YEŞIM NAZLAR: Okay. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 8th of April 2020 at 1300 UTC. We will not be doing a rollcall due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees, both on the Zoom room as well as on the phone bridge, will be recorded after the call.

We have received apologies from Kaili Kan, Glenn McKnight, Sylvia Herlein Leite, and from Maureen Hilyard. And from staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğdu, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar, present on today's call. I'll also be doing call management for today's call.

As you know, we have Spanish and French interpretation. The Spanish interpreters are Claudia and Marina and the French interpreters are Claire and Jacques. Before we start, I would first like to share with you once again the real-time transcription link, here, on the Zoom chat, and also would like to remind you to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please.

And just a heads up that our participants' list is still to be updated and will be done as soon as the call ends. After my reminders, I would like to now turn the floor back to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. Welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call. Today, we've got a slight change in the order

of the agenda. We'll start with our Subsequent Procedures update with Justine Chew and her small team. We're going to have 30 minutes allocated to this.

Then, after that, Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg will be taking us through the Expedited Policy Development Process Phase 2 update. I understand they have a presentation that should be reaching us before they arrive. So by that point, the presentation should be linked into the agenda.

Then, we'll have the policy comment updates, the "usual pipeline," as we would call it, with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu, looking at not that many public consultations in this week but, no doubt, we've got plenty of other things to discuss before that.

And then, we'll have At-Large videos and post-ATLAS III policy activities and any other business after that. So, that's where we are. Are there any other topics to discuss and cover or any amendments to the agenda as it currently is? I'm giving it a few seconds. Not seeing any hands up. It looks like this is the agenda as it currently is on your screen.

So, thank you, and let's swiftly go to the action items from that fateful day, the 1st of April. What a joke, in some parts of the world, but bear in mind all of these are very real action items, only that they have to download in my browser. There you go. There are two that are left open.

One is on a follow-up Q&A regarding the PDP 3.0. Cheryl Langdon-Orr took us through a very, very interesting summary of what we are likely to be seeing in the next generation Policy Development Process. We didn't have that much time on Q&A, questions and answers, so if there are

questions for Cheryl or comments – I haven't seen anything on the mailing list.

If there are, please send them and we'll work with Cheryl to put some answers together and, perhaps, even to add this over to the relevant Wiki page that is going to be required on this.

And Justine to adopt and project with the proposed small team plan for a series of presentations of CPWG calls and single-issue calls. This is coming up. We are still working out the exact scheduling of this and also we want to make sure that when a specific issue is addressed all of the material relevant to this issue is ready. So, it takes a little bit of preparation.

Today's discussion with Justine is actually already part of that pipeline of presentations and work that will lead us to, hopefully, being experts in the topic by the time the public consultation turns up in late August or September this year.

Any comment or questions on the action items? You'll note the other three are complete. Again, it looks like no one wishes to take the floor so that's great. Let's move, then, to our next action item. Without any further ado, we'll have Justine Chew and her small team take us through another exciting topic, the Applicant Support Program. Over to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. I'm not sure about "exciting" but we'll try to make it interesting. Okay. Just to preface the presentation, it is rather lengthy but

there is a reason for it. Firstly, the prior presentations and draft scorecard that we've dealt with so far on the Applicant Support Program have dealt with anticipated recommendations.

So, this set of slides is the first time we're going to be dealing with the actual draft recommendations that are coming out from the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. These are the no longer anticipated recommendations.

Now, even having said that, the draft recommendations could be subject to further tweaking or refining by the SubPro PDP Working Group but I'm suspecting that it's more or less there is coming some work meeting that requires to finalize it.

Also, the small team is attempting to address the capacity-building element, so that's why it had been included "historical facts" in this presentation. It's also why it was suggested that folks who are not familiar with the background of ASP should review the entire presentation or should have reviewed the entire presentation beforehand.

Given the thing about anticipated recommendation, and also the capacity-building element, we found it quite difficult to try and move forward using the draft scorecard because of formatting issues. It's mainly text and the scorecard wasn't meant to include historical, factual background material. It's only dealing with the present.

So, what we resolved here is to … But, at the end of the day, whatever we resolve at today's meeting is going to go into the draft scorecard as a matter of record, and that should form the basis of our statement when

we proceed toward the drafting of the statement during the public comment process.

