ICANN79 | CF – At-Large Leadership Working Session
Monday, March 4, 2024 – 1:15 to 2:30 SJU

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Hello and welcome to the At-Large Leadership Working Session with the NPOC Leadership. My name is Michelle DeSmyter and I am a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments will only be allowed if submitted within the Q&A pod. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak Iif speaking a language other than English. Please speak at a reasonable pace. And with that, I will hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC Chair, and Juan Rojas, NPOC Chair.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Welcome, and we've been trying to get together and get to know each other a little bit better for a couple of meetings now, so this is really the goal. We have some cross-pollination in that we have some At-Large members that are Glenn McKnight and Judith Hellerstein that are part of NPOC, and certainly a lot of people within the At-Large community belong in non-profits and things like that. So it seems like there ought to be a lot of natural synergy. So the idea was just to get together and get to know each other.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Hello everyone, this is Juan Manuel Rojas for the record. Yes, we have a lot of people that are members of both, not just Glenn and Judith. In the past, we have [inaudible], maybe you remember that. I know that we have some several more members that we are part of both, so it's good because we are, I think we have the same concerns in certain things. So I think that we can discuss or we can find a common ground here to work together or to know what each other are thinking about in a specific topic, that's it. So I think it's a good thing.

Before to start, I would like to introduce the few time that we have here with me. Now it's here, Bolutife Adisa it's our secretary, secretariat from NPOC. And arriving there, it's Emmanuel, he's our policy chair, and [inaudible]. So, and we have also the company of, here with us is also Manju, Manju Chen, a councilor from NCSG. So she is going to start here with us. So I would like to know, to let them know, Bolutife, here. To let them know that if they want to jump in, jump in, so go ahead, so no worries. So I think I should do it without the slide, I think. Yep, or you can.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. We have an interesting structure in At-Large, obviously, because we have, we're sort of structured around a group of regional organizations called RALOs that make up the At-Large community. And they elect the majority of the ALAC to represent that community in the

ICANN arena. And the NomCom, the NOMINATING committee adds another five of them, right? So 10 come from the regions and five come from the NomCom. But you know, when all is said and done, we work for the RALOs and represent them here. And so at a particular ICANN meeting, we'll have many members of the ALAC and many members of the RALOs. We didn't advertise this as a full meeting, but just as a leadership meeting, and so we've got sort of a random assortment of people here today, but we've got some folks from different RALOs, from APRALO, NARALO, LACRALO, AFRALO. So we've got some representation from all of the regional organizations that make up the At-Large community. So obviously everybody here is free to speak, whatever they would like to as well. So this is an ad hoc sort of open, that's why it's a little disorganized, because we were just doing a getting to know you meeting. Right, exactly.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Yeah, we know that we have, as you said, that maybe we are trying to do this just a long time ago. And it's good that, okay, we are NPOC, we are not for profit operation, I'm sorry, not operational anymore, now organizational concerns. So it's important to do this differentiation because the old name, it was operational concerns constituency. But it was so long and it was so confusing. So we are not now operational concerns just because the quickly, the question, it was, what is operational concerns? So, okay, we are simplifying just with organization constituency. So, but I don't want to talk a lot too much about that.

Okay, this is our session. Before to that, I would like to say that this is a community forum, so it's a great opportunity as we are having today to share with other groups, thank you. And in case of any of you doesn't remember, we are a part of NCSG, Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group for this. And we are within the GNSO. So this is, we are talking about a little bit about applicant support program. Of course about the applicant handbook because we are involved in that. I have seen Cheryl in the group. Me, she knows that I am also. So I think that our concerns is this one, the impact on civil society and users of small business in this program.

So, okay, a little bit of background about the applicant support. Applicant support is an initiative to develop part of the gTLD program. It was part of the old program and the new one. And it's intended to provide financial and non-financial support to eligible entities to demonstrate financial need. The idea is to provide qualified candidates the opportunity to reduce new gTLD applications and evaluation fees to entities that would like to operate a registry and which would otherwise be unable to apply because of financial or resource constraints. This is one of the aims of the program. The qualified applicants would receive 50 or between amount, between 50 and 85% of fee reduction and evaluation and application. That's kind of idea.

