

---

**ICANN Transcription**

**Applicant Support GGP**

**Monday, 25 September 2021 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/UYAeE>

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

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Guidance Process known as GGP Initiation Request for Application Support call taking place on Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> of September 2023.

We do have listed apologies for Satish Babu and Mike Silber. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the wiki shortly after the end of the call, and an e-mail notification will be sent to the list. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected

---

*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.*

---

Standards of Behavior. With this, I'll toss it back over to Paul McGrady. Please begin.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Terri. Paul McGrady here. Mike can't be with us today, and so he asked that I chair this call as the GNSO Council liaison. So I will do my very best to fill his shoes. Much of the call today, we'll be going through some public comments. I think that Julie Hedlund is going to help us dig through those. So, Julie, I'll hand it back to you and I will jump in as necessary. Or if the queue needs rep for questions, that kind of thing, I'm happy to help in any way that you need me. All right, go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you so much, Paul. This is Julie from staff. I need to be sharing my screen here. One moment, please, while I do that. Then I'll explain a little bit again what we're doing today, for those of you who may not have been on the call last week. So just give me a minute to get my screen share going, and then we'll get started on the comments. Just one second, please. Sorry to be slow, some technological difficulties.

All right. Okay. While we're doing this, while I'm bringing this up, let me just remind us that we have some input that we're awaiting from the GAC. And my understanding is that we will be receiving that input by midday today. And then staff will put that into this Public Comment Review Tool. Then at the next week's meeting, we can start to look through that input as well. So that is still forthcoming. That was a delay—an extension, I should say—just

for the GAC. For those of you who may not have been at last week's meeting, the public comment closed on time. It closed on the 11<sup>th</sup> of September. And there was one late submission from the NCSG just a couple of days after that. And then there's the extension afforded only to the GAC, as we noted, that they will submit today.

All right, I think you can all see that. A reminder again about what we're doing here and the public comment review. So this is a very important aspect of the working group's work, and that's to review and to analyze the public comments. In this case, the working group is expected to read and be familiar with all the comments received, and then be prepared to analyze them on these working group calls. So what we're planning to do is taking at least two calls to cover the comments because their calls are staggered at different times. So each time zone should have the opportunity to join a call and be able to discuss and analyze the comments accordingly. And then these deliberations on the comments will be recorded in the final report, a draft final report that staff will populate as these meetings occur, and that will make available as we go along to working group members. So that we not have to wait until all comments are reviewed and discussed before compiling the final report. We hope that this will be more expedient. This has been the case, for instance, in the IDN EPDP that has used this kind of tool and this type of process. So, we do have a precedent.

So, last week, we started work on reviewing comments on Guidance Recommendations 1, 2 and 3. We've added Recommendations 4 and 5 to this call. We're going to go back

---

---

over 1, 2 and 3, because as we say, we're spending at least two calls on these comments, maybe more if we need more discussion. The homework for this call was that everyone should have read those comments, those comments being Guidance Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and the comments on those in preparation for today's call. So I'm going to go in the Public Comment Review Tool and go to the first of the Guidance Recommendations. What we agreed last time is that since we all are expected to have read these comments, staff is not going to read through the comments on these calls. They're expected to be read. So we will just go right into a discussion of the comments.

So you can see them here on the screen, I'll make the screen a little bigger in case you're reading on the screen, and then we'll also put this—oh, I see it's already in the chat. Thank you very much. So it's probably easier if you want to go ahead and put that link into your own browser and look at tool that way, it's easier to read. But if you want to, I've made the screen a little bigger.

So we have the first comment under "Support the recommendations as written," we have the first comment from the NCUC. Let's go ahead and open it up for any discussion of that comment. Again, this is for recommendation as written. So this is not a request for rewriting the recommendation, but it is a comment we should consider nonetheless. So I will open it up and look for hands. If Paul wants to help facilitate, I'd appreciate that, too. Thanks so much. Paul, I see your mic is open.