So, at that point in time, hopefully, all we really need to do is just skim through the scorecard. So, now we're trying to stick to 30 minutes of discussion for today. So, I'm going to pay more attention to certain recommendations than the other ones.

I will try to preface the discussions with supplementary observations that are drawn from my participation in the SubPro PDP Working Group. At that juncture, I'm going to invite my colleagues from the small team, or the SubPro PDP Working Group, or selected people, to add or correct things that I've said.

So, I would ask you to bear with me as we assess the effectiveness of this approach using a combination of historical data as capacity-building background as well as putting forward the draft recommendations and the issues to be discussed.

So, for this purpose, we might be jumping to and forth in the slides a little bit but I'll try to keep it smooth. Hopefully, if there are any questions, it would relate directly to what we're discussing. The idea is any general questions pertaining to ASP you hopefully would have found the answer in the slide deck beforehand.

So, if we can just scroll to the next page, please? Right. No, not the other image. Go down a slide. Okay. Anyway, it is coming up. Yes, right. So, the idea was we structured the presentation to give you an idea of the purpose of each section or each Google Slide.

So, moving onto the next slide, slide number three. Okay. Three to six, as I highlighted, or as was highlighted in the e-mail going out to CPWG, this is the list of recommendations that have been developed by SubPro PDP Working Group. I've also indicated, as you see in the red boxes, what are some of the key issues that we will be discussing pertaining to each of the recommendations.

So, in some of the recommendations where we don't see any controversy that needs to be addressed. We might just skip through that briefly. Okay. If we can just go straight to slide number 11? Okay. Right.

So, this is a recap of the previous slide deck on ASP. You will remember that we talked about what the ALAC statement has touched on in terms of the elements. So, you see those in the gray boxes on the left. And also, the areas which are related to ASP as well as the CCT recommendation that we linked to this topic of ASP, which is the four that you see on the bottom right of the screen.

So, we're going to go through each of the recommendations and see how they impact on what ALAC has commented on through their previous statements.

So, moving onto the next slide. Okay. We will come back to CCT Recommendation 32 at the end of the presentation because it talks about revisiting the entire program. So, the idea is the SubPro PDP Working Group says that we've done it because we've come up with this series of recommendations.

So, we need to look at the recommendations before we can go back and ask ourselves whether enough interventions have been done or have been made to satisfy what was [the mandate] of Recommendation 32.

So, the first one is affirmation with modification. The impact of it is ASP will continue and the applicants that qualify for ASP will enjoy a reduction in application fee. So, it's good for us. It just means the ASP will continue. So, there shouldn't be any controversies on this one. So, unless someone has something to add I'm going to swiftly move onto the next slide. Okay.

So, Recommendation 2 is more substantial. In the actual document itself, it goes on paragraphs. So, I've tried to break it down into bullets so it's easier to follow. As you see, the text in the black boxes are, basically, what's drawn up from the recommendations itself and the text in the red box is what I would like to draw attention to.

So, in terms of this recommendation, we have, obviously, advocated for the ASP to continue to be open to applicants whose applications are conceived to serve under-served regions or under-served communities regardless of their location.

So the point is, so long as they meet the other ASP criteria, which is financial capability and financial need. So, we support retaining pro bono services, as well, for the candidates seeking support. So, as implied there under "impact," Recommendation 2, the impact of Recommendation 2 is that ASP will continue in Subsequent Procedures. It will be available to applicants which meet the eligibility criteria regardless of location.

Applicants that qualify will obviously enjoy financial support in the form of reduced application fee. They will also enjoy non-financial support in

EN

the form of pro bono assistance. So, remember I talked about the gray boxes earlier? Now, I pulled out the gray boxes, and highlighted the ones that apply here, and indicated them in green as being checked. Jonathan, you had a question?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, just very quickly, a question or a statement. Sorry, my microphone isn't very loud. The Recommendation 31 from the CCT Review, that's not clear. Because if they're saying "ICANN continue to facilitate pro bono systems," we were making the point that they didn't coordinate it last time because they just created a site for people to sign up to either want help or to sign up if they want to give help, but then nothing ever happened.

No help was asked for or received, and so it was more about Org actually coordinating the matchmaking between the helpers and those in need of help. So, I just want to make sure that that recommendation is understood and maybe incorporated into Recommendation 2, here.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So, on the bullet two of Recommendation 2, instead of "facilitate," we should use some stronger words.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. "Coordinate" or something like that, exactly. They did set up a site for everyone to sign up but then literally nothing happened. People did sign up. People signed up but then no help actually happened.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, noted. Thanks for that feedback. Anybody else have any points to raise at this point in time? Nope? Okay. So, we move onto the next slide. I want to just pull out one of the bullet points of this Recommendation 2, which is the extract here.

