
**ICANN Transcription
Applicant Support GGP
Monday, 03 July 2023 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar

Page: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO guidance process, known as GGP, Initiation request for applicant support call taking place on Monday, the 3rd of July, 2023.

We do have listed apologies from Rosalind KennBirch, Satish Babu, and Paul McGrady.

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. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please email the GNSO Secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the public wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call and an email reminder sent to the list. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording.

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.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder 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, Terri. We are somewhat light, but I also don't want to ignore the fact that there are some people who have joined us. And I'd like to move forward. But given that there are three working group members, plus the chair and obviously staff support, can I just get some feedback, Tom, Maureen, Lawrence, in terms of your views? I personally would like to continue, but I'd appreciate your thoughts.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Mike. I'm happy to get an update from staff that I can actually use to report back to my team, of course. Unfortunately, I was unable to get to the last CPWG meeting, but Satish did get some feedback and I just wanted to report that.

Of course, you all know Justine Chew. She definitely keeps us on track and also reminds us about what our brief is. And I just wanted to reassure you that the GGP team is—we are attempting to keep as much in scope as possible, but of course there are always issues that will arise.

But yeah, I had to read through the recorded discussion of the CPWG and a discussion with Justine, just to reassure her that staff kept us on track. And I think that I put a comment in the Google Doc that I appreciate all the work the staff have done and that I think that going along with what's being expected by the IRT, if staff can continue to

keep us on track, we're definitely fine with that and we'll do as much as we can to help. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: Perfect. Thank you. All right. On that basis, unless there's any disagreements, let's continue.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: In the course of our discussion, maybe today or subsequently, based on interaction with my constituency, I'm short on the understanding of social enterprise. I want to know if we have a definition that was used, I mean that was captured, in order to benchmark this amongst our membership and see if this to some extent covers the CSG.

On another point, at the last public meeting, I ran into Xavier, I guess we all know Xavier, Finance Chief, and I probed him on how we basically arrived at the sum of \$2 million for this round of the applicant support. And what I understand the finance team did was basically have that figure as a placeholder so that it's not vacant from the last rounds and they are basically waiting for our team, the members of this working group to come up with what we feel should be the budget, so to say, for the next rounds. So I would also like to have us discuss this further so that we are all on the same page, because my previous understanding had been that the sum of \$2 million was cast and we're supposed to work around that, especially looking at the questions posed in recommendation task six.

So, some clarity might be needed around that. And if it's our remit and our job to determine what the budget for the next round for applicant support should look like, then I think we might need to rework how we've been going around this.

MIKE SILBER:

So, Lawrence, thank you, but let me state categorically, no, it's not our remit. So, if Xavier thinks it's our remit, then there's a disconnect between the GNSO Council and ICANN Finance. I think the rest of the ICANN staff on the call understand it well, but no, that's not our remit at all. So, yeah, I'm a little confused. I don't know if anybody wants to comment on that. I see Julie has said—well, we now have comments from both Julie and Leon, that that's a staff determination. We've provided some input based on the questions that have been asked of us by Council, but I really don't want to get us off track because that's going to be delving into an area that is fraught and not one that we have been asked to address by the GNSO Council.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: All right, so as a follow up, it will be nice to have some clarity, because the discussions we've had up till now, if you recall, is we're working with about 2 million for the next rounds, and we have this question posed that where we have more successful applications, what do we do, and prioritization and some other talks are coming up.

So if that ceiling isn't determined by those of us here in the working group and by staff, we will definitely need to know and have some

clarity. If that is a final sum, who are those who will be making that decision if the decision hasn't been made?

MIKE SILBER:

So, Lawrence, again, I need to respectfully disagree, because we've spoken about numbers as an example of where we are. But we haven't in any way set a budget, and Council has not tasked us to set a budget. So the budget is irrelevant. The question that we've been asked is what happens if the number of successful applicants or qualifying applicants exceeds the available budget, how we deal with it. The numbers there are simply to help us in terms of understanding. They don't form part of the guidance that we're providing, and they've simply been part of the discussion we've had to try and assess and to make concrete the situation. So, Julie, I see you've got a couple of questions, and let me take Maureen's hand, and then I'd like to kick over to you, Julie, just to respond.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Mike. I'm not quite sure if Lawrence was at the meeting that we actually spent a whole meeting on this particular issue. And it was highlighted at the outset, of course, that task six was a staff responsibility, that we were actually just discussing and contributing to that discussion.

