
ICANN Transcription
Applicant Support GGP

Monday, 17 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. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/coDxDg>

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:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the GGP call on Monday, the 17th of July 2023. For today's call we have apologies from Satish Babu and Lawrence Olawale Roberts.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand. Okay, seeing none. If you need assistance updating your statement of interest, 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. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording.

And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of

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.

behavior. Thank you. And I will turn it back over to you, Mike. Please begin.

MIKE SILBER:

Thank you, Julie. And greetings, everybody. Roz, I see you've joined us as well. Thank you. Folks, really excited that we're getting close to the end. Staff circulated a document last week, as we had discussed. I think we're in good shape. But Julie, if I can hand over to you just to take us through the documents. Let's go through. Let's make sure everybody's comfortable and we can move ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Great. Thanks, Mike. This is Julie from staff. I'm going to go ahead and stop sharing the screen and switch over to the document. One moment. Okay, I think everyone can see that. I'm going to put a link to the document in the chat room. Just one moment. Okay, that's the link to the wiki, the document in PDF on the wiki. Sorry, that's sort of a lengthy link. I hope that worked for people.

So, what I sent around was a PDF, because I thought it'd be helpful if people do have comments that we have a chance to discuss them here in this meeting before putting anything into the document. We also hope that the document is now at its final stage and that if there are any comments, they would be maybe some minor typos or editorial things and not substantive changes.

But what I'd like to do is walk you through the document. And just as we do that, I'm hoping you had a chance to look at it. It came

out, we sent it last Wednesday, so hopefully you had a chance to read through the document. It's not terribly lengthy.

The substantive part of the document is the recommendations, guidance recommendations, and we went through those pretty thoroughly and finalized those on last week's call last Monday. So, one would hope there would not be any changes to the guidance recommendations.

The rest of the report is what we call boilerplate, which is essentially content that is pretty much the same for these types of reports. The report format is the same, pretty much, that we use for PDPs, for a PDP initial report. And I'm going to just start going through the document. I'm not going to read through the document, which I hope you've done, but I'm going to look for hands up and ask Mike to look for hands up or comments in the chat if anybody has any comments.

So the preamble just talks about what this document is. Then there's the table of contents. We have a brief executive summary, the working group's approach, the guidance recommendations, and the next steps and then the annexes, just scrolling back up. The annexes are brief background, the working group membership and attendance, which is from the wiki, community input, which in this case was the suggestions for subject matter experts, and then the section of implementation guidance 17.9, the metrics from the new gTLD subsequent procedures final report.

So the executive summary just basically talks about how the GGP was started, the initiation requests, the approval from the council,

the approval of the work plan and timeline, and link to that, the tasks. And then very briefly, the guidance recommendations. And that's just repeating what follows further in the report, but without the other text, so just the recommendations, which is typical, since they're in more detail further on in the report.

And then conclusions and next steps, which is that the report will be published as we mentioned last week for public comment for 40 days. 40 days is the minimum time to publish. Technically, we could do a shorter time but that requires special approval. We felt that since this is the first time the GNSO has done a GNSO guidance process, a GGP, we should at least go for 40 days and not any less than that. And Mike is noting in the chat, we prefer to keep to the longer period. Exactly.

So, once the public comment period is over, roughly, it takes us to about, excuse me, early September. The working group reviews the public comments, and then decides whether or not changes need to be made to the report, and then produces the final report and submits it to Council. Per the timeline, that's to happen in December, but we do hope that that would happen sooner. Any questions on the—

MIKE SILBER: I'm not seeing any hands. It seems all is agreed.

JULIE HEDLUND: Very good, and I see Tracy Hackshaw is joining. Good.

MIKE SILBER: Gabriela has also joined us.

JULIE HEDLUND: Excellent. So, the next section is on the working group approach. And this is essentially also pretty much similar if not the same as the approach used for a policy development process of PDP. And that is that the working group develops a project plan, which was approved by the council.

Early community input in this case was to see whether or not there were subject matter experts that the SOs and ACs and SGs and Cs wanted to propose to join or appoint to join the group. We have one subject matter expert from the GAC, Olga Cavalli, but also other respondents indicated that their GGP representatives were also considered subject matter experts.