So, it talked about financial support. Sorry, it talked about … Yes, okay. No, no. What I was trying to say is it talks about believing that the high-level goals and eligibility requirements for ASP remaining appropriate. What we think we should emphasize is the requirement that applicants must demonstrate how they would serve the beneficiary target region or community and not just a mere general public interest, which is the term used in the financial assistance or the ASP program text, anyway.

So, I hope that's clear. I don't think there is any controversy surrounding that. If there are then please raise them. Jonathan, your hand is still up. Is that an old hand or is that a new hand? Okay, old hand. All right. So, if there are no concerns on this point I will move onto the next slide. Okay.

So, Recommendation 3. It's the one that views the financial support. So, there isn't any specific concern here but there could be points to add, and that's something that I want to bring up for discussion now, which is one of the pending issues is, in the initial report, the question was asked within the public comment process whether there should be an extension of the financial support to ASP beneficiaries beyond application fee. There was specifically mentioned in the question things like application writing fees, attorney fees, and also registry-level fees.

So, if I remember correctly, there were three parties or three comments to the public comment process which sort of indicated support for it. One of the parties indicated very explicit support. The other two, one of which is ALAC, has a general support but the general support applies to the entire question, which includes registry-level fees.

There was one party that vehemently objected, which is the Registries Stakeholder Group. Their argument, basically, is that any financial support should be limited to the application process and shouldn't go beyond into operational concerns.

So, when you see the next slide I have listed the concerns and the arguments for and against this particular question itself. So, you see that I posted the actual question there, 2.5.4.3.7. It includes the term or the item "ICANN registry-level fees."

So, what the SubPro PDP Working Group is going to do, because of the one objection and also the supposed lack of support for the idea of including ICANN registry-level fees as a form of financial support, they're going to ask, in the final report, the question again as to whether people agree to have ICANN registry-level support included.

Obviously, there is time for us to consider. But if people have already read this presentation and been familiarized with the arguments for and against, then it would be good to have your input now. Or, we can do it later. I see Marita's hand up. Marita? Marita, we can't hear you if you are speaking.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, hi. Sorry. My brain is not functioning that well this morning and continues to get worse as we complete work and slides. My question was two slides back and let's just leave it. Thank you. Just drop it.

JUSTINE CHEW: Christopher, you're next.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, and thank you particularly, Justine, for these very detailed and informative slides. There are two points I wish to make here. First of all, writing historically from my World Bank experience, the capital invested in a new project includes up-front purchases of services and licenses but it also includes the ability to finance the almost inevitable negative cash flow in the immediate first year or two of the project.

I think application support should be based on a proportion, normally not 100%, of the total investment costs required to bring a registry to long-term viability. There is a speculative aspect to that but there is also a technical and economic appraisal aspect. My personal view is that last time ICANN was extremely bad at conducting serious economic appraisal of the proposals, but that's another matter.

But I think the baseline should be an assessment of the total capital investment to undertake a successful project. And from that point of view, this fuss about ICANN fees should come out in the wash. It's just one of the costs that will have to be incurred.

My second point is that—Justine, I don't really think you've raised it explicitly yet but maybe it's coming in a later slide—to the best of my

knowledge there is consensus that ICANN should encourage and facilitate parallel financing from third parties. I suggested this several years ago but that's by the way.

My question is, what has ICANN done about it? ICANN should be conducting a fairly thorough promotional activity vis-à-vis the international development banks and national aid agencies so that, when the time comes for applicants to seek additional support, these agencies actually know what we're talking about.

It's not good enough for ICANN just to say that this exists and to, ostensibly, welcome participation from third parties, but you won't get participation from third parties if they start from a standing start with no information.

So, my proposal is that ICANN should proactively inform and encourage the international development banks and national aid agencies worldwide, and there are quite a few of them, to tell them what's coming and what's useful. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Christopher. If I could ask for the next speakers to keep their intervention short because we only have 30 minutes. To your first point, Christopher, the funding for ASP comes in a later recommendation. Obviously, we can make adjustments to it if you feel necessary.