But I think at the end of that, that whole hour of discussion, the decision was that it was going to be left up to staff and GNSO and Board. As you mentioned, because we don't know what the actual number of successful applicants is going to be. So, we can't put a pin in it

anywhere. So the way in which it's actually decided upon is actually outside of our scope anyway. And as is this particular issue. So, I have to agree with you, Mike. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you, Maureen. And can I hand over to you, Julie, if you wanted to respond on this.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. And thank you all for this helpful discussion. Thank you, Lawrence, for raising the question. And just to note what I've put in the chat, and just to note that very definitely, this is an issue. The issue of the amount of funding for the Applicant Support Program is not one that the GGP Working Group has been tasked to discuss or to determine. Task six is only about what should be done in the case of there is not enough funding. And if there's not enough funding, then what should the methodology be for allocating limited funding? So, also not a question of what the actual budget is for the program. So, just wanted to confirm that.

And also, Maureen's recollection is correct. We did discuss this in the meeting. And again, that was the determination. So, I hope that's helpful. I'll stop there. And I need to bring up the appropriate screen for the next discussion. So, I'll do that.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Julie. Yes, I think it's worthwhile pausing there. Let me hand back to you in terms of where we are at the moment in terms of the document.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay, let me share screen. All right, here we are. And Terri has put a link to the Google Doc that I have on screen. So it might be easier for you to view it that way. What I suggest that we do then is go through the comments and text, providing the document, and see if there are any questions. Most of this is pretty straightforward. I hope you had a chance to look a little bit at the document that we sent out last week. I'll make sure it's all covered here and if we need to, we can also spend some time at next week's meeting on Monday as well. But let me just go one by one through the comments here. And Mike, I'll rely on you to pay attention to chat and hands and whatnot. Thank you.

Okay, so starting out with the methodology section, staff added some additional text, which you see here in green or whatever color it is for you. It's more specifics on some of the input that was received during the deliberations relating to tasks three and four and analyzing a prior to the metrics. So, that's the text that was added. Are there any questions or concerns about the text that was added? I'm going to move pretty quickly, because there are some comments I think that we'll need to discuss. And folks will have some more time to look at this document too. So if there are further questions concerning the text, certainly, there'll be opportunities to raise them as well.

MIKE SILBER: Maureen and Lawrence are both supportive, so let's continue.

JULIE HEDLUND: I see that. Thank you. Moving along. An additional text that was provided. Again, on the deliberations on tasks three and four. And I think here, it'd be helpful to go to Maureen's and Roz's comments. Now I know Roz couldn't be here today, but I think the comment's pretty clear. And staff tried to add some text to address Roz's comment as well.

So, anyway, I hope you can see the comment here on the side. I'll just pause for a second so people can look at that. And I'll show you then also Maureen's comment and then I'll show you some texts that staff had added to try to address the comments.

I'm also bringing up Maureen's comment. This one is newer. This is Roz's was from the 22nd of June, this one's from the 1st of July. And this is, I think, what Maureen alluded to the beginning of the call. I'll let you read it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thanks, Julie, I just wanted to mention just, it was basically restating that at the beginning of the call. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Great, thank you. So what staff did was added that furthermore, at least one working group member noted that because of the limited scope, it was difficult to be fully ambitious with recommendations. And then

below, this is added by Roz "However, due to operational briefings and feedback from ICANN staff to the working group, the group lowered some of the initially proposed high level targets, for example, 5% of applicants to be successful, based on information staff provided about operational constraints." So any concerns with the added text and changes? Tom, I see your hand is up.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, I wonder if maybe in a footnote, we should mention what some of those operational constraints are.

JULIE HEDLUND: Let me make a note of that. Go ahead, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: I'm just worried that we're really gilding the lily on this one. If I can suggest, if you've got specific thoughts as to what it should contain, let's put it in there. But otherwise, I'm not really sure that it's necessary to start dotting every I and crossing every T. Just my thought.

TOM BARRETT: Yeah, no, I agree with you, Mike. I'm just wondering what value add including this comment is then, if we don't want to go there.

MIKE SILBER: Because I think we're highlighting the fact that we wanted initially to be higher. And then there was, based on some feedback, a decision to

accept a slightly lower target. And I don't want to go into detail as to exactly what was considered, because then in public comments, we're going to get feedback to say that we didn't consider everything and what factors did we consider. So that's my only concern. I suppose we may get a comment back to say, "Well, what did you consider?" But I think most people will understand. Julie, I'll leave you to go back through the notes. And if you can pull it out quickly and conveniently, then by all means, I'm not going to stand in the way of your search for excellence.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think I can locate it pretty quickly. I think I know what the reference is to. And I think it might be useful to include as a footnote. But I don't know that—or maybe just parenthetically.

