
ICANN Transcription

Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 13 November 2023 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/UQKfE>

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

JULIE HEDLUND:

All right. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the GGP call on Monday, the 13th of November 2023.

For today's call, we have apologies from Maureen Hilliard and Tom Barrett. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand. Seeing none, all documentation and information can be found on the public wiki space. Recordings will be posted after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. With that, I'll turn it back over to you, Mike. Please begin.

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.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you, Julie. Greetings, everybody. Thanks, Julie Hedlund, for circulating the agenda. Very importantly, the timeline and work plan for December delivery. Julie, I'm going to hand over to you just to take us through that. The plan for today is to try and close off the first pass comment review on Recommendations 8 and 9. And then we'll begin the second pass Public Comment Review focused on suggested changes only. Over to you, Julie Hedlund.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I'm going to switch to the Work Plan Document, one moment please. All right. I think you can all see that. I see Rubens just joined. That's good. This is the work plan that we've been working with for quite some time. It shouldn't be a surprise to you. We've been staying on track. We're at the second line from the bottom, October through December 2023, the new Public Comment Review and the developing the Final Report. Then we still have the deadline of December 2023 to deliver the report to Council.

What's new today for you all—just switching to the next slide—is that we've got a little more detailed plan for how we expect to accomplish our delivery of the report to the Council as per our deadline. Let me just go through this quickly. Today's meeting, as you see from the agenda, we'll complete the first pass of the Public Comment Review through Guidance Recommendation 9, and we'll start the second pass. This second pass, just as a reminder, is just suggested changes only. Focusing on what, if any, will change from the original Guidance Recommendations. In most instances, we don't have changes. And in that case, we don't need to review the comments again. We'll go back to

Guidance Recommendation 1 for that and get as far as we can today. Then the 20th, we'll hope to complete that second pass of public comments, again, all the way through Guidance Recommendation 9. And then we'll begin to review the text of the Final Report.

For the Final Report, which staff is filling in, we'll have the original Guidance Recommendations in that section that was published in the Initial Report. Then we'll have the final Guidance Recommendations, including any changes from the recommendations that went out in the Initial Report. What we'll be reviewing is any changes from the Initial Report to the Final Report. And we'll be sure to highlight that text so you can see what's changed. We'll also have filled in the deliberations and the rationale. So we'll be able to also confirm the rationale for any changes.

So it shouldn't be anything new from what we'll be discussing as we review the public comments, but it will enable you to see the text in its final form and approve it. Then following that review, which we expect to continue on the 27th of November, we'll expect that we will have completed that review of the Final Report text. And then we will have a consensus call on the Final Report Guidance Recommendations. And that is to gauge the level of agreement with these recommendations, which we hope will be full consensus, at least, so far based on matters of discussions with the changes. That has been our goal, to reach full consensus on any final Guidance Recommendations. We'll hold off on the consensus call for a week and then we'll incorporate the consensus designation into the Final Report and prepare that

report for Council to be delivered by the 11th of December is the plan. I'll pause there and see if there are any questions.

MIKE SILBER: I'm not seeing any hands or comments.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: Continue. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Sure. I'll stop sharing and then I'll go to the Public Comment input tool. One moment please while I bring that up. Okay. Hopefully you can all see this. All right. We're on Recommendation 8. Let me go ahead and put the link of this document into the chat, one moment, because it'll be easier for you to view it that way. That's otherwise kind of small print. All right. There we are then. Recommendation 8. There's support for this recommendation, actually. All those who responded supported so we have no significant change suggested. We have either support with no changes or support with a wording change. And the NCSG support has written linking back to the comment on Recommendation 7. The GAC also, of course, is written, but has comments and suggest a wording change as a transparent plan in consultation with the community if funding drops below that level.

Why don't we take these one by one, then after this, the GAC suggested change I can go to—

MIKE SILBER: That's perfect.

JULIE HEDLUND: The ICANN Org comments. What should people think about the suggested slight amendment in the final sentence from the GAC?

