

---

## ICANN Transcription

### Applicant Support GGP

**Monday, 02 October 2023 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/oIBME>

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

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Guidance Process GGP Initiation Request for Applicant Support Call on Monday the 2<sup>nd</sup> of October 2023.

For today's call, we've received apologies from Satish Babu and Maureen Hilyard. 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.

All documentation and information can be found on the public Wiki space recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior.

---

*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.*

---

With this I'll turn it over to the chair, Mike Silber. Please begin, Mike.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you, Julie. And good day, everybody. Thank you for joining. Your attendance is most appreciated.

Apologies from my side for not having attended last week, but I've been advised that we haven't made significant additional progress. So we need to kick our foot on the accelerator, especially with IGF coming up. Given the number of people who are going to be at the IGF, I've made the decision with staff that we should rather not try and continue with the meeting and then inconvenience all of you who will be in Kyoto.

And, yes, Rafik. The irony is not lost on me that we're inconveniencing you every time we meet. But seeing as you're the inconvenienced one at the moment, we don't want to spread the pain too broadly and for people to experience what you have to go through every week. So the decision is for next week to take a pause, and we'll resume the week thereafter. So we do need to keep going.

So I'm going to stop rattling on. Julie is on leave this week, so Steve has got the pen. Or should I rather say Steve has the screenshare. And, Steve, let me hand over to you to take us through the comments, and let's see if we can close off on some more of these.

---

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Mike. I shall do my best Julie Hedlund imitation.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Steve. Sorry. One thing that I should note before Steve kicks off. I saw that there was a request in the last call for staff to prepare a redline. So this was discussed with me in terms of the value of preparing a redline. And my view, and I'm willing to accept the slings and arrows, is that I don't think that the effort involved in preparing a redline is warranted at this stage.

I think we as a working group need to be a little bit further down the line in terms of our thinking on some of these points. And then we can ask staff to prepare a redline. But asking them to redline everything I think is significant effort with not necessarily significant value as yet. So I will happily take on the responsibility for asking staff to pause with that activity, notwithstanding the request from the last call.

Steve, over to you.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Mike. Before we dive into the comments, I thought it might be helpful to provide a just a short reminder about some of the benefits of public comment. And this is sort of in the context of the fact that this group has talked about the comments for this GDP Recommendation 1, and we've gotten a little bit caught up in talking about the same comments over and over again.

So I thought it might be helpful just to get a reminder on some of the best uses for public comments. Oftentimes, you're going to

---

identify the concerns and help identify concern from the commenters and help the group improve their recommendations. That's probably pretty obvious.

In another level, it's also going to help the groups understand the community's understanding of the recommendations themselves. But in some cases, it might be used to reinforce position of participating groups. But oftentimes, the crucial part of these comments is to be able to consider new information that the working group has not previously considered. Sometimes those are the absolute most critical comments that come through this process. And I guess just a reminder to this group to be keep their ears and eyes open for those sorts of comments because those are extremely valuable to the deliberations. If the group hasn't talked about it yet, that may be a critical part of the deliberations.

So with that, we will be going over Recommendation 1 again and the comments received to them to this recommendation. So this is the recommendation, I think, that this group has got caught up a little bit in the last couple of weeks. And to Mike's point, we have a schedule we want to try to adhere to, and hopefully we'll be able to make some good progress on this one today.

So with that out of the way, as a reminder, this recommendation overall received quite a bit of support. Five out of nine of the comments support exactly as written, and then three support with some wording change. And then there's one that actually supports the intent, I think, is the wording. Actually, this next one. What's the wording exactly? "Significant change required." So there's one that suggests significant change required.

---

And so you'll see us doing this as we go through all of these recommendations trying to provide an overall assessment of how the recommendations are coming in, weighing against the recommendation. So in this case, you have eight of nine that either support as written or they support the intent with some minor word changes.

So going through these in detail, there are nevertheless, even though it's in the category of Support Recommendations as Written, we actually do have two comments here from the NCUC and the NCSG where they do actually provide some level of input.

