

---

**ICANN Transcription**

**Applicant Support GGP**

**Monday, 05 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/NYU-DQ>

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 GGP initiation request for application support call on Monday, 5th December 2022 at 15:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call, attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. We do have apologies from Rubens Kuhl and Matt Serlin. As a reminder, when using chat, please select everyone. 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-- I'm sorry.

MIKE SILBER:

No. Not seeing any responses. So hopefully, we can move on from there.

---

*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.*

DEVAN REED: If you need 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 on the public wiki 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 multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this I turn it back over to the Chair. Mike Silber. Please begin.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you very much, Devan. So folks, you would have seen a fair amount of activity coming through from the secretariat over the last few days with some homework that we've all needed to do. So hopefully, you've seen that. I won't be giving anybody a pop quiz to check if you have done the homework or not. But I think that it's worthwhile going through the GNSO guidance process manual NX5 five of the GNSO Operating Procedures, and it's just to run through that quickly, if you wouldn't mind putting that up. I don't know who's in control there.

JULIE HEDLUND: This is Julie Hedlund, and I will go ahead and bring that up. One moment, please.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Julie.

---

---

JULIE HEDLUND: I think, yes, everybody should see that now. Would you like me to speak to this, mike?

MIKE SILBER: Yes, please, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Very good. Thank you very much. And welcome, everyone. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. We did have a request from working with members on the last call two weeks ago to just run quickly through the GNSO guidance process manual. And so we'll do that here or just taking a few minutes and highlight some salient points. So much of the manual is dedicated to the initiation of the GGP, and that is the initiation request that established this current GGP for which you are in this working group dedicated to the topic of applicant support. And just to note, the initiation request essentially forms the charter for this working group.

So I'm not going to go through all of the details of how to create the initiation request since that has been done and has been approved by the Council, of course, and establish this group. But I do think it's important to note the types of output from the GGP. And in particular, to note that while there are a number of various outputs from the GGP, one output that is not included is policy making or policy process or policy in general.

So the GGP can provide advice to the Board or other organizations, input on best practices, implementation guidelines,

---

agreements and conditions, technical specifications, research or surveys, budget issues, requests for proposals or recommendations on future guidance on or on policy development process activities, but noting that the GGP itself is not a policy development process.

So in this particular instance, this GGP on applicant support is providing additional guidance to the policy recommendations and implementation guidance in the subsequent GOD subsequent procedures final report. And so it's a very specific, very focused output for this particular GGP and as noted again, is not a policy making process in and of itself. So there would be no output that would be additional policy stemming from this working group.

And in last week's meeting, we went through the production of the GGP's recommendation report, and it's a guidance recommendations report. So I'm not going to go through those details here, and those slides are up on the Wiki of course. But I do want to note that the process that the working group follows for making its decisions is laid out here by reference to the GNSO working group guidelines.

So the methodology for making decisions is the standard methodology section 3.6 in the working group guidelines of the GNSO Operating Procedures. And I'll show you briefly what those are here. One moment please while I bring that up. Thank you for your patience. Every time I share a new document, there's a little process that I have to go through.

So here, you should see the sections 3.6 of the working group guidelines standard methodology for making decisions, and this is

---

a consensus process. And so there are varying levels of consensus. The chair will need to determine based on the discussions in the working group and deliberations on the recommendations that will go into the guidance recommendations report. And so that's full consensus, consensus, strong support, or significant opposition, divergence, no consensus, minority view, etc.

And then this section also describes how the determinations made for each of those categories and what the decision making process is. So that is pretty much all I was going to cover for the NX5, which is the GGP manual. And maybe I'll just stop there and just ask if there are any quick questions. And of course, we'll include the link to this document on the Wiki. Well, actually, it's already on the Wiki for you to reference if you'd like to. Looking for hands, if there are any?

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks. Thanks, Julie. Let me asked specifically because I know there was some discussion on our last call in terms of the role of the GGP in respect to policy. Are there any issues that we need to address? Are there any concerns, queries, questions that any of the members of the GGP have. Seeing no hands and no interventions, I'm very excited that everybody seems to know exactly what the parameters of our engagement are. Okay. Well, that went smoother than was expected. So, Julie, would you mind just taking us through the draft work plan and time line. And let's see if we can get people to buy in on that one.