MIKE SILBER: See what you can find. If it's not a huge hassle, then we may as well.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, I'll see what I find. It just wasn't something that we spent a lot of time discussing. So we probably don't need to put too much into it here in the deliberations. Otherwise it would probably get an undue weight.

MIKE SILBER: Yes, exactly. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: And Maureen's noting operational constraints are out of our brief, which is generally true. Thank you. And so moving on to the next comments. And this was Maureen's comments on the section. Well, I won't read it. Let me just not take the time to do that. But you can see it here. I was wondering if, based on this comment, there's anything more you would like to see us change in the text.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Julie. Yes, I suppose when I heard that at the DC meeting, I found it a little bit confusing because I had assumed that pro bono services were specifically for that. I mean, they were provided as a condition of successful applicants. So there was like a special service that was going to be provided for people who actually achieved that special applicant support criteria.

So when it was going to be made available to all applicants, I just felt that could be overwhelming for the people who are actually providing those service and that maybe it may like impact the actual that the support that they would be able to give to the actual ASP candidates. So, yeah, it was just a bit of confusion in my mind at that particular point in time. And I just thought I'd put it in there. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Valid comment. I don't know if any of the staff team want to respond on that. I think it's a valid concern. I'm not sure if it's within our scope, but I think it is a valid concern. So Aaron, I see your hand is up.

AARON HICKMANN: I will take those comments back and share them with the team. We haven't specifically laid out all the mechanisms. Just speaking personally, this isn't an official Org position or anything, but I think if that is a concern, then there are things we could do when we engage with pro bono providers to ask them to prioritize, for example, applicant support applicants who have gotten approval to use them, that kind of thing. So we'll definitely take that back and try to incorporate those concerns. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: No, Aaron, I think that's a valid concern. And my initial reaction is to say, well, that's for people offering pro bono services to set their own criteria. But I do take Maureen's point that it could overwhelm them. So on that basis, I think it's worthwhile just setting a reminder to staff that we don't want to wait—in response to your comment, Maureen, we don't want to wait until the end of the process because needy applicants may actually need help from the get go. So I don't think we want to wait for people to be qualified before they're entitled to access pro bono services. But we also want to make sure that people who are actually deserving are prioritized for those pro bono services. So let's throw that back to staff. I don't think it's in our remit. But I do think that it's a valid concern that you're raising.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. I'll go ahead and continue then to the next comment. And this is on where we had changed outreach to the word communications on the first lifecycle element. And Maureen has a comment agreeing

with that. And does anybody else have any concerns about changing outreach to communications? Which seems more accurate word?

MIKE SILBER: No, I think I'm happy with it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thanks, Julie. I just wondered whether you actually wanted to keep outreach in there. Because the whole thing was to do with outreach. And I just felt that communications and that whole communication in relation to raising awareness, outreach and communications probably were more appropriate. And although I clicked resolved, so the outreach was actually missed out. But I think in fact, outreach is important. And the communication side of things is important. Awareness is related to communications and outreach, from my perspective, but other people might have another view. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. Associated, I think, with the change to communications from outreach I think had to do with how outreach and communications are handled within ICANN. And that actually it functionally or operationally made more sense to call this communications, because that's where the work would be directed from. And so it can encompass outreach, but it would actually be a communications function as more accurately. And I don't know if anyone from staff wants to comment, probably could say it better than I

did. I think it was Kristy, that comment in the document, but as I said, I don't have it right in front of me.

MIKE SILBER: Let's see if there's any further response. You know, Aaron, I see your hand.

AARON HICKMANN: Yes, Mike. Thanks. I think building awareness will require more than just communications. I think it will require engagement as well. But honestly, I don't know that the title matters that much. To us, it's all inclusive. And so to the extent that we want to add it, I think that's fine either way. Overall, I think it's fairly safe to say that we understand that the communication, awareness engagement, capacity building, whatever you want to call it, last round was insufficient. And so there's a very clear understanding on the staff side that we need to do much more. And so I think it's pretty typical that we're circulating new ideas and trying to come up with ways to be as effective as we can with all aspects of awareness and communications. And we're expecting that we'll end up doing some events to support this. So there'll be engagement as well. So it's all of the above. And then I guess I just want to reassure this group that we're definitely taking this seriously.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Aaron. Personally, I think we're picking at nuts over here, to be honest. I don't have a particular view on this. If we can resolve it and if we can reach consensus, then let's go. But otherwise, I really think that

we're counting angels on the head of a pin if we're going to debate exactly what the words are. So I'm not fussed. I'm good with the edit. If people disagree, then speak now and we can go back. Otherwise let's move on.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. I'll move on for now. Next comment was on the implementation guidance on the word organizations. And I'll just move down so you can read.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:Sorry, before you go ahead, Julie, because you just brushed over something I also put in the chat, I'd asked before about if we have a definition for social enterprises.