The second point that you raised is to do with what Jonathan spoke about a little bit so, again, that could be shunted off to implementation. I suspect that is the case. But again, if there are actual text

recommendations that you want to add to then please, by all means, put that through and we'll see what we can do about it. Maybe raise it back in SubPro PDP Working Group, okay? So, we can move onto … Olivier, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Justine. I didn't hear my name being mentioned. You just got cut off. Yes, just a quick one, here. The application support. Applicant support is really complex in that one always has to think, "Well, how far do you go into supporting an applicant?"

You've mentioned here application preparation. There is, of course, the application fee. There's the design and implementation of the technical infrastructure. There is the subcontracting, perhaps, even, of the technical infrastructure, rather than being designed and implemented locally.

There are commercial contracts, and then there is also the implementation of other services in the registry. Bearing in mind, in many cases, if you're looking at this on a purely business-basis the registry itself doesn't make that much money. It's all these services that go around it.

So, I'm really not sure how far we can ask applicant support to go to. Do we stick to just the application, as in as an applicant, but once they're in business we just let them run things by themselves? Or do we do as what Christopher has said, which is to recommend that, maybe, we could facilitate having other organizations sponsor applicants. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Olivier. In terms of operational items, that's possibly where the pro bono service providers come in. So, applicant support candidates can actually contact parties who are offering pro bono services, like registry operators, for example. They're the back-end registry operators.

So, that's sort of taken care of, per se. But you come back to that point which I was making that the main question is, where does applicant support end in terms of financial support – actual money support? Should it remain within the application process or should it extend into operations? That is one of the fundamental points that the registry operators are disputing, that it should not go beyond the application process.

So, within the application process, you're talking about anything to do with the application. Legal fees, writing, translation, preparatory, consultancy, whatever, but still within the application. Once you go into delegation, that is moving into operationalization. The buck stops there.

So, that's the question. Do we want to push it beyond application process or do we want to limit to the application process itself? Bearing in mind that last round we only had two million allocated, so there isn't even an idea of whether the two million still exists or not.

The point is, if we propose that ASP is going to move forward, and I suspect there is enough support for ASP to move forward, then, obviously, when the recommendations go to the board, the board will have to look into how to fund the program. So, there is no idea of how much that fund is actually going to be. Thank you. Holly, if you can make

your intervention short, please? Oh, hand down. Christopher, I believe that's an old hand. I'm going to move to Tijani.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sorry, it was a new hand but I just [cross talk].

TIJANI BEN JAMAA: Thank you, Justine. For your information, the Applicant Support Program was initiated by a resolution of the board, number 20 in Nairobi, that said that the community should find a way to support applicants' needs to make the application and to operate the new gTLD. So, the operation is included in the concept of the Applicant Support Program. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Good to know, Tijani. Thank you. Holly, you're next. Holly, are you giving up your spot? Because your hand is down.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, I'm not.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Christopher made a point about support until viability, which is a different and perhaps more expansive line. It still says you don't support forever but you support until viability. I don't know what that line is but I

think it's a very interesting concept and I think it's something we might think about and perhaps go back to Christopher for some more details. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So, one of the action items would be for Christopher to come up with something concrete to put forward in our scorecard. Okay. So, I will make a mental note of that. Olivier, you have one final word?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I have a question regarding this proposal, then. So, the proposal could be to take into account, to support the application process, paying whatever consultants there might be, and the application fee, and then that's it. Is that correct?

JUSTINE CHEW: Financial support, yes. It would be the application fee would be reduced. I believe it should be reduced by 50%, as before. And we're talking about expenses such as legal fees, those things that I mentioned before, which can be paid off by cash. Or it could also come in the form of pro bono services. It just depends on which third party is going to put their hand up to become a pro bono service provider, I guess. I hope that answers your question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. I mean, knowing how much lawyers cost or how much people that have helped in the application process have cost, I just wonder, if we're

just dealing with a two million dollar kitty, it's not going to go very far. That'll be pretty wild.

And I just wonder, what would be the criteria for deciding whether to support an applicant or not? Bearing in mind there will be a lot more that will want to be supported than the amount of money that is available for that.

Just the application support fee can … I haven't done the math but I thought it was several dozen people or a dozen applicants that could be supported. So, I'm not sure how that could be changed except if we also say, "Well, we want the application support fund to be higher than two million dollars."