But, okay, this discussion is being, it has been discussion or is being discussion within the SubPro, so Subsequent Procedures Implementation Review Team. We know that we have a lot of acronyms. So, excuse me if I forgot to translate someone. But this is what we're talking about. Now we have three, at least three sub-tracks currently discussing in the SubPro, the IRT. These are ASPs, applications support program, registry service provider pre-evaluation, and registry system testing. Also in this IRT is the discussion, the community of consultation that we have this morning on PICs or RVCs is like a registry voluntary commitments and public interest commitments. So it's like a kind of background because in any case, you know.

And we have found some improvements of these especially for the new handbook that we are identified. So this, an applicant could still apply for the strings even if they are not qualifying for applicant support. But also we have the applicant have to meet the criteria of public responsibility due diligence. And it's different from the public interest criteria that was applied for the last round that maybe some of you know very, very well. Also, we have the enhanced diversity in terms of eligibility requirements, cost, size, indigenous group, not-for-profit. We have more diversity. Many people now can be qualified applicants. So that's very good. And the applicant should have updated financial stability criteria from the financial capabilities criteria. And maybe a note that is not in the slides that if anyone has a sole owner partnership or doing this is not qualified to apply. There is no any person, individual or the owner, one, just one, only personal business or kind of can apply. But it's not clear from this handbook that kind of things that is being discussed and there is not decided yet.

It's a proposal inside the guidebook that it's open for public comments right now, as you know, that could be or should be a training program, right? It's a board consideration of the community supplemental policy recommendation from the SubPro working group 17.2. Also have access to application counselors. It's like a third party evaluators, something like that. Also is a consideration for the same consideration.

The reduction fee that it was talking at the beginning. But in this case, there is not decided yet about the fees, not for evaluation, not for application.

Also, we have not, the IRT doesn't talk about yet about these results over bid credit or multiplier or something like that to the applicant supported in a meeting of an action, right? And it could be also have reduced or waived a registry operator fees. And this also another pending board consideration in this recommendation. That's it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Speaking French.]

JONATHAN ZUCK: ... looking at this was sort of the criteria that said that it would only apply to somebody that would suffer financial distress, or something along those lines. I don't know if that was the exact wording, but only if paying the application fee would cause financial distress, would it be applicable. And I think that gave us some hesitation because the truth of the matter is the application fee probably isn't the be-all end-all. But any help that a smaller business or an underserved region, they're going to have less money overall and have to make choices of priorities. And whether or not to make a TLD a priority may have to do with the overall cost to them. And so I think that that language that says you have to be impoverished basically in order to apply might be too strict. I mean, being an underserved region doesn't necessarily mean you have no money. It just means that your choices are harder. And I think those are the organizations that are most likely to succeed with top-level domains, are not ones with no money, but that just need help. And we need to find a way to engage them and not exclude them because they can afford an application fee. So those were some of the things that we identified as concerns.

We had some conversation about this $2,500 deposit that you have to pay within 90 days of your acceptance to the applicant support program, which could be as much as a year away from the actual start of the application phase. So one of our RALO leaders, Sebastien, came up with the idea of maybe that money going into escrow or something like that because it's certainly not the case that ICANN needs it. But again, my personal bias is that those kinds of numbers aren't going to make the difference. The real difference is going to be in all the work it takes to actually get it up and running. But it sounds like we have some overlapping concerns for sure.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: I'm sorry. Manju is with the hand up. Please, Manju.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Juan. I just wanted to clarify. So this, I don't know why. So these are actually [my observations] on the slides. It was my personal observations that I shared with the NCSG. And probably NPOC agree with all of it. But so I don't think it's either an NCSG position or NPOC position. And I don't know why it's used like this. But just a note that probably it's not agreed upon position of NCSG or NPOC. It's just my personal observations that I shared on the mailing list to the NCSG folks. In case you go to NCSG and you're like, that's not what I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And we don't have a firm position either. We just started having the conversation, obviously. So it's a good time for us to be talking about it and sharing ideas. So no stakes. We're just talking. So we won't hold you to it. But it's good to know who's to blame in case it does come up. Thank you for that. I appreciate that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: thank you very much. Just while Manju's observations are on screen, just to make sure we have some of the concerns that were considered as we were doing the drafting of this handbook. And that, I think, is something we also need to recognize, that there has been significant and, I think, quite worthwhile collaboration going into the development of the text that has come to pass. Anything to do with 17.2, of course, is still pending, the decision on 17.2. But there is some rationale that still sticks, such as, rather than have no floor to a between 50 and 85% fee reduction, if there was no minimum, then applicants could not feel confident that that is the very least they will get, regardless of whatever very high figure the fees actually are. So I think it is important to recognize at this time, as opposed to last time, there is that floor, not just ceiling, of reduction.