And then the methodology for deliberations. Just noting that the working group works through conference calls, primarily, and also exchanges on the mailing list, and had sessions in ICANN 76 and ICANN 77, and documented its work on its wiki workspace with mailing lists, meeting notes and deliberation summaries and draft document, background materials and input. And that should all be pretty clear on the wiki. And then we also have a description of the use of the working documents. And those again are on the wiki. So that groups reading this should be able to follow along how this GGP working group conducted its work. And then a brief section on ICANN org interaction. And then the accountability to the GNSO council. And that brings us to the end of section two. I'm looking to see if there are any hands up, I'm not seeing any.

MIKE SILBER: No hands, no comments, so I think everybody is bought in. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Mike. Well, these are pretty straightforward sections so one would hope there would not be questions, but there's always that possibility. The main part of the document is section three. And we spent the last couple of meetings going over section three. And that forms the preliminary guidance recommendations on task three, four and five and then on task six. So this should not be new to any of you. This is what we discussed the last couple of meetings in the working document. And it's simply been cleaned up with all the comments and changes taken into consideration. And then copied and pasted here. So there's nothing new in this section from what we discussed. And then again we started with methodology and how the working group conducted its work on three tasks, three and four and task five. And no changes from what everybody agreed on from last week's discussion.

And then we have the guidance recommendations themselves. And for tasks three, four and five, these are laid out by lifecycle elements. And here they are in their entirety so both the guidance recommendation any implementation guidance, if any, indicators of success, data metrics to measure success and the qualitative measurements. Again, no changes from the last discussions on the last few calls.

I'm not going to read any of this but I'll just scan through and see if anybody wants to stop me wherever if they have any questions or comments. And really I'll just pause to say today's meeting is just to make sure that there are no lingering comments or questions on the document because the next step after today will be staff's production of the public comment materials. And that's going to be the input form, which will be listing each recommendation, and it'll be in survey form asking if the respondents will accept the recommendations as is or have any suggested changes to the recommendations. And then also there's the public comment announcement. And then there's the link to the final version of the document. So, there can be no changes after today's discussion, the document will be considered to be final. So that's what we're doing today, just making sure that we have no further issues or comments. I'll just keep scrolling.

MIKE SILBER:

I'm not seeing anything in the chat, I'm not seeing any hands. I think we're all good.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Looks like it. I'll just keep scrolling in this case. In case anybody sees something. And for your reference—and then we'll post these on the wiki as well, but from last week's discussion, staff produced a red line version and a clean version of the working document that we used during last week's call. So if anyone wants to go back to either of those documents, they'll be on the Wiki as background documents. And we'll also put them on the wiki page for last week's meeting for reference. Just in case people want to

check to see how the comments were addressed. But everything that was agreed to last week was cleaned up in the clean version of the document and brought into this document.

Okay. And then that was task three, four and five. Section 3.2 is task six with three guidance recommendations. I'm still looking to see if there are any hands up. I don't see any. So, that concludes section three just to pause in case there are any questions.

MIKE SILBER: No, everybody looks comfortable. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. Then again, next steps is repeated in this section four. And that's the public comment and review of public comments. And then here's the background. And the membership structure, link to the members, meetings. The request for input on subject matter experts. And finally the implementation guidance 17.9 which contains the metrics. And this is referenced in the methodology section and section three. And that brings us to the end of the document.

MIKE SILBER: Excellent. Thank you. Not seeing any comments and not having seen anything further on the document circulated. I think we can accept that we're in good shape and ready to go. Do you want to take us through the next steps?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. Yes, I think we're ready to go. Looks like we are. So next steps are, first of all, there will be no scheduled calls until the public comment period ends. And then staff will create a working document that will have summaries of the comments received. And so that the working group can review each of the comments and discuss them and those discussions will be captured in the working document. So there'll be a record of the working group's deliberations, analysis and deliberations on the comments received. And that's actually a very important part of the process. We do have to show how the working group read and reviewed the comments and discussed them and decided how to handle them. So that will be captured. So there will be no meetings until after the public comment period ends. And I think that I should look at the schedule. Look at the timing of that.