JUSTINE CHEW: You are correct, Olivier. Yes, if things go as what we anticipate it to go, in terms of community and awareness of ASP, then I suspect we should be expecting a lot more applicants than three from the last round to share in this kitty. So, if the kitty is going to remain at two million dollars, it's not going to go very far. So, good question.

The point is, do we want to push for an enlarged kitty? How do we push that? So, that's something to think about. I would like to move onto the next recommendation, if I can. Have a think about it and we can always pick this up on the mailing list.

So, Recommendation 4 is quite substantial but a lot of it has got to do with implementation guidance. The crux of it is that it tries to address each weakness that was recognized – the fact that ASP wasn't very well

promoted before the application round started the last time around, which is why it led to very few applicants actually putting in their hat for applicant support.

So, that's something that we should support fully, really, because we want ASP to succeed. So, the implementation guidance is very long in terms of the list so I'm not going to go through all of it. It also touches on the CCT Recommendations 29 and 30. 30 implores the working group to expand and improve outreach into the global south. We've talked about the global south before. And now, the recommendations would cover middle applicants in addition to global south.

Recommendations number 29 of the CCT Review Team report talks about setting objectives and metrics for applications from the global south. So, how do you evaluate whether the program has been successful in reaching out to global south applicants, and obviously middle applicants, as well?

So, in terms of the metrics, I have posted a list on slide number 17. So, the question I have for this group now is, in terms of impact of this entire Recommendation 4, has sufficient emphasis been put on improving the outreach-awareness-raising application evaluation and also the program evaluation elements?

A lot of it, as you see, is being shunted off to the Implementation Review Team to come up with specifics or come up with the actual thing that we're going to use. Have the CCT Recommendations 29 and 30 been satisfied in our view from reading this recommendation? Any points of view? Any questions? Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, just quickly. It could be that I missed this elsewhere. Part of the issue had to do with education around what the business model might look like that was revealed in the work of AM Global that was commissioned by the CCT – that putting together some sort of case studies would have helped potential applicants. I don't know if that's sort of implied in here or should be made explicit. So, it's not just making sure people are aware the program exists but also what the business model is associated with starting a TLD.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, noted. I'll have to think about that one but I will obviously go back and listen to the recording and find ways to slip in the interventions. But yes, point noted. I don't have a proper answer for you right now. Does anyone else have questions? Nope? Okay. Then, moving onto Recommendation 5. This should be a quick one. It has got to do with best practices, trying to get best practices from other panels to use for the ASP panel itself.

So, I don't really see an issue with this particular recommendation. Does anyone else find any problems with this or feel that it doesn't go far enough? Okay. Hearing nothing and seeing nothing, I shall move onto recommendation number six. Next slide.

Okay. Recommendation 6 implores ICANN Op to develop a plan for funding ASP, as proposed in the implementation guidance below. So, this is the recommendation that deals with how to get hold of or how to secure the kitty/how to enlarge the kitty.

So, it does talk about seeking funding partners to help financially support the ASP. I think that was something that Christopher mentioned earlier, before. So, the implementation guidance is in there. So, the question is, is this sufficiently strong?

This is obviously going to be shunted to the IRT, the Implementation Review Team. Do we need stronger terms in terms of what has been put out in the recommendation and implementation guidance? What else needs to be done? Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. This ties in very much with the amount of money available and two million dollars is not very much at all. If we actually can come to some kind of agreement as to what kind of support, or where you can get additional support, other than just say the Applicant Guidebook, then we can't work on that recommendation unless we actually make a statement here saying, "This has to tie in with the additional supports we're talking about," because two million dollars is going to go absolutely nowhere to really helping people. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Holly. I have Marita next.

MARITA MOLL: Hi. I don't think it goes far enough. I don't think it really pushes the edges of trying to get more money into the fund. Two million dollars really isn't going to go very far. Maybe some kind of a community kitty? Like, everybody who's applying should have to donate a certain amount of

money into the community fund? I don't know. It's kind of a crazy idea but, hey, we do it in regular society. So, maybe something like that would work.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Again, if you have some suggested text that you want to see go into the recommendation then please provide that and we'll chuck that into the scorecard. I would like to try and stop the queue at … Jonathan has put his hand up. Yeah, it's just that I'm mindful of time. It's already ten minutes to the hour and we still have a couple of things to get through. Okay. Thanks, Jonathan. Alan? Alan, if you're speaking … Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I don't think we're in a position to really set a number and whether two million in two much—it certainly was last time—or not enough. It's 20 applications. That's a hell of a lot more than we had in the last round from organizations in developing regions that really could use the resources.

