
ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 19 December 2022 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/OYU-DQ>

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

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Guidance Process, GGP, initiation request for applicant support call taking place on Monday the 19th of December 2022 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? Hearing no one, we do have an apology, just in, from Rubens Kuhl.

At this time, if I could please remind everyone that statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand. Seeing or hearing none, if you do need assistance, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space.

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.

Recording 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 behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to the Chair, Mike Silber. Please begin.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you for the introduction, and good morning, good afternoon, good evening, all. Thanks for joining. As we hit towards the end of December, your participation in these last few days of the world are greatly appreciated. The reason for continuing with the working group calls is so that we don't lose momentum and we don't hit pause until the New Year. Hopefully, we can get some work done heading into the New Year. But the idea is that we should just keep some momentum growing and try and deliver.

So the proposed agenda is up on the screen. And Julie and the team have sent through quite a bit of homework. I don't know if there are any comments or thoughts on the agenda or on any of the mails that have gone out. Hearing none and not seeing any hands, then I'm going to suggest that we continue with the briefing that was requested at the last session.

JULIE HEDLUND:

This is Julie Heather from staff. Then moving on to agenda item 2 and thank you very much, Mike. This is relating to task 1 of the GGP initiation request. And it's a briefing from GDS on the implementation of the 2012 applicant support program. I'm going

to stop sharing the agenda right now and move to the slides. And as I do that, I'd like to introduce our speaker Aaron Hickmann, who will be providing the presentation from GDS. One moment, Aaron, while I switch to your screens.

AARON HICKMANN:

Sure. Thank you. Thank you, Julie. So my name is Aaron Hickmann. I'm a senior director here at ICANN. And I'll take you through a couple of slides, just a brief background on how the applicant support program was implemented in the 2012 round. Just to know that I actually wasn't here when that occurred. We were hoping to have someone brief who was, and then, unfortunately, they had situation where they couldn't make it today. So there may be an opportunity there to take back some questions or whatever to them. So we'll take note of those if there's anything I can't answer today. So, Julie, if I could get the next slide there.

We can just go past that one too. Okay. Here we go. So there's quite a bit on here, and I won't read every word. But here's the summary of the background. Applicant support really came from implementation guideline and which talked about having a fee reduction scheme or applicants from economies classified as least to be developed.

And so a working group was put together and established or developed a final report that the output of that ended up defining a few key aspects of the program. So it'd be a final, the financial assistance would occur via a new gTLD fee reduction. There would also be offering of pro bono services. So there was a

directory of those providers that could be available to applicants who could get some pro bono assistance.

And then, obviously, we had to fund that. And so the funding mechanism came from the Board approving in late 2011, the \$2 million fund and part of that was also approving a reduction in that specific fee. So the base fee for everyone, it was 185,000 US, and that was reduced to 47,000 for applicants who ended up qualifying.

So in terms of how it worked, one of the big parts of was obviously evaluating those folks to see, do they meet all the requirements? That was a support application review panel or SARP and that was established to provide that service. It was comprised of volunteers from community. And so in February 2012 there was a request for expression of interest. Total of 8 folks applied, and then the panel, it actually was formed, consisted of 5 individuals.

To help applicants understand what was going on with specifically the applicant support program, a handbook was developed and published, and that took folks through what they needed to know to apply for the new gTLD program. So had information about deadlines and criteria process evaluation, that kind of thing. I'll pause here and see if there's any questions. Otherwise, I can move on to the next slide. Any questions or comments on this?

Okay. Seeing none, Julie, if I could get the next slide, please. Okay. So we already talked about the S-A-R-P or SARP. So as applicants came in, the applicants were reviewed against three key criteria, public interest. So are they proposing to do

something that's going to provide a benefit to the public at large or specific group?

Financial need, do they have a demonstrable financial, oh sorry, can they show that they lack sufficient resources to pay for the application fee and execute the project based on that. And then do they have the wherewithal to still operate? We obviously didn't want to create a situation where applicants would come in and be unable to actually operate the TLD. So there still was a check for financial capability and wherewithal to do that.