We should also recognize that a measure of success is maybe 10 successful applicants, not 100, not 50, not 60. And so we kind of have to manage expectations here as well. I keep hearing concerns which reflect probably thinking of a far greater availing of the support than is at all possible, or is actually desirable at this stage.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What was the number of applicants last time?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Three and one successful. So from the ALAC and At-Large perspective, what we can very much say we agree on is that our focus is on increasing the diversity of applicants for applicant support. And that a clear focus should be encouraged on both underserved and in some cases quite specific niches within underserved, such as Indigenous populations. Now, as a subset of that, and this is where we get down to some of the minutiae of the public comment that is out now, we have seven basic areas of questions to answer. Section two, section three, four, they've all got a little bit of information and important things for us to consider before we go, yes, we think it's written well enough, but we'd like you to say this or no, we don't like, right?

But it's section five where the eligibility criteria comes into play that I think our community is particularly keen on focusing on. Because there's this mix and match, how do you make sure there is minimum barriers to the applicant and the applicant being successful when you're talking not just small business, but small business in an underserved region, which may or may not be in an Indigenous organization. And it can get very, very complex with a system that is requiring a pass or fail. Unlike last time when there was far too much wibbly wobbly interpretation, guesswork of whose opinion of who is what on the review of these applicants, as few as there were, this time it's third party reviewing. Excellent, excellent, fully support that. And it's our job to set the criteria to make sure that third party can go yes or no.

So to me, and I think, Jonathan, I'm fairly on solid ground, I believe ALAC and At-Large will be a party to what Justin and I are saying on this, it's in that section five, and particularly section 5.5, where we get down to those very small specifics, which we didn't get to in our conversation, but our next Consolidated Policy Working Group will drive into that.

I would be very surprised if there was not an opportunity for some mutualism to reflect concerns between NPOC and our communities on that section, at least at a high level. And I'd like to think perhaps before it becomes time to tick the little boxes and say yes, no, maybe on the seven questions, Jonathan, it might be appropriate if there was some mutual sharing of concerns and highlights from the work we do individually. Thanks, Jonathan. Back to you.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Sure, sure. Yes. I think that the criteria that you are talking about are the minor things, the subtext thing that we need to be aware of, because of course, yes, we have indigenous people can apply, but how can be successful applicants in this round or in the new round? Because yes, we have no... It says that, okay, between 50 and 85, but it's just the one ideal thing, but it's not the reality maybe for many of us organizations, because one of the criteria is about the financial things, financial statements in the past two years. So, okay, but it could be, but how many of these small try to say from one way or another, it's like, okay, what kind of this organization can be able to fulfill the criteria before to apply? Because if you look at the criteria, okay, no, I have not fulfilled this, so it's better maybe not apply, right?

