
ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 21 November 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/PoE-DQ>

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

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Guidance Process (known as GGP) Initiation Request for Applicant Support taking place on Monday, the 21st of November 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 not have any apologies listed for today's meeting. As a reminder, when using chat, please select everyone in order for all to see. Attendees will be able to view the chat only.

Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand now. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat.

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.

All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to Mike Silber. Please begin.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you very much. Welcome, everybody. Good to see many familiar friends, faces. Your participation is, of course, much appreciated. I thought given that we haven't seen each other for a little while, it might be worthwhile just going around the room for people to introduce themselves, where they come from, what their interests are, so that we can get to know each other a little better and hopefully help towards a more conducive working environment.

So let me kick off. My name is Mike Silber. I had the unfortunate or fortunate position of having seen the previous Applicant Support process from a Board perspective, and that encouraged me this time around to get involved to see if we can try and improve and streamline it. At the moment, I have no direct affiliation with any entity involved within the GNSO process. But I do serve on the Board of the PIR, at least until the end of this year. Unless AFRINIC gets its act together, I remain on the ASO AC for another month and nine days.

Should we take it from the top as I see it in the Zoom Room, or do people just want to introduce themselves and go for it? I think

we've a small enough group that we don't need to be overly formal.

TOM BARRETT: Hey, Mike. This is Tom Barrett from EnCirca. We're an ICANN-accredited registrar. So I am representing, along with Matt Serlin, the Registrar Stakeholder Group today.

MATT SERLIN: Hey, Mike, and everyone. It's Matt. I'll go after Tom. Yeah, I'm here supporting Mr. Barrett, representing the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and looking forward to participating with everyone. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Excellent. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. My name is Tijani Ben Jemaa. I'm from the At-Large Advisory Committee. I served on the JAS working group. From the beginning, I was one of the active members of the JAS. I am here to represent the ALAC. The objective you said, I don't have any objective other than having a very good Applicant Support program that may result in supported applicants, not like the previous round where we didn't have anyone getting the support. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Tijani. Rubens, I see your hand is up.

RUBENS KUHL: Good time of day, everyone. I'm Rubens Kuhl from NIC Brazil. I was in the Subsequent Procedures Leadership Team. I'm here representing the Registry Stakeholder Group. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Lawrence, please carry on.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. My name is Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. I am a member of the Business Constituency, but I'm here representing the Commercial Stakeholder Group which comprises the BC, Business Constituency, the IPC, the ISPCP. I'm definitely interested in seeing that the next rounds have some actual support in terms of Applicant Support going to [inaudible] entities. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Hey, Gabriela. Please continue.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Yes. Hello. Good morning, afternoon, evening. My name is Gabriela Mattausch. I am the GAC representative. Thank you very much.

MIKE SILBER: Gabriela, for those of us who are not following the GAC that closely, which country are you from? And what's your current role in the GAC?

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: I'm sorry. I'm from Argentina. I'm Argentina representative in the GAC.

MIKE SILBER: Excellent. Thank you.

MARÍA GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Sorry. I should be following more closely, and apologies that I'm not. Rosalind, can I pick on you?

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Absolutely. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Rosalind KennyBirch. I'm the GAC alternate for this working group. I am the alternate for the UK in the Government Advisory Committee. Thanks so much. I'm really looking forward to working with everyone.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you. Sarah, can I ask you to introduce yourself?

SARAH KIDEN: Sure. Hi, everyone. My name is Sarah Kiden. I am from Uganda. I'm from the At-Large Advisory Committee, so alternate to Tijani in this working group. Also, I'm new to the working group so I look forward to learning from all of you. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: But fortunately, not new to ICANN, so welcome. That's appreciated. Then I see that Paul has deemed to join us. Mr. McGrady?

PAUL MCGRADY: Hi, there. Sorry about being late. I am simultaneously trying to get a hold of a doctor and meeting a plumber outside my daughter's apartment. So just because you have children that leave home means nothing. So anyway, sorry to be late.

Hi, everybody. I am the GNSO Council liaison to this team. So I am basically in a support role and trying to make sure that if anybody needs anything from Council that you guys get it. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Paul. Sorry to [inaudible] you. I appreciate that all of us have lives outside of this working group.