What I would like to do is try to summarize at least the way I'm reading and interpreting the comments. And this also takes into account what this group has talked about the last couple of weeks. And then what I would really like you to do is tell me if I haven't actually summarized this correctly. And so the intention of doing this is to try to get us marching through these comments pretty quickly and determining which ones of them might actually change the recommendation.

So with that out of the way, the way that staff and Mike see the NCUC comment is that it seems to just be commentary and doesn't appear to be actually suggesting any changes. So I'll just pause for a moment and see if there's anyone that disagrees with that.

MIKE SILBER:

I think I would concur there.

---

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Mike. Anyone with a different viewpoint? All right, that's a healthy pause. Hearing none. So moving to the NCSG comment.

So as noted, this is actually in the category of Support as Written, but they actually do provide some input here. And I think to be respectful of the time that the NCSG put in this comment, we should take a careful look at it. I think there's actually two elements to the recommendation—or, sorry—the comment here.

So the first part that you see in bolded text here. I believe the suggestion here is not necessarily substantive in nature. It's suggesting adding additional context and clarity via a footnote. So it's not actually suggesting making any change to the recommendation, but rather just adding an additional context, I believe, to the rationale in the form of a footnote. So no substantive change, but added context.

And I definitely welcome—

MIKE SILBER: [inaudible].

STEVE CHAN: I was just going to say I definitely welcome Rafik to weigh in on this one if he has any input.

And then just quickly, the second half. The non-bolded part is, I believe, information about how the surveys should be developed. And just a little bit of staff commentary is that once this program for applicant support is developed, during the course of

---

implementation, one of the things that they will presumably have to do is actually design those surveys. So it could be conceivable that the actual design of the surveys is actually more of a matter for implementation.

But, sorry, Mike. I heard you open your mic, and I kept talking. So sorry.

MIKE SILBER:

No, no. Totally fine. I was just going to say I think that's a useful comment. I think it is additive. It's non-controversial. Rafik, I don't know if you want to add anything further, but I think those are useful comments that we can try and incorporate.

STEVE CHAN:

Seeing no hand or open mic from Rafik, it looks like I did not butcher the comment. Thank you. And we welcome Olga.

All right. So I think it sounds like we can try to add the additional context via the footnote. And then the second part, it does seem like it might be able to be a matter for implementation. So something that the GDS Team, when they're implementing, they can actually take note of.

And I know Leon from GDS is actually on this call, so he can be sure to capture that as a note for something for them to take account of.

---

LEON GRUNDMANN: Steve, sorry. I just rejoined because of the update that I had on my laptop. Would you mind just repeating that last point, please?

STEVE CHAN: Sure, quickly. So the second part of the NCSG comment here, it talks about the design of the surveys. And what I was suggesting is that perhaps the design of the survey might be something that would be eventually addressed during implementation. There didn't seem to be disagreement from that group, and so it was just a flag to you and the team that as you're actually implementing applicant support elements, that you might want to take into account this comment when you're designing the surveys.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Yes.

STEVE CHAN: Hopefully, that makes sense.

LEON GRUNDMANN: I believe we've already noted that in our internal docs as well. Thank you for flagging it.

STEVE CHAN: Perfect. And good luck to your computer update.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Thank you.



STEVE CHAN:

Thank you. So moving on. Now, we are actually in the section, Support Recommendation Intent but With Wording Changes. So this first comment from Gabriel Karsan, I think, is one of the ones that inspired this group to ask for redlines because it's not immediately clear what is being asked for. There's a bit of text, and you need to stare at and look at what is actually being suggested. At least that's what I had to do.

And then based on my reading, it seemed that what Gabriel is suggesting is that he's looking to direct what the outreach should be focused on. And so his suggestion seemed to be to focus on education and engagement and mentoring.

So I'm curious, I guess, if the working group feels like this additional nuance and detail is something that needs to be captured in either the recommendation itself or the Implementation Guidance or some other element of this recommendation. Or perhaps the recommendation as written, and the accompanying Implementation Guidance and metrics are fine as is.

