
ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 04 December 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/bIHPE>

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

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Guidance Process Initiation for Applicant Support Call on Monday, 4 December 2023. For today's call, we received apologies from Satish Babu.

Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need any assistance updating your Statements of Interest, please email the GNSO secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space recordings will be posted publicly shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to say your name before speaking for the recording. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior.

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

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

MIKE SILBER: Thank you very much, Devan. And thank you, everybody, for joining. Your attendance and all of your hard work and participation is greatly appreciated.

We are in the final stretch. Julie circulated a document. I have not seen any comments. Granted, I haven't looked at it in the last two days. Perfect. Thank you for the catch on the missing section. It's greatly appreciated by all of us, and Julie in particular. So thank you for that.

But I think the purpose of this call is just to go through and see if there is anything that we need to discuss, anything that is missing, any comments. Obviously, we have until the end of the week—am I correct, Julie—for any written comments?

JULIE HEDLUND: [inaudible]. Until Thursday.

MIKE SILBER: But if we can short circuit [inaudible] in this call, let's try and do that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: [inaudible], Julie. I was talking over you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Sorry. And I now was talking over you. Sorry about that. Would you like me to begin?

MIKE SILBER: Yes, please. But is my timing correct? Is it Friday—

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, it is, indeed. It's Thursday, just—

MIKE SILBER: Thursday, then? Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah.

MIKE SILBER: So let's go through, Julie. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Mike. And again, this is Julie from staff. And thank you all for joining. And thanks again, Rafik, for quickly noticing the errors in the report and helping us to get them fixed, I think before anybody else had a chance to look at it. So that was very useful.

So what I thought we would do here is first go through Section 3, which is the working group Final Guidance Recommendations. Obviously, you've had a chance to read this, so I'm just going to pause as we go through it and see if anybody has any comments, particularly on the recommendations where there were changes. That's Recommendation 1 and 5. And then we'll go to Annex C, and that is the Consensus Designations.

Leon, though, I see you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Thanks, Julie. Is it too early to start with a comment on Guidance Recommendation 1?

JULIE HEDLUND: No, but I'd just like to cover Section 3.1 just to let everyone know what's in that section.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Yes, sorry.

JULIE HEDLUND: And then we'll go to the recommendations themselves. So if you will just wait a moment, I won't take long.

LEON GRUNDMANN: No problem.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Leon. All right. So one of the areas that's very important to include in the Final Report is the Methodology for the Review and Analysis of Public Comments. That's important because this is a key part of the process. It's very important for the working group to show how they addressed the comments and to explain exactly what their process was for doing so. So that's what the section is.

And it just talks about the methodology; that the report went out for public comment; that there was a staff summary; and that the working group went through the comments. And the comments are recorded in the Public Comment Review Tool, which is on the Wiki and will be there for anybody who reads this report to be able to see as well.

And then the working group deliberated on the public comments and may changes, or not, as appropriate. In this case, changes were made to Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 5. And then there was a Preamble added for Recommendations 7, 8, and 9. So there's a little bit more detail here in this third paragraph on how the working group conducted its work.

There was a first review followed by a second review that focused only where there were some substantive changes. And the results of the reviews were captured in the deliberations and the rationale. So that's what the section is.

Does anybody have any comments on this section? Leon, is this your hand for Recommendation 1?

LEON GRUNDMANN: Yes, it is.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Okay, then. And then the next second is just the reminder of the organization of the Guidance Recommendations. They're organized by task, and then also by Applicant Support Program life-cycle elements. And then there's a short paragraph that just reiterates the interdependencies of all of the recommendations, not just 7 through 9, but all the recommendations as part of the Process Manual as well. So that's noted there.

And then we get into the recommendation and, as Rafik correctly pointed out, the new text.

And I see Terry Hackshaw is joining. I'm sorry. Tracy Hackshaw is joining.

The new text that the working group agreed to is part of the Implementation Guidance, and so the original Implementation Guidance was: "Target potential applicants from the not-for-profit sector, social enterprises, and/or community organizations in under-served and developing regions and countries."