PAUL MCGRADY: I keep telling my family to quit interfering with ICANN, maybe get their priorities right.

MIKE SILBER: That's much appreciated. Have I missed anybody?

RAFIK DAMMAK: I think so.

MIKE SILBER: Oh, Rafik. Please, sir. You're the first on the call so I didn't even think to ask you to introduce yourself.

RAFIK DAMMAK: No problem. My name is Rafik, also from Tunisia and living and residing in Japan. I was in the JAS Working Group, and acted at some level as the co-chair from the GNSO. At that time, I was also in GNSO Council, and that was one of the first topics I advocated for, how to make it more accessible for applicants from developing countries and towards the joint effort between GNSO and ALAC. I'm not going to say it's an unfinished business we are trying to fix here, but looking forward to work with you all, and also see how things will go in this working group.

MIKE SILBER: So then I would suggest that—I think we've got all of the participants who've introduced themselves. Maybe we can hand over to staff.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I'm with the Policy Development department. I'm supporting the GNSO. I'm so very happy to support you all in this important effort in our first GNSO Guidance Process. So this is somewhat new. I'm very excited to be part of it. Thanks so much, and I'll turn it over to Steve Chan.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Julie. This is Steve Chan. I lead the GNSO support team. I'll be happily backing up Julie on this effort and doing everything that she needs to help get the work done, as well as supporting Mike and the team as well. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Benedetta, did you want to introduce?

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Thank you very much, Julie. My name is Benedetta Rossi. I actually support the GAC within the Policy Development support team. I'm just here as observer. Thank you very much.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Benedetta. Leon?

LEON GRUNDMANN: Thank you. My name is Leon Grundmann. I'm also working in ICANN Org as staff but I'm working in policy research and

stakeholder programs in GDS. I will be acting as the GDS liaison. So mostly observing, but also here to sort of feedback between the different functions. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Leon. And last but not least, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Hi, everyone. My name is Terri Agnew, and I'm actually one of a handful of SO/AC support that may be supporting this meeting, sending out invitations, calendaring, updating wiki pages, and greeting you as you join, and all that fun stuff that you see from us. Thank you very much.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks. Over to you.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks to the staff support. Then also just to recognize that we do have Justine observing as well, I'm assuming as an attendee rather than a panelist. Justine doesn't have speaking rights, but just to acknowledge your presence and to thank you for joining. So let's move on.

So we've done the welcomes and introductions, the brief background. I think we're all aware of where we're sitting at the moment. So the SubPro final report, some level of substantive work taking place during the IRT phase of work off to the Board adoption of the recommendations in topic 17 relating to Applicant

Support, Guidance 17.5 suggests the creation of a dedicated IRT charged with developing implementation elements of the Applicant Support program. In conducting its work, the Implementation Review Team should revisit the 2011 final report of the JAS Working Group, as well as the 2012 implementation of the Applicant Support program. So the GNSO committed to providing guidance on selected topics. They've determined that the provision of guidance is best accomplished via the GNSO Guidance Process. We are it. We're a novel process, which is very exciting.

Sorry, I'm just seeing a question from Tom Barrett. My understanding is that observers are allowed to chat, but let's make sure that that's permitted. So thanks for raising that, Tom. So this GGP, while I'm very excited that it's a new process, at the same time, Julie and Steve have been at great pains to remind me that while we're theoretically a new process, we operate as a working group and we follow established precedence. So we can build on a lot of existing work and process and procedures that's developed over a number of years. Hopefully, we can innovate but based on a firm background. Next slide.

So the scope is set out in the SubPro final report recommendations and tasks one to six. We then need to consider the working group mechanism and method of operation, the decision-making methodology, the completion date, and the rationale. In the initiation requests, there's a certain degree of emphasis in that the purpose of this GGP is to provide guidance to aid in the implementation of SubPro recommendations. It's not there to modify the recommendations or the implementation

guidance, nor is the GGP here to develop new policies. I think that's just something that is worthwhile keeping at the back of our minds is that we've got a somewhat limited scope. Let's focus on achieving that. If we do that really well, then maybe we can look at some of the other aspects and we can make some recommendations where we feel the scope might be a little limited. But for now, let's do our jobs and let's do it well. Then we can worry if we've missed anything in the process. Let's not try and initiate anything out of scope and get ourselves into trouble. Next slide.

