
ICANN86 Seville | PF – Cross-Community Dialogue on the Feasibility of a Platform for ASP-Supported New gTLDs
Thursday, June 11, 2026 – 16:30 to 18:00 CEST

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER

Welcome to the ICANN 86 Cross Community Dialogue on the feasibility of a platform for ASP-supported new gTLD session on Thursday, 11th of June at 16:30 local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include French and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room. Please remember to state your name for the record and the language you'll be speaking in case speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. I will now leave the floor over to Becky Burr, Senior Policy Advisor, Public Internet Registry, for moderation. Thank you. Over to you, Becky.

BECKY BURR

Thank you. Ooh, sorry. And welcome to all of you. Kudos for being here at the very last session on the very last day of ICANN in Seville. I know Seville is calling to all of you, or your beds, or your planes, so it's great that you're all here. We're going to have an interesting

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.

conversation today. The board received advice from the GAC regarding platforms for supported applicants for backend service provision. And Tracy Hackshaw and Nigel Cassimire from the GAC are going to talk about the advice. We've got Gordon Dick from Nominet, who is a registry service provider, who will talk about that. We have with us Francisco Arias, who's going to talk about the Registry Service Provider Program, and Kristy Buckley, who's going to talk about the Applicant Support Program. And we hope to do those presentations in the first half hour, and move quickly into a discussion with all of the people and our additional panelists, Justine Chew from the ALAC and board-elect member, Edmon Chung from the GNSO, and Pete Fox from Identity Digital. So, if I can kick it off by handing over to Tracy and Nigel to take us away. And as I said, we're going to get the presentation part of this and get to the facilitated dialogue just as quickly as we can.

TRACY HACKSHAW

Absolutely. Thank you, Becky, and I hear the urgency of not drawing this out too long. So I will just walk through the rationale for the GAC advice, and my colleague Nigel will speak to the experiences of some of our GAC colleagues in the regions in which we operate. So, yes. So as you can see on the screen, in ICANN 79, we had, actually before this and at that meeting when the next round was being discussed, folks approaching us. For those who don't know, I'm the chair of the Underserved Regions Working Group, or co-chair, but I'm also a member of the United Nations organization. So I'm not a GAC country specifically, but I'm also

from an underserved region, from the Caribbean. And they sort of started asking questions about, how can we take part in this program? Because when they did their research, they found that there were some barriers to entry for them. And when we explained what you need to get, and doing further research, they indicated that it seemed as if there was a challenge with finding RSP-type services in their region, in their country. So they had to try and get it from other sources, and there was an impression that it was quite expensive. And they had to know a lot of how to manipulate and maneuver through our system. Of course, these are not experienced DNS industry players. Some of them are cities, or small NGO groups, Indigenous peoples, that kind of thing. So how do they navigate the system?

So when we had that approach us, some of us sat together and came up with a thought process that maybe there's a possibility of utilizing existing resources, maybe from the community or otherwise, to create some kind of environment where this can be a sort of a special platform that could exist for, in particular, ASP applicants and underserved regions generally in the overall program. So that's kind of the rationale for the advice, and we did get consensus on that in the GAC after discussion. So it was useful, and it linked to what we're trying to achieve going forward, because as you can see, we had talked about ICANN 77 advice, which was, if you recall, trying to significantly reduce or eliminate all fees, application fees, registry fees as a whole. So this seemed to

be one way of dealing with that issue. Can I get the next slide, please?

Right. And then we followed that up with, based on discussions with the board, asking questions about exactly what you're trying to say, because we didn't really have a solution to the problem. We're just trying to see, is this something we can do? So we had asked then, as you can see, in June 2024, to set up some sort of dialogue with the community to help us work this through. Is this feasible? Can we get maybe some collaboration going with the existing members of the industry? Is there an opportunity to do, as we mentioned in a previous discussion, special pricing for the region, and even possibly help support other RSPs that exist in a cc program, for example? So very small cc technology providers, I see it's meaning cc country code here, ccTLD. Maybe they could help scale up to provide that support. So on that note, I would hand over to my colleague, Nigel, from the Caribbean Telecommunications Union to speak to some issues from that discussion. Thanks.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you very much, Tracy. I'm Nigel Cassimire from the CTU, Caribbean Telecommunications Union. We are an intergovernmental organization for the Caribbean region that specializes in ICT matters. So we follow the ICANN issues on behalf of our 21 member states and territories. So just to add on to what Tracy has said, and to give you a perspective as to what the interest is for the CTU as an observer member of the GAC to have supported

this GAC advice as well. In the Caribbean specifically, and from our experience as well, working with other small island developing states around the world, there has been an increased emphasis on building resilience. Resilience of our network, resilience of our services, resilience of our people in general. So part of that building resilience is some of the obvious things in terms of technology, diversity, and so on. But part of it is in building local expertise. One might say that right now we have registry service providers existing that maybe have extra capacity that could easily take on additional capacity from small markets in the Caribbean. But that doesn't address this particular priority of ours for resilience. What happens, every year, we have this hazard of a hurricane season, and we've had experiences where a hurricane passes through and basically wipes out the economy of a small state. We need to be able to deal with stuff like that, to bounce back quickly. So building resilience will include building local expertise, building local and regional facilities, building things, the obvious things that you're familiar with, like IXPs, having local route servers, basically to spur adoption and growth of the digital economy in our regions.

So in the context of this new gTLD round, what we were looking for was to encourage applications from the Caribbean, and in encouraging that, hopefully help to also build the expertise in the Caribbean. We want to work on developing our homegrown talent, our entrepreneurship, and the markets. And part of ICANN reducing the entry hurdle for qualified applicants is to reduce the entry requirements. So we have a reduction in the application fee, and

part of the GAC advice also talked about looking at further reductions in ongoing fees for at least an initial period to give any new applicant as much opportunity as possible to enter this market, to give them a chance to build their market up enough so that they can become sustainable. So the GAC advice, in the more general sense, supported the idea of building resilience in these small states, and in fact, even in the previous session before this one, there was a proposed solution for something totally different, mitigating DNS abuse, part of the solution of which was also building local expertise in smaller markets. So I'm saying that we saw the new gTLD round as an opportunity to help us do that as well. It was consistent with our priorities, and hence we supported this particular GAC advice. So as Tracy said, however, we didn't have the solution, so we were looking for this sort of dialogue. And at the time the GAC advice was proposed, this was two years ago, before the Applicant Support Program began. So the hope was that we could have had such a dialogue to help us guide applicants for the ASP. It's come at this time. We're happy to have it at this time, so we are participating. Thank you very much.