The results of the SARP were there was no appeals mechanism. So it was, you were either in or out. And so we fast forward down to the end of the page there, and we had only three applicants, unfortunately, for the program, dot kids, dot IDN, and dot [00:08:13 –inaudible]. And only kids actually prevailed through and actually were just somewhat recently contracted. The results were released as noted there in March of 2013. They weren't particularly detailed in their first revision and were subsequently provided with a little bit more detail in terms of which aspects that each applicant either prevailed on or did not. And so that's the quick summary.

I think it's safe to say that a lot of feedback we've gotten was that that there could be a lot of improvements in the program and certainly the final report demonstrates a number of them. And so we're excited to look at those that build something that helps improve the uptake. I will note that I think one of the issues where why there was only three in 2012 was that if you didn't qualify as an applicant, support applicant, you weren't allowed to continue. It was either you were or you weren't. You couldn't just convert over

to a typical applicant and pay the full fee. And so that probably dampened interest there.

And then, of course, just general awareness of the program and the applicant support probably could have been better as well in 2012, which maybe would have increased the number of applicants and those who made it all the way through. So, again, I'll pause there for any questions anyone might have.

MIKE SILBER: Again, not seeing any.

AARON HICKMANN: Okay. All right. Great. I think that was the last slide. I'm assuming the last one was just a Q&A, Julie. Yeah. So that was pretty fast. I'm happy to always show up again if anyone would like additional--I do have a question. Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah. Thanks for the presentation and the quick overview of the program. I was more interested to know if you had some metrics KPI. But, I mean, you thought about maybe it was not at the end applicable because the limited number of applications. But if you thought at that time and how you can track or what were your KPI for the application program. And also regarding the pro bono support, how it worked that regard, like, how you could get or how many pro bono services were proposed from the community.

And I think the other question is, if you have any lessons learned, I heard one at least, like, regarding that program that if you don't succeed to get, you don't pass for applicant support, you lose your application, and so that seems one of the lessons learned. But I was so interested to learn more about this. And also there was any particular outreach and so on. So it's many questions, many comments, but what I want to say the kind of the rationale behind is ready to learn more about the program from your standpoint, what you see as issues limitation that we can use in particular one you'll help for the implementation guidance.

AARON HICKMANN:

Okay. Sure. Yes. Hopefully, I note all those out. So I think largely there weren't a lot of KPIs established, but I will go back. That's probably something I need to go back and see if there was anything we were tracking. Honestly, there were so much going on with the program at that point that most hadn't been developed. It was the first time any program like this had ever been put into place. So I think we were learning as we went for sure.

In terms of the pro bono services, it was really just a directory. I don't know off the top of my head. I will have to come back again on that as well to give you a specific number in the type, but we basically assembled a directory. There was something you click on and look at here's folks that are offering some level of pro bono services. I do not believe it was the case that all services offered were necessarily pro bono. It might have been a limited number of hours, that kind of thing. But I will have to go back and get some more detail on that.

With regard to lessons learned, I do think a lot of the final report outputs really do address a number of those. And I think one of the things that we had suggested in the ODA was to open up applicant support earlier than the round. We thought that would offer those who need support some additional time so they would get a result prior to the application rounds. Do you receive support? Do you receive these benefits, or not? And therefore, they could make a decision of, well, can we try to raise some additional funds to come in as a regular applicant or not? So we don't really want to shut down people who come in as applicant support, but give them another avenue potentially to continue on. So I think that would be a good improvement.

And then as you mentioned outreach awareness, there's a lot we think we need to do there in general just making sure folks are aware of the program, have that space because a lot of people still aren't. And then expanding that to say, not only is this program going to be available, but there will be an opportunity for those who are looking at a public interest application that you can receive some reductions and fees and other kinds of assistance.