And I think that for... And Jonathan says that maybe the grant program is for that. I think that from my perspective, grant program, from the grant program is for, I think it's impact outside ICANN, for maybe for projects outside ICANN, not maybe in this particular thing, like applicant things or applicant support thing. Could be, but this is my perspective. So we are now discussing about the languages, about some things that on this particular... In the ASP guidebook that this is very, very exciting. We have a meeting this afternoon or something like that today. So, could be a better way to have a focus on, to have the topic, to our view, focus it on, okay, we need to discuss, maybe to develop this more, maybe in another meetings later or maybe with all the whole NCSG group, that could be those also an invitation to recover these joint meetings that we had NCSG and ALAC level that we had in the past, maybe now is the time to recover it because we have this common ground here. So that's a kind of invitation. So I don't know if you agree that we can move to the next topic, I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, we sure can. And I definitely agree on trying to find ways to work together. And there was already a joint session about applicant support. And we've begun the process of kind of blending our recommendations on 17.2 together. They're not an exact match, but there was a lot of overlap, I remember. So let's continue to try to find those areas of commonality because we've definitely found within the ICANN context that the more we can build coalitions, the more successful we are. So we're always up for doing that. So the next topic, JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: I think it's... Caleb, it is yours, I think? Or do you want to jump in?

CALEB OGUNDELE: So, good afternoon everyone, and good to have you all in the room with us. So, why are we having this conversation? More recently the SSAC did make a proposal, and I think ICANN also adopted that, based on the use case of .internal for private use, which we all know by now, that we, ICANN is, or the SSAC is proposing that folks should use the .internal string, gTLD string for private use configuration of their private networks and the rest of that, like that. There is a public comment currently open to us that, and I want to encourage us to also try to follow that.

So, what basically are some of the concerns that we do have about the use of the .internal? The .internal is welcome, based on security approach to things, and I think there is a specific RFC that supports also the use of private networks and the rest of them like that. But the major concern that we do have is that when new strings or TLDs like this are being brought up, like the .internal, it has implications for the end users, specifically the not-for-profits, who cannot afford to start reconfiguring their internal network based on this new string that ICANN is proposing. And so, we do feel that if this ends up becoming a standard, and we obviously don't want to break the internet, we don't want the internet to be broken probably based on internal configurations of certain networks like that, we do feel that it's going to have an additional cost to not-for-profits, specifically those who cannot afford to start reconfiguring their networks simply because there is a new standard that they have to follow based on some of these things. So these are some of our initial concerns that we do have for the .internal.

While we are totally in support of security and anything that allows the internet to be very stable, we only just have some concerns based on the fact that not-for-profits with smaller budgets might not be able to have funds to support or to start reconfiguring most of their network to support some of these things. These are some of our initial concerns. It's not like we have it or we know it all, and so we welcome thoughts, we welcome views from other places to help us have a good way where we can collaborate more on this and maybe have even better understanding to support even the views of maybe folks from SSAC and back up their motivation as well. I see Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thanks Caleb for your perceptions on the use of .internal. We have had two meetings. One is within us, CPWG, and another with SSAC yesterday on this topic. So the way we have been looking at it is that this is a welcome development. We have not looked at any financial aspects, which in any case will be a one-time thing because this provides a guarantee that ICANN will never delegate this in future for eternity. So if there is any financial requirement, which probably for a small organization is not going to be much. It's a one-time configuration change. Beyond that, there is no periodic impact at all. And it provides you the safety, the guarantee that you will never ever have to change it again. So I think generally what we thought was that if there is a financial cost, it is worth it, well worth it, because there is a guarantee that ICANN will never delegate this. So it provides a fairly safe arrangement for the future. That's what we thought. So if you can tell us the details of what is the precise financial issue here. Thanks.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Thank you very much. So the initial concern for us is, take for example a not-for-profit who is not in the business of networking. All they just do maybe is just not-for-profit with limited budget. They have to outsource most of their networking needs. They have to outsource most of their configurations and all of that. Now getting the gTLD is just a small amount. That's what everyone will tell you. But getting the manpower to support the amount, take for example if I'm a network engineer and I have to consult for your not-for-profit and I have to charge you per hour and tell you that this is the cost and I put all the costs to reconfigure your routers, reconfigure everything that is within your internal network. Is that becoming some unbudgeted amount of cost that you did not plan for? Because most times when people do their costs, their costing for infrastructure or need, they just do it one-off and then they assume that that's what it is. So these are some of our initial concerns on the cost implication it might have for folks that are within the not-for-profit.