And, Mike, I see your hand and now a queue. Mike, I defer to you to also manage a queue if you like.

MIKE SILBER:

Yeah. Happy to manage the queue. But let me take Roz first before I insert myself into the queue.

---

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thanks, Mike. Just to throw out my thoughts on this. I think it can't hurt to include some of the additional language that Gabriel has identified, particularly in terms of mentoring and deeper support to new applicants. I think that's very much within the spirit of the program.

But again, as Steve said, I think this is the thing it would be helpful to see a redline and side by side. So perhaps at some stage, if not this one, then we can do that and maybe just revisit and make sure that looks all right and not too repetitive. But I do think particularly around mentoring and deeper support for new applicants, that is good language to include.

Just while we're on this comment in general, one thing I'm not sure about but would really welcome others' comments, because maybe this is just me, but I am worried about the language "eligible applicants" in the second rewording. I completely see the point about encouraging people to learn more about eligibility and come with prepared knowledge about the program.

However, I worry that the term "eligible" could actually almost do the opposite and make people worry, "Oh, are there tons of forms I'm going to have to look at to see if I am," when it's really intended to be quite an open program. So I almost worried that that has the opposite intent. So I think, personally speaking—and if others see something I don't with the second change of words, please do say—but I think I'd support the first suggested word change but not the second rewording addition within Gabriel's language. Thanks.

---

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Roz. If I can insert myself here, I'm not as generous as you. I think that first intercession actually makes no sense. It's circular. It's talking about "raise awareness" and "educating applicants ... for the applicants ..." It just doesn't make sense. It's grammatically weak, and I don't think that in the circularity of providing an enhanced awareness adds anything.

I think what we set out is we're looking at increasing awareness of the Applicant Support Program. ICANN Org has two tasks. One is to raise awareness of the New gTLD Program. We're not talking about that. We're talking about the Applicant Support Program. And I think mixing and muddling and cross-referring and circular references just add nothing to what we're trying to do over here. So I would argue quite strongly that we have no need to be polite because somebody has gone to the effort of making a submission if this submission does not actually add anything.

And with all respect to Gabriel, I don't think that his submission over here adds anything to what we've already crafted and spent some time actually putting quite succinctly. And if we include it, we then just muddy it because we're then telling staff they have no clear objective. But that's my opinion, and ignore if you feel that I'm being too forceful.

Roz, is that an old hand or a new hand?

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: That's a new hand. Yeah, is it okay if I—I can just come back on that. Totally take your point about the grammar and perhaps trying to pack too much into one on this first recommendation, Mike.

---

I wonder if a compromise is keeping the first bit, which I think is in line with our recommendation, as written—"raise awareness and educate applicants about the next round of gTLD applications for the Applicant Support Program" including "providing mentoring to new applicants who qualify for increasing outreach."

MIKE SILBER:

No, but, Roz—sorry to engage in a dialogue here. But where does mentoring come in in terms of increasing awareness? Mentoring comes in at a later stage when we're starting to talk about pro bono opportunities. Whose responsibility is to provide mentoring? We've structured the guidance recommendations very clearly so that it followed in lockstep in terms of the different steps of the program.

And Gabriel, with the best of intent, has just muddied everything and thrown everything. So, suddenly, we've got mentoring next to awareness. Where does that all fit? Whose responsibility is it? If we give that to staff, they don't know where to start and where to finish. That's my concern. We just create a complete mess without a clear step, and then staff have to look at this.

And in any event, we're not giving this to staff. We're giving this to the GNSO Council, and GNSO Council hasn't asked us for this. This is out of our scope.

I've seen Roz's comment that we look at it in the pro bono section. I'm happy to look at it in the pro bono section, but I really think that this is somebody who is well-intentioned but a little muddled in

---

their thinking because I don't think they've understood what we've been asked by Council and what we're trying to achieve here.

