

---

## ICANN Transcription

### Applicant Support GGP

**Monday, 18 September 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/rAAFE>

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 request for applicant support call on Monday, 18 September 2023. For today's call, we did receive apologies from Satish Babu. 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. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, 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 the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I turn it back over to the chair. 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: Thank you so much. This is Mike Silber for the recording. I appreciate it, Devan. Good to have everybody back after a relatively brisk break. And now the real work starts. We put together our best thoughts. We gave them to the community and they have given us some feedback and responses. So Julie, do you want to take us through the process, the tool, and the way forward?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. Thanks so much, Mike. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. And welcome, everyone. Welcome back. And thanks for joining us today. So I thought it might be useful to begin by running through the work plan again. And then we should talk about the schedule of our meetings, whether we want to continue to meet weekly for 60 minutes each meeting, et cetera. And then I can give you a preview of the comment tool. And then we can start, if there's time permitting, with the comments received on recommendation number-- what, guidance recommendation number one. So I'm going to stop sharing the agenda screen and go ahead to the work plan. One moment, please.

And here's the work plan. So we finished up our preliminary or initial report, guidance recommendation report, in July. And we put that out for public comment starting on July 31 for approximately 40 days. It went to September 11, last week, Monday, because we didn't want the public comment period to end on a weekend. So that added a day or two.

Now as some of you may know, we did get a couple of requests for extension. We got a request from the GAC for an extension to

---

25 September. And after consulting with Mike, we decided to grant that extension, but just for the GAC. So not extending the public comment period, because we realized that with the work plan, as you see here, we really needed to start the review of the public comments in September. And if we were to wait for the GAC to submit on the 25th, and with the time it takes to put comments into the public comment tool, then we would not have had time. We probably wouldn't have started the review of all the comments until October. And so we'd lose at least a few weeks for reviewing comments, and we really don't have that kind of slack, or any slack in our schedule. So it was determined to allow the GAC to submit comments on the 25th, but we would start to review-- all the rest of the comments would still be due on the 11th, which we would start to review, well, obviously, today, if time is permitting.

So the other extension request was from the NCSG for a couple of days, which we granted. They had two more days to submit, and then they submitted according to that schedule, and that was accommodated. And so we were able to get their comments in with everybody else's, and through the tool for all of you to see as we start reviewing them. So no delay there.

MIKE SILBER:

And maybe just to clarify one thing, Julie. Between staff and myself, the view was not to grant an extension, but rather to confirm that we would still consider their comments, even if late, provided they were received by no later than the 25th. And it may be a distinction without a difference, but I think it's a useful one going forward, so that we don't get into a situation of perpetual extension, but rather a situation where, you know, as long as the

---

work can continue, we can allow people a little bit of extra time and a little bit of leeway without creating this ongoing extension process. I don't know if that's useful. People may feel that I exercised unnecessary editorial discretion, in which case, no doubt, I'll be shouted down at some stage.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. This is Julie again from staff. I think that's an important distinction I see in the chat that Paul McGrady agrees. And that was really why we decided to proceed as we did, so that the work could continue while they were preparing their comments. So what it does mean, though, in practicality is that, well, we'll start reviewing the comments and that we've received on time today and next Monday. We'll have to revisit the GAC comments as they fall under various recommendations. So we'll have to backtrack a little bit. It does also mean that the GAC comments will not be considered in context with the other comments that we've considered already. So if we were looking, for instance, today at guidance recommendation one, we will not be able to consider the GAC comments in context of recommendation one. So any questions about the work plan? We are still on time. And we will try to definitely keep to the schedule because what we want to try to avoid at all costs is asking for an extension of this project. We do want to try to deliver on time or even before December 2023. I'm not seeing any hands up or any questions.

The next item of business related to our work plan is, as you know, we've been meeting weekly for 60 minutes each meeting. And the question is, do we want to continue with that schedule?

---

Do we want a longer weekly meeting of 90 minutes or a more difficult proposition would be two meetings a week? I'm not sure if we could find unconflicted time to that. Mike, I see your mic is open.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you, Julie. I don't know what other people's diaries look like, but it's quite congested and especially moving into the third quarter of the year. I suspect others have got a fair amount of workload. My proposal is for us to start with the weekly 60 minutes. Let's run it for four meetings and see if we're making progress. And if we're not making progress or if we're continuously running up on the 60 minutes and we need to run over, then let's discuss at that stage whether we run to 90 or whether we try and get a second meeting in a week. I think that would be my suggestion before we decide up front that we need to extend.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. And this is Julie again from staff. Are there any concerns or objections with going to a weekly schedule at 60 minutes each meeting and sticking with the same rotation of times? I see a hand from Ros.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH:

Thanks. Yeah, so just so I'm clear, the proposal is to stick with a weekly schedule at time being, but we're looking at potentially extending to 90 minutes if need be. Is that correct?