SATISH BABU: Just a quick jump in for just a 30 second intervention. So firstly I think this point is well taken that you need information on how to do this. If you have a home network or a small organization network, it can be done by yourself with a little bit of... We can ask for technical documentation on how to do this, certainly. On the cost side, I really do not know how to... because the risk is that if you don't make this change, whatever random string you're using will sometime later be delegated and then your networks will go for a toss completely and you have no control over it at all. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I think one thing to remember is that the use of this won't be mandatory. So there's already extensive work being done on name collisions, right? That's where this issue comes up. So home and mail and things. And so they already have some blocked domains and they've done a whole risk assessment framework around the other ones that are out there, and it turns out there's a lot of them. So this is just meant to be an option for people to use that if they use this as their internal domain, they can do it with confidence as Satish said. But there's nothing urgent about doing it necessarily and there's nothing required about doing it. It's just a way to take yourself out of that challenge that people have when they're using a string that somebody might delegate. So it's really just a promise to protect this string which feels like it wouldn't have any upfront cost for anyone and once they decided to do it, maybe when you're upgrading the network or something like that, that could be the time to combine it with other costs and things. But there's nothing urgent about doing it because that name collision work, it's not instead of the name collision work. That's still happening. Those block lists and that risk assessment is still taking place.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan said exactly what I was going to raise. I guess it's a natural, if you're then setting up a new system, you know you've got this safe space to operate with. It'll be a gradual transition if a transition at all. But if something goes wrong, that's the name you'll be able to use with absolute security that won't alter again.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Thank you very much. So one of the key takeaways for me specifically is the fact that what I'm hearing now is that ICANN is not making it mandatory. So if it is not mandatory, I don't think not-for-profit folks should have a lot of concern because at the end of the day, if it's mandatory and then you have to make it like a standard, like an RFC standard and the rest of them like that, and that's where the issues start coming in that most people who don't even understand, most not-for-profit, small not-for-profit who don't even understand their networks, right, have to go hire an expert to ask them to come and start reconfiguring their internal network to support that. And I think with some of the things I am hearing in the room is the fact that if ICANN is— not compulsory, they are also going to provide certain documentation support for this, and I think it's a welcome development from us, and it's one of the ways that makes me also happy about this meeting because we would never have had this perspective and we would have probably [inaudible] this same perspective in our public comment.

And so one of the few things that we will do when we have when we go back into the room and do some reassessment now is see how we can reassess our own public comment, take into consideration of the fact that there is a commitment not to make it compulsory and that there will also be help for not-for-profits. So I think basically from me it's a wrap for my own session except if there are any questions in the room that we can also answers to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: As someone who runs a very small non-profit, I think the danger of the server being under the coffee maker is a much higher danger than .internal. So it should be okay. Nothing mandatory.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Caleb, I have no any other questions or comments, but I think that maybe Bolutife wants to add something that the topic that we are talking about before was the applicant guidebook thing. So Bolutife, please.

BOLUTIFE ADISA: I just wanted to add a few comments initially regarding the applicant guidebook and also the applicant support program generally. I think my input, I think a lot of things have been said, but I also wanted to say that it's important to consider that the application process is either easy enough or perhaps funded for the applicants basically because the cost of application is not just the only challenge. Sometimes it's also the know-how, and sometimes they might need to hire people to help with putting together a good application.

But also in line with that, I wanted to highlight a public comment that we are currently working on at the NPOC regarding the proposed language draft for the next round applicant guidebook. And I think particularly for us, because there were about eight different topics that were highlighted, including the predictability framework, the code of conduct, and conflict of interest guidelines, and also the applicant's freedom of expression.