MIKE SILBER: I get a little bit worried about transparent. What is in consultation need? How does that work? Does it need to be another PDP? Just a public comment process? I'm not sure that consultation adds anything.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. I see in the chat Rubens says, "Consultation means delay." Yes, it could be. I mean, the most likely scenario would be something that's put out for public comment. But that indeed would introduce a delay. I think staff would also be concerned about putting wording about consultation and the need for the requirement for a consultation into the recommendation itself.

Rubens is saying, "Since this program is on the critical path, that's very unwelcome." That's also a good point. But I don't think we have a new—Satish, please go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Thanks. I think the GAC observation is based on the wording of Recommendation 8, which says “ICANN Org should designate a minimum level of support.” Should is not binding, whereas must is binding. If it is not binding, then perhaps GAC might have thought that there is a possibility that the funding will drop below that level. Normally, the should versus must versus need, I think there is a difference. As it is worded right now, this makes it optional for ICANN Org to designate a minimum level of support. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Any other comments? Perhaps we can return to the GAC comment. Let’s first perhaps next consider the ICANN Org comments. ICANN Org notes “It would be helpful for this Guidance Recommendation to consider how to balance objectives indicated in other Guidance Recommendations (e.g., quality, timeliness, and efficiency of communications) in the scenario that the number of qualified ASP applicants exceeds the designated minimum level of support and any additional resources articulated in the ASP funding plan (built as part of implementing SubPro Policy Recommendation 17.12) have been exhausted. It may also be helpful to reference Policy Recommendations 17.12 to clarify that the GGP is not suggesting ICANN Org only develop a funding plan per ASP if funding for supported applicants drops below a certain level. Also see the comment of GR 7 concerning clarifying whether GR 7, 8, and 9 are to be interpreted as interdependent.”

I see there’s a comment in chat from Leon. “I am wondering what is the value of the addition of this sentence. The IRT will have a

specific ASP sub-track to discuss implementation, which already is a community consultation.” That’s, I think, a very important point, Leon. That’s back to the GAC comment.

I’m wondering if I could suggest, Mike, that we put some—well, obviously there’s a caption in deliberations, this particular discussion. But if we should put some language into the rationale along the lines of noting what Leon has suggested that there will indeed be consultation with the community on any plans with respect to funding which dropped below a certain level as in the recommendation.

MIKE SILBER:

I think that’s valid. I think that it’s also valid to reference the comments that Rubens has made. Although I know that you’re an alternate for the GAC, but could I put you on the spot and ask you if you have a view?

OLGA CAVALLI:

Hi, Mike. This is Olga for the record. Thank you. Honestly, I’ve been traveling and I have no chance to talk with [Gabby] or someone from the government but I can check certainly with them if we choose the background of this format. I think Satish’s comment about the non-binding mandatory is important but let me check with the government.

MIKE SILBER:

Okay.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Olga.

MIKE SILBER: We'll come back to it in the second review. But my view is at the moment, I think there is more harm than good that comes from inserting the language of consultation.

OLGA CAVALLI: I see the point. I'll send this message to my colleagues. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Let's close off on that. And we'll move on to the ICANN Org comment, seeing as we will be coming back to this.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. We will come back to this. Also just noting that the GAC comment is in the category of supporting the recommendation as worded. I think we could also take that into consideration that we can deal with this comment and reflect it in the report, if not necessarily in language of the recommendation.

Back to the ICANN Org comment, we discussed this a little bit in Guidance Recommendation 7. That is noting the interdependencies between Guidance Recommendation 7, 8, and 9. And then also, as noted here with a slight wording change, helpful to reference Policy Recommendation 17.12 to clarify that the GGP is not suggesting a funding plan only if the funding drops

below a certain level. Since Leon is on the call, I'm wondering if you have anything you'd like to add to this comment.