BECKY BURR

Thank you very much. And to move us a little forward on this conversation, Gordon Dick from Nominet, who is a registry service provider, is going to go through some of the basics of the services that a DNS service provider provides to a registry operator.

GORDON DICK

Thank you. Next slide, please. So just want to set a little bit of context here, first of all, the ecosystem that the registry service providers operate within before going into some details around the services they actually operate. So ICANN has the registry agreements with the registry operators, and an ICANN accreditation agreement with the registrars that are allowed to buy from those registry operators. The registry operators create their own registry-registrar agreements with the ICANN registrars. And a registry operator will then either operate as an RSP themselves as a unified entity, or have a service agreement directly with a registry service provider. The registrars will then need to do technical integration in order to sell the domains of the registry operators by connecting to the RSP. Next slide, please.

So, as I said, the registry service provider is either the registry operator or is in contract with the registry operator. They're not in contract with ICANN, although there is an evaluation program at the start for round two. They generally operate the five critical functions of the registry system and operate to the required SLAs on behalf of the registry operator. So those are the shared registry systems, which includes the Registration Directory Service, or RDAP or WHOIS, as it's better known. The DNS, the DNSSEC signing, and the depositing of the data escrow out of the shared registry system to an accredited escrow provider. Next slide, please.

The way ICANN has split the evaluation and setup this time identifies four clear different types of RSP. There's the main RSP type, which ultimately operates the central registry, the database

which registrars access by EPP, that users read from the WHOIS or RDAP services in order to see the registration details of a domain. And they generally do the deposit of the data to the escrow provider. They then integrate with a DNSSEC RSP, or they may be a DNSSEC RSP themselves, because any one of these, you can be multiple. So a registry will typically operate with one DNSSEC RSP. It would be possible to have multiple, but there will typically be one. And they do the cryptographic signing of the registry zone to make the security of the DNS work. The DNS data populating the zone is fed from the main RSP to the DNSSEC RSP. That RSP then transfers the data to a DNS RSP. Now, any registry may operate with one or more DNS RSPs, and each of these DNS RSPs does need to be accredited. So for example, Nominet, who operates multiple top-level domains, will utilize our own Anycast DNS networks. But also we use a third-party DNS RSP as well to add wider resilience to the network, and that's common practice across the industry. But they operate the network of authoritative name servers, and they take the feed from the DNSSEC RSP. There is a type of RSP referred to as a proxy RSP, which is largely focused on local law compliance, which is in order to operate, I think it's primarily in China. I'm not aware of any other countries, but there may well be, in terms of meeting the requirements of the local laws there. Many RSPs will operate as a unified setup and be multiple of these types. But there are some RSPs that just go for one or other type in terms of the market. Can I have the next slide, please?

So the registry operator is ultimately the business owner for the gTLD. They're the ones that are responsible for the commercial success. They're contractually and legally responsible for all aspects of the gTLD with ICANN. They're required to enter registry-registrar agreements only with ICANN-accredited registrars to get registered domains. And they're required to operate the five critical functions mentioned in the earlier slide to the SLAs that are set in the ICANN registry agreement. So the registry operator is either an RSP or outsources those functions. Can I have the next slide, please?

So, looking at why the RSP market exists. It lowers the barrier to entry for registry operators because the economies of scale play a relatively large role in running a gTLD. The costs of developing and maintaining your own registry software to run EPP, to run RDAP, to keep that up to date, regularly patched, et cetera, that is a relatively large undertaking. And you see that across the market, that the reason quite a few country codes have gone into the market has been a method of covering their ongoing operating costs across a greater number of different domains under management. So sharing the costs of operating the actual platform itself makes the cost per domain much lower, and it enables a much more scaled approach to DNS abuse, identifying patterns that are happening across different TLDs when they provide other services to them. One of the critically important things, though, is ultimately your route to market. RSPs are your connectivity point to your retailers as a registry. And the challenge you've got as a registry operator is

that to get a space on your registrar's shop shelf for sale, you need to be relatively low cost to integrate with. It's much easier and cheaper for a registrar to do the same integration for multiple TLDs on one platform than it is to put even multiple endpoints where they have to connect across different RSPs. And it also allows us to, as an RSP, share the support costs across multiple TLDs. Next slide, please.

So there's a reasonable question of, is the same level of infrastructure needed for all TLDs to cover this debate? While all gTLDs do need to meet the same SLAs, that doesn't necessarily mean they need the same level of infrastructure. So it is true there are certain TLDs that have a lower activity profile in the registry systems. So, for example, .brands tend to have very little ongoing activity in EPP, or on RDAP or DNS lookups compared to others. So from that perspective, they don't necessarily need to build their platforms to operate at the same level and scale. But they do ultimately need to be capable of withstanding any denial-of-service attacks or any challenges there, because if those start to impact your SLAs with ICANN, there is a risk of your top-level domain being taken away and put into ICANN's EBERO program, which is there as a safety net. So that's the summary. I'll pass back to Becky.

BECKY BURR

Great. Thank you. Turning now to Francisco, can you talk a little bit about the ICANN Registry Service Provider Program?

FRANCISCO ARIAS

Thank you, Becky. So this is Francisco Arias from ICANN. My team handles the gTLD technology side of ICANN. And as such, one of those things that we manage is the RSP Evaluation Program, part of the new gTLD program. So the RSP Evaluation Program was put in place per policy recommendation. The intention is to be more efficient. And the way we evaluated the gTLDs in the previous round in 2012, every application was evaluated as a monolith, and as such, for example, the technical evaluation of the gTLDs was repeated. So if 200 applications had the same organization operating the DNS service, for example, the same technical evaluation would be repeated 200 times. This time, we're doing it differently. And so the organizations that are operating the TLDs, the five critical functions, well, four of those, as Gordon mentioned, they are evaluated only once. And then once they are considered evaluated, then a gTLD applicant simply selects from the combo box of the approved RSPs for each of the functions, as Gordon said, the main RSP, DNS, DNSSEC, and in the case of DNS, they can select more than one RSP provider. This is a requirement for policy that all organizations that want to offer RSP services for 2026 round, they need to go through the RSP Evaluation Program. Even if the gTLD applicant themselves, they want to operate their own services, they still need to go through the RSP Evaluation Program as a separate application from their gTLD application. You can find more information about the RSP Evaluation Program in the RSP

program webpage. I believe the slides are going to be published on the website, so you can find the link there. Thank you. Next slide.