---

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, very good. And thank you. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff for the record. So I'll speak to two work plans and timelines, both of which were sent out last week as a homework reminder. And I'll ask if there are any comments, questions or concerns with these plans. And also, more importantly, ask whether or not the version for Council is ready to be confirmed to be sent to Council. But I do see that there's a hand up. And while I stop sharing the screen and going to those documents, if you want to fill that question, I'll bring these documents up. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mike. As for the timeline, I would like to say that I would be fully booked for the 13 of March with the NomCom, also from 12 to 21 April, and from 7 to 18 June. By the way, ICANN77 is from 12 to 15 June. That's all right. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much. Yeah. We do have it included here in the May-June time frame, but I will note that for the version to Council. I'll switch that page in a moment. But thank you for that. Very helpful. So was there another question, Tijani? I see your hand is still up. No? Thank you very much.

So as known, there are two timelines and well, work plans/timelines. One is the timeline that is, I would say, somewhat

---

challenging. But the one that we still feel from a staff point of view and from the chair's point of view that it's achievable for the work plan and for the working group. And that is to deliver the report to Council by September 2023.

Now, just note that the reason we have to work plans/timelines is because we have not done a GNSO guidance process before. We have obviously done a lot of policy development processes, other types of working groups, but not this in particular, this particular process. And because of that, we thought that it would be useful to have an aspirational work plan. One that we feel is possible to do, but is quite challenging, but one that we'd like to try to stick to on a meeting per meeting basis. And that's the one you see here.

And then we also have a work plan, which I'll switch to in a moment. That is the version for delivery to the Council. And the difference with that plan is that it allows for the possibility of unforeseen delays. And we have that plan because we have not done a GGP reform. We don't know what might possibly happen in that process. We don't know whether or not the deliberations will take longer or the production.

We've never produced the recommendation report before. So it allows for additional time if the working group needs it. We hope we don't need it, but it's there if we need it. So I'm just going to switch over to that other document. And I think I have to stop sharing [00:13:37 -inaudible] to do that. So once more please while I do that.

---

Okay. So this is the version that's for Council. And that has the report being delivered to Council in December. So that's roughly three more months for delivery. So again, taking into account the possibility of unforeseen delays. And also taking into account the desire to not have to put in project change request. And just to those of you who may not be familiar, there is a project tracking system in place that staff maintains and it's overseen by the GNSO Council whereby all PDPs and other work processes are tracked and their health is tracked so that we know whether or not something might be slipping and there might be delays.

If there are any delays in a project, then we have to submit what's called a project change request. And for a process as relatively short as the GGP as we hope it will be even for delivery in December, we would like not to have to put in for a project change request. And so in a sense, what we're doing is we're building in time to avoid the possibility of a project change request.

Yes, Paul McGrady, the dreaded PCR indeed. So by submitting to Council, we think a timeline that allows for some possibility for delay. We hope to avoid the project change request. And so I will just walk quickly through this. This is the work plan that we would like to deliver to the Council today, actually. And along with a motion for the consent agenda for the Council to consider at its meeting on the 15th of December, especially given the fact that this working group has already started its work, we feel that the sooner we can get the work plan and timeline approved, the better. So this would be we'd be looking at tasks three, four, and five. The major finishing tasks one and two in December,



---

hopefully, even by this meeting. Beginning task three, four, and five in January and continuing those tasks through March.

And then also starting task six in March, finalizing task six in April and then beginning the draft report development in the April to June time frame. And then the public comment falling in the July through September time frame to include ICANN77. We'll put that back in the previous column, and we'll make that correction before submitting to Council. And thank you Tijani for noting that. And then October to December for developing the final report. And noting that actually that July to September time frame includes the public comment review and then delivering the final report to Council in December.

So this is the timelines that we would like to submit to Council today. The other timeline would be for submitting the final report to Council in September. And that is, the other timeline is the one that we will have the working group working towards that's how we will schedule the tasks in the various meetings that you will see. So I'm going to stop there. And I see Tijani, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Julie. Shall we propose this timeline with the dates here, or these are not important, it's just a plan for the tasks?

MIKE SILBER: No. I do think, Tijani, we need to give Council an idea of the dates so that they know what we're working towards.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So I gave you dates that I cannot do.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. But Tijani, hopefully, your presence or absence at a particular time will not impact the ability of those groups to do the work. And feedback can be given through the mailing lists on calls. And, hopefully, we would have captured any of your inputs so that, your absence over a particular period shouldn't have a specific impact on the delivery of the outputs.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: And it's good.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. Thank you, Mike, for explaining that. And just to add to that. It should be noted that we don't expect one hundred percent attendance for working group members at all meetings. It's not realistic. It's not possible. Which is why meetings are always recorded and transcribed, and while we also have the Wiki and the mailing list input from the working group.