LEON GRUNDMANN:

Thanks, Julie. I don't know if the comment is clear for everyone in the working group. I'm happy to expand a little bit on what we mean there. It's really about Recommendation 7, 8, and 9 together. Because on the one hand, the working group said that they would like to have a floor, a minimum amount that we would want to have respected. At the same time, we would like applicants to know as early as possible whether they'll receive support, and at the same time, we would want that to be equally distributed. That's what the working group came down on. Some of those might seem contradictory on the face of it. Of course, we understand why they're all included. It makes sense why they're all included. But I think for that reason, we would like to clarify that they are interdependent. They really depend on one another and 7, 8, and 9 should be read together in that sense. We were hoping for clarification.

MIKE SILBER:

I think that's a very valid point, Leon. We consider that they are interdependent. I think that adding the additional language doesn't detract from anything that we've been dealing with. I don't know if anybody disagrees. But to me, it's a good clarification. This is all about balancing needs and requirements. And I think calling that out explicitly, it will be helpful.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Leon. Thanks, Mike. Just to clarify, if we were to add language, are we talking about adding language to the recommendations?

MIKE SILBER: Well, I think in terms of 7, 8, and 9, that might be useful.

JULIE HEDLUND: Exactly. Okay. Perhaps to add a preamble before as included, well, before we go into 7, 8, and 9, that has language along the lines Org has suggested. Just note in the chat, Rubens is saying "I believe the clarification goes towards what I remember from our discussion." Thanks, Rubens.

MIKE SILBER: Well, I have one question and that is all of the recommendations interdependent, not just 7, 8, or 9. I think that we should certainly reference 7, 8, and 9, but when we get to the second pass, just consider whether we want to indicate that all of them are interdependent.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, we certainly can do that. I think that's a good point. But I think we also need to emphasize that 7, 8, and 9 have particular interdependencies. Leon, please go ahead.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Just to add on that, we noted the point there that Policy Recommendations 17.12, we mentioned that to clarify that the GGP is not suggesting ICANN Org only develop a funding plan for ASP if funding for supported applicants drops below a certain level. So just clarifying that that is something Org is thinking about, in any case, projections of how many applicants there might be and how much funding will be needed is in any case going to be an essential task for Org. I think that's worth noting here as well.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Leon. Should we think about noting that in the rationale?

LEON GRUNDMANN: Yes. I think the rationale would probably be sufficient to make—

MIKE SILBER: Makes sense to me as well.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Does anybody have any further comments on any of the comments for this recommendation? I didn't hear in our discussion an agreement with the suggested wording change from the GAC. We are noting again that it is in the session, they've selected support as written. So we're not quite sure how to weigh this comment. But thank you, Olga, for checking back. We'll circle back to this one. But for right now, I'm not hearing a lot of support for making that suggested wording change. But we do have

support, as far as we can tell, to make it clear in our recommendations the interdependencies, and in particular, those among 7, 8, and 9, and also to adjust the rationale to include the wording relating to 17.12. Anything else on this before we move on to Recommendation 9?

MIKE SILBER: I'm not seeing any hands or through the comments. I think let's move on to 9, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Very good. All right. 9 is up on the screen. Of the eight comments, seven supported as written. Again, we have some comments from the GAC despite supporting as written. Then just as an overview, we have a wording change suggested from Gabriel Karsan. Not with a particular rationale for why these changes should be made. Then there's the ICANN Org comment emphasizing again the interdependencies of 7, 8, and 9. I think we've dealt with that.

Let's go back and look at what we have from the GAC. Support as written, wishes to highlight the importance of providing early indication of support to applicants when this is feasible. I think I could suggest that we could include that in the rationale. I don't know that there's a particular wording change that would be necessary. Any comments on that?

MIKE SILBER: I had a look at it. I'm really not sure what problem it's trying to address.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. We can, of course, emphasize in the rationale the importance of providing early indications of support when feasible. But I don't know that there's a specific wording change we need to reflect that.

MIKE SILBER: Correct.