So, I think putting a number in the report or saying it has to be more than two million is probably a fool's errand. We certainly could put a recommendation in, "Over the next two years we should try to assess what the market would be for this," and then set the amount accordingly, but I think that's as good as we're going to get. So, doing a study and trying to assess what the market potential is, I think, as far as we can go. Setting absolute numbers makes no sense. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Can we move onto Recommendation 7, please? Okay. This one is important because it substantially changes one element in the ASP from the last time. Now, if you've gone through the historical, factual slides in the slide deck you'll know that in the 2012 round any applicant who has applied for ASP, applicant support, and does not succeed in getting applicant support, will have its application terminated.

So, it doesn't proceed at all. So, this is one of the potential reasons that were suggested why the numbers of applicants were low. People were afraid that if they tried to apply for applicant support and failed then the applications could not proceed – they'll be knocked out straight away.

But obviously, that was put in place to prevent gaming. The concerns about gaming were very intense for the last round, which is why we had that stop-gap to say that if you don't succeed in your application for ASP then your application will not proceed at all.

Now, the recommendation that we see, Recommendation 7, changes that. So now, the recommendation basically says that if you apply for ASP and you don't get it, you can still have the option of withdrawing, obviously, and then you get some refund back, or you can transfer your application to a standard application. You'll be given time to pay the difference in the application fee.

So, remember I said that if you qualify for applicant support you will get a reduction in the application fee. So, obviously, that portion is discounted if you succeed. If you don't succeed then you'll be given a chance to transfer, to send it, and pay that difference. So, this is

something that we asked for, we pushed for, and it has received support so it has made it into the recommendation.

The second point about this issue is going back to gaming. We did suggest that, to deal with the potential of gaming, the SARP, or the Support Application Review Panel, be tasked with looking at whether an applicant is willfully gaming the system by putting in an ASP application.

So that's going to be, obviously, shunted off to SARP to deal with. The question is, does anyone have concerns about this? No? Okay. Moving forward.

Recommendation number eight. Yeah, this is just to ensure that the financial assistance handbook that is used to provide information about the ASP program is finalized beforehand and also put into or incorporated into the Applicant Guidebook.

So, for the next round, it wouldn't be a separate document, a stand-alone document, but it will be actually included into the Applicant Guidebook, which I think is a good thing and also will ensure that it is well-prepared and finalized before the application round begins. So, I don't actually see any problems with this. Unless people do, I'm going to move on. Okay. So, these are slide 23. Okay.

I don't necessarily have any concerns with the two new issues. There are some points to the priority for two successful applicants in terms of … This one talks about if, say, for one string, there were two applicants who applied for ASP and both got it – how do you prioritize between the two? That is the question that we're dealing under this particular issue.

So, we've talked about this before and some of the suggestions were to use some qualifiers like the points earned during the evaluation to see if one of the applicants had scored a higher point than the other. Then, maybe, they could get priority. We also talked about using a quota per region to try and limit the numbers that will actually receive support.

And new issue number two, I will skip through it unless you have concerns because I actually want to get to the next slide, which is 24. Priorities in string contention. Okay. So, don't confuse between the earlier issue of priority. This has got to do with priority in string contention.

So, the idea is, if an applicant is successful in getting applicant support and there is another party that is not in applicant support or does not succeed in getting applicant support, and both are vying for the same string, should the one that succeeded get priority? That is the question. So, I'm going to ask Tijani to speak to this point, if I could. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JAMAA: Thank you very much, Justine. I think that any applicants who are being supported or who succeeded in the Applicant Support Program wouldn't be playing on the same [foot] as the other applicants because he or she already didn't have money to make the application.

So, we'll not ask them to come and to pay [optional], for example, or to enter into the process of string contention. So, from this point of view, money-wise, the applicant support applicants will not have the same opportunities or the same chance as the others.

The second point, very important, is, as you have seen, the main criteria for the Applicant Support Program is that the application is serving either an under-served region or under-served community. So, this application is not for money profit, nor for political profit. It's only for public interest. It would reason to give them priority. So, I think that those applicants who got the support have to have the opportunity for any string contention. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Tijani. Alan, if you want to make you point? I'm going to preface some things after you've finished.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep. Thank you very much. The rationale for giving applicant support applicants priority is if they didn't have the $185,000, or whatever the number will be, to make the application they're not going to be able to fairly participate in an auction process. So, that's almost a given. There has been talk about they participate in the auction process but there would be a multiplier, which is another way of handling the same problem. But whether it's as good or not, I'm not sure.