Yes, so the public comment, there'll be some time needed to prepare documents. So as mentioned, there's the input form that the respondents used to provide their input. And that helps us to analyze the comments, because that way respondents can provide directed comments on each recommendation. So it'll be much easier to capture and summarize and categorize. And then there's also the public comment announcement materials. And those materials, we prepare those as support staff, but they go to other staff to finalize and post so we'll need a couple of weeks for that.

So we're projecting to post for public comment no later than 31 July, which is a Monday, and 40 days would take us until the 9th of September. And so the first meetings would be, I would say, mid-September. It'll take staff a little bit of time to put the

comments into the working document. Generally, that can't be done until the public comment period ends because usually people tend not to comment until just as the public comment period is ending.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, and I think we will sort of take into account that some people will be taking some holidays. But the likelihood is we're only going to get comments quite late.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, very good point. I suspect we won't get comments in August. They'll probably all come in September and probably most will come in just before the public comment period ends. So we'll take probably about a week or so, staff will to prepare the working document depending on how many comments are received. And then we'll schedule meetings, so mid to late September, I think, on a weekly basis, probably since we want to be able to be timely in our analysis and meet the deadline. Yes, it's not summer in South Africa.

To meet our deadline or beat our deadline of delivering the report to the Council by December. That, and you'll see, let me here I can go ahead and show the timeline again, remind everybody.

MIKE SILBER: Yep. Thanks, I was going to ask you that we have a graphic. You've been pretty clear, but I think it's worthwhile seeing it.

JULIE HEDLUND: It's always helpful to have the graphic. Okay. Hopefully you can see that.

MIKE SILBER: Indeed. So we've slipped slightly but really not too bad.

JULIE HEDLUND: We're still within the timeline. And I really think the development of the final report, I would say, well, public comment review will certainly go into October. I think we can expect several weeks for public comment review. But once that's complete, well, one, I should note something that will be helpful, I think, to the working group is that since we'll be documenting the working group's discussions as we go, so as the working group is analyzing the public comments, staff will be capturing those in the working document, that analysis and the working document, but also will capture any changes in a working draft of the final report. So we'll do that as the discussions go, as they're ongoing, so that it should speed up the process of developing the final report, since we'll have been gathering those changes as we go. So I don't think that the public comment review and developing final report is going to take from October to December.

MIKE SILBER: We can hope.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. And I'll just note too that we're not planning a meeting at ICANN 78. We've found, I think, with the last two ICANN meetings, that the working sessions at the ICANN meetings were not particularly productive. And there's no reason that these analysis of public comments and the development of final report has to happen at an ICANN meeting. So for the moment, we don't have any planned working session at ICANN 78.

MIKE SILBER: Yeah, I think for now, we don't require a session, but let's see how we get along in December or sorry, in September, once the comment period is over and we start doing analysis. Let's see.

Personally, I think that a session is unlikely to produce significant benefit. I don't think we're going to be discussing general principles. We're going to be doing a fair amount of analysis and review and possibly wordsmithing.

JULIE HEDLUND: Exactly. I'll just note that we'll need to decide very soon whether or not to have a meeting at ICANN 78 because generally these schedules are developed very early on. And so if we think we might need a meeting, we should put in a placeholder for one. But I suggest that we would be equally productive if we're working outside of a meeting where we don't have to take time to explain where we are and what we're doing to the general public. But I see Maureen has her hand up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Julie and Mike. I just feel that a public meeting, which is actually happening after the public comment, a public meeting after the lots of discussions that we may have had as a group as part of the analysis would be good because we had quite a lot of people come along to that meeting. It might not have seemed to be very productive. But at the same time, it was an opportunity for people who may not know much, especially for public meetings where there are a lot of people who come in to an ICANN meeting and not quite sure what's going on.