JULIE HEDLUND: Then from Gabriel Karsan, wording change. He suggests, "ICANN Org should develop a flexible, predictable, responsive Applicant Support program that informs applicants of their evaluation outcomes and support levels promptly. This should also be modeled according to principles that offer metrical measures that are user driven and parameters of competence, usage, use case build and localization at domain resources. Furthermore, deeper collaboration and inter-regional studies and advocacy should be engaged in the aim of deeper practical awareness building, collaboration building, feedback mechanism from application and then stakeholders." There's not a rationale associated with this. Just from a staff point of view, it seems like a lot of detail that otherwise should be left up to probably the Implementation Review Team and probably doesn't need to appear in the recommendation itself. Satish saying in the chat, "Number 8 appears to be overly complicated language for a recommendation."

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Satish. I think that was a very polite way of phrasing it.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think the spirit of what's being suggested is still captured in the recommendation as it's currently worded. I don't see that we benefit by adding that additional detail.

MIKE SILBER: I'm not seeing any disagreement.

JULIE HEDLUND: Then I think I can move on and go back to Recommendation 1. There are no further comments on 9.

MIKE SILBER: Yes, happy with that.

JULIE HEDLUND: This is our second pass through. What I wanted to emphasize then, as noted was, as we go through the second pass, we'll focus on any suggested changes to the original recommendation. There was support for aspects of some of the comments. To make a suggestion of a combined change taking into account several of the comments. So we have captured as a GG team action. The following text shall read and I got it highlighted here. For those following on your own link, it's in row 11, column E. I see Gabriela is joining.

Target potential applicants from the non-for-profit sector, social enterprises and/or community organizations from underserved and developing regions and countries. This should not exclude any entities from outreach efforts, such as private sector entities from developing/underrepresented regions. Recognizing the goal is to get as many qualifying applicants as possible.

That takes into consideration comments from Com Laude, comments from the GAC, and comments from NCSG also. There was only left, Recommendation 1. In previous discussions, there was general agreement for this wording change. But I'd like to open this up for comment and see where we stand at this point.

MIKE SILBER: I'm not seeing any comments or any hands. I think this is a reasonable compromise.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Again, of course, we'll be able to see this language when we review the Final Report text. Okay. Shall we move on?

MIKE SILBER: I'm happy with that. Anybody wants to pause, any further discussion? Let's move on, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Very good. I mean, we did discuss it fairly extensively. Here we did have noted that in response to the GAC recommendations that

ICANN Org was to formulate a response with respect to potential concerns, as well as applicant's pro bono needs and bring it back to the working group, I think this is still in progress. We can consider that wording change on list. Just a couple of reminders of the comments here. We had several comments under support recommendation as written but not necessarily changes to the recommendation.

NCUC is asking for responses in 17.2. We noted that that was out of scope. Just looking, again, at NCSG. I don't think we agreed on any language changes with respect to that comment. Then the GAC had suggested a modification that we express some concerns about. And that was about the recruiting and mentoring programs. And the concern about ICANN Org being the middleman in matchmaking and trying to pull together the applicants in the pro bono services. I think there was concern about making any changes there. Good one, Rubens. tinder.icann.org. Do we have any further discussion on this?

MIKE SILBER: I don't know if there's any comments from ICANN Org on this.

JULIE HEDLUND: Leon, do you have a sense of when we'll get this response circulated for the working group to review?

LEON GRUNDMANN: Yes. I've been following up with colleagues on this who have to review and make sure that we've got the right message to be

circulating this amongst on list. But I can come back to what we were saying last time. I think we already discussed that matchmaking doesn't really seem feasible and it's not really in the scope of what ICANN would be doing. I think that's what we said last time as well, that it would not be matchmaking, it would be more of a case of providing a list of potential pro bono services providers based on the information that we collect.