The new text agreed to by working group members was a compromise text, a combination of the Com Laude and the GAC comments that: "This should not exclude any entities from outreach efforts, such as private sector entities from under-served and developing regions and countries, recognizing the goal is to get as many qualifying applicants as possible."

And then there's the rationale. So in each section [it's] organized, as we saw last week, with the rationale for the Guidance Recommendation. And one thing we did add—and just to point this

out to you, it's not new information, but we pulled the text from the Initial Report just so that people didn't have to go back to the rationale of the Initial Report, but to include it here for reference because it's still applicable.

And then noting: "Following the Public Comment Review, the working group agreed to compromise language, combining suggestions from Com Laude and GAC to specifically not include private sector entities as a bounce to maintain the integrity of the original Guidance Recommendation while providing further clarity."

And then—

MIKE SILBER: Sorry, Julie, to [inaudible].

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. Please go ahead.

MIKE SILBER: Lawrence has asked the question in the chat whether there's a redline on the changes made. I'm not aware of a redline, but maybe you just want to comment.

JULIE HEDLUND: No, we didn't produce a redline. And we did review this text last week, and the only change from last week that you would note is this section here, which is text that's pulled directly from the Initial Report. So this would be the only new text that you would not have

seen last week. And we didn't redline it, but I hope it's sufficiently clear.

We did this because as we went through some of the other sections, really, the recommendations other than 1 and 5 had no changes. And so it was important to include the original rationale because if we hadn't, there would be no rationale. Essentially, there were no changes made.

MIKE SILBER:

Yep. Julie, I'm comfortable with this. It was just a question that was asked. My preference when I read the final version is to read a clean and not read a redline because, reading a redline, your eyes instinctively go to the changes, and you don't actually read it holistically. So I'm hoping people have actually read it holistically and won't just go looking for a redline to see what's changed. So I'm totally comfortable with this, but the question was asked and now answered.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you for pointing that out, Mike. And to Rosalind's question, yes. Roz, we did pull—the changes that you made and had sent in before last week's call are all in here. I did check again to make sure they were not missing. But thank you for asking, and thank you for doing that. I really appreciate it.

And just to reiterate, in each case for each Guidance Recommendation, we've included a paragraph. That's the first paragraph in the rationale that reiterates what was in the Initial

Report because in some cases, that's still the rationale, and particularly where there have been no new changes.

And Maureen says, "I felt that any changes were clearly [detailed] in Julie's notes, so I didn't need a redline version." Thank you, Maureen.

So, Leon, you've been patient. You've had your hand up. Please go ahead.

LEON GRUNDMANN:

Thanks, Julie. And thanks for the changes so far. Quite happy with the way Guidance Recommendation 1 stands. One of the only points now, maybe it's a minor question. Maybe it's a major question for the group. I don't know. But at the moment, we talk about, at one point, developing countries in, I think it's the Implementation Guidance part for that recommendation. Let's see exactly. "From under-served and developing regions and countries. "

And then the developing regions and, especially, developing countries comes up again one or two other times in the report as well. Org was simply wondering if the term "developing economies" could be used because this is the general term of reference, which is usually used rather than "country." I don't know if this would be a feasible change for working group members or if there are any concerns with changing from "countries" to "economies" because that will be the more generally used in this case.

MIKE SILBER: Leon, I claim no expertise, but as I recall correctly, this was a recommendation from the GAC, and they did point us to some sources. So I don't know if we deviated from that. So I'm hoping that, Roz, you can maybe just keep us on the straight and narrow there.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah. Thanks, Mike.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Sorry to just come in, but as my name was mentioned in the GAC comment, thanks for inviting me to contribute. Yeah, it's important to keep "under-served," and that has been a definition and scope that the GAC has been referring to. I think we could be open to, though—as long as "under-served" is kept—"developing economies" maybe as a [compromise].

I know Gabriel, who's not here, was working on that. So I don't want to agree to a massive change here. So would it be possible to do "under-served and developing regions and economies"? Could that—

MIKE SILBER: Can I make a suggestion?

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah.

MIKE SILBER: Let's just park this. I don't think we need to [inaudible].