PAUL MCGRADY: Hey, Mike. Just know you have a hand from Rafik.

MIKE SILBER: I'm sorry, Rafik. Please carry on. I missed that.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mike. Sorry for the interruption. I was thinking maybe I can ask later on. But since I'm here, I understand that the request or the mandate coming from GNSO is to initiate GGP. But I was wondering if it could be really helpful or it was planned to explain more about GGP because it was never tested. And to be honest, even myself, I was in GNSO Council, we just have only theoretical idea what is the process. So I was wondering if—I'm not sure if it can be possible today—but if Steve and Julie can give more explanation later on about GGP, what does it mean, and help us to understand more about the process. Thanks for also

emphasizing in the know, that we are not going to rework any recommendation or implementation guidance.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks. Julie, do you have a response?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. Thank you. Thanks, Rafik, for your question. I think it's a very good point and it would be helpful for staff to send to the working group—we can do that after this call—the part of the GNSO Operating Procedures that is the GGP, that particular Annex of the Operating Procedures. So we will do that and we'll ask members to go ahead and review that, just to provide some background. So it is a new process and it hasn't been used before. We'd go over it here today but it's probably better to have as background, and we'll link that into the wiki as well so that we can focus today on the scope and the work plan and some of those details. But thanks again for your question and request.

MIKE SILBER: Julie, I think that's a valid comment. I think once we have shared that, and once the group members have had an opportunity to either look at it afresh, if they're not familiar with it or to remind themselves, if we need to either on the next call or if we need to arrange a breakout to discuss any issues around that, we can certainly do that. Steve?

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Mike. I think the plan to share the materials as well as to go over those materials in more detail in the future makes sense. But I guess I just wanted to draw a little bit of attention to the things that we talked about, I guess Mike talked about already, which I think are relevant to Rafik's question. So what you're staring at on the screen right now in red are some things that we felt were important to point out and about the GGP that it is indeed a guidance in reference to existing recommendations and implementation guidance and it cannot develop policy. So some of those things are really important to note about GGP.

Then the other thing that Mike mentioned on the previous slide was that while the GGP is a new process, it's not novel in the sense of how it operates. In general, it's going to rely on the existing working group guidelines. So we have quite a bit of background and existing processes that we can run. So there's no doubt we'll go over this in more detail, but I just thought it might be important to point to some of those things. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you, Steve. That's appreciated. Any more discussion on this element? So let's get to the exciting stuff.

So Julie and Steve have put together a review of scope and tasks. We thought it best to run through those on this call and just make sure everybody understands. So task one is to review the final report of the JAS Working Group and the 2012 implementation of the Applicant Support program in detail to serve as resources for other Applicant Support-related questions or tasks. So there's

Recommendations 17.3 and 17.5 setting that out. Everybody comfortable with that as task one?

Lawrence, I'm not sure if that was a fleeting hand or just a mistake.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry. I was just looking for the icon at [inaudible] and agreement.

MIKE SILBER:

No problem. Thank you. Okay. We then move on to task two, which is working with ICANN staff as appropriate, identify experts with the expertise to aid in task three, four, and five. So there's Implementation Guidance 17.8 which sets out a little bit more detail and a little bit more robustly the scope and the task. So we need to draw on experts with relevant knowledge, including from targeted regions to develop the program elements to outreach, education, business case development, applicant evaluation, and then insights on development of business credit plans from different parts of the world.

Okay. Now, we've got some of the people on this call. But given the fact that some of us are wearing multiple hats, we may not want to necessarily task the people on this call with that level of responsibility or call on their expertise in that respect. So we need to identify experts to help with tasks three, four, and five. All comfortable? Hearing or seeing no hands and hearing no objections, let's move on to task three.

So then we need to analyze the set of suggested matrix in Implementation Guidance 79 and propose which one should be prioritized. Then the prioritize matrix is not limited to what is identified in 79.

In task four, identify other appropriate metrics and measures of success. Also considering how data can be collected, how metrics can be measured, who can collect the data, as well as what represents success. I think that Tijani and Rafik both touched on this a little bit in the introduction. There's a debate as to whether JAS was successful. I think many would consider that it wasn't particularly successful, given that it didn't support anybody. So how do we make sure that we just evaluate this going forward so that we actually have some objective way of measuring what is success and how we can measure it?