MIKE SILBER:

Leon, I think there are a couple of things that can be done to address this. I wouldn't want to see it in a recommendation because it starts getting into a lot of detail. But I think the first thing is will there be outreach to potential service providers? Well, I think there already has been but I think that that can be noted. I think that we can look at the types of pro bono services that applicants may require, then we can help guide potential providers. The other thing is that we'd be providing not just a list but a portal, which would indicate who does what. You don't want as a needy applicant who doesn't know much about this to have to go to a list and ask everybody, "What do you do?" "We just do technical." "Okay, can you point me to somebody who can help me with the legal? Can you point me to somebody who can help with the commercial or economic model?"

I think that ICANN can do more than just a list. But at the same time, I don't want to get into a recommendation as to exactly what ICANN should or shouldn't be doing. I think that the recommendation as written is broad enough. But I think in the implementation, it would be very valuable to be able to drill down a little further so that the matchmaking they're talking about would

come through over there. I'm just not sure that it's appropriate to put it into a Rec. And I think the matchmaking is very light in terms of what can they provide as opposed to now trying to—matchmaking as Tinder—that as Rubens suggested, it could be as simple as Tinder. Or it could be really complex, where you have to now try and put people together and ICANN Org now actually has a proactive response to find out what the potential applicant is looking for. Then for it to go through its list then find a suitable match. I think there is a happy medium where you can get a little bit more detail as to what pro bono service providers, what type of service they're willing to provide. But I wouldn't want to see that come into the recommendation. I believe that's an implementation question.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. That's very helpful. Leon, did you have any comments you wanted to add with respect to what Mike has said?

LEON GRUNDMANN: Thanks, Mike. Actually, I think that's a very good way to approach it. I think it makes sense to proceed in that way. I think the term matchmaker, indeed, it can be interpreted broadly. And as the working group members might have seen in the e-mail I sent on list, I believe that was already one or two weeks ago now, we've already started. As you said, Mike, we've started reaching out to potential pro bono service providers. There's an Expression of Interest survey there, which folks can fill in. So there's the processes already ongoing of seeing who can fulfill which category of support. I think that could be a useful effort. But I think

something like matchmaking, as you said, that sets up a completely new matchmaking responsibility, in a way, an accountability for ICANN, and that would be going beyond the scope of what we have now as a report. So I don't see the value necessarily of doing that at this point, I think, as long as we can provide enough details for people to find what they're looking for without getting into the weeds of how exactly is that supposed to happen. Then I think that suits better the role and the scope of what ICANN can do here. Because obviously, setting up a tinder.icann.org sounds like a larger effort to me.

MIKE SILBER: We seem to be on the same page. Satish has supported that as well. Maybe just to ask Olga and Gabriela if they have a view. Personally, I know that they can't speak for the GAC. But if they have a personal view, that may give us some indication as if we were on the right track or not, that will be very helpful.

JULIE HEDLUND: Mike, I'm not seeing any hands up.

MIKE SILBER: Likewise. I didn't mean to put anyone on the spot. Gabriela has responded in the chat that she doesn't have a view right now. I think let's take that as read. Org still owe us some response. But they can take this discussion potentially as some assistance towards their response, because, again, I suspect that when the GAC talks about matchmaking, they're not talking about a

personalized service but rather helping applicants find the right type of service provider.

Gabriela, thank you. I appreciate the offer to take it to the GAC. Depending on how long it takes the team to get back to us, it might be worthwhile to wait for the ICANN Org response that you can take to the GAC. Because hopefully that'll have a little bit more detail instead of just taking it cold. But I'll leave that up to you and your processes, whether you think it worth while waiting for Org to respond first.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Thank you, Leon, too. And thank you, Gabriela. So, I think we can go ahead and move on from this recommendation.

MIKE SILBER: I agree with you. It's a reasonable pace.

JULIE HEDLUND: Very good. Recommendation 3 then. Here we had support as written. Support but with a wording change from the GAC, suggesting a small improvement, further clarification of the notion of resources and what it encompasses, particularly with regard to the notion of operational readiness. The GAC would like to stress the importance of viewing necessary resources is a broad term, not simply in terms of financial backing, but to include human capital for the program.