---

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah, there's my video. I'm just reporting in that I don't see any hands so I think we can move on to the next one.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think you're right. I don't see any hands either. Thank you for that. Then I think we can go down to—now I see a hand. Ros, please go ahead.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Wait, sorry. Just a clarification question. So right now we're just doing hands per comment, but we will get a chance to reflect at the end of the recommendation on any comments in general. Is that correct? Just to make sure I'm following. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Ros, and that's a really good question. Let me try to explain again how we're approaching this. So as the example here that we're looking at Guidance Recommendation 1, so we've got comments that we've received. We have under the heading of "Accepting the recommendation as written with no changes," we have comments from NCUC and NCSG. And then moving down, we'll also have comments from support recommendation. I'm sorry. It's blocking my view here. Just to be clear. Then we have "Support recommendation intent with the wording changes." We have two comments there, Gabriel Karsan and Com Laude. And then "Significant change required in changing wording," we have a comment from BC.

---

So we're just going down the line and looking at the comments received. Right now we just looked at the NCUC comment. We'll look at the comments from NCSG and move on down. Because we're assuming people have read these comments and thought about them, so we're asking if people have any questions, concerns, suggestions for how the working group might address these comments. And keeping in mind, these two from the NCUC and NCSG are not necessarily asking for change and they are supporting the recommendation as written. But we do have suggested changes in comments below. So we do want to capture deliberations now on these comments how the working group thinks we should address them or not, and then we can indicate that in our deliberations. So I hope that's helpful. Maureen, I see your hand is up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: All right, Julie, was it for me?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah. Maureen, yes, sorry.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Sorry, I just missed it.

JULIE HEDLUND: No, sorry.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: I just wanted to start some of our conversation, I guess, on the comments about the NCSG comment. I think the first one was, for example, the comment about the underserved concept. Yeah, they didn't feel that was easily understandable. But I felt that in the report, in the explanation, I thought that the paragraph three on page 13 fairly clearly stated what the GGP agreed as a definition for underserved. I just felt that it was quite clear. I just wondered if others on the group were concerned that didn't explain what we believed was a pretty fair definition for underserved using the GAC kind of definition, but without incorporating governments into it. So, that was just one comment.

There were there was another comment that I wanted to mention about the Recommendation 3, although we'll leave that for later when we get to Recommendation 3. But that was just a first up, kind of wondered what other people felt about that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. Anyone else have thoughts on this? Lawrence, please, and then Rafik, and then Ros. Lawrence, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right, thank you. Not attempting to answer any of Maureen's questions, but just for the sake of clarity, we are basically looking at Recommendation 1 out of all the public comments, or are we basically reviewing everything, all the submissions, or comment on the NCSG?

---

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks for that question. That's a good one. Right now, we're just looking at Guidance Recommendation 1 and the comments we've received on that. So right now we're just looking at NCSG's comments. And noting again, they're under "Support recommendation without any changes." So they're not actually asking for changes, although they are perhaps suggesting the possibility of changes. But just this recommendation right now and just NCSG.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Julie. We have comments and also request for clarification. So now we are reviewing the comment and the categorizing by those who are just supporting and other that may request wording for change. But are we expecting for each comment to respond to those who submitted or not? So that's the first clarification.

About the NCSG comment, I think maybe to make it maybe more easier to review or to discuss, really, there are kind of two or three points and they should be separate. Fortunately, the format and putting whole text in a spreadsheet cell doesn't make it easy for reading. But if it's possible to split it, I think, in two or three, because I think several points are mentioned and maybe make it a



---

little bit hard to review and to respond appropriately to the comment.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Rafik. So to your first question, the working group is not—excuse me. The working group—I don't know why I'm so hoarse. Excuse me. The working group is not expected to respond directly to each of the commenters. But the working group is expected to put some response in this public comment or review tool so. So you'll see there is a column that has—let me get over to that column. There is a column where we can record the GGP team's response. So that's a response on the specific comment. We're not actually going to go back to the commenters and provide a response. But we are going to record a response here.

So for example, as with the IDN EPDP, the response for those that have supported the recommendation as written is to thank the commenter for the support of the preliminary recommendation. So we're not preparing a specific response to that, but this response will be different depending on, for instance, if the working group is planning to make a change to the recommendation based on the comment, then it would indicate in this column what that change would be. So there is a response, but it's not necessarily sent directly to the commenter.