But for us at NPOC, I think there are about two or three that really stand out for us. That's the freedom of expression, and seeing that there's an understanding to incorporate international laws into it, I think that's something that we would like to support. But also the predictability framework, which currently now is part of the SPIRT charter drafting team, which I think is quite interesting because ICANN places value on some of the possible changes that might occur to the operational process for this. And seeing that they describe the changes to include minor operational changes, non-minor operational changes, and also policy changes. This is quite interesting because we haven't started the drafting for the charter, for the SPIRT team, but we had one meeting yet. But I think moving forward there will be a lot more updates regarding that. So for NPOC, this is just something that stands out for us. I don't know how important that is to ALAC, but I just thought it's important to highlight that. Thank you very much.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Thank you. You know, we have an internal chat from our region going on now. So I would like to read a message from our partner, Lance Hinds, from the Caribbean. He says, "I might be a cynic, but I am skeptical as how underserved regions can successfully participate in the next gTLD round, even with applicant support." Thank you. Just a comment, but wanted to let you know that our conversation is going on that way. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's a fair concern. One of the things, I was the chair of the CCT review, the review of competition choice and trust in the previous round, right? And one of the things we were asked to evaluate was the applicant support program, which was easy to evaluate because it was meager, let's just say. But as part of that, we actually hired, some of you might know Andrew Mack, who does a lot of work in Latin America and in Africa as well, to look at the kinds of organizations that applied for new TLDs and find similar organizations, we call cohort, right? Similar organizations, but in these underserved regions, and then just ask them. And some of them said they hadn't heard of it, which is communications, but some of them said that they weren't able to identify a business model and how that would work. And so this was happening at a time when nobody knew what the business models were, and a lot of them didn't succeed, even the ones that were created by wealthy companies, right?