I'm trying to look again. But I don't think we had support for a change in wording. I see in chat Leon has a comment. "RE the pro bono question, we will try to come back on this as soon as we can. We are very close to a final text to share on-list ASAP." Thank you, Leon.

So, Mike, I don't have an indication that we agreed, that the working group agreed with a wording change along the lines of what the GAC had suggested.

MIKE SILBER: Yes, I'm not sure that there is further clarification required. In my mind, necessary resources would include human resources as well as financial resources. I'm not sure it adds anything to include that. And again, it possibly gets us into the weeds of implementation.

JULIE HEDLUND: Right. So let me just go back to that.

MIKE SILBER: I'm not seeing any hands or comments. So I think we proceed on this basis that the term is sufficiently broad. We obviously will look forward to our GAC colleagues when we do a final read, if they have a significant issue with that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Yes, I don't think that there was agreement for a change. Well, of course, we'll be including this conversation in the

deliberations. We could also add to the rationale some contexts around the term necessary resources and what that is envisioned to encompass to address the concern expressed by the GAC. But I don't think we hear any agreement to make any change to the recommendation itself.

MIKE SILBER: Yes.

JULIE HEDLUND: Then moving on to Recommendation 4. Again, the changes suggested here. This is one also we did not find any agreement on changes. We have support recommendation as written. We have eight respondents. We just saw a comment from NCUC. "Measuring the understanding of the application requirements is important." I won't read that all out. And then the GAC comment emphasizes the importance of the word timely. But neither of these comments are suggesting, as far as we can tell, are suggesting changes to the recommendation. And they're both under the category of support the recommendation as written. So I don't see that we record any changes to the recommendation. I'll pause there to see if there are any further comments.

I'm not seeing any hands up. Satisfy, thank you. "Recommendation 4, agree." Mike, anything you want to add?

MIKE SILBER: Nothing further from me. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Then moving on to Recommendation 5. We had some discussion at the last meeting on the suggestion from the GAC to put in a stretch goal. And Russ had followed up with some language that we circulated on the list. And we had a suggested change from Satish. This is for indicators of success, ICANN must ensure that I've also successfully delegated gTLD applications 10 or 0.5% (that is 0.005) from supported applicants. This should be considered a floor, not a ceiling. And ICANN to strive to see this minimum by adopting a stretch target in order to achieve the aim of facilitating geographic diversification within the New gTLD Program.

I think that the latest comment was from Mike where you're wondering about the term adopting, adopting a stretch target, whether that would be appropriate as a recommendation to ICANN Org. I'm wondering, not to put you on the spot, Leon, but if GDS would have concerns with the term adopting a stretch target as part of a recommendation?

LEON GRUNDMANN: That's a good question. I'd probably consult with colleagues on that. I don't know if this was already covered on the discussions that we had on the list. But what would we exactly mean by the stretch goal, is that something that we would then define in the rationale, for example? Where could people read more about that?

MIKE SILBER:

Leon, the GAC was saying that the target is unambitious. And the GAC was recommending that we should push that target very significantly. And there was a fair amount of discussion and quite a bit of pushback in terms of that approach. The compromise seems to be that we should look at the possibility of some sort of stretch target, where it's not a binding target—and that's why my concern about using a term like binding—but we should see to what extent we can stretch ourselves to do more than the minimum. That was some suggested wording to try and capture it. I don't think anybody is particularly focused on that issue. Sorry. I don't think anybody has a particular view as to the numbers, but just that we shouldn't consider the current numbers as mission accomplished if we get those, but rather a situation where we should try and stretch and see how far we can get. And that was suggested wording. I'm concerned that the suggested wording potentially creates more problems than it solves, that I think we should look to Org in terms of how do we best go about trying to define a stretch target? Should we put the number? Should we simply say that this is a floor, not a ceiling? I'm happy with language like this is a floor not a ceiling. I think it's evident from the fact that that's from the language as it currently stands. But let's find ways to actually try and push this through and make it absolutely clear that what we're looking for is to see how many supported applicants we can get, rather than just to hit the threshold and then be satisfied, job done, and go away. Recognizing, of course, that if we exceed the number by 100%, then the budget may not accommodate it, and then we are stuck with a situation where the budget has to either only go to the most deserving or the first in or gets spread really thinly. Because

unless we actually have a target, it's very difficult to create a budget. We can create a budget based on the current numbers. But if we were going to stretch and the stretch works, then the budget is just going to get blown very quickly.