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah.

MIKE SILBER: It's a suggestion. If the GAC has a particular view, I'll go back to the notes as well, but I'm quite sure that we agreed "developing regions and countries." I'm hesitant to change that without some feedback. So, Roz, if I can ask you just to nudge and see if there's any feedback on that from the GAC. I have no view one way or the other, and I think your suggestion to keep it as close to the agreed language as possible makes sense. But let's see what other comments we get by Thursday, and then we can make a call on that.

And, yeah, Leon's just confirmed. It's not to remove "regions," and it's just to change "countries" to "economies."

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. This is Julie from staff. I'd just say we're hesitant to make a change to something like the Implementation Guidance at this late date. There was quite a bit of discussion around that entire phrase, not just "under-served and developing," but "regions and countries" as well. So it would be very hesitant to change it at this late stage. If it's generally understood and if the terms are

somewhat interchangeable, then I think it would be better if we could stick with what was discussed and agreed, particularly as it would be a change to the actual recommendation itself.

And Leon is saying, "Another small question. This debate about the term 'under-served' was well-explained in the rationale in the initial version."

So, Leon, it wasn't in the rationale. It was in the deliberations. So we're not repeating everything that was in the deliberations that was in the Initial Report because that's a standalone report. Although we did pull out the rationale from the Initial Report because in some cases, that still applies in cases where there have been no changes to the recommendation.

Yes, it does still stand in the record in the deliberations and the Initial Report. What we could do, if it's helpful, we could put a footnote there was a footnote. There was a footnote in the Initial Report that was to a GAC publication, and we could pull that into this report. It would be simple enough to do.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I think that would be helpful, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'll go ahead and do that. We'll be sending some notes after this call and reflecting changes, and we can call that out. Since there's some time until Thursday that people will still have to review the report, we could ask if there's any objections. Thank you.

Anything else on Guidance Recommendation 1 from anyone?

MIKE SILBER: I'm not seeing hands or comments. I think we can move on.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. All right. And then I'm capturing an action item with respect to adding a footnote.

Recommendation 2. There were no changes to the Guidance Recommendation language, and so the report—sorry—the rationale here reflects what was agreed to in the Initial Report.

Yes. I noted, Maureen, the addition of clarity on "under-served" in the deliberations." Yes, we'll pull that out for a footnote. I'm trying to show the text here a little bit better. All right.

So we note in the rationale that the working group agreed after reviewing and analyzing the public comments to maintain the Guidance Recommendation. So there were no changes. And then we go back to what was stated in the Initial Report. And then we go through the summary of The Public Comment Review to talk about the NCUC comment and the request to respond to 17.2 as being out of scope. We talked about the NCSG comment. We talk about the GAC comments. And we go through the ICANN Org explanation for the survey of pro bono service providers, and then to the question about matchmaking and vetting of the service providers and the concerns about doing so.

And that this last paragraph is significant because it noted that after extensive discussion, there was no agreement from working group members to amend the Guidance Recommendation language based on the GAC comments.

And let me just check something. We did agree to add to the rationale that: "Following the Public Comment Review, the working group agreed that ICANN Org should not take on a matchmaker or facilitator role between pro bono providers and applicants," but it can "assist by providing basic information such as the types of services [set up] or that are provided."

And Leon says, "I think this part is quite clear. The onus is not on ICANN Org to manage this process, but to cultivate and enable it."

"When there is a mention of a survey, this refers to the survey of pro bono providers," Maureen asks, "how will they identify gaps?" Between the services provided and those that are needed? Is that [inaudible]?

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. I'm not understanding what gaps and who needs to identify what.

JULIE HEDLUND: Maureen, did you want to speak to that?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. It was just a mention about the fact that—oh, when I was reading it—if there were any significant gaps identified, that they

would help to identify opportunities for additional outreach if there were significant gaps in available capacity.

So what I wanted to know is, just, how would they identify those? What were the gaps that applicants consider gaps. And this is Org actually organizing the pro bono services. [It was] something that just came to mind when I was actually reading that and trying to think, well, how are we going to find out what services might be required, especially by new applicants?