So we'll make sure that there are plenty of opportunities for you and other work working group members who might have to miss a meeting to be able to provide your input. And we'll make sure all inputs are collected in the deliberations of public comments and the production of the final report. And that is the key deliverables

---

from this working group. So thank you for raising that point. I appreciate it.

Are there any other questions with the timeline, particularly the timeline to go to the Council? We'd like to submit it today. Today is the documents and motion deadline for the 15th of December Council meeting. We have a short motion that would just have the Council confirming the work plan. And also noting that we have a motion that we'll be submitting today to confirm the liaison from the Council to the GGP. And that is Paul McGrady, which you may all know, but there is a minor formality that generally, we put on the consent agenda at the Council's confirmation of the liaison, which we found had not yet been done. So Paul, we're going to make you official today. Oh, well. Yeah. Oops. We'll make you official, I'm sorry, on the 15th.

PAUL MCGRADY: Sounds great. I will continue on between now and then in an unelected, unaccountable fashion.

MIKE SILBER: You're always accountable.

JULIE HEDLUND: So any concerns about submitting this work plan to the Council today for consideration on the 15th?

---

MIKE SILBER:

Yeah. Well, folks, please know that this is a slightly formalistic request, but at the same time, we want to ensure that we have buy in from everybody within this GGP. We'd originally put up a slightly more aggressive timeline and then staff hopefully suggested that it might be worthwhile just pulling back slightly. You know, we can still work towards the slightly more aggressive timeline, but to give ourselves a little bit more space. But if we're submitting this to Council, I'd like to make sure that we have buy in from everybody and that it's not just, silence. And then people later on start questioning if we're moving too fast, too slowly and anything else.

So please speak now if you have any concerns. Otherwise, we are going to be working to this. It's 12 months, which I don't think is too short given the relatively constrained tasks that we have to perform, but it also is quite speedy, as Paul mentioned, in ICANN policy time. But this is not a policy process. It's a guidance process. So that's why we think we can get it done within the 12 months.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Mike. This is Julie Hedlund again from staff. So hearing and seeing no objections, we'll go ahead and get the motion on the work plan submitted today by Council leadership. And I'll move on to the next item on the agenda, which is task one. So one moment, please, while I pull up that document. Again, this is Julie Hedlund from staff.

And the homework assignment was for the working group members to read through the 2011 final report of the joint

---

applicant support working group, as well as the information on the implementation of the applicant support program in the consideration of task on, the review, which is the review of those two items to serve as resources for the applicant support related questions and task.

And the homework also included the opportunity for working group members who may have been involved in the joint applicant support working group or the implementation of the applicant support program to provide any comments that might be helpful to the working group. So we might take a few minutes here for folks to provide any comments that they may have before we close out this task.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you, Julie. I'm hoping that people had taken the opportunity to review that section of the final report. Rafik, please continue.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Mike. Yeah. I reviewed, let's say, the [00:25:26 - inaudible] report kind of to refresh my memory since it was maybe long time ago. And also the, I think, the review of the implementation. But for the seconds report is, I mean, the implementation process is not something I got involved with that much. And so, I'm missing maybe some information. I recall like this the top of this, the panel and so on, but no idea really how it worked at the end and so on.

---

So I'm just wondering, instead of just counting on reading the report if there is any possibility to have, if possible, I know that maybe cannot be doable. But if we can have some briefing from someone from, I'll say, I forget not enough division. Whoever division in ICANN that took care of the implementation of the new ccTLD so they can give us any briefing if possible about implementation and give any detail that's not necessarily in the report because, for example, I didn't really find any information about like the outreach report and support. I have some kind of feeling or position how that went at that time.

But if anything, that can be from ICANN staff. I'm not talking about policy, but from, I forget really how to call it. But the division that took care of implementation in 2011-2012 can be really helpful for us. So just an idea.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Rafik. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Yes. I don't think it was called that at the time, but GDS would be the group that oversees implementation. And we can certainly request someone who is involved at the time to provide a short briefing. We could request that for the next meeting of the working group for the 19th if that would be okay.