LEON GRUNDMANN: I see some concerns that if we look then at Guidance Recommendation 7, 8, and 9, because then they're all interdependent, especially if there are delays or something like that, because of a completely new funding expectation that that could be an issue. But my next question is, would the working group now already set this stretch target? Or is it more the idea of what Gabriela is saying in the chat that this will be a floor, not a ceiling? How exactly are we going? What was the plan? Where would we come down on that?

MIKE SILBER: The numbers that the GAC suggested were in the view of some of us somewhat unrealistic. So we didn't come up with a number. And so here's the question. Do we need to come up with a number? Because I think for this working group to come up with a number is going to take a significantly long period of time. You've seen Gabriel has commented in the chat, the GAC would like to see this as an indicator of clear success. But that's meaningless because it doesn't take us any further. So either we're going to now find out what our stretch target is and we can spend several weeks debating that, or we can say this is a floor, not a ceiling, and we must try and exceed it without giving a number. Or we

must find a different formulation, just recognizing through all of those that it has a significant impact on the budget.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Mike, just to note that the last discussion on this language, the suggestion from the GAC, I think there was general agreement in the working group that we not include a number and that it will be problematic to include a number as that target, but to instead try to reflect the concept of it being the number that's quoted there, the 10 or 0.5%. That's a floor, not a ceiling. And that's when Russ came back with the safest language that was more general. So I think there's still agreement that we avoid putting in a stretch goal number. As you noted, it could be difficult, if not impossible, for the working group to agree on what that number should be.

I see Satish is saying, "Agree that the stretch target doesn't need to be specified."

Gabriela is saying, "If we do not have a number as a floor..." We do have a number of the floor. "There won't be clear indicator. What else can replace a number as clear indicator?" Gabriel, it's not clear. We still have a number of the floor. We just would need text to indicate this is the floor and not a ceiling, and that there is an intent to exceed that minimum. But there is concern perhaps about the word adopting a stretch target. I'm wondering if we don't have to use the word adopting if we look at this, "ICANN Org should strive to exceed this minimum by..."

MIKE SILBER: With the aim to achieve or with the aim of facilitating geographic diversification. I, in the last call, used the term stretch target. I'm just worried that it's not moved into the language when I was referencing a concept that we're looking to stretch, where we don't want to hit the target, we want to actually stretch beyond it.

JULIE HEDLUND: I noticed Leon has a comment in the chat. My other concern is that if Org should not see 10 supported applicants as a job well done situation, but stretch further, does that also mean that if ICANN Org gets 10 applicants but not a stretch number, that this would mean failure explicitly?

MIKE SILBER: That was one of my concerns when this was raised. Does that then create a stick to beat ICANN Org as opposed to overachieving? That's part of my issue with the language. So I'm very happy and I think that there's a reasonable compromise to be found with language that indicates that hitting 10 is job well done. Getting more than that would be a job exceptionally well done. But I'm very hesitant to say, "And we should go for 20." And then the comment is ICANN get the 50% cost but they didn't get the top marks that everybody was hoping for.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike and Leon. I'm wondering then if we can still say this should be considered a floor and not a ceiling.