So in the RSP program, we have had already our first round of applications and evaluations that happened last year. And the initial list of evaluated RSPs was published, if memory serves, at the end of January this year. And since then on, as RSP applicants have cleared their evaluation, they have been published in the link. The link comes in the next slide in case you're interested in seeing more. This is the current list of evaluated RSPs. You can see there are 28 different organizations. There are still a few that are going through the evaluation program from the initial round. There is a second round of RSP applications that has exactly the same dates as the gTLD application window, so opening 30 April and ending 12 August. As you can see here, if my math is correct, we have organizations from 14 different countries, from three different ICANN regions, and you can see the breakdown on the type of RSP that they apply for. Next slide.

And here you can see a set of links where you can see, for example, we publish monthly statistics on the RSP applications and what status they are. You can also see the list of evaluated applicants, as I mentioned before. We also publish the IDN tables that they have been approved to offer, together with the registry services that they have also been approved to offer. Registry services is also something that in this round is doing differently from last time, and they are only evaluated once per RSP, and then the gTLD applicant

simply selects the services from the menu of pre-approved services from the RSP. And I believe this is the end of my portion. Thank you.

BECKY BARR

Thanks. And next, and last in the presentations, Kristy Buckley is going to update us on the Applicant Support Program.

KRISTY BUCKLEY

Thank you, Becky. Hello, everyone. I'll just have a couple of slides as a refresher on the Applicant Support Program, otherwise known as ASP. So here are a couple of excerpts from the Subsequent Procedures policy recommendation. So the first one here, 17.1, asks ICANN to facilitate non-financial assistance, including the provision of pro bono assistance to applicants in need. And I also highlighted Supplemental Recommendation 17.2, which recommended expanding the scope of the program beyond the application fee to provide access to an array of resources useful for capacity building, planning, application, evaluation, pre-delegation, and post-delegation phases of the life cycle of the application. Though, the recommendation did note that it's not obligating ICANN to provide support for all phases of the life cycle of the application as well as the registry.

The next slide is a high-level overview of the professional service providers that are offering volunteer services, so pro bono. And we have a high-level description here of all of those, as well as the count of professional service providers offering volunteer services.

And I note here that this does include technical service providers. We have 26 listed on the sheet, which I'll share in the chat in a moment, though the registration is still open. So if you have professional services, if you're an RSP, for example, and you would like to volunteer providing free or reduced-cost services to supported applicants or others in need, I'll post a link to that in the chat. And with that, I'll turn it back to you, Becky. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

Great. If we could go to the next slide. I've introduced us, so let's move right on to the next slide and get to the conversation. Next slide. Great. So the first question that we want to tackle is what are the barriers, the technical, the financial, and the structural barriers for new entrants to the RSP space? We have a variety of people who have a wealth of experience in this regard. And Edmon, I want to turn to you and ask you that question first. You, I believe, are a registry operator, including an applicant-supported registry operator. So take it away.

EDMON CHUNG

Thank you, Becky. So as Becky was saying, I guess I'll first make a disclosure that, of course, .asia ourselves are an existing gTLD, but we also support the operations for .kids, which is the only ASP-supported applicant in the last round. I guess when you look at the question about the barriers of entry or in terms of RSP, it sometimes mirrors the situation with ASPs as well. So one of the things that we are trying to work on, in fact, when you look at the

GAC advice from ICANN 79, very close to what we're talking now is also the concept brought about by ALAC about an ASP incubator. So one of the things that .asia is trying to step up and do is to become something like that, because it is the economy of scale, I think Gordon and others mentioned. If you only have one new TLD with no registrations, that is a difficulty in its own. And because a lot of times, an RSP would charge minimum fees, even ICANN charges minimum fees, so that minimum fee becomes a barrier for the ASP. On the flip side, if you want to start up an RSP, it would be the same, right? Before you gain the economy of scale, getting to set up the entire infrastructure to meet the ICANN requirements will be challenging, and the challenge is not that, as you would say, it's not like rocket science. You need to take time and good people to build it. But the challenge is you don't know whether your TLD is going to be successful and how much scale. Gordon also mentioned maybe smaller TLDs could require smaller ones, but you have to build to ICANN standard, you have to build to a certain scale. So I think on this particular question, if you ask me, the biggest challenge is the unknown for building up an infrastructure with the minimum part, that bar itself is set relatively high. And it's reaching the economy of scale that will be the largest barrier, I think, rather than technical or other aspects.

BECKY BURR

So I just want to follow up because you use a registry service provider, right? And so, can you talk a little bit about what the most

important benefits that you get? Why did you decide to use a registry service provider and not build it yourself?

EDMON CHUNG

That's a good question. In fact, another thing, .asia actually operates the .mo ccTLD registry for the Macau government. And there we run the backend with the team in Macau. But that is known to be a smaller scale because Macau has a very restrictive registration requirement, so we're not expecting anything more than a few thousand domains. So the undertaking itself is, first of all, subsidized by the government and would be able to build it. For us, I think the scalability side is really important, and having Identity Digital as the backend helps us do that. But I think rather than .asia, because we are actually celebrating 20 years now, a new gTLD, and especially in ASP, the challenge actually is getting to the registrars as well. So I think having a new infrastructure, getting all the registrars to be willing to connect to you technically, because it's a lot of work, right? If every gTLD has a different infrastructure, the registrar is going to have to redo that integration, redo that technically many, many times. That, I think, is the biggest consideration, especially when we advise ASP applicants that we support, is the connection to registrars, making it simple. I already touched on economies of scale, but this technical part is something that shouldn't be lightly considered.

BECKY BURR

Thanks. Pete, I want to turn to you, and get you to talk about the same questions. What are the barriers, and what do you think that the registry service providers are bringing to the table, most importantly, for small, starting-out new TLDs?