But let's get on to the next two. Let's not take up too much of our time. Steve, handing it back to you.

STEVE CHAN: You actually have a couple of hands up. One from Lawrence and one from Paul.

MIKE SILBER: I am terribly sorry. I need to actually move the chat up because I did not see that. So let's take it in the order as suggested, Lawrence then Paul.

JULIE BISLAND: Lawrence, I see you're unmuted, but we're not able to hear anything. Mike, are you **[21:28 inaudible]**?

MIKE SILBER: Maybe let's take Paul in the meantime while Lawrence sorts out his audio issues.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Are you able to hear me now?

---

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Mike. Paul McGrady here. So with this one, it's important because this is exactly the kind of thing that the small the Council Small Team is looking into. And there will be a community process on this issue, like what other monetary and non-monetary things can we get the Board to do or pay for.

And so I think that the response to this one could very well be, "Thank you for these good ideas. It's out of our scope, but staff is packaging this up and is sending it over to the Council Small Team who is actually considering this issue." That way the commenter doesn't have to feel like they weren't listened to. They just said something really useful, but to the wrong people in the process. And so I would encourage this team to ask staff to send it over to the Council Small Team, SubPro Small Team who are actively working on next steps for this part of applicant support. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER:

Excellent suggestion. Paul. Thank you. Lawrence, have we resolved your audio issues? Lawrence, I see your mic is open, but not hearing it. And Lawrence has just dropped. Hopefully, he'll rejoin and maybe with better audio.

Steve, in the interest of time, while we're hoping Lawrence will rejoin, maybe let's get on to the Com Laude contribution. And we can go back when Lawrence manages to join us with clear audio.

Lawrence, I see you're back. And I see your mic is open, but we're not hearing you.

---

STEVE CHAN: Mike, did you want me to go ahead and move on then? And we can hopefully come back to Lawrence once his—

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, please do.

STEVE CHAN: Okay. Thank you. So what I was thinking to do is to group the GAC, BC, and at least to some degree the Com Laude comment together because they seem to be thematically related. The Com Laude one a little bit less so.

So to summarize at a really high level, these comments from the GAC and the BC are talking about something this GDP has as discussed before. And that's primarily around the targets of the outreach. And so the comment from the GAC is actually talking about adding an additional element for that outreach. They're actually suggesting including private sector entities.

And then the BC comment actually potentially goes a little bit beyond that where they actually say "all potential applicants from diverse organizations from underserved and developing regions and countries."

So the way that staff and Mike had read these two comments are that they are actually in some ways changing the intent of this recommendation where, then, the goal was to focus the outreach on certain parties that are listed in the recommendation. And so the GAC comment and the BC comment seem to be changing that intent.

---

And so the Com Laude a comment, I said it's sort of related. It's not exactly the same. What the Com Laude comment seems to be doing is actually trying to make the intent of the recommendation as it's currently written clearer. Which is to say that the targets that are identified in the GGP Recommendation 1 are the intended focus for outreach, but it's not intended to be at the exclusion of certain parties.

So hopefully, that is a decent summary. I know we have folks from the GAC, I think, and then also definitely the BC. But if I've summarized your comment wrong, definitely please chime in. But also interested in the impressions from the group.

And again, I'll be happy to turn over Mike to manage the queue.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Steve. I see a hand from Tom. Please, Tom. Go ahead.

TOM BARRETT: Hey, guys. Tom Barrett from EnCirca. I can't get my camera to work. I guess my original interpretation, if you look at the Com Laude a first line, "Target potential applicants from the not-for-profit sector, social enterprise, and/or community organizations ..." I did not assume that all three of those categories were nonprofits. And so I certainly don't see any [inaudible] prediction by explicitly making the statement that this includes for-profit entities as well. I don't think that's it.