Rafik, then. Please go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Julie. I hope you don't have hard time to speak. But I want to say here, I understand that this is categorized as support

---

recommendation as written, since there is no [inaudible] the amendment to the recommendation that's written. But my understanding here from the spirit of the committees asking maybe for more clarification, so not just change to the text itself of the recommendation, but maybe clarifying some points or elaborating more. So I believe just responding by thanks seems little bit underwhelming here when we are asking people or different parts of the community to submit comment, and we I just gave a notice via thanks. While here there is maybe some points for elaboration. But anyway, that's up to the rest of the group.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks. I think that we just carried over, for example, that text that's been used also, as an example, in the IDN EPDP. But if we want something more specific, if the working group agrees, perhaps to add some additional explanation in the rationale or elsewhere in the report and final report, that is, we can indicate that here. So if we want a more specific response, we should capture that in this column. So let me ask what the working group members think might be an appropriate response to the NCSG's suggestion. I see a hand up from Tom, please.

THOMAS BARRETT:

Hi. Yeah, I think there are some specific suggestions here that we should acknowledge, deserves some consideration. So I see two. One is this assumption that the definition of underserved may not be defined enough and may deter people from finishing the survey, but I'm not sure how significant that is. But more importantly, this suggestion that we keep track of the metrics of

---

people attempting to complete the survey versus not completing it and trying to draw some conclusions from that. I would simply have a canned response saying, "Thank you for your suggestions, we will discuss them in the group," something to that effect.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Tom. Anybody else have some thoughts they want to add? Ros, please.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Yes. Thanks so much. I think it's really useful to be going into this. Well, it's a good point about the accessibility of the term underserved, how well that's understood outside of the ICANN community. I do think it's important to be using this ICANN well-developed terminology where possible. I do note that in various documents, we've included underrepresented and underserved or underserved and developing countries to help use more broadly accessible terms. So I think it would be a mistake to get rid of that term just because of that reason. Like I said, it doesn't tend to appear on its own that much anyway. But I think it's a really important highlight to a term that is widely accepted within the ICANN community, and it's important that that constituency is captured. So that's my main comment on this particular comment. I've got a couple more comments when we scroll down to the wording changes one. But yeah, I thought I'd put that out there now. Thanks.

---

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Ros. Anyone else have any comments on the NCSG's comments? We're capturing these discussions, as I said, into the draft of the final report. You'll have a chance to review them. And also at a high level in the notes as well, and of course, in the transcript of the call. Any other comments on NCSG's comments?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Julie, this is Maureen here.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Are we going to make comments on—I mean, they've included Recommendation 3 in this one. Or are you going to discuss it further when we go down to Recommendation 3? I just had a couple of comments on that particular comment.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. Yeah, I think we should discuss them now. I think it's been submitted here, so yeah, in the content of that one. Go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: About the surveys, I think that what this does highlight is the importance of the communication processes to make sure that the information that is available, it needs to be arranged and available in a range of different ways to ensure that the most relevant

---

information is accessible to potential applicants, especially to find out if they qualify for Applicant Support and what this entails. I think, too, like it mentions, like the click-throughs and that would provide good data of the effectiveness of the information that we actually gain from the surveys. And having a question like, when we're on the website and having that extra question like, "Did you find this information useful?" would also be an opportunity for people to comment on the spot that's needed for more clarity on access and information. As a website, that process would be ongoing forward, adding information as people sort of think that there needs to be a little bit more clarity in the communication process. What they put on websites, for example, that the information that they put on the website initially as we get feedback, the information needs to develop. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Sorry, it took me a moment to get off mute. Thank you, Maureen. That's very helpful. Anyone else have any further comments on the comments that are on the deliberation section in Recommendations 3, or anything else from the NCSG? Does anybody have any objections to suggestions that Maureen has made, or some additional explanation that we can add in the deliberation? I'm not seeing any hands. Then I suggest we move on to the next comment. Let me do that here. You can do it in your own documents.