PETE FOX

So I'll just add to what Edmon said. Connecting to the registrars for a brand-new registry that could start up with perhaps an open source implementation is just very difficult. The major registrar players, they will extract a fee for that. They're reticent to fund another wallet, meaning prepay for the domains that will be acquired in the next period. When you work with an RSP, and I'll take a chapter from our own book, we have a common wallet. So all the registrars are funding one wallet where they can get our own TLDs or a wide variety of our RSP TLDs. Registrars generally appreciate that, and it lowers the friction to bring a brand-new TLD onto their platform. I'll also add that many of the largest platforms, because they have so many TLDs, and I'm sure they have engineering challenges to add another set of potentially hundreds, they're charging just placement fees, an onboarding fee at the registrar level before they would even host a brand-new TLD.

So I think for me, scale is really the key here. If you are an ASP where it's a small and sequestered target audience, Macau was a great example, there are things that you can do. You're not going to rely on the biggest RSPs necessarily to carry that. You've got a small sequestered target audience, and that can be done anywhere. You

can choose an RSP like Identity Digital. We would love to have that type of business, and we do have options where the fees could be structured in a more advantageous way for verified ASP customers. Or you could go an open source route and be very successful. However, if you're looking to scale, it is a really complex multivariable challenge to do that completely on your own because you're having to access all the registrars, at least the ones that you want to be included on, and that is a challenge because it's engineering effort on their part to participate in one new registry that's never been proven. And they now need to understand what's your outage schedule, all kinds of aspects that make it difficult for them, whereas they go with somebody like Identity Digital, they already know our cadence. They know how to fund the wallet. Everything is very well known. So I think it's a scalability issue mostly, Becky.

BECKY BURR

Great. Thank you. Nigel, I see your hand, but I want to give Justine an opportunity to jump in here, and then we will turn to you.

JUSTINE CHEW

Sure. Thanks, Becky. This is Justine Chew from the At-Large Advisory Committee, or ALAC for short. So ALAC has been a strong supporter of the Applicant Support Program, ASP, since the beginning. And it's important to us because, and I'm not going to get into the technicalities of it, but I just want to mention the fact that ASP is intended to bring smaller players into the market to

make it more competitive, make it more wide choices. And it's also about supporting applicants who are going to promise to service underserved regions and underserved communities. So that's our angle for it because we want those kind of players in the market to service our communities that are left behind. Right? And we had quite a significant role, I would like to say, in shaping Supplemental Recommendation 17.2, which Kristy talked about already. But that one only, I would say, addresses the front end. So it talks about bringing an applicant on, helping them with lower fees, and all the way up to getting a string if they get that far. Right? But the missing piece is actually what happens after they get the string. Right? Which is why I welcome this conversation because that is the question that we're addressing now. How do you make sure that an ASP qualifier who gets a string, right, gets all this benefit that ICANN has provided through the ASP program, but in the end doesn't know how to really operate, doesn't know how to scale, doesn't know how to get the registrations, and potentially fail. Right? We don't want that to happen. We want many players to succeed. Right? And therefore, this piece is important because at the end of the day, if they are small players, they have limited resources. So it's a question about where do they want to place their resources, right? And the fee may be one aspect of the support that's being given to them. But again, as I said, if they get to the string and they start operating, there are heaps and heaps of operating costs, which are not covered, and they will have to fund that. So if there's a way for them to use their limited resources to plug into an existing

platform like this incubator that Edmon talks about, that's a perfect solution. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

Thank you, Justine. Nigel.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you, Becky, and I'd like to thank Justine for the comment that she just made. And I heard the earlier speakers talking about the difficulties of scaling, if you want to connect to registrars and so on, and there were some terms mentioned that I don't understand right now, like the wallet that was mentioned, for example. So clearly, there's a lot to learn. But there is one aspect in terms of structural barriers that I wanted to clarify whether it exists or not, and maybe Edmon could help me, having been a cc operator. I can point to a couple examples of ccTLD operators in the Caribbean who are homegrown, who run their own hardware, have developed their own systems, and so on. How does one compare their registry operational expertise, technical expertise, with what's required for the gTLD? Do they know pretty much what they need to provide, or is that also one of the barriers to be overcome?

BECKY BURR

Let's start with Gordon on that.

GORDON DICK

Okay, so obviously, I come from Nominet. We're the .uk registry operator, and we also run an RSP setup for 85 top-level domains. We currently operate, like many ccTLDs, our .uk on a platform that's not technology-aligned with the gTLD world and the requirements of it. That's something we're changing next year, partly to add to our scale. But from that perspective, because you're running a country code, because you're not subject to ICANN rules and requirements, to necessarily the IETF standards, you sometimes develop your policy in a way that means your technical integrations are different. So you can't, by default, get to that point. So we do operate two entirely different platforms for our gTLDs and .uk today. We recently announced that that will change in February next year. But it is quite a different business, the gTLD world.

BECKY BURR

Edmon, go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah, Edmon here. So I guess directly in response to that, the easiest answer is we wouldn't run the .mo system for a gTLD. In fact, it would not satisfy the ICANN requirements right now. I actually haven't looked at this round's RSP requirements in detail, but if it's similar to last round, then just by the kind of geographical diversity of some of the infrastructure, the resilience and redundancy parts, that was not needed for Macau, but would be needed for gTLDs. And so, yeah, as Gordon mentioned, some of the

requirements are different, and it always goes back to scaling, I think.

BECKY BURR

Pete, you want to jump in on this?

PETE

So what we've experienced is, I'll reiterate again what the two former panelists had just said, is that sometimes country codes, if we're talking about country codes as opposed to gTLDs, do create unique requirements that meet their specific needs or desires. It could be life cycle changes, it could be minimum term, any number of things. At the core, though, it's DNS, DNSSEC, and resolution from name servers around the world. But the operation of the registry can have different requirements. The other thing that is interesting about ccTLDs, specifically from small countries that don't have established data centers, that can also be a barrier for some RSPs. Again, in our experience, we deploy to one of the major cloud providers, and sometimes we're requested by a ccTLD, it has to be in country. And if the infrastructure has to be in country, it has to have cloud data centers, and some of them don't have it. So sometimes, for a company like ours, there's just a barrier in terms of what the sovereignty rules are for where the registry runs, and that precludes us in some cases.