MIKE SILBER:

I think that's a very interesting suggestion. Can I get some reactions from the grouping if that would be useful? I don't want to schedule a briefing if it's not going to be useful to this working group. So if people want to applaud or thumbs up or, other

---

appropriate reaction, it will just be useful to get a brief response. Sarah, I see you've got your hand up.

SARAH KIDEN:

Hi, everyone. And this is Sarah Kiden for the record and from the At-Large Advisory Committee. I want to give a plus one to Rafiks's suggestion because within the ALAC, I think, two weeks ago, we started to have some sort of discussion and people who have been in the ALAC for a very long time are saying that, for example, in 2012, people had an idea of what they wanted the applicant support to look like, but not how it would be implemented in terms of metrics. So I think this exercise would be very helpful so that we sort of have a place to start. Yeah, and give feedback as well to our constituencies. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you, Sarah. That's very useful. I see Gabriela we've got another plus one. I was hoping people would make use of the online reactions just to get a few more thumbs ups. But I'm taking we've got enough response that I think a briefing would be useful if you can arrange for that please, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Well, thank you. Staff will definitely take this as an action item and arrange it, try to arrange it for the next meeting, the 19th of December. Thank you very much.

---

MIKE SILBER: That will be great. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Is there anything anybody else would like to discuss on task one? I'm not seeing any hands. Mike, shall I move on to task two?

MIKE SILBER: Yes. Please do.

JULIE HEDLUND: Excellent. Let me get the document. Okay. Sorry for the delay. Takes a little bit of time to switch documents. Sorry about that. So, again, it's Julie Hedlund from staff. And this is the document related to task two. This is an outreach document to the supporting organizations' advisory committee's stakeholder group and constituencies with a request for them to submit subject matter experts to aid in the deliberations of tasks three, four, and five of the initiation requests.

And the document which was sent around for your review envisions that it may be possible that some of the groups that we contact may have already submitted their subject matter experts as members of the working group, but some may have additional subject matter experts that they would like to provide in response to an outreach request.

And we'll note also that, excuse me, the initiation request and the GGP process manual in general notes that there is a step in the process for the working group to perform outreach to the various



---

stakeholder groups and constituencies and supporting organizations and advisory committees to provide input to the working groups deliberations. And so this request for input can form also the function of the output or outreach to these organizations or for input to the working groups' deliberations.

I'll open it up for comments or questions that anybody might have had on the document, and we can also discuss the timing of when we want to try to get this out. But in any case, it should probably go out before the working group begins tasks three through five in earnest. I see two hands up. I think, I see Tijani and Thomas.

MIKE SILBER: Yes, Tijani and Thomas. So let let's take them at least as they [00:33: 15 –inaudible] our screen. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry, I was muted. Thank you very much, Mike. And I would like to ask if the, which is quoted here, the working group has the flexibility, the discussion to relay as subject matter experts at specific fields to add and evaluation for certain tasks. Is this a quotation that is in the document or we can perhaps tweak it a little bit.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Tijani. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. This is actually a quote from the initiation request. But we can paraphrase it if you feel that it would make it clear. We don't have to use this particular quote.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay? May I propose the following one? The GGP initiation report [00:34:21 –inaudible] that the working group has the flexibility discussion to relay on the advice of subject matter experts in specific fields for certain tasks. Because requesting, moment, what was the writing before? Yeah, relay on subject matter experts in specific field to add and deliberation. Add and deliberation. How can it add and deliberation? I find this not-- anyway, I find the other version more clear, if you want me to repeat.

MIKE SILBER: Tijani, if you wouldn't mind just pop it onto into the chat or on the mailing list so we don't miss anything in translation? I'm happy to take it under advisement, but that is a specific quote. So we'll just need to tweak that otherwise.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I put it on the chat if you don't mind.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you. Thomas?

THOMAS BARRET: Hi, Tom Barrett from EnCirca. So my question has to do with regarding the outreach this group will perform and whether or not it would be limited to other ICANN groups or if we're thinking of doing outreach outside of ICANN.

---

JULIE HEDLUND: Mike, would you like me to try to address that one?

MIKE SILBER: Yes. Please do, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Thank you for your question, Thomas. I think that remains to be seen. I think that's going to depend on the deliberations of the working group as they consider tasks three, four, and five. And as to whether or not outreach needs to go beyond the ICANN community, I think probably the scope envisioned in these tasks is focused on the ICANN community, but if indeed the working group were to identify groups outside of ICANN that were useful to request input from or outreach to, then that would certainly be a possibility. It certainly is not something that we would rule out. But I think that we would want to be very specific on what those groups or who those groups might be. Thomas?