MIKE SILBER:

Yeah. Maureen, I think we're now starting to get into an implementation detail which is beyond our scope now.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

I know, sure. It's an implementation [detail]. Yeah. And I guess I'm anticipating what some people might ask when I'm going through it because it was something I was putting into my notes that I'm going to be giving to the CPWG. Okay, I'll mention that that will be an implementation.

And no doubt, because I've got Justin Chew, who's working on the Small Team. So she'll no doubt tell me that they'll be working on that. I can pass that over to her. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks, Maureen. I don't know if ICANN Org has given any thought to what they might plan to do with respect to—

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. Julie, I think that's out of scope. I think we need to move on. We've noted the survey. The reference to the survey was a request, but the survey is not indicative of anything. And it doesn't really form part of our recommendations, so I think we need to move on.

JULIE HEDLUND: Good point. Thanks, Mike. Moving on. Recommendation 3. There are also no changes to Recommendation 3, although it was noted that after the Public Comment Review, the working group agreed that the phrase "necessary resources" was sufficiently broad as to include the notion of financial and human resources, and thus they agreed not to amend the Guidance Recommendations accordingly.

Maureen is noting, "Happy to pass this onto the Small Team, which Justine Chew is part of and can explain in her reports." Thank you, Maureen.

And again, as noted before previously, the rationale from the Initial Report is repeated here for reference.

[Here in] in the Public Comment Review, we start by talking about the GAC comments and necessary resources that was really the primary comment that needed to be addressed. And that the language was, as we noted, it was added to the rationale.

Anything on recommendation 3 before we go ahead?

MIKE SILBER: I'm not seeing any hands or comments.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Recommendation—

MIKE SILBER: Let's move on.

JULIE HEDLUND: Great, thanks. Thank you, Maureen. Yes, 3 is an important recommendation. Recommendation 4, again, also had no changes from the original that appeared in the Initial Report, so that rationale is repeated here.

And reviewing and analyzing the public comments, the working group agreed to maintain the Guidance Recommendations, so there were no changes. There was just, in the Public Comment Review, there was the note about the GAC comments with respect to "timely." And the working group agreed that no changes were needed.

Maureen, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. It says here that the applicants need to be notified well in advance. Should we mention somewhere that we might support the—someone mentioned 18 months or some kind of an indication? Or is that out of our scope?

It's just that "timely" is really our word because we understand how important it is that the applicants are informed about all the things that are required, all the information they need to know before they actually apply for the Applicant Support Program, and then wait for

the evaluation thing, and then apply for the—make their own application for a domain when the window opens. So, "timely." Does that need some kind of clarification?

MIKE SILBER: Maureen, it does, but not from this working group.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. I thought not. I thought you were going to say that, Mike.

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, and further to that, Mike, we did discuss what was meant by "timely" and whether or not a number should be attached, a specific number should be given in the deliberations for the Initial Report, if I'm remembering correctly. And we decided to settle on "timely" as opposed to a specific number.

MIKE SILBER: Your recall aligns with mine as well, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: And I think, also, there was a concern about being prescriptive and not getting into implementation details.

And Leon is saying, "Concerning how to see the demand versus supply of pro bono services, ICANN sent out a survey in 2012 to providers and 2012 seekers to see how people felt about the pro

bono supply/demand in the last round. This might partly answer your question, Maureen." Thanks, Leon.

So moving along to Guidance Recommendation 5. This is one where there was a change under Indicators of Success. It was added: "This should be considered a floor, not a ceiling, and ICANN should strive to exceed this minimum."

And then, again, we iterate what was in the Initial Report for context. And then we talk about the rationale following the Public Comment Review and adding the new language. And also to add to this rationale that "adequate resources should be made available if the number of qualified applicants exceed or greatly exceeds indicators of success, since the indicator of success should be seen as a floor, not a ceiling. The working group agreed that this change captures the intent that ICANN should strive to exceed the minimum number while addressing the concern. The stretch goal could result in failure or lack of adequate resources."