So I still think it's hard to say what success looks like. That's just a tough thing to say. I think if we had a little broader -- certainly more than three applications, I think, would be safe in terms of percentage. 1930 applications and only three of them were applicant support is not a significant number. So maybe bringing that up a little bit would be a positive improvement just to at least prove that the awareness is out there. But I don't think it's necessarily the case that all applicants shouldn't necessarily get through. I mean, that goes in the sling, I think, track. Not

everyone might really come in and understand what public interest means and that kind of thing. So I think it still need to have that panel to move forward and reviewed folks.

So hopefully, Rafik, I caught all your questions there. I know two owed follow-up response. But did the rest of that cover, or did you have any other follow ups?

RAFIK DAMMAK: No. I think you've given several highlights that's useful. And then, anyway, also, in our group we have limited scope. So thanks.

AARON HICKMANN: Okay. Very good.

MIKE SILBER: All right. Thanks. Thanks, Aaron. I think that was very useful. Lawrence, I see your hand. But I just wanted to check Gabriela. I see you posted a comment in the chat. I don't know if you want to talk to that.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yeah. Is it possible to really -- Hello? Hello? Can you hear me?

MIKE SILBER: Yes. We can. Yes.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Sorry. I arrived a little bit late. And maybe you mentioned this before in the meeting. But I would like to know if the definition of success of this applicant support program had to be with the geographical distribution of the DNS. Because if this is the case, then the criteria that I see that it's only the financial need and not the region you are from. I mean, I don't understand why if the main goal was to distribute geographically, the only evaluation was the financial need.

Also, I would like to ask if other motivations mentioned in the AM global new gTLD and Global South were taken into account or, for example, only the time constraint, but also for example, the cost, the business model and the awareness were mentioned in this report as the need of the motivation for the Global South. Thank you very much.

AARON HICKMANN: Okay. Understood. Thank you. So if I recall the outputs correctly from the final report, this time around, it actually went from -- in the 2012 round, it was the least developed countries were the definition of the target group. In the current, the most recent final report 2021, that was changed to a term called struggling regions. And so I don't think it was specifically, we want an applicant from every particular region or however that's defined, but it was meant to, I think, give folks some assistance who are coming from those kinds of challenge regions.

And so it's certainly a metric we could consider to measure even if we can't necessarily understand what success looks like yet, because I think it's still fairly young. But it's not a bad thing,

obviously, to have geographic criteria. We had dozens of different countries that applied in the 2012 round in general.

But it's not at least not in my reading, and understanding it's not specifically a main goal according to the policy. I think it's a benefit because struggling regions are all around the world and might actually even be found in certain more advanced economies potentially. So I think it really opens up. That's an aspect that we can certainly explore. And we in org certainly will do whatever the community ends up saying is the priority, but at least as written, it doesn't seem to be a top priority, although, it's a benefit because when you talk about struggling region, they can be anywhere in the world and obviously are.

MIKE SILBER:

Yes. Aaron, I think you've done an admirable job answering that given that you went around during the previous round. Maybe let me just add my own personal comment there. And that is don't think the criteria, Gabriela, were well enough established in terms of geographic distribution. I think it was seen as desirable, but it wasn't documented and it wasn't fully evaluated based on those criteria. So I think what we need to do is for future rounds, we need to make sure that we don't leave it open. If geographic distribution is a criteria, then we need to be really clear about it.

I think the weakness of the previous process was this general feel. And then I use that term very intentionally that we need to do something and that we should provide a mechanism for applicant support without being really crisp and clear in terms of what's available and to whom.