So I have two comments related to supporting the recommendation with wording changes. The first is from Gabriel Karsan, which you see here. I'll open up the floor to any discussion about this comment. This is supporting the intent but

---

with ... Sorry, I got muted somehow. Any comments on this comment? Rafik, please go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Julie. So I understand here the case of change of wording. It seems there's, I think, much more text. But the question here or maybe the criteria should follow if, I'd say, is it being more specific here or it can be more confusing or it's not adding really anything helping in terms of implementation. Because I'm reading it but I'm really having a hard time to see how we can help here. But maybe this question for the ICANN Org liaison, if changing the text will help them or doesn't really bring any added value in terms of being specific or giving more guidance.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks, Rafik. That's really the question for the working group members here. In any cases where commenters are suggesting changes to recommendations or to implementation guidance, the working group needs to decide whether or not the changes does provide, does it actually benefit making clearer, or does it make things less clear? In any case, the working group should discuss and decide whether or not it thinks that this is an appropriate change or not, and why.

To your question earlier in the chat, if there are suggested changes that the working group is deciding to accept to recommendation or to implementation guidance, then that would be indicated as redline. And the working group would see that text

---

and discuss it and make sure they agree to it. So it wouldn't just go into the final report without some discussion. We bring it back to make sure that everybody's clear on what the change might be doing. I see Leon and Maureen. I'm not sure the order there. I think it's Leon then Maureen.

LEON GRUNDMANN: I'm not sure of the order either. But okay, if no objections then I'll go ahead because it's kind of responding directly to what Rafik was saying. This is Leon Grundmann from ICANN staff in my role as liaison from the GDS function. Looking at this comment, I would agree with what you were saying, Rafik. I'm not sure necessarily of the added value here because I do see that a lot of the points that Gabriel mentions there are touched upon in the Implementation Guidance indicators of success data and metrics to measure all of those points in Guidance Recommendation 1. So from my side or from our side, I guess it would be more of a question. What is the rationale here? Is it to strengthen the Guidance Recommendation by putting those points about awareness, engagement, mentoring, etc., into the text of the main Guidance Recommendation? I'm not sure how to interpret this. If anyone in the working group has an idea or really a rationale behind this, then I'm happy to hear it. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Leon. Maureen, please.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hi. Thanks, Leon. I actually like the changed wording because I think it incorporates not just the initial recommendation into the Implementation Guidance, but it makes the actual guidance statement a little bit more broader and more inclusive of the potential targeted group of applicants and enhances the intent of the Guidance Recommendation. I guess, similarly, with the second recommendation that was made quite like that, too, and I agree that there's a risk that the intention could be lost if it's not actually specifically stated within the Implementation Guidance. I know that within our explanation, we said we didn't want it to be too detailed. But I think that if we incorporate not only the intent but the additional information, I think it enhances the intent of the Guidance Recommendation. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. Rafik, Leon, do you agree?

LEON GRUNDMANN: I would say I don't think any major concerns from our side with the change. So I'm happy to leave this to the working group.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Leon. I didn't mean to put you on the spot. Lawrence, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I just wanted to add my voice to what Maureen has highlighted. This is to me, the comments should be adopted by



---

our working group, it's more inclusive. And it also clears any doubts or confusions that may arise in the minds of applicants on if they should go ahead or if they qualify or not and stuff like that. But I think, for me, this is a language that I believe that all parties should embrace. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Lawrence. Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. I don't have any kind of restriction from the beginning. But my comment, first, is really if we have some criteria and to see if there is any other alternative. But if others believe it's helpful, why not? But then I guess we cannot just maybe accept as is, because when reading again, I find maybe the wording a little bit—it can be improved. I'm not a native speaker, but I believe it can be improved and I think we can simplify. While we can keep, if it's about the intention here, to be specific about what kind of activity like awareness, engagement, mentoring, but like deeper support, what does it mean, really? It's just support. But if we are stressing here something in particular, we'll be happy to know what is it? What we mean by deeper support versus support.