THOMAS BARRET: Just a follow-up question. I wonder if it might be helpful to identify the basic life cycle of, say, an application for new TLD and identify when are we are looking for subject matter experts against that particular life cycle. So for example, are we looking for subject matter experts after an application has been submitted, are we looking for subject matter experts to find eligible applicants who might be interested in submitting. So it might be helpful to at least

---

---

map the phase of life cycle with which we're looking for interested SMEs.

MIKE SILBER:

So Tom, valid comment, but I don't think that's what we're after at the moment. I think we're looking to provide guidance into the process rather than looking for an expert to help us, for example, you raise the point to identify applicants. That that's not what the GGP's here for. The GGP is here to give guidance as to the process to be used to identify applicants and the type of support they may require. So if we don't have the subject matter experts within this grouping, then we need to try and identify where they are to be found either individuals or a type of person whose input are--

So, if the comment comes from somebody to say, we need an economist, a development economist to assess certain facts, then the key question is if they're part of the ICANN community, then hopefully we can get their input at no cost. But if that is something that people feel is absolutely essential for the guidance that we're going to give, and we don't have somebody within this community, then we may need to go and ask for budget and try and find somebody from out of the community. But this is simply just to try and expand the pool and see if we have all of the subject matter experts within this grouping or if we need to cast the net more widely. So that's the thinking. What you're asking, I think, goes to the next step, which is around implementation rather than design. But maybe I'm misunderstanding your input.

---

THOMAS BARRET: Well, thank you for that, Mike. Yeah. Let me consider your response and see if that addresses what I was thinking of.

MIKE SILBER: Okay. Thank you. Tijani, thank you. I see that you've put some proposed language in the chat. What I am concerned about, Tijani, is I don't think that we are going to rely on the advice of subject matter experts, especially if we are the subject matter experts. I think what we're asking for is additional input from subject matter experts. Because this is, we have the flexibility to rely on the advice. I'm not sure that adds anything to the discussion.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The other version says add. Is add better than advice.

MIKE SILBER: No. No. But it's to aid us in our deliberations. And that is a direct quote.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: I'm just not understanding the problem that we're trying to solve with the edit.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No problem. Go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND: Mike, this is Julie Hedlund. May I add perhaps a point clarification for Thomas's question? And perhaps it's helpful to note for Tijani as well. With respect to the subject matter experts, the focus is on those experts that can aid in specifically the working groups' discussion and review of tasks three, four, and five.

So that is the analysis of the metrics that are suggested through the implementation guidance 17.9 in the SubPro's final report, and prioritizing those metrics, identifying other appropriate metrics and measures of success so to the extent that subject matter experts might be able to assist in identifying other metrics, and identifying how the data might be collected, how metrics can be measured and who would clock that data as well as what represents success.

And then task five advices to the various outreach factors that may be impacted by these metrics and measures of success. So it's a fairly focused group of experts. And in the request, which I can switch back to, we're pointing to those specific tasks as those that pertain to the subject matter experts. So it's fairly prescribed. I think that you're right in that in the implementation, there may be additional need or opportunity to rely on experts at that point. So there's really sort of two phases here. But this group is simply providing guidance that would perhaps then inform shall we say the implementation process. I hope that's helpful. Tijani?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I'd like to read and implementation guidance 17.9. The dedicated implementation review team should seek advice from expert and the field to develop an appropriate framework, etc. So it is from this paragraph that I took it. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you for that. That's actually very helpful. I see, seek advice from experts in the field to develop. Yes. Okay. We'll take a look at the wording and I think I understand your point. It may be that we want to. It's a bit of a difficulty because we've got wording that specifically in the implementation, I'm sorry, the initiation request. If we're quoting that, we can't really change it, but we can try to make it more clear. ICANN staff will make some suggestions for perhaps clarifying in line with implementation guidance 17.9.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Julie, and thanks Tijani. That's useful clarification. Much appreciated. Any additional comments, thoughts, questions.

JULIE HEDLUND: I see there's something in chat from Gabriela Mattausch. Certain tasks include topics such as the qualification of candidates for the program and the ability to reach expectations. FYR, [00:45:36 – inaudible] alone able to expand DNS markets through all regions or do we need to expand the criteria? Anything you want to add to that, Gabriela? I'm not sure if I understood your comment. Or maybe if you want to speak to it.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. I'm also not quite following the comment. Gabriela, did you want to speak to it, or maybe you're not in a position to speak?