The downside of saying this is it will really encourage gaming for those who are trying to get a particular string and want to get to the top of the list. So, there are pluses and minuses. I, personally, would advocate that we give them priority under the CPE priority but above regular applicants. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Alan. I will speak my personal view, here, and I'm going to also share some points. I think this is actually going to be hard to get because it has not received any support from any other stakeholder group.

The second thing which is important to note, also, is the only priority that allows someone to win out if through the CPE at this point in time. That goes through a stringent evaluation process using third party consultants and what-have-you. We'll be talking about CPE in the single-issue call.

The SARP is made up of community experts and also business experts. So, it doesn't go to the level of the CPE evaluator, in my opinion. Part of the reason for that is because SARP is tasked to just decide whether the applicant should receive a fee reduction in the application fee and also where they can benefit using the pro bono service providers and so forth.

Getting priority to win against everyone else is actually one level higher. If you're going to push for that then I don't know how the SARP is going to function. It might not come back as SARP. It might come back as another sort of CPE. So, that's a complication that we need to bear in mind.

As I said before, we're pushing the envelope on financial support to make sure that there is a kitty there that is large enough to anticipate the increased numbers that we hope to get when the awareness and education of the program works out good.

So, there is already the reduced fee, access to financial support, and the access to pro bono service providers. Now, the SubPro Working Group has already recommended that there will be no termination. So, that's

something that would encourage more people to apply for ASP because they can still have the chance to transfer.

And the last bit is what Alan mentioned before. We're now pushing for additional benefit to an ASP applicant who participates in the CPE, does not win, but goes through auction. So, if the application goes all the way to the auction, what we're pushing for is that a successful ASP applicant be given a multiplier.

I mean to say that, for example, if they bid one dollar they might get a multiplier of two, or three, or four. So, their bid works out to be four dollars. Someone who doesn't get that multiplier, in fact, has to pay five dollars to win out. So, that is a tangible benefit for someone who is an ASP applicant and also ends up going to an auction. I believe we can get that through. I see some support in SubPro. So, that's something to bear in mind.

I will cut off here because I know it's ten o'clock. The other two related topics, we can pick up in other places. Obviously, the final question is, based on what we've discussed today do we think that Recommendation 32, which is the last slide, has been met?

Okay. So, that's the final question there I'll pose to the group, here. Please feel free to put any inputs to me or to the list of CPWG. We'll try to pick that up. And obviously, we'll try to include that into the scorecard and we'll push out the scorecard, hopefully, before the next CPWG meeting. Thank you very much for your attention and your participation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Justine. Let's move swiftly to ePDP Phase 2 updates with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I could have my slides?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I note that the slides, Alan, are now in a darker color, more orange-like, so I gather as things are getting warmer and warmer the slides will get towards … Was it bright orange, and then red afterward? What's the plan, here?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's the same color I used on the capacity-building webinar the other day. If people don't like it I can change it. There is no message in the color. Okay. This is a very quick update. It's not a particularly good update but it is what it is.

I've spent a fair amount over the last several days talking to various people. There has not been a meeting since last Thursday. Last Thursday was a disastrous meeting in that we accomplished virtually nothing and, if anything, we went backward on a number of points.

I've been talking to a lot of people so this is certainly my opinion but it's not unique to me and Hadia. Next slide. At this point, I think the prognosis for our coming up with something is poor, and that may be optimistic. What we have now is not going to satisfy the intellectual property and business people. We have significant issues.

The GAC has not made a global statement, nor, probably, will they, but so far their positions have been pretty well-aligned with our in terms of what we believe has to be done going forward.

The contracted parties seem to be pulling back on some of the commitments they've made, or at least the words that they're saying imply they might. Certainly, there has been very little willingness to go any farther.

The SSAC, I know legal/natural is a major issue. It's hard to read them because they've made very few comments on the overall position, but I'm pretty sure that on legal/natural they will end up coming up with a very strong statement saying it should be addressed.