So if we want to go with this, maybe we should kind of try to reword it, to simplify it. So, for example here, applicant about the next round to the application for the Applicant Support Program, we know it's about the next round. Just to say it's about the Applicant Support something. So just my suggestion here, if we

---

want to go with this is maybe to try to simplify, having maybe the main elements at the end, it's maybe to be more specific.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Rafik. Any further comments? Lawrence I see your hand is still up.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. As a follow up, I had typed in the chat to know what areas of concern, especially looking at what Rafik just said, if the area of concern is words such as Applicant Support, because that's what we're working on, I'm not sure that that is so much of an issue that could water down the submission. But I'm happy to also consider any alternatives. Maybe if we agree to adopt this, then maybe we could look at what we might not be comfortable about and work at seeing if we can get alternative language around that. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much, Lawrence. I'm looking if there are any further hands. I'm not seeing any. There seems to be agreement to consider this change. And what staff can do is produce a redline version of the change, and then the working group can suggest changes to that. Because I think there's also support for maybe simplifying the wording that's suggested in the change, and maybe making sure it's clear. So I think we could produce a version of the revised recommendation redlined for people to review and come back to the discussion at a later time.

---

We'll also note that likely we're coming back to Guidance Recommendation 1, in any case, because we will be coming back to these recommendations based on the comments from the GAC, and it's quite likely they will have comments on each of the recommendations as well. So we'll take the action to produce a redline, and then we can revisit this in the working group.

So, moving along. I'm not seeing further hands, moving on to the Com Laude comment. You see that there. Then opening up for discussion on that comment. Thanks. That's the change to the Implementation Guidance. Anyone have any thoughts? Tom, please?

THOMAS BARRETT: I guess my first reaction is I don't know how we would explicitly exclude any entities. But we could fix this very easily by simply adding the words such as "the target potential applicants..." or say "from but not limited to". So after the word "from," say "from but not limited to the following," and then that way, it doesn't look like we're excluding anybody.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Tom. Rafik, please.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Not to comment but just a clarification here, just trying to understand what's really proposed. So this is totally new text or just some amendment on the existing one?

JULIE HEDLUND: I believe it's a suggestion for a change to the Implementation Guidance text. So what you see in quotation marks would be the new text replacing the existing text. We can produce a redline if that makes it easier.

RAFIK DAMMAK: That will be helpful because it also maybe show the difference in the intent here.

JULIE HEDLUND: We can do that as an action item. Ros?

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thanks. I was just going to say I feel like what this comment is getting at—and perhaps I'm mistaken, I'm keen to hear what others say—is sort of connected to the next comment on significant change required to the intent and wording. I think the general point I'm seeing in the theme throughout these comments is that in our recommendation, we've been quite focused on the nonprofit sector. But I think the way it's phrased, it makes it sound as if it is a bit exclusive. I know we've had quite a debate too in this group about actually, you know, once we got talking about this while we were originally talking about nonprofits as a focus, given financial sustainability concerns over several years, actually noting that perhaps private companies in developing countries, for example, would be quite a good group to target as well. So I think there is potentially some more thinking to be done on this. I'm just

---

reading the comments. Yeah, I think their addition of this should not exclude any entities from outreach efforts is important so that we don't accidentally leave a gap for those other entities we've discussed in general. I think we could come back to discuss this more perhaps when we go to the next comment. But I think, from my perspective, it seems like a reasonable inclusion just to make sure that all outreach efforts aren't lopsided in this regard. I hope that helps. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks, Ros. Any other comments? Otherwise, what staff will do is take an action item as we did with the comment from Gabriel Karsan, to produce a redline reflecting the suggested change from Com Laude for this working group to review and decide if that's acceptable or if there needs to be other changes. I'm not seeing any other hands. Let me just check. I'm not seeing anything to address in the comments, too.

Oh, I see Leon says, "I can see the link between the two comments too. The explanation of the debate Ros mentioned is included in the rationale of the draft final report." Exactly. That will still be there. Just to clarify, too, in relation to what Leon has pointed out. So the final report will include the rationale for the original recommendations. And then, of course, the deliberations on the comments received in the public comment proceeding, and also the deliberations and the rationale for any changes based on those comments to the Guidance Recommendations. So there'll be the original text, the rationale for the original text, as well as the deliberations and rationale for anything that might have changed,

---

so that people can see why the working group is suggesting a change to the original recommendation.

Ros is saying, "I guess I personally don't see that it does much harm (and could potentially do quite a lot of good) to add the short additional sentence."