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Hello. The microphone is working?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. It is. We hear you fine.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Okay. Sorry. Just for clarification. I don't have to ask if we received the first [00:46:36 –inaudible] of qualification to come in the program is only listed on countries. Are these countries alone able to expand in as in the objective of this program? I thought it was or a [00:46:53 –inaudible] meeting will expand because I see at least different countries not many from the Latin American region. And that's why if the expectation is to expand throughout all regions, is it possible or is it something that is being elaborated the expansion to other countries, not [00:47:21 –inaudible]. Thank you very much.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Gabriela. Mike, if you don't mind, I'll try to take a stab at that. Okay. So we're looking at the quote, the working group has the flexibility especially that's discretion to rely on subject matter experts in specific fields to aid in the deliberation for certain tasks. So in this case, a certain task actually means the tasks in

---



---

three, four, and five. And we actually can move on to this document anyway since it'll be the one that we'll run through quickly in the next agenda item, which we'll have to come to quite quickly here. One moment while I switch that document. Oops. Sorry. Apologies. All these documents look the same on small screen. So it's hard to see. There we are.

All right. Thank you for your patience. So, specifically, the certain tasks, references, tasks three, four, and five. So as far as expanding it to, I'm just looking at your comment, sorry. Let me just look at it. Look on again in chat. Expanding certain tasks to the qualification of candidates. I think one of the tasks that staff will try to assist with tasks through four and five is to break these out into sort of sub-elements or sub-bullets to be more specific as to what the working group is looking at with respect to these measures, these metrics. The metrics that have already been identified in the SubPro final report as well as other possible metrics and measures.

And then we can see whether or not that would include topics such as qualifications of candidates for the program. And I do know what you've mentioned the ability to reach expectations. One of the items that working group members will be looking at as far as task four is what represents success. So we might also be considering what are the expectations that the working group is expecting to be met with respect to the metrics and measurements?

So I think the short answer to you, Gabriela, is it's possible that certain tasks might include the qualifications of candidates, but I have to say that until staff does more in-depth review of these

---

tasks and sort of subtasks to them, we'll be able to give you more information there for the working group to consider as we get into these specific tasks. And thank you for your helpful comment, Paul. I'm glad you like the way we're going through this material.

MIKE SILBER: Can I just check, Gabriela, does that answer your question?

JULIE HEDLUND: Gabriel, did that answer your question for the time being? You could send us a check marker set.

MIKE SILBER: Great. Thank you, Gabriela. I think the key point is we want to reach back to the constituencies because while we have lots of very knowledgeable people on this call, we might need some additional help. And it would be really useful if we could get some pointers as to where that additional help could come from. But again, to Tijani's point, I don't think that would in any way restrict us at a later stage, when we get onto any of these tasks and we realize that we actually need some expertise to then reach out at the time.

You know, I'm just very conscious that we don't want to be in a situation where at the eleventh hour we realized we need some additional inputs, then we find out that we don't have anybody within the community who can provide that. So we then got to go and look external, then we've got to have procurement processes. So we just don't want any opportunities for delays. Hence the

---

desire to reach out to the constituencies and say, if we're missing any experts, tell us now.

Obviously, it doesn't stop us from finding, identifying, and bringing in experts and expertise at a later stage. So I think, Julie, we seem to have a reasonable agreement on that step so we can carry on. I just got a message from Julie that she has lost her connection. So that puts us in a slightly difficult position because I don't have the agenda up and available. So let's just give Julie a second to come back on.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry, Mike. This is Lawrence. I'd like to be on the queue. I can't find the --

MIKE SILBER: Yes, Lawrence, please. No problem, carry on.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. So I think this takes us back to the question that Thomas raised earlier with regards-- because if we are going back to the community to say we might need subject matter expert, definitely question will be in what area. So I think, early in this process, we should definitely be looking at some specifics. Maybe not going really into detail, but really looking at specifics around, what kind of subject matter experts might be required?

This will mean that we have to also take a closer look at JD, or rather, our scope. So if we're going back to the community we

---

should be able to go back with answers to questions that they would most likely ask, which will be, what kind of experts are you looking at, in what areas, and stuff like that. So there really is a lot more groundwork, but I think we need to do.