BECKY BURR

And that's in the cc context that the sovereignty rules apply. There's also some data localization issues that probably come up, but that would be replication of data in country.

PETE FOX

That is also true.

BECKY BURR

So I'm hearing that the comparison between small country ccTLDs and small, just-getting-started gTLDs is perhaps not perfect because the requirements are different in that context. So that answers the question for me. I was sort of thinking, well, why aren't small-country ccTLDs in-region getting into the business? And that's an answer. They're operating on a code set that is tailored to the regulatory environment that they're in, as opposed to the kind of global security, stability, and resilience standards that ICANN necessarily has to require. Other thoughts from the panel on this question of barriers? We do want to go to the audience, so I'd like to hear from the audience on this point about barriers. What are other barriers you know about and are seeing? We do have a sort of next section on solutions, but let's focus on barriers now. Mike, I see your hand up, and others can raise their hand in the Zoom room, and I will see you here.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Thank you. Michael Palage, for the record. Edmon, you talked about Macau, where you're using FRED. FRED, which is used by

CZ.NIC, has scaled to over a million names. So clearly, FRED could handle volume. The other thing I'd like to point out is I was talking with Jaromír from CZ.NIC. They are actually in the process of seeking RSP accreditation, so FRED will be able to be fully used for gTLDs going forward. So I think that's important. And I'll let you speak to... Okay. So the follow-up I had is, when you stood up FRED, you had to pay nothing. It was zero, correct? When you stood up FRED to support the .mo registry, you didn't have to pay anything anyway. You just stood it up and provided service. So now I want to go over to Francisco. Francisco, under the old material subcontracting arrangement change, if Tracy, two years ago, decided they wanted to take their contract from Identity Digital and bring it in-house, they would have had to submit a material subcontracting change. And under the guidance, that review for a new technical provider would only cost an estimated \$14,300. If the UPU wanted to stand up an RSP right now, they would have to pay \$90,000. So that's a 600% increase for someone that would want to do this, and I'm struggling to see how that does not represent a barrier to entry for smaller RSPs.

BECKY BURR

So let me have Edmon answer the FRED question, and then we'll turn to Francisco.

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah. So, it's not just the software, right? It's the infrastructure and the hardware that runs it. Of course, the software, as you said,

would be scalable. But currently, what I wanted to emphasize was that currently, the hardware won't be. So, there's a big difference there. I just want to highlight that.

FRANCISCO ARIAS

I apologize. I do not know about costs.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Would you be able to look into that and just confirm it? Because I do think, to the point that Tracy and the GAC and ALAC are concerned about, under the material subcontracting arrangement, that document estimated a \$14,300 fee for a new RSP. And now, under the new gTLD, that process now costs \$90,000. So I'm trying to justify that 600% increase, and if you could look into that and confirm it and get it back to Tracy and the GAC, I think that would be helpful.

BECKY BURR

Thanks, Mike. I see Jonathan Robinson, and I'll...

JONATHAN ROBINSON

Yeah. Hi, Becky. Thanks. Jonathan Robinson, for the record. I suppose, I just look at this and see a situation where I'm thinking of an analogy of starting up any business. To some extent, one would choose to outsource as much as possible so you can concentrate on your core function. And in many ways, the core function is operating the registry itself. So I can see very many reasons why,

and some of them have been talked about already. You're buying in or contracting in a key technical, financial, as you've said, structural. But in addition, there's the distribution that's mentioned, which has been this whole concept of a wallet and the distribution cycle. But it's a much broader set of expertise as well. The registry's got to do all sorts of compliance, anti-abuse provisions. There's tremendous depth of expertise in these RSP providers. And so I just imagine starting up, there's a whole set of barriers to just simply getting going that aren't necessarily that there's anything wrong. It's just a matter of where would you concentrate your energy. I would think one would concentrate on the core expertise, which is running that specific registry that you've chosen to do so as a registry operator, and outsource financial accounting, and of course, the RSP work. Thanks.

BECKY BURR

Thanks. Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER

Thanks, Becky. Roelof Meijer. I'm the chief executive of SIDN. We run .nl, the Dutch ccTLD. I would like to address two points. One is the difference that you were mentioning, and even in the line between a system being used for gTLDs and a system being used for ccTLDs. I don't think that is the issue. We are one of the largest ccs, and we are about to go live on the system that we co-developed with our Canadian colleagues, and that runs both gTLDs and unique ccTLDs, unique as in completely different from each

other in functionality. So that's not the problem. In my opinion, the problem, and Edmon touched upon it earlier, is economies of scale. Because if I'm not mistaken, ASP applicants are supposed to serve underserved regions. So I assume that the potential to pay high amounts for registrations is limited. If you start something completely new to serve those applicants, the initial costs will be very high because there will be no scale, and I suspect that scale will take some time to come. So I think a much better choice is existing RSPs that take this on as a special case, like we do, for instance, with some of our peer registries in the Caribbean. And maybe focus on nonprofit RSP providers, but I think developing something special for this group is going to be very costly, and in the end, it will potentially prohibit registrations instead of facilitating them.

BECKY BURR

Thanks. And the next section, we are going to talk about what are the creative ways that we can overcome some of these barriers. So, don't go away. I've got Kristy and then Gordon.

KRISTY BUCKLEY

Thanks, Becky. Just a quick clarification, and I may have misheard, but supported gTLD applicants are not required to serve underserved regions, right? This is not a requirement to qualify for ASP.

BECKY BURR

So just to be clear, it's worth saying that these are applicants for gTLDs that have limited resources of one variety or another. Now, they may, in fact, be serving underserved regions, but that is not a specific requirement. But obviously, a significant point of the Applicant Support Program is to provide support for diverse offerings. So, you're not wrong. Gordon.

GORDON DICK

I think it's also just worth pointing out in terms of the issues around scale is that RSPs that exist today that have been serving under round one are largely having to compete against each other for a market that is static. There's no growth in it until round two completes. Round two is then opening up the market, a second wave of entry. But again, it's going to be a static market until the growth of the registries more generally. So trying to scale is based on taking away from other operating businesses that have scale. So there will be a balance across the industry of relevance. Now, there's definitely various options there in terms of what can the market sustain. And I think also worth pointing out that the different types of RSP will have different levels of scale. You see a lot of RSPs in the DNS market that don't touch the main RSP because it's such a niche scale, it's a static-scale registry.