And I think that's what the purpose of this guidance process is, and that's why I don't want to get a little bit too stuck in the weaknesses of the past, but rather to instead recognize that if that is going to be something that we desire to achieve, then we need to make sure that it's appropriately documented and we provide guidance to the GNSO in terms of our recommendations as to how it should be included. Gabriela, I don't know if that's addresses your concerns. And Rafik is trying to distract us by mentioning football.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Sorry. Yeah. I was late because too much celebration last night. Thank you for the --

MIKE SILBER: No problem. Understandable and well deserved.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Thank you so much. And I wanted to add, yes, the main idea- I agree with you, both. Thank you very much for your answer- is to ensure geographical distribution because at the end, the least developed countries coming from a specific region, mainly. So region as mine, the Latin American countries, Caribbean. I mean, I am middle income countries. And we had the cost for us is too high to access to the request for the gTLD. For the company's infrastructure, I think the cost will be a main restriction, but also the awareness that this is more than, and, of course, the education and training. So the technical support. Thank you so much.

MIKE SILBER: All right. Lawrence, you've been very patient. I see your hand.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Chair. Good day, everyone. So I heard in the presentation or rather I've heard from the presentation that out of the three applications received, there was one that advanced to some stage in 2013, I suppose. Could you please give some more insights as to what was different about that application? That's the one, I think you mentioned dot kids. What was the difference in that application and the others? What's missing out for what they did right that got the application moving forward.

AARON HICKMANN: Yep. Excuse me. Hello, Lawrence. Yes. Only kids made it throughout of the three. Kids did prevailed and is currently in it as a registry operator being operated by a registered operator. The other two did not make it through on one or more aspects. So the three I mentioned, which was public interest, financial capability, and -- I'm blanking. Sorry. Let me look back at my slides. So sorry. It's still early.

So financial need, public interest, and then financial capability. So any of the other two would have not passed on one of those, and I think one of them didn't pass on two if I recall correctly. So they had to pass on all three to make it through, and they didn't.

The link on the slide, if I can get that to open up. I'm waiting for it to open. I can drop that in the chat as well. Which is indicated in

a little bit more detail which area. Here we go. Let me share this. Yeah. Actually, Julia, if you can click on that updated link that might show it as well. But here's the link in the chat, and it breaks down which of the criteria each of the applicants met. So for example, kids obviously had to meet all of them, IDN didn't meet the criteria in any of them, and then [00:25:11 – ? uma] met the criteria for financial need and financial capability, but did not meet the criteria for public interest benefit. So hopefully, that helps a little bit.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you very much. It does help. And we'll review those links for that. Thank you.

AARON HICKMANN: Yes. I mean, it is still pretty high level, but that's the ultimate scorecard for those applicants.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. I think that was one of the weaknesses also of the process last time, is that the scorecards were not particularly transparent. But the one thing from my perspective and touching on what everybody has raised so far is I don't think that you can ever have a single gating criteria. I think it has to be a matrix. And I think what we're providing some guidance on is what those factors should be? Should it be all as we had before or can it be a pass mark in some and then a qualifying mark in others? So this is some of what we should be thinking about as well as giving expert advice and guidance.

So, Rafik, was there any evaluation of the software as a mechanism, and I'm not aware of a specific evaluation except a distinct unhappiness amongst many of the community that it really didn't achieve the desired object. As Aaron indicated, three applications, one successful, not a lot of metrics in terms of or a lot of transparency in terms of the process. I don't think that can be considered a success.

But my question and I'm wanting to move on to the next item, but my question is, why do we want to go back and do an analysis and evaluation of a process that clearly failed? Sorry, let me rephrase. That was not as successful as everybody had hoped. The only thing is the only reason in my mind is not to repeat mistakes. It's not to use it as a basis going forward, but not to repeat historical mistakes. Okay, that's my personal view. Lawrence, I don't know if you're responding to that or if that's an old hand.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry. It's an old hand that will take it down. But I definitely support what you say on the sense that, well, the program didn't appear successful, but it's helpful to also know, but to also analyze and evaluate what went wrong so that we can avoid that going forward.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. I'm just a little worried that the two ways of doing this. The one is to analyze what went wrong or rather to try design a program and then we can test it against the historical. I'm not sure

that getting involved in detailed analysis. We've heard from Aaron. He wasn't around. A lot of people weren't around. I don't think we want to dredge up the past necessarily. Because it is almost 10 years ago now. And we tend to think of things with slightly blinkered vision or slightly distorted vision when it's that far behind us. So, yes. I think we can test against it, but I would really caution against this group trying to do an analysis of a 10-year-old program.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Point taken.