MIKE SILBER:

Any other thoughts, comments? Because I take your point and I recognize that if we want any development economist, for example, we need to point that out. But I don't think we're there yet. And I don't want to hold out until we have identified the exact expertise we require to reach out. So we're trying to proactively say, is there any subject matter expert that you know of that should be included.

And if we don't get any, then once we identify a specific gap, then we can go and identify somebody to fill that gap, then we don't have to go back to the communities to fill that gap. Because that then will push our 12-month timeline into a 24-month timeline quite easily. And I don't think it's necessary.

I don't know. I am being too directive here. Please let me know. The point that I'm just trying to make and to your comment Lawrence, I agree you. We may not know exactly what we require now, but I also don't want to go through a design phase of six months before going to the community and then get inputs and then it it's another six months before we're actually doing any work. I'm looking for some feedback.

---

THOMAS BARRET: Hey, Mike. This is Tom Barrett from EnCirca. I think what may be missing and just needs to be shared with the group is the specific expertise you're looking for from these subject matter experts. Has someone already enumerated the types of expertise that they're looking for?

MIKE SILBER: So, Tom, I think you're raising an important point and as had Lawrence. We don't have that as yet. This is more a general request, which says, have we missed somebody that's not part of this group, but who has general expertise. We don't want to be too prescriptive in terms of the type of expertise because we will get a second and third bite at this particular cherry if we need to in terms of finding very specific expertise to address specific questions. I just am not sure if my own view is being persuasive because I'm the chair and I've got the largest voice or because people generally agree. If you don't, then please let me know so that we can adjust accordingly. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Mike. I think that perhaps we can let it to the mailing list. We can send on the mailing list the kind of expertise we find relevant. Because there is only these some identified, for example, for the business case. This is something that I don't think we have expertise in our group for that. So let us perhaps be more specific and try to do something really that we work on. And sent on the mailing list the kind of expertise we need for each member of this group. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER:

Tijani, this is not the expertise required members of this group. This is reaching out to our communities asking if there are any subject matter experts that we are missing in the process who we should add into this group. This group is not going to be building business cast. I'd really like to pose intervention on the chat if I can summarize or let me not summarize and let me just read. Paul said, we won't know what we need until or if we hit the wall, we can't come on our own. And the question is whether or not there's an expert who's amazing that should be rubbed in right now. And that's the good points.

And Tom, to your point, yes, you're out in what areas and the areas would be as outlined in the GGP process and as outlined in the recommendations. So, Julie, I think it's worthwhile. Let's just post that to the list for general comment. Let's get some additional inputs. I don't think we're necessarily going to conclude on this call. But let's post the draft to the list.

Please if I can ask for your input over the next week so that we can get it across the community. And yes, I'm seeing the comments, what do we need? What expertise do you already have? And that's why in the correspondence we'd actually say if you've appointed your subject matter expert to this grouping then we're good. Because the idea is that the people who are part of this working group will have subject matter expertise.

Okay, Julie, you're going to take it as an action. Let's see if we can close this off in the mailing list instead of having to delay it for another call. Let's see if we can close it on the mailing list. Not

---

seeing any objections or hands. Let's move on. So then we've got a homework for the next meeting, which is essentially to review tasks three, four, and five. Julie, I don't know if you've got your network back and if you're able to talk to that.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you. This is Julie Hedlund from staff, and apologies for my network dropping. Just nothing really much to add for the homework just that you review the document we'll send around, which is for tasks, the description of tasks three, four, and five. And that also relates to the expertise we're looking for in task two. So those are interrelated. And also, staff has, we'll take an action item to provide a framework or a framing document for discussion for the next call on task three, four and five to try to break out those tasks into further detail to assist in your consideration and kick off the discussion. Thank you. With that, Mike, I think there's no other business.

MIKE SILBER:

No, there is not. So let's just do a quick AOB. I know we're over time, but let's just do it quick AOB if there is anybody who has a question or comments that they'd like to raise. Excellent. Not seeing any hands, and any further interventions. Thank you everybody for attending. Thank you for your input. Thank you for the useful discussion. And let's try and close this particular item off on the mailing list if we can.

---

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Mike, and thank you, Mike, for leaving this call so well. And thank you all for joining. And this meeting is adjourned, and we'll look forward to talking to you in a couple of weeks and chatting on the list. Goodbye, everyone.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you all. Have a good day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**