BECKY BURR

Thanks. I just want to point out to the board members in the audience that we just heard a really good argument for getting to steady state as soon as possible. Okay. Let's turn to the next

question, which I think is one of the things that is important. If we can go to the next slide. It's how can these barriers be overcome? What resources and timeframes are required for this? And I'd like to ask everybody to sort of engage in brainstorming here. Roelof mentioned that there are special programs for supporting smaller registries. Let's sort of get those out on the table. Let me start with the panelists, and let me start with Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah. Edmon here. So I think Tracy actually touched on it in two dimensions, which I think is a good way to start. One dimension is utilizing existing capacity, existing providers, and the other is pulling together a new platform, right? There are two dimensions to go. If you ask me how to overcome these barriers of scaling, I think on dimension one, if we could have some sort of, again, if I have the magic wand and change policies or whatever, if the ASP applicants could obtain funding support for meeting the minimum fee requirements for many of the RSPs, that would be very important. It would help bridge some of the challenges there. On the other dimension, which is trying to pull together a new platform, that's kind of way out there, but it's not like it's impossible. First of all, it's obviously feasible, but you would then need to probably fund and build an open source platform, and have policy to require all the registrars who are interested to sell new gTLD domains to integrate and connect with it. Because again, that, I think, is the key aspect, to connect to the new platform, and then that new platform will be useful. So I think, again, I go back to,

yes, I think those barriers could be overcome. One dimension may be easier to think about. The other dimension is not impossible, but the hurdles to jump through might be much and high.

BECKY BURR

So I'm going to challenge you on that because we have heard that the access to the registrar base is a critical contribution that registry service providers bring. Does ICANN have a basis, authority, to require registrars to participate in a platform like that? I think that's what you were suggesting.

EDMON CHUNG

Yes, that was what I was suggesting. That's why I was saying if I have a magic wand and change all the policies, but those are the high barriers that you...

BECKY BURR

I feel compelled to say I sense a picket fence problem, but what do I know? Other suggestions, and I would like to hear because I've heard some suggestion that there are special programs, and it's not a one-size-fits-all kind of approach that the registry service providers are offering. I've also heard that the minimum pricing is an issue as you're scaling. So, Gordon and Pete, can I turn to you guys for thoughts on this?

GORDON DICK

Yeah. I think most registry service providers, as I understand the market, tailor their pricing to the relevant circumstances of the requirements of the customer. Now, obviously, if the customer is requiring bespoke deployment, independent of an existing platform, that's going to cost more, but that's the nature of the cost on the RSP. Being able to offer it depends on being able to, at a cheap price, fall into existing operating practices. So where a registry operator is willing to decide their business model fits with the current standard of that RSP, it is a much more competitive scenario. And obviously, the scale of the actual TLD as to what the projections are, what its plans are, are going to be relevant to the decisions made.

PETE FOX

So from our perspective, I understand that there's all these mouths to feed for a new entrant. You've got the application fee, you've got the yearly TLD fee, you've got an RSP fee, you might have onboarding fees of major registrars, and it all adds up. I'll just say for our company, just like you said, we have programs. There is a minimum annual commitment, but from our view, it's still a fraction of what ICANN fees are on a yearly basis. I understand it all adds up, but it can be reasonably economical for entrants to come on. But if their business model or their target market doesn't support enough money produced, and they're not getting subsidized, we're still talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars of outlay before you can build it back in volume. And I understand, too, let's face it, when you start out with zero TLDs or

zero domains in a TLD, you don't have any revenue coming in. And that's where, if ICANN had the ability to not just lower their fees, but subsidize them in some way, that would make it a more available market.

BECKY BURR

Tracy, before we go to Kristy, before we go to you, I just want to check in with Kristy on the applicant support aspects of the sort of post-launch, and specifically ICANN fees, because I think we are doing something this round that is significantly and materially different than was true in the 2012 round.

KRISTY BUCKLEY

That's correct. Thanks, Becky, and thanks for the point. So that policy recommendation, Supplemental Rec 17.2, did ask for expanded support beyond just the initial gTLD evaluation fee. So there is the same percentage reduction of 75% on other conditional evaluations, and post-delegation, post-contracting, we also have a graduated scale of reduced base registry agreement fees starting the first year at 75%, going to 50%, and down to 25%, and then it phases out. And that's exactly for the reason of just making those first few years a little bit easier for the new registry operator who was a supported applicant to get up off the ground and be successful.

BECKY BURR

I just wanted to make sure we all took that improvement in the world into place. Tracy, go ahead.

TRACY HACKSHAW

Yes. Thank you. So I just wanted to see if I could answer the question directly. So the question is, how can these barriers be overcome, and what resources and timeframes are required for this? So there are two aspects I think we could look at again. One is I think there needs to be a willingness and an appetite to do it. To me, that is the first thing that's required. If there's not, then this is a failed activity. So if there's a willingness, an activity, and an appetite to do something, I think we can find the solutions if that happens. And secondly, there are models in the technology community that we don't need to close our eyes to that have existed. Not wanting to call names, but the Android project is something that is very successful because of an open source platform, and has been able to make money for others. If you were to take what one company did or bought, as the case may be, and allowed it to be used by others and make money for them without having the larger organization have to sort of do it, is what I'm trying to say. So there are opportunities, if there's willingness and appetite, for the market to sort of grow, because that's the goal, right, is the market to grow even organically if possible, if not, maybe with an injection of goodwill to allow the market to grow beyond what's happening today and not stay static with the finite number of entrants. I think that's good for everybody. It'll increase jobs, as Nigel was trying to point out. It would increase resilience.

It would strengthen the countries that are trying to get somewhere in this race. So I think it needs to be seen from multiple levels as an opportunity for the community to say, "You know what? What's happening now is just not what should happen. We should do more. And what can we do?" And I think that will answer the question, that willingness and appetite. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

Well, let me push on that. What are you asking for specifically? Edmon gave up his magic wand to you. What is it you'd like?