Yes, Roz, if you want to go through your edits as we go into the summary text in 5. Do we know if—

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Where should I come in? Now, Julie, or, sorry—

JULIE HEDLUND: Go ahead. Yeah.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: —as we go through the paragraph? How would you like me to come in?

JULIE HEDLUND: I'd like to do it now.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Cool.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think I've tried to incorporate them based on what you sent through prior to the last, well, around the time of the last meeting. It was maybe just before or just after.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Great, yeah. Thanks, Julie. Oh, I see you've already incorporated some. Maybe I'm looking at the wrong—

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, they should be in here.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah. So, yeah, apologies. Maybe let me just take a minute and double-check because it looks like, basically, to the group, they were minor textual edits mainly. So let me just do a quick cross-check and make sure I'm looking at the right one. But I can already see, I think, the first two were included. So, yeah. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. I did try to capture them. I thought I got them all, but if I've missed anything, please do let me know because I thought they were good changes. Great. Thanks for double-checking.

So just go back to the top. We did look at this last week, but just to remind everybody. We talked about the Com Laude comments and the metrics and then Org response. And then we talked about the GAC comments. And here there was quite a bit of discussion.

Thank you, Maureen, for noting that you're good with #5.

So we get into some detail with the GAC comments because there was quite a bit of discussion. And the original new language, which was somewhat pared back, as noted in this final paragraph.

And, Roz, let us know if there's anything missing in there. Probably—I don't know if [you had]—

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thanks. I've just got two more to go through, but so far I see all captured, so I think we'll be all good. But I'll be able to confirm in just a minute. Cool?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks very much. Appreciate it. Anybody have anything else they want to say [with regard] to 5?

MIKE SILBER: No. Maureen has expressed her support, so I think you've done a very good job, as well, in summarizing the discussion, and I think the discussion might be useful to anybody who's looking at the recommendations to get a broader context.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. With Guidance Recommendation 6, there's also one more where there were no changes from the original that was in the Initial Report.

And again, we've included the rationale from the Initial Report, and then the rationale after the Public Comment Review and that the working group agreed that the recommendation includes the concept that's supported applicants were awarded a gTLD in the next (not from this round) and that the recommendation is meant to be forward-looking.

And the working group agreed that the countdown for the Guidance Recommendation for a supported applicant to "still be in business"—

MIKE SILBER: Sorry, Julie, to interrupt you—

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, please go ahead.

MIKE SILBER: —but we have a question from Leon.

JULIE HEDLUND: Oh. Thank you, Leon. Go ahead.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Sorry for interrupting. I have a small question. I think you'll get to it a little bit further down. We have: "In its comment, ICANN Org suggests making the recommendation forward-looking, so using 'next round' in the recommendation, as in 'supported applicants that were awarded the gTLD in the next round.' The working group agreed to include this concept in the rationale."

I don't remember, but I assume we discussed it on one of the last calls. Is that right? Because I'm just wondering why we didn't put that just into the text of the recommendation. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah. Thanks, Leon. There was some discussion about whether or not to alter the recommendation, and the working group instead to include it in the rationale as opposed to altering the recommendation. In general, as you see with these recommendations, we've leaned towards not making any substantive changes to the recommendation themselves, if at all possible. So where there's been additional clarity that the working group [result] is needed, it's been placed in the rationale, as is the case here as well. Thank you, Leon.

And, Roz, let me go back up to make sure we have your edit. Which paragraph is that?

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: I think it was the last one. Sorry, I've exited out of it now, but it's literally just a typo. Maybe it's the second-to-last paragraph, I think. If you Ctrl+F, maybe. There was also a suggestion. There's just a second "was" where there shouldn't be. It's just a really minor typo. Sorry.

JULIE HEDLUND: Oh, I see. It's a repeated, okay. I'll find it.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Sorry to be a pedant.

JULIE HEDLUND: I won't take time now, but I'll find it. No worries.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah. Great, thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm surprised our wonderful spelling checking didn't catch that, but—

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Oh, there. I see it in that—if you go down, Julie. See in that paragraph—

JULIE HEDLUND: Where?

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: —"There was also a suggestion was ..." It should just be, "There was also a suggestion to ..."