MIKE SILBER: And I see, thanks Rafik and Paul for some interesting discussion and debate in terms of the SubPro working group. Yes. And point taken and valid comments all. Let's move on to the next task. Paul, sorry. I see your hand.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Paul McGrady here. For what it's worth, because I was active on SubPro, I don't think anybody expected this group to be a review team, but rather much more along the lines of what Mike is saying, which is essentially, we didn't hear anybody say -- well, I shouldn't say that because I don't know from a record, but there was not a groundswell of support for the past process.

And so if we don't spend a lot of time rehatching the past and figuring out what went wrong, I don't think anybody on the SubPro team is going to lose a lot of sleep over that. Instead, I think Mike

suggestion that we'd be forward looking, that is ringing true in my head at least. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: All right. Well, let's see if there there's bigger as subjection to that. But while we wait for that, Julie can I suggest that we move on to the next item task 2.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Thank you very much, Mike. And as you may recall, the homework from the last meeting was that a revised version of the outreach input request would go out following the discussion on the last call, incorporating some changes. And that was done. And the request was made for working group members to review that revised version and to provide any input or comments to the list. None were received.

So just bringing forward here again the revised version of that input request. And the versions are in red line. And just asking again if there are any further comments on this revised version. And then we can move to a discussion of the timing of when we want to try to send this request. Noting that we are coming into a period of the holidays, and we probably do not want to send a request prior to holiday closures and have it be lost, but perhaps we could consider sending the request out to the various SOs/ACs stakeholder groups and constituencies with the beginning of the year and perhaps in that second week in January when various groups are starting up their activities again.

So just to pause and see if we have any hands or anybody wants to make any comments about this draft? And I'm also looking at the chat. I'm not seeing any hands up. Then let me ask if people are comfortable with the considering to send this out perhaps in that second week of January. I'm asking for, perhaps, a couple weeks for response. I see one thumbs up. Anybody have any objections to that?

MIKE SILBER: That makes sense. That makes sense to me, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, mike. And I see Thomas Barrett saying, draft looks good. Then, staff will take the action to finalize the document to accept the changes. And we'll go ahead and send that around to all of you. And then we'll also take the action to get this sent out to the various groups in that second week of January once we all get back from the holiday break. And if there's nothing more on that item, and since we're a little bit behind schedule, maybe Mike, I can go ahead and switch to the next item on the agenda, which is the introduction to tasks 3, 4 and 5.

MIKE SILBER: Please do, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Very good. Let me share screen again. One moment, please. Pardon me. Slow to share. All right. And okay. That looks like

this is the right document. So, also part of the homework -- again, this is Julie Hedlund from staff, -homework for everyone for the working group members was to review the information on tasks 3, 4 and 5 from the GGP initiation request. And that document was sent around for all of you to review. And that is the document we have on screen here as well. And I think two that as we as we go through this, and I'll go through it in some detail here as an introduction. Keep in mind the purpose of this working group and this GGP with relation to these three tasks.

So the previous discussion, when we had the presentation from Aaron on the previous applicant support program and the discussion of whether or not this GGP working group has a task of reviewing that program and perhaps analyzing it for lessons learned or areas of improvement or working at this, I'd say more that as you look at these three tasks, the focus of this working group is more forward looking.

And that is not to conduct a review of the past program. And I think we're seeing agreement with that in the chat and from Rafik and from Mike and others. But instead to take what we can learn from the past program and use that to help define a set of metrics and criteria for success that might be used to build the next program.