MIKE SILBER: No, we don't.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:Yeah, so because discussing with my own constituency, there is that confusion on if majority of those we might represent will fall under such a threshold. Again, I understand that there was a EURALO, what's it called now? They have something, a review of some sort that is done after each public meeting. And that GGP and its progress were one of the issues that came up. And pretty much the feedback that got back to me as a rep for the commercial entities is that over 80% of commercial entities within that region, which is in the global north, happens to be

small businesses. And it is assumed that that large chunk might also be a huge potential for the applicant support. So going back to, at the risk of sounding like a broken record, I think that somewhere in the implementation guidance, if we have to keep social enterprises, I don't have an issue with that. But I think that we should also clearly state business because—

MIKE SILBER: Lawrence, I'm sorry.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:Sorry, will you allow me to finish please?

MIKE SILBER: We have been through this before, Lawrence. And I think the group reached consensus.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:No, I don't think the group reached consensus. If indeed the group is reaching consensus, then we might need to put this to a vote.

MIKE SILBER: Quite happy to do that. But if you [read it again—]

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS:I'd like to know what percentage of [inaudible] is not agreeing—

MIKE SILBER: Lawrence, sorry, Lawrence, the comment there is targeted. It doesn't exclude anybody. And the proposal that we accepted from one of your colleagues, we accepted wording as proposed at the Cancun meeting. And that I thought was a very elegant approach. And now you're relitigating something that I thought had been closed.

JULIE HEDLUND: I just want to point out that also, there's no consensus process in this initial report. There can be a consensus process in the final report. But that being said, the working group did discuss this issue. And it was noted that the working group generally agreed to this language that you see here. But noting that just because enterprises or businesses are not listed here—and it's [inaudible] target potential applicants—does not mean that they are excluded, as you noted, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: So I really have an issue with things being relitigated that I thought had been closed. And that one of your colleagues from the BC had proposed a way forward that I think everybody had agreed to. And it's now being relitigated. And I have to question why that's being done. If you have an issue, and if it's not adequately covered, then staff will insert a comment to say that there was a feeling of one participant that businesses should be specifically mentioned over there. And that was not accepted by the rest of the working group.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: Okay, so-

MIKE SILBER: But your own colleague suggested a way forward that I think we all accepted was a reasonable way.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: I'm sorry, I missed that. I would like to know who this colleague is.

MIKE SILBER: We'll go back to the Cancun minutes. And you were there. But okay.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE ROBERTS: All right, so thank you for that. But again, like I said-

MIKE SILBER: No, we'll reflect it in the document. But what I'm not willing to do, Lawrence, is I'm not willing to relitigate something that was closed. Because that seems to me like an intent simply to delay the outcome of this process. If that's not the intention, then let's find positive ways forward, rather than trying to reopen items that we all thought had been closed.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. This is Julie from staff. We'll go ahead and take an action item to look back on the deliberations and add some text. But moving ahead, I just want to call attention to a couple of suggestions in

this text in front of you that Roz has made. And there was also her comment. We were going to that when we went back. And that was also related to the point that Lawrence has made. So we'll make sure this is covered in the deliberations. And then there are the two edits that Roz made under indicators of success. And hopefully there are no disagreements with those or objections to those. They seem pretty straightforward.

And then moving along, what staff has done in each instance here is pulled out the rationale for each of the recommendations, the guidance recommendations. In some cases, this is new text, but really is just text that reflects the discussions that this working group has already had. In some cases, staff pulled text from the deliberations section and separated it into a rationale section. So I'm just not going to read that there. You'll all have a chance to look some more at this document. I think given the time, I think we'll probably be spending some time on it next Monday as well.