---

So maybe there's an implied assumption that people think that social enterprises and community organizations are not-for-profit, but that wasn't my assumption. And so I thought these were reasonable comments. So the Com Laude edit is very reasonable, saying no one is excluded. Obviously, the GAC's trying to be more explicit. But it all depends on how you assume whether or not social enterprises need to be nonprofit or not.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks, Tom. Appreciate the inputs. Lawrence, I see your hand is back up. Let's see if we can get you on audio this time.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. [inaudible] you can hear me okay now?

JULIE BISLAND: We can hear you, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Great. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: [Please proceed].

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. [inaudible] or rather [a point I wanted to] make much earlier. But I think since we've moved on, I should let that go. To the points that we're discussing at the moment, I also see a lot of

---

value and identify with the Com Laude's submission in the sense that—which, to a large extent, basically is saying that we should maintain some kind of [inaudible] that doesn't in any way give the impression that any one group within the community is not expected to assess [inaudible].

As I said on the last call, I think we—and previously—I think that should be left to the criteria that will be applied towards sieving out applications at the end of the day. But it's always good to have a very rich [group] and have to apply different methodologies to sieving out who eventually gets support.

But in line with what Com Laude is saying, which is, basically [inaudible] we shouldn't, on behalf of this particular program, be given the impression that any one group shouldn't bother to apply. I think that there's some value in that, and I would want to encourage that we take much a more critical look at [inaudible] [at this point]. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER:

Okay. Lawrence, one response to that. I think you've missed. This has got nothing to do with application. This is setting metrics for outreach so that we can measure staff's performance in terms of outreach. It's got nothing to do with applications. But—

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: The outreach—sorry, to [inaudible] here—the outreach at the end of the day has a direct effect or is supposed to have a direct effect on the quantity and quality of applications received. Otherwise, if we are not considering, if we're not looking at the

---

type of applications or the quality of applications that should be received, at the end of the day we will not even be discussing this issue of outreach. So—

MIKE SILBER: Sorry. [inaudible].

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: [inaudible] about.

MIKE SILBER: Sorry, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry. You cannot divulge—

MIKE SILBER: Applications or applications for support?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: The applications for support are the applications that [inaudible]. This is going to be a result of the outreach or how good the outreach is in the first instance. We've kept talking about the last round, and some of us believe to a large extent that it's performed so poorly because a lot of people who could have applied did not even know that there was such support that they could plug into.

---

So I see a lot of value in really getting as much people as possible—as much persons, individuals, companies, all the walks—as much as possible to know what kind of support exists so that they can make an informed decision if they will eventually plug into this program. And that has a direct effect on the quality and the number of applications that we will receive eventually for applicant support.

MIKE SILBER: So can I ask a question? Is the point of the Applicant Support Program to fund somebody who wants to set up a registry business? And is ICANN just a trade association where we are going to fund people who want to start up a business?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I don't think that is within the remit of this working group to determine.

MIKE SILBER: No, but we're being asked for metrics, and metrics against which staff will be measured. All I can say is I think that this has been addressed by the working group. I think it was asked. It was answered. And I think the GAC and the BC have tried to take a second bite of the cherry.

I'm quite happy with the Com Laude comment. I think it's a very reasonable and rational comment. But I think the other two groups are simply trying to use the comment process to achieve what

---

they didn't manage to convince the working group of in the discussions.

Rafik, your thoughts?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yeah. Thanks, Mike. So we discussed this last week. So [inaudible] just to reiterate some points. As you said here, it's about attrition, first place, and to inform about the Applicant Support Program and [acknowledge] the—how to say—not sure to call it New gTLD Program, but to inform more applicants and get them to join.

But I have, really, a concern here if we get this kind of mission or scope [inaudible] and try to use—because at the end, probably, it will be limited resources—to use them just to try to get a type of applicant that are not necessarily the first target.

I get about the argument that in developing countries, maybe private sector companies have less resources. But even in developing countries, private sector is still private sector, they are trying to make profit. And I don't believe using this program for those kinds of targets/applicants is right.