And so part of the outreach effort this time around is to help with business models. I think that it's a mistake to say that when we're going into an underserved region, we're going from having a lot of money to having no money. And I think that's a danger to talk that way, right? There are plenty of organizations that have money, but they have choices. I mean, if I put it here, that means I won't put it there. Whereas if you're Microsoft, you can put it both places and still have the same amount of money you did when you began, right? But in these underserved regions, they have money. It's a question of whether this is the right way to spend it. And that's a different kind of question than I don't have any chance. And so it may or may not be the right way for them to spend it, but there are some community TLDs that have done okay, and those are less funded ones. And so I think there's a possibility of some of them succeeding, but we shouldn't get too optimistic. But I think there's a lot more we can do than we did to at least give them the best chance.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Thank you, Jonathan. I will take your answer to Lance. Well, it depends if, for example, you're a bank and you need that for security reasons, you will not look at how much it costs and you will get through. But one thing you said, to help with the business models, who will be in charge of that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I just know that it's part of the communications plan. So my guess is that it will be ICANN coming up with materials on business models in consultation with the existing TLD operators that were able to succeed. And maybe the ones that weren't. Don't do this, right? Maybe that will be part of the lessons too. But that was the number one response back when Andrew did these surveys was not, we can't afford it, but we can't see how we would make money. And that was the number one response. And to me, that's an opportunity.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to follow up on the opportunity of getting that business modelling and assistance. Certainly in the outreach and communications plan, one would hope that the examples are going to be instructive. There is also for the non-applicant supported entities, the opportunity for, I'm sure, the businesses which will spring up to offer services around such a new round of names. But for those who don't have as much resourcing, one of the big benefits of being a successful applicant support processed person, entity, not an individual, entity, that's the one, the applicant support applicant, is that you get access to the coaching and the pro bono services. Now that's before you even put in an application for a string. So there is a serious derived value to being a successful ASP applicant. And if anything is going to assist, I think it's going to be in that refractory space between becoming a successful applicant and the names being open for application. And so that means in that 12 months of applicant support possibilities, the earlier applicants apply and with between 12 and 16 weeks get a yes or a no, then the longer they have for all of those benefits. Remembering that those benefits don't suddenly disappear. They'll have put in a $2,500 US dollar deposit or held it in escrow or whatever it happens to be. But none of those benefits disappear if they then don't continue as an applicant support applicant in the next round, because you are allowed this time to go on and be an ordinary applicant. So there's a real sweet spot there for smart operation without any form of gaming. But it does mean that you've got to have a consortium or a group or a system that indicates if you are a successful applicant support entity, that you can also then use that as a proof of concept, for want of a better word, that you are also going to commit for a particular string because remember we're giving the support go ahead to the entity, not to a string. And then one string is going to be allowed in that particular benefit. But if you think about it, there's a minimal risk of gaming, but there's an optimal opportunity for going for further support and funding. So you may have in country or in region support that having got through this original gating, being a likely candidate to succeed and having benefits as outlined in the applicant support program, that that might be good leverage to ensure that there is better financial stability and likelihood of being able to run a successful registry because that's not cheap either.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And it's worth saying Lance could also just be right. I mean it's definitely possible, right, that this won't work. But I think we should do everything we can to try because the map didn't change at all in 2012, right. I mean it just got thicker in the places it was, the registries already existed. So that's why we've made it a priority to try and to create every opportunity. But in the end they have to make a decision whether or not it actually works for them and it looks like a business model that will work for them and the answer could be no.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thank you so much. I love the concern that Caleb actually raised when it comes to .internal. I hear in the room that it's just one time cost, little effort, but whether it is one time cost, whether it is little effort, it's something that we need to consider when we are talking about non-profit organization. And the comment I want to actually add to that is that I hope in the long run, we will not make it de facto that this is compulsory because we are saying that it is not compulsory, then you can just go away, you can accept it. But we should have that, you know, very clear that in the near future we won't be saying this is the standard. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. And that's really important to keep an eye on. I think what's possible to have happen that we need to pay attention to is the risk analysis project that they are doing for name collisions. So in other words, if you've chosen something else as your internal network name, like MyHouse or something like that, and if later on the risk analysis project says, well, there aren't enough collisions happening with MyHouse to prevent it from being delegated, then somebody could apply for it. And then the browser, when you are going in to try and get to a place on your network, goes out to the internet because it's resolving outside before inside, then that will cost you much more, right? So ICANN will never need to make it a requirement. It will never be a requirement. The real issue is whether or not the choice you made ten years ago when you set up your network, I mean that's the problem, could end up becoming a conflict and that will be much more costly for you than changing it. That's really the issue. So there may be no way to avoid some cost if the world changes.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Yeah, and add to that that we are hearing also in ICANN that many people doesn't use DNS right now because they are accessing through the browsers, the search, the Google thing, this kind of thing. So it's not using the domain that anything. Or QR codes or not using the domain name itself, but the search, the browser search. Search engine, yeah. So we have also have in mind to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If there aren't more comments, it seems like we had a productive conversation. We found some areas to work together, particularly in the area of applicant support. So as we develop our concerns and you develop yours, we should trade them back and forth and look for opportunities to say the same thing or make a joint statement sometime about that. And let's keep that in mind. Caleb, go ahead.

CALEB OGUNDELE: Yeah, and I think probably this is a good avenue to also say a big thank you to ALAC because during the time there was a public comment on NomCom, I think I also kind of worked with Cheryl at that point and I need to give some open credit to her as well. We seem to have lots of things in common. Plus she did give us lots of background information that supported our own public comment.

And when we also read the one from At-Large and ALAC, we realized that you guys were also supporting some of the views that we have. And I think this is something that is very commendable. And the cooperation that we seem to, or how will I put it, the chemistry that we seem to have gotten, I think it's something we should continue to keep up and work towards as we move forward. That's just my closing remark. And thanking ALAC for supporting our public comment views there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of course, you worked hard to make this meeting happen. So I appreciate your efforts on that.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Thank you. Thank you, Caleb. And yes, I think that we are capable to say that we are making history, because it's the first time in the ICANN meetings that it's happened, this one. NPOC with ALAC, not only NCSG and ALAC that we have to recover that, of course. But this is the first time that we have not-for-profit operational organization constituency now joined together with all At-Large leadership. And it's kind of we are doing now to do an outreach inside ICANN, out in outreach, to know that we are there, we are a small constituency, but we are there and we are relevant in this topic. So that's it. My final remarks. And thank you all for being here. And thank you, you and the staff, our staff working together to be able to have this space in this meeting. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]