---

MIKE SILBER: That's my suggestion is let's see how efficient and effective we are. Let's not beat ourselves up before we start.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Agreed. Yeah, no, I completely agree. I think 60 minutes is reasonable for now and we can always look at extending that later on if we feel we are getting stretched on time. The one thing I would point out, and I'm not sure how many other people this affects on the call, but quite a number of people are going to be in Japan for the Internet Governance Forum in about, what is it, three weeks' time now. So just to say that we might want to be cognizant of that week, people being out and attending that from this community. So just to flag that as a potential problem week, I guess.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, good point. I think we will need to make a call just depending on what the roll call will look like. And if people can just let us know if you will or won't be able to attend, we can then make a call whether we continue in your absence or if we postpone by a week. I'm totally fine either way. And again, I don't like continuing in people's absence, but if we can do work and those who weren't able to attend can catch up, that's also an option. So let's look at the numbers and if people wouldn't mind just letting staff know what their attendance is likely to be in that week, let's have a look at it. So far we've got two people. If we get a few more, then I agree. It may be worth postponing. If it's just the two of you, I'm sure that you both have been very diligent and

---

can catch up quite well as well. But let's see what the numbers look like. I don't want to make a call on that just yet.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. This is Julie from staff. And I see that Maureen has in the chat that she would prefer the 60-minute meetings and that she'll, as you note, also be at IGF in Kyoto. So why don't we see about attendance? And also we could, this time that we have here at 20:00 UTC is the more APAC-friendly time, although it is, as we know, quite early in the morning. And it might be that we at least would use this time for that week. But let's play it by ear. What I suggest we do is go ahead and put meetings on the calendar for the rest of September and for, well, that would be one meeting in September and then also for October. But putting the, what was the date, which week is that? Ros, could you let me know which week that is for the IGF? And we can switch that meeting to 20:00 UTC.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yep. It's taking place from Sunday, 8th October to Thursday, the 12th of October.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Okay. So Monday the 9th then. Devan, if you could take note of that, that would be much appreciated. But again, if we get enough apologies, I'm quite happy to postpone.

---

JULIE HEDLUND:

Indeed. All right. Thank you. Then we'll take the action item to get those meetings on the schedule. And what I'll go ahead and do is now bring up the public comment tool. So just one moment, please, while I bring that document up. And then I'll explain a little bit about the public comment review process and how that works for those of you who might not have been involved, which I think many of you have not.

Okay. All right. I hope you can all see that. So there is essentially, this is a Google Sheets document. And it is a standard format that has been used for other PDPs. Most recently it was used for the ePDP on IDNs. And the first page is a snapshot of the comments and the recommendations and the number and whether or not they've gotten comments and whether or not—those marked in yellow, as you'll see on the left-hand side here, are those that have received comments. The one marked as red is one that received a significant concern or objection. And then as we go through them, we can indicate on this right-hand column where my arrow is whether further discussion is required. And then we have some statistics on the table on the right. The number of submissions is nine. That includes the GAC. And you'll see the commenters listed here. And the number of recommendations that received comments. All recommendations received comments. And the one that received significant concerns. And the notation that GAC will submit comments on the 25th of September. So we'll update the snapshot as we go along.

And so let me explain a little bit about comments. This is the first page, first sheet of the tool. And this is on guidance recommendation one. So the first thing to keep in mind is that



---

working group members are expected to read all the comments in the tool prior to them being discussed. And the main reason for that is that we don't spend time in the meetings themselves reading through the comments. There's generally not time for that. And also because working group members are expected to read and have read all the comments prior to discussion. It's very, very important for working group members to have read and considered all comments. So we will take comments as read in the meetings. And then we expect all of you to be prepared to discuss the comments in the meeting. So that does not mean that we cannot answer any questions or clarifications you may have about a comment, but it does mean that we're not going to read the comments, take time for reading out, I should say, take time for reading out the comments in the meeting. That's not so much an issue in this case, because most of the comments aren't that long. But in some cases, in some PDPs, the comments can be quite extensive and there's not time to read them out during the meetings. So your homework for each meeting will be to read the comments ahead of the meeting and we'll give you an indication of which comments, which recommendations, guidance recommendations we'll be covering. So which comments we'll be covering prior to that meeting.