MIKE SILBER: I think that that conceptually is fine. If you're considering 50% of cost, then for us to get to 50% means job well done, it's successful. But if we can get above that, then that would be exceptionally good and an indicator that the program has exceeded expectations, rather than met expectations.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. I'm wondering, just looking at this language, that if we just say this should be considered a floor, not a ceiling, and ICANN Org should strive to exceed this minimum and just take up by adopting a stretch target. Exceed this minimum because that in itself implies that you're trying to go beyond this floor in order to achieve the aim of facilitating geographic diversification within the New gTLD Program. So we would take out by adopting a stretch target. Since a structure seems to be implied in the statement, ICANN should strive to exceed this minimum.

MIKE SILBER: Can I make a suggestion? I think this is something that staff need to consider and staff need to review and get back to us. I am hesitant to try and call the issue without getting some feedback from staff. And I think a number of the team were not on the previous call and may not have had the opportunity of reviewing the call. So I think we need to give them the opportunity to get up to speed and for them to actually consider this and come back with their feedback.

JULIE HEDLUND: That sounds like a very good plan, Mike. We can definitely take that as an action. We'll work with our colleagues to review the language and make some suggestions on the list. I'm noticing that we are losing people at the top of the hour.

MIKE SILBER: Indeed.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm wondering if we should take this opportunity to wrap where we are here. I think you can easily accomplish a second pass through in the next call and start the Final Report language according to the plan.

MIKE SILBER: Can we look at 6 quickly, what needs to be done?

JULIE HEDLUND: We have a few actions items we captured for Recommendation 6, that was to capture the nuance that comes down for three years, starts from delegation. And that can be further refined during implementation. Replace language with future rounds or subsequent procedures, and add periodic and comparative review as elements.

MIKE SILBER: So I think 6, I don't have anything to add. I know it's a little unfair. But my recall of 6 is that there wasn't anything particularly contentious, and that's what I'd like to just close up.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think you're right, Mike. The suggestions for the action items were related, I think, to wording that we can include in the rationale as opposed to changes to the recommendation.

MIKE SILBER: Yes. Agreed.

JULIE HEDLUND: So we'll follow back with those changes as captured in the action items. Then for 7 rationale, just noting an action item. Noting in the rationale, the team has made a deliberate decision not to prioritize. So that's relating to the various comments relating to prioritization.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah. I don't know if you have noticed, it's worth noting that there was an apology from Lawrence. He's had some power issues. Given that we've lost a significant portion of the team, I'm wondering if we should potentially call it here. And then we can look at 7, 8, and 9 as a package, because I do think that they are interrelated. I don't think there's significant work to be done on them. But I do think that they're best considered as a group.

JULIE HEDLUND: I agree, Mike. And also, we can have some language for the working group to consider with respect to the interdependencies of those three recommendations as well for the next call.

MIKE SILBER: Excellent. Thank you. Leon, without putting you on the spot, because if you can provide input on some of these for the next call, that will be very useful so we can try and close off. Obviously, if you can share before the call, that would be ideal. If not, if you can just present on preferably all of them, but I understand there is internal consultation, and some of this is being discussed on the fly. So I'll leave it to you in terms of what you can get to, but the sooner we can get Org's feedback, I think the more helpful it'll be for us to try and close off on some of these issues.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Thanks, Mike. I'm going to take forward the points that we had raised today, and a lot of those were the previously already open questions such as the one on pro bono services. Also noting the one about the stretch goal and what ICANN Org thinks about that.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you.

LEON GRUNDMANN: And in relation to this one, Guidance Recommendation 7, are we still planning to draft some language there? Or is there anything

else that's needed from our side? Or are we good for the moment?

JULIE HEDLUND: Leon, I don't think it's from your side. I think staff is going to incorporate some concepts into the rationale. But otherwise, we're not making any changes to the recommendation itself.

LEON GRUNDMANN: Okay, great. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: You're welcome. So, Mike, I suggest we go ahead and wrap it up. But just to remind everybody that the next call is next Monday, the 20th, at the rotating time of 20:00 UTC.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you very much for that reminder, Julie. I think at this stage, Julie B., we can stop the recording.

JULIA BISLAND: Thank you, Mike. All right, everyone, this call is adjourned. You have a good rest of your day. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]