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. Yes, I see it.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: I think probably it was just one of those Track Changes issues when I commented. But, yeah, thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, very good. Thank you. And I think I did use track changes to integrate your changes. And, yes, that's a [inaudible] way to introduce typos. All right, very good. Thank you.

And we answered Leon's question. And then there's the explanation about the countdown of three years, "starts from delegation." And then the periodic checks thereafter. And that was also included in the rationale. Yes, that is the rationale.

And, yes, that's pertaining to the ALAC comment, which is noted here. And then also noted, the NCSG comment.

Anything else on 6? On 7, 8, and 9—

MIKE SILBER: I'm not seeing any comments. I'm not seeing any heads.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. On 7, 8, and 9, there's the added preamble text about the interdependencies.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. I thought that was spot on, based on our discussions. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: And then also, another from ICANN Org was that: "Per Recommendation 17.12, the GGP is not suggesting ICANN Org only development funding plan for the Application Support Program if funding for supported applicants drops below a certain level. And I'll just ask Leon if that's reflected correctly.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Yes. I think the operative word there is "only." So funding for supported applicants dropping is not the only recommendation in this guidance report, which suggests for ICANN Org to develop a

funding plan. But there's also a solid recommendation for that in the SubPro Final Report. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Leon. So there are no changes to the Guidance Recommendations 7, 8, and 9. And we've grouped them together because they're interesting interdependencies was that it was helpful.

Yes. Maureen notes that these guidance recommendations are backed up by Recommendation 3. That is to have sufficient resources. Quite correct.

And for 7, we repeated what was in the Initial Report. And then after the Public Comment Review, we note that "the working group agreed that it's important to emphasize that it made the deliberate decision not to prioritize groups of applicants seeking support."

And in 8, after reiterating, from the Initial Report, the rationale, the working group emphasized that "in the case where funding should drop below a certain level, as in the recommendation, there could be a community consultation such as via the IRT."

"Small typo." Yes. I just fixed that, Leon. Thank you. I think we're talking about the same one. There, where the "[applicates] seeking support." Yes.

And then for Recommendation 9, after repeating what was in the Initial Report again, we just note that "the working group agreed to emphasize how important early notice is to applicants."

And then the Public Comment Review is a combination of 7, 8, and 9 because these ... Well, first, the summary of the discussions where the three are discussed together. Again, because [inaudible] [didn't] want them being interdependent. And then we pulled out the discussion where they existed for each recommendation, as there were some differences in the comments received.

Then we talk about the NCSG comments relating to prioritization, the budget and funding, GAC comments in Recommendation 8 on having "a transparent plan in consultation with the community," concerns about have a recommendation that includes a consultation; but adding that, instead, to the rationale.

And then with Recommendation 9, both the comments from the GAC and the comments from Gabriel Karsan.

That is all of the recommendations. Anything on 7, 8, and 9? Going back to the top.

MIKE SILBER:

Let's just give it a minute for people to digest, but I'm not seeing any at the moment, any hands or comments in the chat. And again, other than the introduction, this is largely language that was already agreed.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. Yes. As you note, the deliberations and the rationale both reflect text we pulled and summarized from both the notes as well as from the transcript. So there shouldn't be anything new here for anybody. We would be most concerned if there was

any gaps of anything that we should have covered but didn't. But we did try to be thorough while summarizing, as opposed to reflecting, verbatim, the discussion.

MIKE SILBER:

I think you've done a very good job. So, Julie, I'm not seeing any further hands. I'm not seeing any further comment other than Maureen supporting the work done and indicating that she's comfortable with these final recs. I'm comfortable with the recs as they stand.

We have until Thursday for people to make comment, so I really will encourage everybody if they can please go through the documents. Any further changes, typos. And we've had some very good typo spotting. So well done, everybody. But if anybody spots anything else or wants some clarification—obviously, typos, feel free to reach out directly to Julie. But if there's something that we need to deliberate, then obviously, if you can send it to the list.

And then, Leon, I see you have a question about the report.