But with something like this, I think that even if it was a breakdown of the comments and just explaining the analysis that we've actually just sort of like been through and what we're actually a final presentation, I just sort of think that making it more public makes it makes it more transparent. And with all the discussions that we've been having before, it becomes sort of like a public document and goes back to the council and board and wherever it's going to go. I think a formal presentation would be appropriate. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: So Maureen, comment noted, but I'm not sure that we need as a working group to meet in order to do that. And in fact, I don't think that us meeting would be productive. I think what we can do is ask staff if there is some opportunity to engage on where we are. It's a little tricky because we wouldn't have finalized or we're unlikely to have finalized the analysis. So we're unlikely to be able to present a final report. But let me take that offline with Steve and Julie and come back, because I agree there is some value to that. Roz, I see your hand.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yep. Just to come in and say, I agree with Maureen, and I think just it would be really valuable. We only get the chance to meet in person three times a year. And I think if we can talk about what might be a more productive format, really open to that, because I think last time, maybe going through on the screen line by line last time when we were in the middle of the report wasn't the best stage. But for something where we're awaiting public comment, I think it's really important that we have the chance to meet in person, maybe assess initial feedback, but also take questions and listen to the community. So perhaps we could have maybe a more open session where people can come in and ask questions, state what feedback they've given so far on the public comment to really open up that dialogue. But in any case, I really think it's important we meet in person. And to make it most productive, I don't think it has to do with not having it in person at all, but maybe we could revisit the format we used at the last two meetings in order to make that more productive. But I think we shouldn't squander the opportunity, especially in such a crucial stage of our work.

MIKE SILBER: Roz, I'm a little confused because comments would have closed already. Comments would have closed more than a month before. We will be in the middle of analysis. So I'm just not sure. You know, I'm quite happy for us to tell other people what we've done and where we are. It's going to be at a slightly difficult place because we won't have concluded and we're in the middle of analysis. Maybe we'd be lucky and we finish. So you know, we

can tell people what we did and what the comments are. But we're not going to be able to get new comments. And all we're doing is working through existing comments. So what is the purpose of us meeting? And what are we going to communicate outwards? I'm just not getting it.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: So yeah, I guess for me, it's a transparency thing in some ways. But I think, yeah, even if people are just speaking to comments they already put in, I just think, why not take the opportunity? But again, I mean, that's just my opinion. I don't know if others agree. But I just listed off a few reasons there why I thought it would be helpful. So I don't know. Maybe others don't agree. But I think why wouldn't we take that chance with the community there to explore that, even if the timing is not perfect, if we're in the middle of analysis. But to allow community members to perhaps elaborate on what they've put in so far.

MIKE SILBER: You wanted to respond?

JULIE HEDLUND: So thanks for the comments, Maureen and Roz. So keep in mind that we have another opportunity to present where we are and what we're doing to the community. And that is the prep week webinars. So if the intention is to let people know what we're doing and show where we are and see if there are questions, then we can do that through a webinar during prep week as opposed to taking time during the ICANN meeting. The reason I note that too

is because it's actually extremely difficult to get these slots at the ICANN meetings. It's a very tight schedule. And so if we think for any reason we might not need a slot, we should forego that slot rather than take up real estate if we could do equally well with a webinar during prep week.

Also with regards to the analysis of public comments. So we will have made probably, I would say, likely a fair amount of progress on comment analysis. And I think the concern might be that folks who had sent in comments or folks who hadn't sent in comments, both might equally think that they can make comments during the public meeting and have those be addressed, either with questions or new comments or comments that they didn't submit and now decided to submit. And that would be problematic. The comment period would be closed. And we have to analyze the comments as they stand. We can't take new explanations or new additions to those comments. So as Rafik points out in the chat, and I think that's helpful, that he doesn't recall any working group doing public comment analysis during the face-to-face. And frankly, I don't recall that happening either. That's not to say it hasn't. But anyway, some things to think about and staff is happy to work on this. Sorry, go ahead.

MIKE SILBER:

Can I make a suggestion before Maureen responds? I think there's a clear message from the working group that they believe we should communicate. I am not convinced there's a need for this working group to meet. But I do believe that we can do better in communicating. So one of the things that I think we can do is communicate with GNSO Council. So we can try and see if we

can get an update session with GNSO Council. I don't think we need a hugely long session. But I do think we should update GNSO Council.