So let me just go over each of these tasks in detail and then also the implementation guidance 17.9 that's associated with them. And then once I've done that, I can open things up to questions and discussion, and I'll ask you Mike to help you facilitate that. So just looking here at the document on screen, we have task 3 which is to analyze the set of suggestive metrics in

implementation guidance 17.9 and propose which one should be prioritized. The set of prioritized metrics is not limited to what is identified in 17.9.

MIKE SILBER: Do you want to just scroll down to 17.9 and put it up on the screen?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. Absolutely. And these are noting that these are the working group identified a non-exhaustive list of potential data to support for a discussion. I see Gabriela has a question. These current metrics are for qualification or for evaluation. Well, if we look at these metrics, and these metrics and others, I think we have some. Okay. Those that are for awareness and education are not qualifying or evaluating, but are measuring how one is gauging the level of awareness, the number of applicants, you can see here, diversity.

MIKE SILBER: My understanding, Julie, is that these are evaluation of the program. But I think there are a few of them that certainly can add to recommendations around criteria for scoring applicants. Now it's not to us to score, but we can make recommendations in terms of how we score.

JULIE HEDLUND: That's very helpful. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Julie. Still a [00:40:03 –inaudible] the task here is we have some that propose that a criteria or metrics. And also we have that ability to add more if we think it can be valid. But before going on that, kind of in some place, try to explore maybe the different metrics that we might add, I have more question that we need clarification regarding what elements, if you scroll up, about the element listed in the task, the guidance, which awareness, education.

So my question here, is that something fixed in term of benefits for the program, or we also can propose some element with that we define some metrics to measure? So just here to make to be sure, if that's fixed at least and we have to work around that in terms of KPI and metrics. So can you please clarify that?

MIKE SILBER: So, Rafik, I think it's very clear. But that's not a fixed list. So task 3 as I understand it is evaluating the success of the program. And there are some suggestions of matrix over there. And then task 4 gets into a little bit more around metrics and measures of success in terms of the program elements. So that would be potentially qualifying criteria as opposed to whether the program was successful or not. But at the moment, we have an open list. I think we're obliged to consider 17.9. And if we're going to reject anything that's currently in 17.9, we need to explain why it's not appropriate. But we can certainly add to that list.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Mike, just to clarify, I understand and I think about tasks 3 and 4. And just about the task 5 we have the section of the element of the applicant support. So if I got what you are saying, we can add to that list. I'm not talking about the metrics and measure of success. Because those will be driven by those elements of the applicant support program, which are listed here outreach, education, business case development, and application evaluation. Can we add more element there, or if that's fixed in this that we cannot [CROSSTALK]?

MIKE SILBER: Yes. We can.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Gabriela, I still see a hand, and I see a hand from Sarah. Can I just check Gabriela?

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes. My question is very small. Just I need to know first which one is the goal of the program. Now this one the new programs. Because, a, if we are going to suggest a set of metrics for this program, we need to know which one will be the objective. So if your objective is to read other regions, we will need a set of metrics for this specific goal. If we are trying to reach countries needs, we will have another set of metrics for qualification and

also for the evaluation of the program. Just following a logical framework.

And that's why we're trying to understand the problems in the 2012 round of the applicants support program because if we analyze the programs of the previous program, we will have the problem tree and then to try to overcome this problem. But I understand that this is not our task. But to suggest new metrics for the new program. But taking into account the task 4 and being the success of the program. Okay, but what is the task where we were what we need.

MIKE SILBER: Well, that's what we're trying to define here.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Okay. Task 4 then should be before 3 because it's the logical. But it's just the second thing.

MIKE SILBER: Sorry, Gabriel. I didn't quite understand the last point you were making.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yeah. We will need to have a general objective of the program to have a set of metrics. Because we cannot prioritize metrics if we don't know what we will reach with this program.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. And that's what we're here to do.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yeah. That's why I'm telling that maybe task 4 the mission, the program success is the main thing that we will need to discuss and then check that the suggested metric.