TRACY HACKSHAW

Well, we're in solutions now, right? So in the long term, that's a discussion, right? So we can brainstorm a lot of interesting ideas about white labeling, existing technology, et cetera. I don't know if we're going to have that discussion today, but there are ways we could do that. But in the very short term, I think the ideas are starting to emerge already. There appears to be, or sounds as if there are things that are happening that are not well known. There's special pricing. It's not advertised very well, I don't think. It's not known. So when people come and say, "I don't know what's out there," or, "It's too expensive," it doesn't seem that they're talking to the right people. Maybe that's what is a problem. So if one RSP is saying, "Look, I have pricing for the big guys and some for the smaller guys," then let's know that, and let's talk to people about that. I think that is the easiest way to deal with this. Or you can advertise, "Look, we have special pricing for NGOs." That's

what a lot of technology companies do. They simply advertise, if you are an NGO, if you are whatever you are that is not proper corporate, you can get special pricing. And that doesn't seem to exist from what I could tell. It's not known. The industry is a little bit closed, so it's not really known. And I'd like to see that be known so that the GAC members could communicate that to applicants. Even now, those who are not in ASP could actually benefit in the actual round that's open, so they can do it. I think that'll be the first step in understanding what exists. And as Kristy has mentioned, and I think you'll see in the advice coming from the GAC, using the applicant support directory in a more concrete way. Make it more visible what exists out there, and even saying, promotion, "If you need help in this, here's who can help you," and make it more clear. Things like that, I think. It seems as if there's a lot of resistance to doing more than just publishing things. I would like to see that happen.

BECKY BURR

So Kristy, talk about the pro bono services list, because I'm pretty sure there are registry service providers on that list who have volunteered to provide pro bono support for applicants.

KRISTY BUCKLEY

Thanks, Becky. Yes, I don't know if they're pre-evaluated yet, or they're in the process of being pre-evaluated, but there are folks that have volunteered. To Tracy's point, we did host some webinars with the pro bono service providers so people could meet

them. I believe APAC region, and then there was a collaboration between Africa and Latin America region to meet the pro bono service providers. They each talked about what they offer. Supported applicants could come and ask questions. So we did try to raise the visibility of that. Those are recorded and available on the website. We could see about any interest in doing more of that, especially at a regional level. We really appreciated the regional groups leading those efforts. But yeah, we do have a number of folks on that list. And we actually send out weekly communications to all ASP applicants, reminding them of the links available, the resources available, reminding them the pro bono service providers are available, reminding them that if they've had a relationship with a couple, they should communicate that so they're not dominating all of the resources themselves. Just letting people know who they're going to move forward with and not. So we do communicate that, not publicly necessarily, because these are resources that we are trying to cultivate for supported gTLD applicants. So you may not see it on ICANN social media, for example, but we are communicating that regularly through constant contact with ASP applicants.

BECKY BURR

Go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah. Just building on Tracy's point, and I acknowledge what Kristy mentioned. But I actually quite like, Tracy, your point, and I think

we can implement this. In a sense, there is a list of RSPs, right? All we need is to add one more column that says they're willing to provide ASP special packages, or to support ASP-supported applicants, and show it there. Just one more column that says, if you're willing to, then ASP applicants might go to you more. So I think we can take, I don't know how it works, but it can be done in a short order. Just ask the qualified RSPs whether they would have packages for ASP and just list it over there. Doesn't have to list the details, of course. That would be probably under NDA, the details. But at least to indicate whether they do have ASP special packages.

BECKY BURR

Yeah, and I think it would be very hard to list the details because as Gordon said, it depends whether you're going to fit into a standard registry package or you need some bespoke support. So, Tracy, you are very good at working with ICANN's engagement team to getting the word out about the Applicant Support Program. I think maybe some more work on getting the information out about the pro bono support for supported applicants is probably a good place to start. Anything else from the panel on the overcoming barriers? Okay, we'll turn to the audience. I see Mike Palage's hand is up.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Sure. Mike Palage, for the record. So one of the discussions that was heard earlier was about how established RSPs with a common wallet and an established registrar distribution panel was the biggest asset for a new TLD going live. What I heard was that

dynamic is actually market power, and if you do not have access to registrars, that is a disadvantage. So to me, before I get to my magic wand, just to call out to Tripti and any other ICANN board members in the room, ICANN has had the ability since the 2012 base registry agreement went into existence, the ability to conduct an economic survey, a comprehensive economic survey. It has not. I would seriously encourage the board to undertake an economic survey to look at the market forces and market power and dynamics to see whether those create a barrier of entry and how that can be lowered.

Now for my magic wand, and it's going to be my JJ magic wand. I get to add a new specification to the agreement, Specification 15. And what Specification 15 would do would allow a registry operator to serve as a registrar for its TLD. So instead of having to worry about market forces and market dynamics, that registry, through its RSP, could go direct as a registrar. Does not need to go and seek ICANN accreditation to be a full registrar. We're not doing that. Right now, Becky, if you look at the baseline agreement, registry operators have the ability to manage up to 100 names in their own self-record. They do not need to use a registrar. What I am saying is empower those registry operators to serve as a registrar, so they will not be beholden to registrar listing fees or other barriers to entry. And if we undertake the economic survey, which ICANN has not, we can see how these can be removed. Thank you.

BECKY BARR

So I just want to press on that a little bit because I do not believe that... I believe we eliminated the prohibition on vertical integration. So a registry operator can operate a registrar. Your concern is the fees?

MICHAEL PALAGE

So what I'm proposing is it is a barrier to go then to become an ICANN-accredited registrar. All we're asking a registry to do, and Edmon or any of the other registries, as a registry operator, you have the ability to put into the zone, without the use of an ICANN-accredited registrar, up to 100 names. The UPU, I believe in your agreement, you had up to 1,000 names. Correct, Tracy? Yes. So what happens here is integrating with registrars can be a burden. The fact that some registrars right now are proposing up to \$50,000 as a listing fee to be carried is a burden. So instead of sitting there telling a new applicant, "Pay \$90,000 for this, \$227,000 for this. Oh, you want to become an ICANN-accredited registrar? Go pay for this." Simplify it. The ability for the current registry agreement to just add an additional specification to say, "You can be a registrar for your own TLD, just your own TLD," is a simple ask, Becky.

BECKY BARR

Well, sure, except that I want to be really clear about what change is involved because the only change, I believe, is the ICANN fee. Registry operators can have registrars. They have to be ICANN-

accredited registrars, and it's the registration and the fees that are the burden, not the fact that they can't operate their own registrars. I just want to make that crystal clear to make sure we know what we're talking about. Now I'm going to step out of my facilitator role and tell you, you've all heard me talk about how implementation of the elimination of the vertical integration should have been handled in a different way, in my humble experience. However, having said that, I do see value in that, but it doesn't solve the access to the established market if people want to go... Right.