Now, this first meeting, we noted that we would cover the comments as time permits. So we'll probably take at least this meeting and the next meeting to cover the first set of comments in guidance recommendation one, just to make sure everybody's had a chance to read them.

---

Another thing to note is that we'll be updating the final report. We produced a template for it and we'll be updating the deliberations or entering in the deliberations into the final report as we go. And we'll be posting that for you to review as we go. And in that way, we'll be able to work more efficiently so that we don't have to wait until all the conversations are over to produce the final report. But instead, we'll be entering any deliberations as we go and also any changes suggested to the guidance recommendations for the final report. Note that if there are significant changes to guidance recommendations, and this is quite unlikely, but if it were to happen, there were significant changes to the guidance recommendations, it could be that the working group will decide to push the final report also off of public comment. And we don't have time in the schedule for that, but if we had to, we could do that. Just keep that in mind. In my experience, I've not seen that happen. But the idea is that if a report has changed significantly, it could go out for public comment a second time. It's changed significantly from the initial report.

So are there any questions of the process? We'll go through these comments by guidance recommendation. You see in the sheets here, we've got a sheet per guidance recommendation. And there was also a question that was asked. And just to remind you of the question. The question was, are there any issues pertaining to tasks 3, 4, 5, and/or 6 that the GGP has not considered? See the list of tasks on pages 3 to 4 of the initial report. And we did have one comment relating to that question. And then other was for other comments. And generally, those other comments were summaries of the submission. So summary comments. And there

---

were some others that just fall into a general category of other. So we'll have those two go over as well.

But I'd say overall, we received quite a bit of support for the recommendations. That is quite a few of the commenters indicated support as written without any additional comments. There are instances, and you'll see them here in recommendation 1, where there's support as written, but there are also comments associated with that response. There were some comments with support recommendation with intent and wording change. And then for one of the recommendations, we had a comment for significant change required, changing intent and wording. We had no comments that did not support the recommendations, and none where there was no opinion, no response indicated. Thank you for putting the link to the tool in the chat, Steve.

MIKE SILBER:

Well, I think, Julie, that already says that we're on the right direction. And there's general happiness with the direction we've taken. Now we need to parse the responses.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Exactly. That's Julie again. That's exactly right, Mike. I think we can feel that that's a very positive response, and that it generally could be taken that we have crafted the recommendations well, at least according to the commenters.

So what I would like to suggest, unless there are questions or concerns, we could dive into the responses to guidance recommendation 1 and see how that goes.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I'm totally comfortable. Let's make use of the time we have.

JULIE HEDLUND: Excellent. Thank you, Mike. So this is Julie Hedlund again from staff. So we have here five responses that are supporting the recommendation as written. We have two responses that support the intent with wording changes. And one response with significant change required, changing intent and wording. And none that did not support the recommendation.

And of those who supported the recommendation as written, we had comments from three of those. So what this means here is that for the first comment, Juliana Harsianti, there were no comments other than the indication that it was supported the recommendation as written. For the registry stakeholder group also. The NCUC had a comment, and yes, noted, Steve, this is important because this is pretty small text. Zoom pro tip is that you can zoom in on your Zoom instance if the text is too small to read. And actually, I can also increase my view to help you out also. So let me do that. That's a bit much. Hold on.

Okay. So the first comment we received under a support recommendation as written is from the NCUC. And you can read it on the screen here. Since I'm not assuming that you've had time to read these, I will go ahead and read them off to you. Let me just do that right now. The NCUC especially agrees with the implementation guidance. At ICANN 76, I, Benjamin, discussed my thoughts on the importance of reaching out to some of the