MIKE SILBER: Sorry. I'm still not understanding because that's the point of this guidance process, is to develop that. So we need to actually start with that process.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes. Reading the metrics that we have here in the 17.9 and I'm trying to go down, scroll down, visit the success of the launch gTLD, and then we have a couple of metrics here. The number, spell my names, registered envision, and new gTLD compared to the number of internet users in the regions, all of these are metrics that we will prioritize. Right? And this is according to the overall objective that we are going to say. This is right.

JULIE HEDLUND: This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I'm sorry Gabriela, we're having some difficulty hearing you. I'm wondering if you could put your question into the chat. I mean, I think we've been trying to address what we think you're asking relating to the metrics. And the tasks here are we have some metrics that are suggested by

the final report of the SubPro PDP. And the others can be suggested also by this working group.

So there's a set of metrics to be prioritized. It's not limited to what is in 17.9, but this work group is expected to consider what is in 17.9 and to propose additional metrics and to then prioritize those metrics. And then that's task 3. And task 4 is to identify other appropriate metrics and measures of success to help measure the program success.

And I know that Thomas Barrett is saying in the chat, and I think it's helpful to note that this could be metrics relating to the entire life cycle of the program such as outreach applicants received eligible, etc. And that's some of what we see in 17.9. And then task 5 is to consider once we've identified the metrics and prioritize them how the outreach, education, business case development, and application evaluation elements may be impacted by those metrics that have been identified and prioritized. If it might be helpful, let's see.

Gabriel says, sorry, just following the logical framework, we would need to have an overall goal task 4. We're just suggesting a set of metrics for qualification location and evaluation. Yes. I think that's correct, Gabriel. I think that's what we would need.

If it helps at all, Mike, I might suggest switching to-- Before I do that, I see Sarah's hands up. But I also staff have also developed some documents to help frame this discussion as we continue the consideration of tasks 3, 4 and 5. And I could switch to those if it might be helpful, but maybe I should go to Sarah.

MIKE SILBER: Yes. Let's take Sarah's intervention first, and then we can switch up.

JULIE HEDLUND: Excellent. Thank you. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH KIDEN: Hi, everyone. This is Sarah Kiden for the record. And I think I should start by just informing you that Tijani is supposed to be the ALAC representative, but he has seasons express his interest to step back. So I will represent the ALAC until someone else is identified if at all. So to respond to the homework on tasks 3 and 4, we discussed this within the At-Large advisory committee, and I have some general feedback.

The first one related to task 3 is that it's something actually we've already started to discuss when Aaron gave his update and what Gabriel has just talked about, is that it's had to prioritize the metrics in 17.9 if we don't have clear information on what success looks like. So the recommendation from ALAC is to have a bit more granular from measurements, some objectives, and numbers. And if you look at, for example, 17.9 it could be x number of outreach events targeting x number of potential applicants so that it makes it easy for us to know what's important for our community, and it also makes it easy to evaluate the metrics after the fact.

There was also some discussion about portfolio applicants, which I think it's still under 17.9 under one of the item. And people from the working group, we didn't agree on anything, but there was a question around putting a cap on the number of applications from portfolio applicants. So we didn't agree but it's something that I wanted to put on the record from ALAC. And, yeah, I think that's it from our working group. Thank you. From our constituency. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Sarah. That's appreciated.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. Thank you very much. This is Julie Hedlund again staff. I'm going to switch to another document that might help this discussion. Let me share this momentarily. Thank you. So there was a bit of homework for staff to develop- sorry. Let me get back to the Zoom in here. -staff to develop a framework for discussion document to help the working group begin its discussion of tasks 3, 4 and 5.

And so we've put together a couple of draft documents that we hope might be helpful. And what we'll do is we'll send these out for all of you to review over the holidays and into the New Year. And then we can come back to them and revise them at our first meeting, which will be the 9th of January.