I have, really, a lot of issues with it because we are trying more to get those applicants, like, from nonprofit sector and so on that they have much more hard time to participate. So it's not because you are this developing country [in the] private sector [inaudible] they are not making profit, maybe less. But still, they do.

---

So I would really want that we focus our resources because if you remember [inaudible] like for other, let's say, [correlation] [inaudible], we already put an assumption that we have no idea if we will get much more funding and so on. So I would really insist that we focus on those less privileged targets.

I am fine with the proposal from Com Laude to be open. We are exclusive to extend, if possible. But other than that, I see a huge problem if I try to push for more.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you, Rafik, for saying a lot more politely what I've been trying to say. I really appreciate it.

Roz, I see your hand is up. Please continue.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thanks, both. Yeah, I think just two things for me. I think, one, going back to—so I'm here. Obviously, my position is as an alternate for the GAC. So just to give a bit of insight here.

So the GAC held a webinar in preparation for this public comment. And one presentation was given by an ALAC member as part of this webinar that pointed to, actually, the goal of this next round of new generic top-level domain applications. The original intent for that round was to help raise the number of names being operated by, say, people or organizations within developing countries because it is quite a skewed landscape at the moment.

---

So I think sometimes we may—that got me thinking, and I think it did quite a few others as well, about what are we trying to achieve here, and what funnels could be best to achieve, if that is the goal. And if that is the goal, that means financial sustainability in the long term matters to achieve that diversity in the domain namespace. So that's one thing I would say.

The second thing I would say is I think we just need to be a little bit careful about how we're talking about different committee and constituencies' comments here. The GAC's engaged in this public comment, which is actually something we want to encourage. Myself and others helped organize a webinar to help encourage further feedback from those not close to the process so that we don't get to a stage where we recommend all of this and then it gets shut down later in the GAC. So I do think we need to look at things like that more closely.

And I don't think that just applies to the GAC. That applies to all of these. But I think we just need to be a bit careful about how we're talking about different committees and groups that did take the time to feed into this public comment, including developing countries, I should say, from the GAC that haven't been as much part of this process directly but certainly have a large stake in it.

So I'll leave my comments there that I hope that's helpful.

MIKE SILBER:

Roz, valid comment. And thank you for that. At the same time, I do have an issue with adding areas. You know, we have seen domain speculators in the last round, pure speculators, and some

---

of them taking on communities. And community applications being undermined by speculators, some with very deep pockets.

Now, what we're saying is that if you're a speculator and you can't go to a venture capitalist to raise funds, you can come to ICANN who will help you raise funds for your speculation, as opposed to real communities. And I include social enterprises, and Tom raised the point. You know, social enterprises can be for-profit, but they generally are trying to push a particular community or social grouping rather than being all about making profit for a small group of [founders].

We saw this with .africa. Would we be in a situation where the unsuccessful applicant for .africa could apply for applicant support, for example, in the face of an overwhelming community support including governments? And ICANN would consider that? I think that the GAC would be shocked and offended if that was a situation where ICANN was considering applicant support.

But the way that the drafting has been developed seems to invite and in fact oblige or recommend to the Council that they recommend and advise staff that they must go out and solicit domain speculators and that they're welcome to come and apply for applicant support, as opposed to real communities. And I include social enterprises who may be running a for-profit-making business but serving a community as opposed to just serving their own profit motives.

And I think we're going to look really bad, both as a GGP, but more broadly as ICANN, if we're being seen to be supporting domain investors and speculators and offering them applicant



---

support. So we've tried very hard on the language to confirm we're not excluding anybody. But I also don't want to create a false impression that we're running around the world drumming up support for speculators and then they don't get through the next round, and then we're suddenly [inaudible] hit with a slew of reconsideration requests because people felt that they should have been given support for their personal profit-making speculation.

Roz, you wanted to respond?

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah. I was just going to say it's obviously a great point you raise about .africa, Mike. And I think there are real risks here. However, I do think the other risk is that we only get three applications again, potentially two. And so it's a complicated question, and it needs to be balanced. I think the difference here for me is that we're talking about outreach in the first place.