---

listed categories of potential applicants, and that seems to be reflected in the implementation guidance. So that comment doesn't seem to suggest any changes to the recommendation. Any questions on that? The ALAC comment, there was the word consensus. I'm not sure what they mean by that, other than that they have perhaps consensus to agree with the recommendation. I see Maureen's mic is open.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Julie. I had actually hoped to send everyone a document that basically summarized the responses from the ALAC. Most of the questions, the recommendations, sort of like came out at around about 75% plus in favor. So there was general consensus. I mean, there were probably just a few who suggested that, you know, wording may need to be changed, is that no one actually sort of like, as you say, no one was against any of the recommendations. The general consensus, I think, was, you know, we just decided that we just sort of state that there was general consensus for all of the recommendations. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. That's very helpful. So then there was also a comment from the NCSG that's still under the category of supporting the recommendation as written. So I'm not sure if people have had a chance to read this. I will go ahead and read it out for you. But we won't normally be doing this in the meeting. Although the recommendation adequately highlights the purpose of the applicant support program, ASP, and who should be its main focus, it is important to notice that the quote unquote

---

underserved concept is not as easily understandable to those who are not highly familiar with ICANN or ITU discussions. And searching for this term in ICANN-related pages does not provide a clear, precise, and precise definition. Considering the scope of this concept was a central part of what was debated in this GGP, an explanatory footnote, which could at least provide a link to more details, would be useful for those who are the target audience of this recommendation. The deliberation section in recommendation three mentions that working group members agreed that the guidance recommendation does not need to specify when surveys would happen because there would be inflection points throughout the process, including when an applicant submits an application. Even if the appropriate timing of the surveys, after or before round or both, is not defined within the GGP, it may be relevant to better discuss this issue considering the probability that those who do not understand the information provided will also not participate in indicators that require active responses. It seems important to understand at least some rough indicators about the effectiveness of this first contact, so measuring click-throughs in these initial messages, checking on how many participants do not follow through, may deliver some relevant data to identify possible interviewees. With this initial data, trying to interview applicants who abandon the procedure early on into a more qualitative collection of information could provide fruitful information to improve awareness initiatives. We do realize, however, that this may be a difficult task and would like to recommend the workgroup to develop a bit more of the excellent work already done to find alternatives to get good metrics on this aspect of

---

awareness effectiveness, if possible. So I'm going to stop there and open the floor for discussion on this comment. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Julie. Any thoughts, comments, clarification, input?

JULIE HEDLUND: Are there any thoughts about adding an explanatory footnote?

MIKE SILBER: I don't have a principal objection to it. I would like to read that through myself. It's a somewhat dense comment and I just want to make sure that I've fully parsed it.

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, that's a good point. Might I suggest that we, since we didn't expect people to have read all these comments prior to today's meeting, we weren't sure if we were going to get time to read them all, that we spend also next Monday on this recommendation as well, and we ask people as homework to read through these comments and bring forward any concerns or items for discussion?

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, that certainly works for me.

---

JULIE HEDLUND:

Very good. We'll do that then. We'll capture that as homework to prepare for next week's meeting. So we're moving on to the next category, which is support recommendation intent with wording change. So we have a comment from Gabriel Karsan and one from Com Laude. I'll read the first one. The, it says, yeah, Leon, I see your note. They submitted late, so I don't think it's been posted yet. Yes, it was submitted two days late. Yep, exactly. Thank you.

So his suggestion is change to raise awareness and indicate applicants about the next round of gTLD applications for the applicant support program and provide enhanced awareness, engagement, mentoring, and deeper support to new applicants who qualify for increasing outreach. The reason for the changes is subjective and concise and shares avenues of awareness, mentoring, and more support as needed for new applicants and promotes raising outreach of the objective for the program. So here's a rewording addition to the original recommendation. Increase awareness of the applicant support program for the next round of gTLD applications for reasonable, for eligible applicants. Reason it is direct and to the point that eligible applicants have a direct targeted objective that supports more inclusion of people to learn about eligibility and come with preparation, knowledge, and deeper insights of the program. And Mike, I'm going to suggest again that for the suggested wording changes that we give us homework for people to consider them and we can put the wording change next to the original wording so people have a better sense of what's being changed.



---

MIKE SILBER:                   Yep. I think that's not a bad idea. You know, my initial comment there is that starts pushing ICANN down the slippery slope in terms of what ICANN's responsibility is for performing those various functions, but agreed, let's look at the language side by side and we can then make a better call on that.

JULIE HEDLUND:               Thank you, and I will note too that in this public comment tool what we will indicate is what is the working group's response to this change, to the suggested change, and whether or not it's accepted, and if it's not accepted, why it's not accepted, and that also will be captured in more detail in the deliberations document, deliberations portion of the final report, I should say. Maureen says it would be appreciative if we could have time to consider these additional comments for further. Exactly, Maureen, that's what I'm suggesting, that we give everybody another week to look at these changes as homework for next week's meeting.