So at any rate, let me just briefly show you what I have here. And we have just five minutes left today. So we'll just introduce this document if that's okay. I don't see any hands at the moment.

And there's another document, a table that we can show you. And then, again, we'll set as homework to invite people to comment on these documents and help us to get them in shape to help frame the discussion as we resume on task 3, 4 and 5 at the beginning of next year.

So first, what we see is task 3 and we've broken that into to subtasks, just as to try to provide a bit more granularity, a bit more detail. And that is that task 3 really is about prioritizing metrics. And part of that is to provide a rationale for those not included. If any and why and then suggest other metrics if any and prioritize. I'm just noting, Sarah's comment from ALAC, that it's hard to prioritize without knowing what the success metrics are.

And I think something that we'll do in sending this document back to you all is to show the dependencies between these tasks because I think it is difficult to take task 3 for instance, without also considering task 4 which is the measures of success and to the extent that we're looking at measures of success for particular metrics that would help us to determine how these might be prioritized. So I think task 4 and task 3 are really to be undertaken together.

And then task 4 also in addition to identifying measures of success is to propose in more detail how the data can be collected, how metrics are measured, and who can collect the data, as well as what represents success. And what we've done, and I'll show you this document momentarily, is put together a Google Sheet to help the working group work through the various elements of each of the metrics. So with each metrics, with each suggested metric to give it as a priority. That would probably be

the last step, but to suggest how to collect the data, the measurement techniques, who collects the data, and what represents success.

And then task 5 really follows after task 3 and 4. And that is after all the metrics have been identified and prioritized, then we want to see how those metrics would impact the approach for performing outreach and education. And that also can be captured. I'm just looking at the chat. I see Rafik says, Gabriela, I believe we were working on evaluating the program, setting metrics to be measured not working on the value of applications per se, and I think that's correct.

Spot on says Mike. Thomas says regarding the definition of public interest benefit, is this defined somewhere for success metrics, how much weight is it given compared to the financial and geographic consideration? I think that's something that this working group could consider and tell us. So that's an important point to make also. Something we can capture here as well.

MIKE SILBER:

Yeah. I think, Tom, you raised a very important one, where I think we need to actually -- and to Julie's points in terms of the document from staff, I think it's time to start potentially putting up a straw proposal. You know, I don't think that there is any one criteria that is more important than the other, but we need to weight them.

So for example, Gabriela raised a concern about geographic diversity and the global south. Paul then asked the question, is it

a country? So how do you cope, for example, a very wealthy business from at least developed country as compared to a community organization from a very poor part of an otherwise wealthy country?

Now my opinion is neither of those is the perfect applicant, but neither of those should be disqualified. But rather we should be making recommendations as to a weighting and scoring system, which firstly recognizes that by getting both applications in, we're achieving success because it means we've got more than 3 people who are aware of the program that understand if they qualify or not and decide to make use of the program because it's not punitive as Aaron was explaining earlier, where you're all in or all out.

And then the next stage is to provide some guidance in terms of how the evaluation would work so that we get towards outcomes that are more desirous than others. But the first is we need applications to come to in from people who are generally qualified in the broadest sense.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. And I'm noting that we're one minute past the top of the hour. Might I suggest that staff can send around the framework documents and ask for input on them? We'll obviously also send around some notes and some action items from today's meeting. And then we hope that you will all have a wonderful holiday and a very relaxing break.

And our next meeting is in 3 weeks on the 9th of January, and it's actually at 20:00 UTC at the alternate time that we'll be starting up in the New Year to make it a little bit easier for folks in the Asia Pacific region. So happy holidays to everyone, and thank you very much Mike for meeting us today, and we'll look forward to seeing you all in the New Year.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you, everybody. Let me just quick AOB before we close off, if there's anybody who has something pressing that they'd like to say. Seeing none, let me join the good wishes from Julie and all of us in the chat. Happy holidays, all of the best for the New Year and looking forward to seeing you in 2023.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]