five minutes left here. Rafik says, “What will be the proxy to measure such element? Is it based on some survey inquiry of prospective applicants?”

RAFIK DAMMAK: So if I can clarify here, the problem here is the level of awareness, something I'm not sure how we can measure. So in terms of metric design, we need, I guess—what will be kind of the proxy here, how we will evaluate that. So that's why I meant—so is it kind of—we will use some survey or something to identify that? So that's why I wanted to if we can clarify more about this one. Probably we need to elaborate.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Rafik. That's a helpful clarification. Ros, please.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thanks very much. I was just going to add my comment, apologies all. I submitted my comments in a separate spreadsheet, because I thought we were supposed to do that instead of commenting on the big one. So my apologies for that.

But basically, I just thought we should be quite careful as to scoping this metric in terms of how we're gauging awareness and really come up with concrete ideas for measurement techniques in this regard. For example, reach of communications is only one part of the equation of awareness. We should also consider where that reach is going towards in terms of considering diversity of groups being targeted or attending different awareness events and considering diversity of groups in terms of social characteristics and stakeholder group characteristics.

So I'll leave that there for now that just think we need to be really precise about how we're defining awareness in that context, and especially to distinguish it from other metrics. For example, outreach events is a good metric noted above, and we just had a good fruitful discussion on that. But I would see that as one element of awareness. So I think, yeah, being precise about that, and what different pieces that could encompass would be useful. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Ros. And I have to say apologies from staff for not also trying to bring your comments in at the same time as we were discussing the others. With your permission, I'll go ahead and

combine your comments into the main sheet. And that way, we can speak to them at the same time. You're very welcome. I'm seeing that we have about three minutes left here.

MIKE SILBER:

With three minutes left, can I really admonish working group members to please submit comments? It's quite difficult if we don't have your comments and then we don't have active engagement on the calls around the comments submitted by others. We really need to make progress on this. So I know Julie is not enjoying being a bit of a teacher sending out homework reminders. But we really need to close off on these items as quickly as possible. So please, can I ask everybody to actually submit comments to make sure that we're capturing the right elements here?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. And yes, that will be very helpful, that we can get more comments into this sheet. And if it's easier for you to send your comments in a separate sheet, you can do that too, and staff will take the action to integrate them all into one sheet. And then we can proceed with this discussion at the next call.

The next call will be in two weeks, it will be on the 6th of February at the alternating time of 20:00 UTC. We do have ICANN off site meetings that week, some staff may not be able to attend on that Monday the 6th, but I will be there and our secretariat support staff will be there. So we'll go ahead with the call.

MIKE SILBER: If it's not an imposition on you, that would be fantastic.

JULIE HEDLUND: It's not at all. And we do want to stay to our schedule, so definitely easier to continue.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you. That's appreciated.

TERRI AGNEW: And Julie, I'm not sure if you were wrapping up the call and we lost your audio or if that was it, but if so, we are not hearing you. So I'll go ahead and just close up the meeting.

MIKE SILBER: I think we can just close off the meeting. Thank you all.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, Mike. I'll go ahead and stop recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Stay well, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]