Similarly, I think it might be worthwhile updating the GAC who have indicated strong interest on the topic. Likewise, we can update ALAC. And I think those are useful. I think taking 15 minutes in a broader discussion on the next round to update on this particular topic, which is obviously of interest to people, I think is very worthwhile. But what I don't want to do is pretend we're going to have a working session when there's no point in us working in front of people.

I think the idea of communicating is useful. The timing's a little unwieldy, but happy to communicate. And let's work that out. And let's see how we can get into other people's sessions and how we can make best use of those people who may be there to engage in that process. So it's not just me doing a roadshow. But members of the working group who can engage on the topic. I think that would be a better way of dealing with the communication and the transparency. But Maureen, I don't know what your thoughts are.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Mike. I think that's a good idea, actually. The fact that if it's held during a GNSO Council meeting and it's on their agenda and it's advertised as such so that people know that there's going to be a report on it, that's fine.

My query was actually about public comment. I guess it's going to be sort of like some sort of instruction that says don't try to make any changes to policy because it's not going to be accepted, blah, blah. Because you know that during public comment, people will comment on just about everything and anything. So I was just wondering, how do people know who may not have been keeping tabs on how the GGP runs, operates, and how do they get to know that why their comments have actually been sort of not accepted if it sort of like involves a policy sort of like issue? I guess for me I just want to know what the process is with public comments. Do individuals get told that no, it wasn't accepted, your comment wasn't accepted because it involved a change in policy and that's not what the program's all about? Thank you. I've seen the comment, thanks. Just a query because I'm going to be talking to the CPWG tomorrow this week and I just want to let them know. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER:

That makes sense. Thank you. All right. So we're agreed. We're going to talk about communications at ICANN 78 and in particular, as I said, I would like to keep any outreach that we do accessible to everybody in this working group. I don't think it should be a chair roadshow. I may do some talking, but I think in terms of any interaction with the communities we speak to, it should not only be myself. So I certainly think, Julie, we can start reaching out to various groupings, asking them if they'd like an update. And in particular, those people who have put the significant contributors onto this working group and people who've given us significant

input and guidance. I think their communities would like to engage with us. Julie, you had your hand up.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Mike. Just to respond to Maureen more completely, it's actually a very good question about how the public comments are dealt with. And it's a very important question. It's important because the working group needs to show that it reviewed the public comments, analyzed them, and addressed them, and that should be reflected in the deliberations of the final report. So it's clear to all what comments were received, who they're from, and how they were addressed. So that's what we will do to help support the working group with the working document, is to make sure that the comments are thoroughly addressed. So thanks, Maureen, for that helpful question. And just to note again also that there's potentially a number of different bilateral meetings at ICANN 78 or in the run-up to ICANN 78 that might be good venues for outreach. I agree that outreach is important. It's important for the public to understand how we got where we did and what we're doing with the comments. So we'll work with Mike to work on an outreach plan for ICANN 78 and before. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER:

Thanks, Julie. I think hopefully that'll address people's concerns. But again, I want to stress I'd like to try and make it as inclusive as possible and that it doesn't turn into the chair's roadshow. I have not requested travel funding because I'm likely to be there in a different capacity and I'd be happy to take some time to engage with people. But I'm going to need your help engaging with your

communities and dealing with questions, comments, criticisms, appreciation, as it may be, because you're the folks who've put in the hard work.

All right, not seeing any further hands, not seeing any further comments. I think we can call it and thank everybody for their work and effort over the last number of months. It's been a pleasure to work with you. Old friends, new friends and significant contributors all. It's really been a pleasure. Thank you very much. Looking forward to the final report being published and getting some of those comments in so that we can get together again in September.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Mike. [inaudible] get us to this place. And thanks for leading us so well, Mike. But sorry, Olga, you were speaking. I didn't mean to interrupt.

OLGA CAVALLI: No, just wanted to thank all the work that we have been doing and the leadership of Mike and of course, the fantastic help from all the staff.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks so much, Olga. Thanks again, Mike. Thanks, everyone. Thanks for joining today. Very helpful to look at this one last time. We'll get it ready and get it out for public comment. Thanks all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]