So moving along to the next comments. And here we have a comment from Roz. And this is on noting the survey response rates from entities that chose not to participate may be quite low and difficult to measure. A suggested alternate text to address Roz's comment was ultimately chose not to submit an application as opposed to chose not to participate. Actually I should put brackets around that as well. I don't know yet if Roz had a chance to look at the suggested alternate text. But staff did have—let me just pull her text up again.

So her note was we need to capture if applicants who chose to walk away did so because the pro bono service provision was inadequate.

And actually, staff had a comment on that. And something that we think that the working group should consider. So this is an important measure of success, but it's stuck under pro bono services. I don't think the intention was to say that an applicant will decide against applying because of pro bono services, but rather they're fully informed, but make a conscious decision that a gTLD is not for them. And so maybe this belongs in section four or elsewhere.

MIKE SILBER:

I think Roz's comment is valid, but I also think Steve is 100% correct that it's in the wrong place. I think we're looking at two different issues here. The one is people not being happy with the pro bono services. And the other one is just recognizing that survey response rates may be low. And I think we can capture both of those.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. I think staff can take the action to see where this is a better fit. And then again, staff had pulled out some rationale text, which you see here. We're going to the next comment. And here, there was some text that Roz asked if it was that they chose applicants might decide not to apply because they realize they don't have a compelling business case. Roz asked if that was the exact phrase used by a working group member. Actually, I wasn't able to find that that was the exact phrase. And so instead I used staff suggests, something a little less specific that they may decide not to apply for a variety of reasons. And then Roz had suggested some text here, which you see. And also staff suggest some text based on Roz's comment here.

MIKE SILBER: Just given the back and forth that's going on at the moment, maybe instead of going through this in detail, let's agree a way forward so that people can review, assess and work forward.

JULIE HEDLUND: Good idea. Thanks, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Because I really want us to make progress and the comments have been very good and they're appreciated, but at some stage we need to draw a line in the sand and say the comments have been accepted, we've done as much wordsmithing as we can, we're not going to get perfection. And there is a line after which if working group members want to contribute further, they need to do it in the public comment process, because otherwise we could just be carrying on like this indefinitely.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. So should we give folks a little bit more time to review and then set a cut off which people can review and/or provide additional comments? How would you like to proceed?

MIKE SILBER: We have a call next week. Is that sufficient time?

JULIE HEDLUND: Do work group members have any objections to say taking until—

MIKE SILBER: I really want it to be closed next week. I just don't think we can do this indefinitely.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think you're right, Mike. And none of these issues that are raised here are really substantive or controversial. I think a lot of this is wordsmithing or clarifications. And I hope as folks review, they can agree. So perhaps cutting off by COB this Thursday and so staff can clean up the document and provide a clean document for a final review next Monday.

MIKE SILBER: Does that work for everybody?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, exactly, Maureen. We could work through a clean document. And staff can have ready the other boilerplate sections too. I think there's only a couple where there would be text that working group members would need to review. Most of it is, as I say, boilerplate. I'm not seeing any objections, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Yep. All right. So let's move on on the basis that we are looking at closing this off next week.

JULIE HEDLUND: Very good. I think it might be useful for folks then to spend a little time reviewing. Some of Roz's comments are [inaudible] provocative, I would say. So it'd be interesting to see if anybody has opinions on them. Here she's saying recommendations [inaudible] raising awareness. Should we provide additional [ambitious] recommendation specifying that several million be provided to cover successful applicants? That seems to be out of scope of what we're being asked.

MIKE SILBER: I think you're right.

JULIE HEDLUND: I don't think that this working group is expected to take to make recommendations concerning dollar amounts. I see Maureen's agreeing.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, so Julie, I think Maureen's very correctly suggesting that staff accept what you think is viable and useful, just noting it. And where there's an item that is still uncertain, then we raise it for next week for discussion. But I think we must try and clean up as much as possible, just so that we can highlight those areas which require actual deliberation and engagement.

JULIE HEDLUND: Very good. We can certainly take that as an action. Also to the above, Roz has a comment about whether or not we need a specific timeline as an indicator of success. And that may be something that working group members may want to consider.

MIKE SILBER: Okay. That work for everybody?

JULIE HEDLUND: Not seeing any objections, Mike. Then we'll do that.

MIKE SILBER: Okay, but let's make use of the 10 minutes that we still have left. Let's see what we can rattle through.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. I have a comment from Maureen that I'm not sure if we can—when Roz suggests, do we need a specific timeline as an indicator to what timely is, Maureen suggests, not sure that we can identify what timely means at this point. I don't think so either. I'm not sure that we want to constrain the implementation review team as far as suggesting a specific timeline.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, exactly. That's outside of our remit. We're telling them it has to be timely. They must go and look at it and we're providing guidance. We're not providing details.