Moving to Com Laude, they have suggested the change in the implementation guidance. Target potential applicants from the non-for-profit sector of social enterprises and/or community organizations from underserved and developing regions or countries. This should not exclude any entities from outreach efforts, recognizing the goal is to get as many qualified applicants as possible. And that, I think that last sentence is a new one. The rationale is there is a risk that the intention to not exclude any entities from outreach efforts will be lost if it is not specifically included in the implementation guidance. Any initial thoughts, and recognizing that we'll come back to that next week as well.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, again, I think we discussed and debated this somewhat ad nauseam, but it's obviously an issue that's causing some grief, so let's properly consider it.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Mike. And this is Julie again from staff. So business constituency has selected significant change required, changing intent, and wording. And I'll go ahead and read this, but this is quite extensive, so I'm going to suggest that again, we're going to spend some time looking over this as homework and coming back to a discussion of this at next week's meeting.

So the Applicant Support Program, ASP, is a great initiative by ICANN to bring forth increased diversity in the next round of gTLDs. Its aim is to enable applicants that might, without support, be enabled to successfully participate in the next round. It is unfortunate that the program communication is considered specifically to not focus on businesses, even as there is no restriction on who may apply for support. Businesses come in all shapes and sizes from across the world, from a one-woman entrepreneur to a multi-billion dollar enterprise. It's unfair to group all of them under one umbrella of for-profit and to exclude them from communications targeting plans. There are businesses all over the world that work hard to uplift the community that they operate in and can significantly benefit from a brand TLD or a generic TLD to further spread their message and impact more lives positively. Moreover, these businesses may be as resource constrained as other entities that are specifically targeted for

---

communications, even though they may provide the same benefits to an underserved community. For example, consider the small business that makes a big difference in the community they represent. Two Blind Brothers is a comfort clothing company created by two visually impaired brothers and 100% of the company's profits go towards funding research to cure retinal eye disease. Customers can browse and purchase individual items or shop blind and purchase mystery boxes without seeing the products, much like the people they are supporting. ICANN Org suggested that the Applicant Support Program should not limit communications and outreach to particular regions for applicant support. Instead, the intent is to seek potential applicants that will qualify from all regions while emphasizing that more attention should be paid to underserved regions. We recommend that the communication for the ASP should be inclusive and should aim to reach as many people and organizations as possible without specifically including any group, country, or region based on their assumed capability to participate in this program without help. One of the quantitative metrics for success for the communications and outreach awareness is conversion rate. We would be setting up the communications program to fail if we are more concerned with whom not to focus on as compared to focusing on all possible and relevant communities for creating a more diverse applicant pool. The second round of new gTLD expansion is an immense opportunity for every organization and everyone should be allowed to benefit from it, including businesses. The decision to grant support is based on a robust methodology and by specifically including one type of organization from targeted communications is a significant flaw in this program.

---

Therefore our recommendation is to reword the implementation guidance as follows. Target all potential applicants from diverse organizations from underserved and developing regions and countries.

MIKE SILBER:

Yeah, I think there is so much that is misconstrued over there. I actually find that comment to actually be quite offensive because with respect, I don't think Two Blind Brothers or any other business is going to run a TLD. We've seen multi-billion-dollar organizations that applied for a dot brand deciding that they don't actually need a dot brand, so they're conflating dot brands. And the key thing is, is this program intended to provide support to commercial entities who are going to then sell names for profit? And I think we need to think about that really carefully. My vote there is no. That's not what the program is there for. And I think that they have so totally misconstrued what we are trying to say as for the comment to be almost irrelevant, because this has got nothing to do with registrants. This has got to do with operating a registry. And is the role of this program to help people set up a commercial registry? If the general consensus is yes, then I'm totally happy to accept that. But that's not my understanding. And I don't want to substitute my opinion or my understanding for the group. But please, can you very carefully consider this when we're discussing this next week?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. This is Julie from staff. Any other comments from people on the call? Any? Recognizing that we'll be

---

discussing this next week as well. Mike, I don't see any hands. I see in the chat, Lawrence is saying, "Interesting view there." Anything you want to add to that, Lawrence? And we'll revisit this next week, and we'll ask all of you to take the time to read this in detail and to come back with your thoughts on how to address it. So we've still got some time, Mike. I can go to recommendation two, if you'd like.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, why not? Let's give a quick overview. I suspect we're not going to reach consensus on anything, but let's give the highlights.