I would hope that we can look at risk management and things in that area when we're looking at the application process itself. I think giving the opportunity to apply in the first place and raise that awareness, though, is different, and the risk is much lower in the remit of what we're discussing. Because again, I totally appreciate that. I have similar concerns, for sure. But I think my also concern is that we're also going to look really bad if we get three applications again.

---

MIKE SILBER:

Yeah. But, Roz, sorry. I do share that concern. My concern here is that we're telling staff, or we're telling the Council, "This is our recommendation to staff, that you go out and you target." So if staff now have to go and hit every trade show out there, the focus is very much split, as opposed to focusing on specific sectors. We're now saying every sector in developing areas. And suddenly, we run the risk that staff are running ragged, and we actually lose the impetus because they don't know where to go.

Personally, because I'm from Africa, I can tell you that events and outreach are not that well divided as you might find in more developed markets. And it's very possible that if there is outreach through social media online as well as at events, that there's going to be crossover between the two. And we're not excluding anybody, and we're not going to say, "No, no. If you're a for-profit entity, you can't attend it." But staff need to focus, assess, and measure based on the guidance that they're given. But everybody should gain benefit from it, and that's why I think the Com Laude's approach is very useful. And it follows what was also discussed in Cancún. And I think that's a useful way of looking at it because the more we tack on, the more complexity we create in terms of assessing staff's performance and whether staff have actually delivered on the program.

But you're right. Having three. But again, I'd rather have three well-qualified applicants than have 33 and we cross off 32 of them because they don't actually qualify. So, yeah, it's neither here nor there. I think we can deal in hypotheticals. To me, the critical issue here is the quality of the application rather than quantity.

Rafik and then Lawrence.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mike. So, again, here it's all about [inaudible] for the Applicant Support Programs. It's not about outreach, I'd say, for the new round itself. We want, of course, that program—I'd say the [onus] for the whole program to be making the way to be more inclusive to get applicants from all parts of the world.

But here, since about the applicant support, we want enough application, too, since also we had some of the kind of metrics or kind of threshold we want at least to achieve or to reach.

But I have a concern here. It's one of the comments from Roz here. I mean, we want to improve the metrics to have enough applications, but I'm worried just because of that we are trying to gain in some way by opening and hoping that if we have more applicants from the private sector and so on, we'll have much more applications. I don't think that should be the goal or the target. We want to have sufficient number, but it doesn't mean that we will try to do it by all means. We want a proper [inaudible] program that can reach enough applicants from all over the world. But it's not by trying to extend to put who maybe are not really our [inaudible] first place. So I get what you're trying to do here, but I don't think it's the right way.

MIKE SILBER: Lawrence, you wanted to respond?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, thank you [inaudible].

---

MIKE SILBER: Lawrence, sorry. We're struggling to hear you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Okay. [inaudible].

MIKE SILBER: Sorry. Is anybody else able to hear Lawrence?

JULIE BISLAND: No, Mike. He's definitely not [inaudible].

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah. Can you hear me?

MIKE SILBER: Lawrence, can I suggest that you type in the chat? Because at the moment, your audio's unintelligible.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Can you hear me now?

MIKE SILBER: Yes.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Oh, great. So [inaudible].

---

MIKE SILBER:                   And we've just lost you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I want to get a dial out.

JULIE BISLAND:                I'll work with Lawrence on the dialing out.

MIKE SILBER:                   All right. If you can try and sort that out.

You may have forgotten that right at the beginning of this process, we discussed how we were going to talk. So this is our guidance. Okay. So far we have support for the Com Laude insertion. I think that's what we were trying to say anyway, but I'm happy to add it as a friendly amendment which I think adds value. And more clarification is always better.

I'm a little hesitant about the GAC insertion. I'm not sure that "private companies" as a term adds anything. And to the extent that "private companies" are better placed, then I would assume that they're able to actually raise funding. But do we have support for the GAC insertion, or is there not?

Roz?