Then task five, consider and, to the extent feasible, suggest how outreach, education, business case development, and applicant evaluation elements can be impacted by the identified metrics. There's an example over there in terms of how that can be done.

These tasks make sense to everybody, bearing in mind that we need to identify experts that can help us with these tasks. It's not going to fall specifically on the shoulders of this group to perform these tasks, but we're also going to be looking for expertise. Yes, Tom?

TOM BARRETT:

Thanks, Mike. Yeah, all this seems to make sense to me. I wonder, is there the opportunity for financial resources in the

event that some of these require some outreach or third party type of expenses?

MIKE SILBER: My understanding is that we will, but let me defer to staff to double-check my understanding.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you for the question. At this point, it's not anticipated that the subject matter experts would require additional financial support to provide guidance in part of this process. Just noting that this is separate from the task that the working group will consider task six, which talks about the financial aspects of the program relating to Applicant Support, this is a separate question. But with respect to the subject matter experts not anticipated at this time that there would need to be financial support.

MIKE SILBER: So I suppose that it raises the question, Julie, how do we identify these experts and how do we bring them on board?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. That's a very good question, Mike. As part of the preparation for the next meeting, staff will put together a draft document that will be an input request, whereby the working group members can take this request after reviewing it and determine that it's sufficient, take the request back to their groups to identify subject matter experts. Also, ICANN Org will be tasked with

making suggestions as well, and this is part of if we're going back to—this is actually task two that we just summarized. Yes, there we are. Working with ICANN Org staff as appropriate, identify experts with expertise. So envisioning to help with this request would be to develop a request form or a document, a letter that working group members can take back to their groups, and ICANN Org can also use, and then we'll give a certain amount of time for groups get back to us with subject matter experts. So that's one way we can approach that task. If others have other suggestions for outreach in this area, we're happy to hear it as well. That'd be a discussion that we can have at the next meeting.

MIKE SILBER:

I would encourage the participants just to contemplate that. Because to me, it does create an interesting situation whether we are the experts in terms of this group, or whether we need to expand this group and what is the impact, or whether we're getting objective third parties as experts to assist us and what is their role and status? Just something to think about. I don't have a firm view. Paul, I see your hand is up. Your thoughts?

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. Again, I don't want to put a thumb on a scale one way or the other. But when I was reading the background materials on this, I kind of thought that the additional experts would be when we ran into a problem that we weren't expert enough to solve rather than lining up a bunch of experts at the beginning, but again, others may have a different view of how that was meant to

go down. But that's what I was thinking. I'm curious if staff had a different view on that. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Paul. Julie, please.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Thanks, Paul, for your thoughts and question. I don't think that staff has a particular view. The task here is worded to allow, I think, some flexibility. It says, "Working with ICANN Org staff as appropriate, identify experts with expertise to aid in tasks three, four, and five." So I think it's up to the working group to determine whether or not it needs expertise beyond its membership.

I think it's a good point that Mike makes too that the working group really should consider whether or not it is itself the experts, and whether or not it needs expertise beyond the membership. And it might be too that there's not a lot of flexibility to add more expertise within the ICANN community within your various groups. So that would depend as well.

So perhaps what we'll do is put together an input document that working group members can consider for the next meeting. That document would be how the working group members could work with their groups to collect the suggestions on expertise, if any, or maybe the working group decides at this time that it doesn't need additional experts. Or maybe once we get into task three, four, and five, the working group could decide that it needs to do more

outreach. I think there's a number of options there. Thank you very much.

MIKE SILBER:

I think you're spot-on, Julie. To Paul's point, I don't think we need to run out to identify an expert to walk with us every step of the way just yet. But we need to factor this in because I also wouldn't like us to get stuck and then start looking for experts or expertise. So let's do the analysis of three, four, and five. Then we need to do some careful thought in terms of do we want one or more additional experts, and if those need to be paid, how we would do that, given that we don't have an expectation of payment. Rafik, I see your hand.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Mike. I understand this kind of idea of identifying expertise in the initiation request. But my thinking here is that it's not surprising. Usually in any charter, there is this provision that we can bring subject matter expertise, it's required. It's not necessarily use it.