JULIE HEDLUND: Exactly. So here we are at guidance recommendation two. This is related to Pro Bono Services. And we had quite a number of respondents who support the recommendation as written. And so you'll see that seven [inaudible]. Of those seven, three provided comments. And there were no comments that supported with a wording change or significant change required or that did not support the recommendation. So quite a bit of those who commented, of the nine, well, ten, including ICANN Org, there were most that supported this as written.

So just looking at the Business Constituency that had a comment. I'll read this out again, recognizing that you probably haven't had a chance to read it ahead of time. Are there any comments or issues you would like to raise pertaining to the rationale for [inaudible? If yes, please put your comments here. And the BC says the ASP states that support requested by applicants does

---

not necessarily have to be financial. It could be technical, educational, or even language support for those businesses that may have a valid applicant, but need help understanding the application help with filing the required form. Even small support such as handholding during the application program and pointing out relevant resources could be beneficial for many who are not familiar with ICANN or the first round of gTLD expansion. That seems from at least an initial glance to be consistent with the recommendation and the implementation guidance.

MIKE SILBER:

Yeah, I just think there are a few issues over there. It's not only going to be businesses. We've actually been three rounds of expansion before this, but yeah.

JULIE HEDLUND:

And then there's a comment from NCUC. We would like to see the GGP respond to 17.2 as a potentially related to this recommendation despite the GGP declaring it to be out of their scope as it is an important complimentary program to the pro bono services. I believe that is essential for ICANN to communicate the availability of pro bono services for gTLD applications and to seek feedback as to whether or not they are useful.

So for those who may not be aware, recommendation 17.2 is currently pending with the board and it is indeed out of scope of the tasks of the GGP. Paul, go ahead.

---

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Julie. Hi, everybody. So yeah, this particular question is out of scope of this GGP, but it's not being ignored. This is one that does rest with the board, kind of, but the council, this is on the small team's radar. And I expect there will be either a supplemental recommendation or a what's known as a section 16 process, which is a little more community heavy, where the council tries again to get the board to take on board the community's will, that we would like to see more than just rebates and discounts and things like that. But we want the board to dig in their pockets a little deeper and help out applicants with some of this kind of pre-application work.

So I only raise this so that nobody has to feel bad that the correct response to this at this particular moment to this particular comment in this particular GGP is that it's out of scope. Yes, but it's not just dropping off the radar. And so for those of you who are interested in that, there will be more discussions on that on the small team and those small team deliberations are open. So I encourage you to listen in and see how this issue is evolving. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks, Paul. That was really helpful. And actually what we can do if the working group agrees is include in the deliberations some of that information to indicate that recommendation is indeed being addressed, just not in this particular venue. And Steve Chan says in the chat, recommendation 17.2 was actually formally non adopted by the board. But as Paul noted, that does not need to represent the end of the road for the recommendation. Yes, that's important to note. Anybody else want any comments on that one

---

before we move on? I think we have time to read out the NCSG comment.

MIKE SILBER: Perfect.

JULIE HEDLUND: So that goes, the [inaudible] applicants report they found information services offered by pro bono providers to be useful seems to be more of an indicator than part of the recommendation per se. Explaining why the working group seems to have included an indicator as part of the recommendation, whilst making the wording clearer to show that it is not an indicator, can be useful to give more clarity to the text. As an indicator of success, that is also related to recommendation one, it is important to encompass not only the degree of satisfaction among those who used these pro bono services, but also how many potential applicants learned that these tools were available, including the question specifically about pro bono services in the surveys, presumably sent to all participants mentioned in the metrics of recommendation one may be useful for this purpose. Any comments on that comment? Then again, I'd suggest that we revisit these, or give people a little additional time to review these and comment on them in advance of next week's call. And perhaps I'll suggest, Mike, that we stop there and send out some homework for folks to review.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I fully support that. You know, even some of our most ardent and committed participants have been a little quiet, so I



---

think let's give everybody the opportunity to read, engage, digest, and then we can be a little more active next week. Thank you everybody for resuming, and thanks for your participation, even if it was just following along as Julie gave us the headlines and the highlights. But yeah, next week we'll have our homework and you'll be expected to participate in class discussion. So thanks everybody and have a fantastic rest of your day.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike, for leading us so well. Thank you all for joining, and we'll talk to you next week.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**