---

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yeah. I was just going to express my support for the GAC insertion. I've made several points in this regard tonight. The last one I would just make is I think the GAC submitted this comment very much in the spirit of compromise and trying to find solutions, noting that they didn't submit under Significant Change Required, Changing Intent, and Wording.

So I do think, when I'm looking at the comment below and whatnot, I do actually feel like there is a middle ground to be found here. But again, I know I've spoken a lot this evening. I'll raise it there, but I would support this. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: I'm seeing two in support. I don't see any other in support. I'm really not sure that we have sufficient support to move beyond it. Personally, I think that what we had with the Com Laude clarification and additional emphasis, I think, adequately deals with the issue.

Tom.

TOM BARRETT: This is Tom from EnCirca. So I wonder if we could take the Com Laude edit and simply add the words to it so it reads "This should not exclude any entities from outreach efforts," and we simply say, "including private entities, recognizing the goal is to get as many qualifying applicants as possible."

---

MIKE SILBER: Can I play devil's advocate and ask you to define "private entity"?

TOM BARRETT: Well, sure. So, yeah, maybe "private sector entities" is—maybe "commercial." Maybe "commercial" is a better word than "private"? I guess what we're saying is—

MIKE SILBER: Because I'm quite sure that social enterprises and most not-for-profits—in fact, I think, all not-for-profits would be private sector.

TOM BARRETT: I agree. So let me try again. "This should not exclude any entities from outreach efforts, including for-profit organizations, recognizing the goal is to get as many qualifying applicants as possible."

MIKE SILBER: I'm happy to do that if that is the general impression. I think Rafik has expressed a vehement no. My only comment is I will be indicating that it was with my objection because I think the optics of this are appalling, and it looks self-serving, and I will not support it. At the same time, I'm simply here to chair. I'm not here to impose my opinions on the working group.

Lawrence, I see your hand is up.

---

JULIE BISLAND: Lawrence, you'll want to press \*6 on your phone. That will unmute your phone from Zoom. \*6. Lawrence, it's still muted.

MIKE SILBER: Noting Steve's time check. If I could ask people if we could just try and give it another minute or two to see if we can get Lawrence's input.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah. Can you hear me here?

MIKE SILBER: Yes, we can.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Okay. For some reason, I think I'm double muted or something, but [inaudible] isn't working on the audio line.

I definitely support Tom's proposal, and I think it definitely gives a wider umbrella to who might want to qualify.

The point I was going to make earlier was that at this point, we're basically looking at outreach. And for some, especially private organizations, it's believed that the kind of support they might need might just be understanding the process of application. Some might not even be interested in assessing some form of rebates because they might feel it might come with some restrictions that they might not be okay with.



---

So at this point, the focus basically is on outreach, and to a large extent, it doesn't mean that ICANN might end up subsidizing applications for private entities. Yet, if ICANN does this, it is still a plus from my own end. I say this because, definitely, at ICANN we're to provide some kind of applicant support to a private entity that qualifies for it. There is a double assurance that, one, it might not take 10-12 years for that entity to eventually get the domain delegated. And aside from that, there could also be that security and rest of mind that they will not continue to depend on some form of funding or not to get their TLDs operational.

So at this point, where we are looking ... And I believe this speaks to Rafik's concern in the sense that success for the next round—I mean, targeting private sector or for-profit organizations is not just to up the numbers. You're actually going to be having, in the pool, people who can keep those TLDs live and comply and all, whatnot.

But not to drag this further, I support the proposal to adopt the Com Laude's language and adjust it in line with what Thomas has proposed. And I would love to see this help rest the issues around Recommendation 1.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you. And, respectfully, I'm going to have to disagree. But we ran out of time, so we're going to have to pick this up in two weeks' time. Hopefully, we can get enough of a quorum so that we can get this addressed. And maybe the BC and GAC can bully their way into this one.

---

Thank you, everybody. Appreciate your time.

JULIE BISLAND:

Thank you, Mike. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This meeting is adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**