LEON GRUNDMANN:

Thanks, Mike. Sorry for interrupting you there, but it's a general question about the status or, let's say, the meaning of this report. So just for clarity because it's my first GGP and—well, everybody's first GGP, the first time we're doing the process. The Initial Report stands on the record. It can be consulted for background and deliberations.

But just so I understand it correctly, the guidance and everything recommendation-related in this final report supersedes what is written in the Initial Report. Have I got that right?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks, Leon. That's correct. Okay, the Initial Report stands alone. So that will continue to be its own reference. And an important one, too, because we're not trying to repeat everything that's in that report, although we have [four]...

And the importance of showing context. We've included some texts on the rationale for certain recommendations, but on the whole, that is a separate report. But with respect to the recommendations themselves, this is a definitive report. This is where the final recommendations appear. These are the recommendations the Board will review and consider after—well, these are ...

Well, let's put this in order. These are the recommendations that the Council will review and consider and adopt, or not. And then assuming they're adopted, they'll go to the Board, and the Board will review and consider them and adopt, or not. And these are the recommendations for which we have Consensus Designations as required in the GGP Manual and then in the working group manual, which also applies. So, yes, this is the final version that is up for adoption. Thanks, Leon.

So we are also conducting a consensus call. And that's for the different groups to bring the Consensus Designations back to their group and indicate whether they support or not. So we do want the various representatives to respond back to the list whether or not

they support the Consensus Designations. We would like a positive response. We'll send that reminder again today. We have until Thursday.

And as noted here in Annex C, we recorded a suggested designation, or I should say a proposed designation of full consensus for each recommendation. What that means is that there is no disagreement with respect to the recommendations among the working group members. There is full agreement among the working group members. So far, in reviewing, and as you saw as we just reviewed the Guidance Recommendations, there was no indication of non-support for any aspect of those recommendations.

Is anybody aware of any concerns with designation full consensus? You can look in the working group guidelines for the definition of full consensus. Basically it means full agreement.

Maureen says, "I haven't heard anything from anyone." Thank you, Maureen. That's good. No news is good news.

MIKE SILBER: In this case, yes.

JULIE HEDLUND: So that's the designation proposed. We'll send a reminder out today and ask people to respond positively. Either they accept this designation or, if not, why?

MIKE SILBER: Excellent. Thank you, Julie. I think, then, that our work on this call is done. We are looking for any more typos. If there are any more comments that we have missed, please let us have them. Alternatively, as Julie has pointed out, please signal your confirmation that we have consensus because I would hate to claim consensus when there is something outstanding. So please bring it to our attention as early as possible. Otherwise, on Thursday, the plan is to call consensus.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. And just a reminder. The next steps. Staff will produce a motion for the Council to adopt. We'll send that to you, Mike, and to Paul just for a quick review. It will be a fairly standard motion. We would have Paul introduce it as the liaison to the GNSO Council, and the deadline for doing so would be Monday the 11th, which is the document and motion deadline.

We'll put this on the agenda for the Council meeting on the 21st, although it's possible any Council member would have the option to defer until the following Council meeting. And given the time and close to the holiday, it's possible that may happen. So that's the plan. We'll send a revised ...

Oh, yes. Leon, please go ahead.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Sorry to interrupt. It just feels a bit scary that everything gets finalized. But, of course, happy with the report and happy to have had the opportunity for so much discussion around it. Just trying to remember. Earlier in this call, did we say that we would like to pull

the rationale about where the term "under-served" came from into this report? That was the GAC definition, I believe.

MIKE SILBER: Yes. There's a footnote that Julie will [inaudible].

LEON GRUNDMANN: Okay, sorry. Thank you. Just wanted to confirm.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. Thanks, Leon. We'll bring that footnote in, and that can be reflected. Actually, we can footnote the recommendation itself since we're not actually altering the recommendation. And we'll pull it in from the Initial Report, though it's not anything new. But there will be a clarification. [This is] background. Thank you for that question.

MIKE SILBER: Any further questions, or any other business? Seeing no hands and no further comments. I'm going to call the meeting. Thank you, everybody, for all of your contributions, for your hard work, for your patience, for your tolerance. And I bid you a good day.

Devan, we can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]