The second point, if I recall, what was sent to the different groups to appoint representative, the point was made that they should appoint those with some experience and knowledge related to this topic. So what I'm trying to say here is just we have some provision to help us if needed, but it doesn't mean we have to do it. So unless really we identify something missing and we urgently need it, I don't think we should worry so much at this level. But I'm

fine we can do that later on if we find any issue and it should not be blocker anyway.

MIKE SILBER: Okay. I think that's a good suggestion. Julie, did you want to respond to that?

JULIE HEDLUND: Sorry, I was muted. No, I think that's exactly right. I was going to suggest in the chat. Task two is worded in such a way that it allows the working group to have some flexibility on the identification of experts. And you're correct too that in the outreach to the initial appointment of membership to the groups, if it was requested that those members have expertise. So there could indeed be some overlap there as well. So thank you very much.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Julie. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Mike. Just to follow up on the comments from Rafik and Julie. So Rafik is absolutely correct. Charters generally have that provision about seeking external subject matter expertise as needed. I guess I just want to point out the reason why it's called out specifically in the initiation request, at least as I understand it, is because that is essentially the way that the implementation guidance from the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures. That's how they worded it. As Rafik noted, this is generally a provision always

allowed and it doesn't necessarily mean that this GGP has to go get that guidance. It called out specifically because that SubPro called it out. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER:

I have no doubt our colleagues will point out to us very quickly if they expect us to go and identify experts and bring them on board and we don't do that, I'm sure somebody will point it out to us. We can always rely on the multistakeholder model to point out our errors. Let's move on.

So Steve and Julie have put together the Implementation Guidance 17.9. I'm not going to read everything, but some of you are familiar with it, and if you're not, you need to get familiar with it because this is what we're basing those tasks three, four, and five on. Everybody wants to read through. Maybe the next slide because it runs on. And it runs on. Some of this does require analysis. I suppose the question is, is staff in a position to provide this level of analysis for us? Or do we turn around and say this is only in respect of implementation going forward and the historical is not that important to us? We don't need to go back and reanalyze. We can almost take some of that as given from the history. Julie?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. Actually, you just said what I was going to suggest, that we probably don't need to spend too much time going back and analyzing except for to the extent that we identify

areas of improvement for the future Applicant Support program. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER:

As I read the Implementation Guidelines—and please, those who who’ve been involved or more in depth than I have, there’s almost an acceptance that we need to understand a little bit of what was happening before but we weren’t collecting great metrics and we need to set this up going forward, rather than trying to do a historical analysis. That’s due to the point that Thomas raised in the chat, whether this group is sufficient to assess why no applicants received support in the 2012 round. So yeah, I think that’s something that I’d appreciate you considering and thinking through in terms of your view and position when we come to our next call. I’m not sure we’re going to make that decision today but it is something that I need you to think and come back with a clear position on.

All right. Then that moves us on to task six. This is going to be the fun one, which is a methodology for allocating financial support where there is inadequate funding for all qualified applicants. So here, IG 17.10 seems to contemplate financial support in one very specific way which is fee reductions. It also seems to suggest there’s an application process and that there is a scoring requirement threshold. So it seems to me to be asking questions that have a number of expected outcomes, not all of which we’re looking at as a GGP. So “Is fee reduction the only approach?” is not something that is in our purview. “What is the scoring requirement and what is the scoring requirement threshold?” is also not in our purview. So task six is an interesting one. I don’t

know if anybody else is feeling similarly uneasy about task six. Maybe I'm the only one. Hopefully, I'll get really comfortable by the time we get to task six.

All right. Let's then go through in terms of the report. We are responsible for producing a report. It should be posted for public comment for not less than 30 days. We need to review and to take into consideration the public comments. And then we may update the recommendations report if there are any recommendations that require modification to address comments received through public comment.

This is something that I debated with Steve and Julie. The feeling is that this is the correct approach, is that we should not be lobbying something over to the wall and expecting GNSO Council to publish a comment, but we need to take responsibility for publishing for comment and evaluating in the light of comments received. Any issues with that? Okay, next slide.