MICHAEL PALAGE

So I'm going to push. So we are in agreement, Becky. How the ICANN board handled the vertical integration back in 2011 was disappointing. So let's get back to why having the ability of a registry to go direct. No one has talked about the fact that when a registrant from one of these developing regions, nobody's looked at the market share. We talked about the market share of RSPs. We did not address the market share of the registrars. And when a registrant signs up under the UDRP and other things, they're generally consenting to the law. You look at the market shares, most of those registrars are in the US. So in the case of the UPU, right now, they only have one registrar, EnCirca. So when any member state decides to register a domain name, they need to consent to EnCirca binding them to US law. So if we really want to empower developing countries, let them not only choose their registrar, but what law they're bound by. Because if you're just

sitting there letting them use ICANN-accredited registrars, the vast majority of them dictating US laws, that's problematic.

BECKY BURR

Okay. I think there are 12 ways to slice that pie. And that is probably a discussion for another day. Other hands on overcoming barriers, ways to do it? I'm not seeing any hands in the audience. I'm not seeing any hands on the panel. If we could just go, starting with Nigel, just one-minute closing statements.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you, Becky. Well, I would like to thank ICANN for this session. It's two years after the fact, but I think it's still useful and enlightening for me. So, I think there's a lot that I've learned from it, and a lot to take forward. One question that came up, there was a reference to steady state. Are we talking about no longer having rounds and just first come, first served? What does that mean? Thanks.

BECKY BURR

It means sort of moving expeditiously from one short opening and closing of a window to another short opening and closing of a window. As a practical matter, I think it would be difficult to completely eliminate rounds because it would require the GAC, for example, to be looking every day at what new names are being applied for. But getting outside of that constraint, you could have a round that opened for January and February, and another round

that opened in January, closed in February of every year, and another one that opened in September and closed in October. And it would be first come, first served, would eliminate a lot of the things that impose significant costs on the program, which is contention resolution. And it would allow an entrepreneur to say, "I have a business idea. I'm not going to wait 10, 12, 13 years for the next round." So I think the board is on record, I'm looking at Tripti now, but as I recall, the board is on record as having getting to a steady state in a predictable manner that does not drive the GAC crazy as soon as possible, which requires some policy development, which hopefully will not take 13 years.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thanks, Becky. So again, I say I welcome this conversation. Thank you, Becky, for moderating and ICANN for organizing it. I think at the end of the day, I would love to see more willingness to come together and have a solution that works for the people that we're trying to help, right? Wherever possible, reduction of cost, easy access to RSP services in a cost-effective manner, as well as access to registrars, because that is the piece that's also going to help them bring in the domain names. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW

Thank you. Thank you very much. I'm just echoing the two points, and I have a magic wand as well. So magic wand one, well, I have two wands, is that at the end of this session or subsequent to the session, the interested or willing parties do exactly what we're

asking them to do. If they're not already in that support directory list, step up and submit and say, "I'm willing to do this." And that willingness is clearly identified. I like Edmon's suggestion about saying, "For the RSP, I'm willing to do this. I have a package for you," et cetera. And/or, "We're willing to help you build something." So I'm just saying this may be a long-term thing, but the idea is that instead of just staying in our own creases and saying, "It's all about what we need to do and what we need to do," let's work better together as a community to see how we can make everybody do better, and we all do better together, right? So it seems as if to me that there's a lot of horse trading going on in ICANN, and when I started in ICANN, I think I felt it was something else, and I don't like that feeling that you're coming and the people fighting because of the private sector, public sector thing. I think we could work together to find solutions that grow the industry for everyone, not just one part of the world or other parts of the world. And I would like to see that happen as the other magic wand. We all work together, and we all win at the end of the day. Thank you.

GORDON DICK

Yeah. I think I'd just sum up with just highlighting that issue of scale, and that ultimately, the reason there is the challenge is the nature of the rounds and the speed at which the industry moves, in terms of expansion. Because by the nature of being able to scale something in a new region, bring new market entrants, you are truly taking away from somebody else's scale somewhere else. So we're, as I said, happy to work together, very much supporting the

message of working together to grow the wider industry. But the industry can't just be looked at from the RSPs itself. It is the market to the RSPs.

EDMON CHUNG

Yeah. So, I'm kind of doubling down on what Tracy said. And very seldom do we have a session like this and actually potentially have a concrete outcome. So if we can at least add the designation of the RSPs, whether they're willing to provide special consideration to ASP, I think that's already a big win for this particular session. And I'm excited about that on its own. The thing that I also want to bring up, I think after this discussion, what really occupies my thought is that we probably should encourage more the idea of ASP incubators, because it's really the incubation that many of the ASP applicants will need, navigating the registrars, and the registry service providers, and also navigating the ICANN community itself, right? So, encouraging more people to be willing to step in and step up to become kind of incubating these ASP applicants will, I think, in the long run, make the difference.

PETE FOX

I want to support Edmon's idea of adding the extra column, identifying which RSPs are willing to support special programs. I do understand special doesn't necessarily mean free, and it also doesn't mean very expensive. It's just a special program. And I also support the idea of, to Mr. Palage's idea, allowing registrars to be aligned with or be part of a registry while still being ICANN

accredited. I was under the impression that was still somewhat disallowed, but obviously there are exceptions to that. So that's also something I think is important.

BECKY BARR

Kristy, Francisco, any closing remarks?

FRANCISCO ARIAS

Not really much to add, just thank you, everyone, for being here.

KRISTY BUCKLEY

Once again, I continue to be impressed by this community's support of the Applicant Support Program and the intentions of that program. So thank you very much for showing up and for providing that support, and I really appreciate the dialogue today. Thank you.

BECKY BARR

Thank you, and I want to thank everybody who came to this. It's shocking. I thought Lars would be my only audience member. Oh, there he is in the back. So thank you all for attending and participating, and I think the message is clear. More conversation, more brainstorming, and I think the community does have strong support for the Applicant Support Program. So let's move forward with it. Thank you, all. I think it's cocktail time.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]