Okay. Lawrence says, "Rejoined Zoom."

So I think at this point, we'll go on to BC, and I think we will probably finish with that with Recommendation 1, and then pick up on next week for Recommendations 2. And also, maybe if we've got GAC comments on Recommendation 1, we'll go over those as well. So you see here the BC comment. I hope you've all read it. It's fairly lengthy. This is for a significant change to the recommendation. Opening it up for comments. Maureen, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Julie. First of all, looking at the comment on the inclusion, the focus on businesses, and whether we should be ... We had quite a significant discussion on this. It's just that I can't agree with the focus on businesses. I know that notwithstanding all the discussion we have had, but I can't agree with that. I think that the list of people offering pro bono support for applicants would make themselves available to those who are already businesses but probably for the normal fee. Applicant Support to these services for free advice should be prioritized for those who are not currently even at a level of a registrar business or whatever their interest is in actually making an application for pro bono service support. I think we have to look at the potential for

---

the current limited resource that we're going to have available or potentially needy applicants who may be serious startups rather than fully fledged businesses. That's my comment in relation to business. I think that it's probably going to start a discussion here now. So I'll stop there.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. Lawrence?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I'd like to yield the floor to Rafik and I'll go after him.

JULIE HEDLUND: All right. Rafik then.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. I think this comment first is related to the first recommendation. It's about communication about Applicant Support Program. I see an issue here, it's because I understand the reason that we believe there are some for-profit from underserved or developing country, that they may be interested to apply for gTLD, but still they're for-profit. I can understand there are other companies or enterprise that they're not necessarily looking for profit that might be eligible or targeted to apply for this program. But for profit, whatever it's coming from, it's still for profit, even if they are a startup, the end goal is to make profit in the long term.

---

So I find it's little bit concerning where, for example, in about the task number six, we already know that we are not sure that we are able to provide enough funding. So that's why we see kind of prioritization here. We are not excluding them. I understand that the language is enough open to allow them, but I would be concerned if we are trying to add them and to give them that space. We are not excluding but I really am mindful that we are trying also to support more for-profit companies. I get they are coming from underserved region, but at the end, also in underserved region we have for-profit entity. They are trying to make money and it's questionable that we are going to support them. So that's my position. I would not really for supporting any change here.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Rafik. Lawrence, I don't see your hand now unless I'm missing it. Further comments on the BC comment? I'm looking for any hands. Okay. Ros, please.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thanks. I was just going to come in quickly. I've said a bit on this earlier today, but I think Rafik makes some really valid comments. And just to say, I don't want to jump ahead of the game. But in addition to the kind of theme that's running between this comment and the Com Laude one, but also what I've seen from the GAC public comment, which should be coming out today, if it hasn't already, but this is coming up as a point so I do wonder if it needs a broader conversation to revisit. Thanks.



JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Ros. I think we may have lost Lawrence. Maybe has dropped from Zoom, which I don't see. Right now, I'm hearing support for the BC's comment, but then again, we have not heard from Lawrence. So it's possible he would speak in favor, but in general, we would look for rough consensus or at least consensus that the working group agrees to make changes as requested by commenters. I'm not hearing that support at this point. Just going to look again for any last comments on this comment. Terri confirms that we've lost Lawrence.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Julie, can you repeat that? Sorry, I didn't catch. Did you say that you think there's been a consensus that we would accept it? I'm confused. Sorry. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Sorry. I think my use of contraction was probably confusing. I think the consensus is not to accept at this point the BC's comment, the changes requested in the BC's comment. So I think that there is consensus to go with the status quo, which is the recommendation as written and not incorporate the changes as requested by the BC.