As part of our comments, we need to—as one would expect from a comment period—yes, Lawrence?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I have a question about the last process I was talking about. The understanding is that whatever work we do in any way will lead to some form of policy change. I mean, we go into public comments, if there happens to be a reason to possibly take a very close look at something that has been, I'll say, cast in stone in terms of policy, what then happens?

MIKE SILBER: My understanding is we're not undertaking policy work. But I don't know, Steve, Julie, if you've got a view on that?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. Thank you for your question, Lawrence. This group is not tasked with conducting policy work, as Mike notes. This group is producing guidance. So it was envisioned, as noted previously in the slide and in the initiation request for the GGP, that the GNSO Council and the GNSO community found that there needed to be some additional guidance with respect to the recommendations and implementation guidance coming out of the SubPro final report with respect to Applicant Support. So this group is tasked very narrowly with providing additional guidance with respect to the recommendations and implementation guidance already in the final report. So this group cannot make policy recommendations. And you'll notice that the title of the report, the output from the GGP is Guidance Recommendation report. It's not a Policy Recommendation report. So any output from this group would be in the form of guidance. Then as noted as with all working groups, regardless of whether it's policy or otherwise, those outputs do have to go out for public comment, and those public comments need to be analyzed. But there's no expectation that this group would be making any changes to existing policy or to the recommendations and the implementation guidance coming out of the SubPro final report, which is indeed policy recommendations. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Lawrence, does that address the query?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, it does. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: All right. I'm assuming those are old hands so let's move on to the next slide. Sorry. We are on the next slide. This is how we're supposed to deal with public comments. Carefully consider analysis of public comments' rationale, you agree or disagree with the comments received, and how these be addressed. Following receipt, review additional deliberations, we produce a final report to transmit to the Council, including the analysis of the comments. Next slide.

Is that all clear? Assuming so, let's move on to the meeting schedule and draft timeline. Let me hand over to Julie who has put this together.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm sorry. I was getting off mute. Thank you very much, Mike. Just to speak to the meeting schedule, at least to look ahead through January of 2023, as you'll see, coming up here, we do have a fairly ambitious work plan. So we are looking to establish the schedule now so that people can plan for meetings.

What we have here is, of course, today's meeting. When we'd sent around the Doodle poll, we did ask people to consider that

the times in the Doodle poll as times for recurring meetings every two weeks. Based on the Doodle poll, then the schedule for the meetings would be the next meeting in two weeks on the 5th of December at the same time, and then 19th of December. So, two meetings in December. Then there's the winter holiday break. Then resuming in January, on the 2nd, the 16th, and the 30th.

I'm seeing that Lawrence's comment, the 2nd of January is in the holiday. It is for some and not for others. We'd like to suggest that we schedule for that day. If it turns out that we have too many conflicts, we can try to adjust. But we don't want to get too far off track. I mean, for instance, if we were to shift to the second week in January, then we would effectively have only two meetings in January. Let's see how things go in December. We could set the meetings for January, and if need be, we can adjust as necessary.

The focus of having meetings every two weeks, just to note, is that we're hopeful that the working group will be able to accomplish a lot of work outside of the meetings, so in that intervening period in between meetings. So staff will assist with documentation and tools to help the working group do work between meetings. And if need be, we can spin out smaller groups if necessary, although this is already a fairly small group.

I'm seeing in the chat that Leon is asking if they'll be recorded for posting and the recordings will be posted. Yes, recordings will be posted on the wiki.

Rafik is suggesting if we can have a time rotation. We can look at a time rotation so we can consider also doing that as well.

I'm now just reminded from another staff member that Monday, the 2nd is actually considered an ICANN holiday, so we might need to look at the Tuesday or another day that week and if other people also are out of pocket that day as well.

MIKE SILBER:

Julie, I think that will be appreciated. I'm just concerned, if we don't have sufficient attendance, there's not much point to drag people into a meeting, which is not well attended. I'd rather push it out by a few days or if we have to, by a week, rather than missing people because of holidays.

Tijani, I see your hand. Lawrence, I see a hand but I suspect it's an old one. So please jump in if still you want to speak.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Michael, and thank you all for your comments. As for the rotation, I think that staff can perhaps find time that will not be harmful for anyone of the group, if possible. It can be at the end of the evening or at the beginning of the morning, but not in the middle of the night for any of the members. Because if it is like this, as Rafik is now midnight, we may lose some of the members of the group, and this is not a good thing, I think.