JULIE HEDLUND: So here we had some deliberations about facilitating successful applications, and we changed that language to the aim to facilitate as opposed to facilitate. It's a subtle difference, but important. We had stricken the original language to avoid suggesting that the applicant support programs could somehow ensure success of an application because after discussions with ICANN Org, we determined that we had to be careful in saying that we could do everything perfectly in the applicant support program could still not have successful applications. And Roz is saying, "I would contest this notion. We need to ensure that the ASP does deliver more successful applicants and thus stronger and more credible submissions. It is imperative that we do not have only one submission that meets requirements." [I see amendment of] the language. Thanks, I'll take that. Any comments concerning Roz's comment? I'm noting Rubens in chat. So avoid timing issues. I see. Thank you, Rubens. So anyway, I'm not quite sure what to do with Roz's suggestion. We tried to cover it in the deliberations.

MIKE SILBER: I don't know if there's specific language that is being suggested, because I share the concern.

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, the only difference between what we had and what we changed to was we had "facilitating successful applications" and we changed that to "with the aim of facilitating successful applications." So the sense is

that we can't guarantee successful applications, but that indeed is still the goal. To my mind, I think it gets us as close as we can.

MIKE SILBER: Any thoughts?

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. Maureen says she's okay with the aim of. And we did have this discussion in the working group and that's where they landed with the language. So this falls under the relitigating.

MIKE SILBER: Yep, I think so too.

JULIE HEDLUND: All right. So the next comment has to do with deliberations and the summary of the discussion on the ICANN Learn module on the applicant support program and that there were discussions on whether or how to do that, but there is no plan right now to have one. Roz is suggesting that the GGP consider recommending that an ICANN Learn module be developed. Again, I don't think that's in scope of this working group.

MIKE SILBER: I think you're right there.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think we could say that at least one member suggested that that might be helpful to recommend, but I don't think we as a working group are being tasked with doing that.

MIKE SILBER: Yep. I'm in agreement.

JULIE HEDLUND: The next comments are all related to the 0.5% or no fewer than 10 applications from supported applicants. There was a discussion at the last meeting raised by Lawrence to reference gTLD the applications. And what we try to do is reflect that discussion here. Noting applications, but that those applications will be from supported applicants. So trying to cover both issues here. And, and then Roz has raised the comments from some GAC members, indicating that perhaps 10 is not ambitious enough. We had quite a bit of discussion around the 10, and I think that the working group arrived at that pretty clearly.

MIKE SILBER: Again, I'm feeling a little torn, because obviously wants to improve the document. But I'm getting a bit worried by how many editorial changes there.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think here, actually, there aren't very many. I think it's more accurate to talk about delegated gTLD applications. And then saying that those

that are from supported applicants. So I think to an extent, these are making this text clearer.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, but I'm not sure we've agreed this. Because it was a very useful intervention at the last meeting but I'm not sure that we've concluded.

JULIE HEDLUND: This is I think the only possibly substantive change in the document. Is it something that we want to ...?

MIKE SILBER: Well, can I ask people to please consider this, because it's something that disturbed me at the last meeting. Because I think it was an important question that was raised. Staff had suggested an edit and a very understandable edit, and there was pushback. And I really want us to be clear what it means and what we're happy with.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. And noting Maureen's note in the chat about the 5%, I thought we had corrected it to 0.5%, but we'll make sure that that's consistent. All right, we're one minute from the top of the hour. I don't think the rest of the changes here are substantive. So people can review them going forward. And there are very few changes in task six. All right, then I think, Mike, we have the action items to capture from today's discussion. We'll look back at the notes too and the transcript and fill in the notes.

MIKE SILBER: Yep. And we can capture the Business Constituency desire to include business in outreach, but it's not going to be guidance that is provided.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, we'll definitely capture that.

MIKE SILBER: And I am not having this discussion again, because I find it pointless to relitigate issues that I thought had been closed. I pulled out the transcript from Cancun. I think Anne Aikman Scalese made an excellent suggestion, which I thought had been accepted by everybody. If that was not the case, it would have been appreciated if it was said earlier, but be that as it may, let's capture that in the notes and we move on. But we're not causing delays to have a discussion about whether or not business should be targeted.

JULIE HEDLUND: Understood, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you all.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Thank you for sharing so ably today. Thank you all for joining. And this meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]