If someone wants to contradict me, but I did note that we have lost Lawrence, so we may hear some other thoughts. Although in general, this group operates by consensus, so we would look for agreement before making changes. So I have Maureen and I have Tom, and then we've got five more minutes. We do need to

---

mention what looks likely to happen with the meeting on October 9. Please go ahead, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I just wanted to comment about the lower section of this long comment. I think that this comment is actually covered by the bigger emphasis that Org needs to or proposes to put into the communication needs and interests of potential applicants within the information packs that they're considering for outreach and awareness raising. But it also indicates that access needs to be easy-to-read information about ICANN. There's a suggestion that people who are applying won't know about ICANN, which seems rather strange, but there needs to be information about ICANN, some relevant info, and perhaps some relevant info on what happened in the first round and what are the improvements that have been proposed for this new round based on the learnings of the last round, and perhaps some kind of background information may be necessary to give people a better understanding of the new process. Again, the communication thing is really highlighted in this comment. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Maureen. Okay, Tom, and we have Lawrence trying to get back in the room. So we'll look at who has the last word, but we'll go to Tom first. Tom, please.

THOMAS BARRETT: Thanks. Tom Barrett from Encirca. I generally agree with the intent of this comment, which we discussed previously, which is

---

we do not intend to exclude anyone in our outreach. Provided we're going after underserved regions, there's no intent to exclude anyone. And so I think we can address that by specifically saying, as I said earlier, is not limited to, etc. I guess it raises a question about whether or not we want to prioritize nonprofits over profit. That may be a different discussion, but certainly, it's not our intent to exclude for-profit companies. Again, we can address that by adding a qualifier in the recommendation.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks very much, Tom. That's helpful. I'm wondering if we have audio for Lawrence yet. Lawrence, are you able to speak?

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

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, we can. Thank you.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Great. Sorry, I got knocked out of Zoom again. I believe that the entirety of the BC's comment, sorry, I've not been able to follow the trend of discussion so I might not be able to provide some feedback as may have been desired. But I think the final trend of this submission, basically, is trying to let the committee understand that the breadth of businesses and what's important to one business concerning, I mean, in comparison to another, differs across various lines, location, interest, and all the works.

---

And I believe it's not the intention of our group to also in any way exclude any parties.

Hearing the earlier part of some of Rafik's submission before I got knocked off, while some of us might have our own expectations of who should qualify for an Applicant Support, which is not the phrase I think we are even discussing and dealing with at the moment, it is also important to ensure that for us not to have a repeat of a earlier process we had over a decade ago, that outreach should be as inclusive as possible. Businesses should be let make their decisions if they want to apply for Applicant Support or not. And if they desire to apply, if there are certain conditions that we feel should warrant them not applying, that should definitely come up for discussion and shouldn't be assumed or presumed.

So at this point, it is our belief—when I say “our,” I'm talking about the Commercial Stakeholder Group—that the Applicant Support pool is open to all. And in terms of outreach, it should also be as inclusive as we can possibly make it and leave entities to decide if they would want to go with such support. At the end of the day, that support might not be the support that some applicants might need, it might just be around the pro bono services, while some might actually decide to apply for some kind of financial waiver or not. But at this point, in terms of outreach, in terms of reaching out to people, we have a responsibility to let people know that there is this program, there is going to be this level of support, and bring them into the basket, not minding whatever divide they're in. And if at the end of the day, they qualify in metrics, [sift] some of them out, all well and good.

---

So I believe that we should take a second consideration. Look carefully at the BC's proposal. The proposal Com Laude basically talked about outreach also. And then the gentleman—I don't have my screen in front of me to know what the name is—the proposal language. We should take a second look at all these proposals and see how best we can reword what we have so that we can eliminate any confusion whatsoever and ensure that we are as inclusive as possible. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Lawrence. Then I think as an action item, we'll ask working group members to look again at the BC comment and see if there's any suggested changes that they would make to the recommendations or implementation guidance. We'll put that as homework for next week.

I'd like to wrap up discussion today on the comments. We're about three minutes after. That I will mention that we did ask people to respond as to whether or not they were an apology for the meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> of October, or whether they would be able to attend. We had five people who are apologies. We had two who confirmed they could attend. So it's looking likely that we will cancel the call. But we do need to confirm this first with our chair, Mike Silber. So we'll do that and let you know by tomorrow whether or not the call is cancelled. But otherwise, the next call will be next week, Monday, on the 2<sup>nd</sup> at 20:00 UTC, the rotating time.

---

Thanks to all. Thanks for your very helpful comments and discussion. We'll talk to you next week. Thanks so much for chairing, Paul. We really appreciate it. This meeting is adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**