Second thing, this end of the year is very busy for me, very, very busy. Fortunately, the dates you gave here doesn't clash with any of my schedule. But I think that we will start working but I am not sure we will do a lot of work in these upcoming days or upcoming weeks.

I think that Rafik asked the right question at the beginning, asking about the GGP. Because now that you made a presentation and you said that in our report to not make any policy recommendation but guidance recommendation, I really need to understand more. And perhaps, I will ask you please to send this presentation on the mail and explanation of the GGP on the mail, too. Of course, I can find it, I can search it. But it's easier to have it on the mail quickly so that we can understand better. Thank you very much.

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Tijani. Valid comments all. I'm seeing a fair amount of discussion in the chat as well in terms of the second. I think the general consensus is that we should push the meeting to be second week of January, not trying to do it the first week. It does mean that we've got to push a little harder on our homework in between so that we don't run behind.

Rafik, I also noted your comment about sharing the pain in terms of time zones. It's something that we are going to struggle with a little bit. So I will work with staff and we'll see if we can find a better time that would be less inconvenient, just recognizing that we do have a reasonable geographic spread, which means it's not going to be that easy. Let's see if we can come up with some other alternatives on that one.

Tijani, in terms of sharing the slides, yes, absolutely. We discussed whether we should share the slides ahead or afterwards. But they'll be shared afterwards. We thought we'd talk through it. But yes, we have a very specific set of actions and they're quite limited in their extent. On that basis, we wanted to

move with a degree of speed to see if we can wrap them up and get the recommendation to the GNSO Council as soon as possible because I don't think the tasks that are assigned to this GGP are so extensive that we need to run for 6 or 9 or 12 months, but that we can wrap things up quite quickly. On that basis, I would like to suggest that we continue with the proposed times for December and at least get everybody on the same page in terms of expectations and outcomes.

Thank you, Steve, for putting up the next slide, which is exactly appropriate. We'll tweak the January meetings. But the idea is that we run according to the schedule. Julie, I don't know if you want to talk in any more detail to this.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you very much, Mike. I'll just note that this is a fairly aggressive timeline with respect to GNSO groups and working groups in general. But also, we will note that there's quite a bit of information that the working group can rely on that is in the SubPro final report. And also, there will shortly be coming out the Operational Design Analysis for SubPro, which will also provide helpful information and guidance with respect to Applicant Support, which the working group can rely on for some of its tasks as well. Staff will try to help expedite this work with as many resources and tools as we can to help the working group with its work.

If you want to go to the next slide, and I see we've just got a couple of minutes here, this is a graphical representation to give you a better sense of the timeline, but the hope is to try to wrap up

by September. What staff will do as an action item from this call is to put together this work plan and timeline with the adjustments with respect to the January meetings and put it out for consideration of the working group and discussion at the next meeting with a view to wrapping it up as a document to submit to the GNSO Council for the Council to consider and approve either its meeting in December or its meeting in January, depending on when the working group is ready to move forward with it. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER:

Does that make sense to everybody? As Julie said, we're aware this is somewhat aggressive. But the idea was to try and push this because we've got a limited number of tasks here and we didn't want to spend an inordinate amount of time on what's quite a limited set of tasks.

I'm not seeing any hands, not seeing any comments. I think that takes us—and our timing is pretty close to spot on. Are there any further questions or is there any other business that anybody would like to bring up? Okay, seeing nothing. Then thank you, everybody, for attending. Thank you for your participation. Thank you for your engagement. Some very important questions. As Julie and Terri have indicated, we will send a follow-up now. But we're looking forward to starting to actually get our hands onto tasks one and two in two weeks' time. And maybe Rafik and Tijani, as people with experience, you may want to just apply your minds in terms of any specific thoughts or experiences you want to share around the JAS Working Group from 2011.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Mike, very much, for leading this group. Thank you, everyone, for joining and participating. We do appreciate it. We hope you have a good morning, afternoon, or evening.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you all.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you all. I'll now stop the recording and disconnect all remaining lines since the meeting has been adjourned. Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]