The chair is pushing very, very hard for us to get our report issued by June. He leaves the position in June, regardless, because of other commitments, and it's not clear what we would do for a chair afterward, going forward. At this point, Rafik Dammak has been acting as vice-chair when Janis could not be there. I don't believe that would be an appropriate path going forward.

ICANN Staff has preached gloom and doom in terms of both funding and availability of staff to complete the work after doom, and at this point face-to-face meetings are pretty well off the table for the foreseeable future. We're now holding three-hour meetings, which I think are counter-productive and certainly the opposite of face-to-face where often we can make progress in a face-to-face meeting. So, overall, I don't think things are looking real good. Next slide.

Number of other comments. We and others wanted to issue dissenting views in the current draft report and we were told they're not allowed. There are no words in the GNSO policy books about that but that was a ruling, so we were told to simply make comments in the public comment if we're not happy with something. But addressing comments at the very last moment is not likely to be a way to get things.

And without having made a public statement with a dissenting view to the rest of the community that were unhappy, there is no way for them to respond to it, either. So, we'll comment, but I don't think the chances are high that anything will change because of it.

There is talk among various parts of the community, and not just one part of it, about putting on the brakes and changing the direction of how we're doing – that if, this SSAD model that we agreed on, we do not think is actually going to see the light of day in a practical, usable way, then maybe we need to stop and to rethink where we are. That, of course, means we would not make a June deadline. So, not clear if that's even going to be mentioned in public or, if it is, what the reaction will be. I may know better by the end of tomorrow's meeting. Next slide.

Out main issues are currently the SSAD implementation will decentralize, that is move to the registrar most decisions and, at this point, there is no clear and believable mechanism that will allow the SSAD model to evolve and improve.

The current version will get us better statistics than the status quo. That is, we'll know if people aren't responding. But that's not clear, that we can do anything that will be able to change that.

EN

Yet, contractual compliance may be able to penalize some registrars if they don't respond. But we're not likely to see the kind of SSAD that both the cybersecurity and the intellectual property people want, nor the government people. Legal versus natural is an issue and accuracy is, clearly, also on our table. Next slide. Olivier, I see your hand. I'd like to go through the slides and then I'll open it. I want to try and do this as quickly as possible.

Okay. If things go as today, it's not at all clear this will be adopted by council. Clearly, there are minority parts who will clearly object to it in council. I could see the contracted parties not accepting it if they don't think that the effort to put all of this in place is going to be worth what it's going to take.

At best, it's going to take a year to build this and there is going to be significant effort on contracted parties to interface with it. I'm not sure it'll get through the GNSO. If it gets to the GNSO, the board is going to be faced with a really difficult situation because there will be strong negative comments.

And if we don't adopt anything, either it stops at the GNSO or stops at the board, then we have the status quo which we know is not satisfactory. So, it's a rock and a hard place and none of the outcomes look particularly positive. Next slide.

At this point, we have to be prepared to issue a strong dissenting statement when the final report is issued. I think we have a statement pending at this point that we have to write on the addendum to the report, or whatever it's called.

So, that's something we need to start drafting virtually immediately. I'm not quite sure when the deadline is but it's some time in May. And we have to be prepared to give strong advice to the board if this is adopted by the GNSO Council. Next slide.

Or, if there is a decision to change direction, well, all bets are off the table. We're going to have to come back and see what that direction is, if it's something we can support, and how we get there. I think that's the last slide. Hadia, do you have any comments before I open the floor to questions?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Alan. I agree with everything you said. I would just add that if we cannot actually agree on a mechanism for the system to improve then I do not see a value in them, in this asset/this disclosure system. Yes, the value lies in the statistics that we would have, but not more than that.

And we were looking for a system that would truly allow a disclosure to the third parties with legitimate interests [on local basis]. So, I'm not sure that agreeing on a disclosure system that has no means of improvement would be a good idea. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I'll point out that the model we're using originated contracted parties and, although the words weren't there in the writing, the words were there verbally. But this system can evolve.

At this point, we're getting strong pushback from some contracted parties and from the NCSG that the only way this system could evolve is through another policy process and any change going forward would be a policy process.

We know the number of months and years that are involved in those, both to initiate them and to see them through, and we know the GNSO Council, at this point, has a huge workload that it's currently working on, others that are coming, and the ability of really opening PDPs for accuracy, policy, or evolution of the SSAD does not look really worthy. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much, Alan. My question was actually specifically on this. My initial question was, why can an SSAD model not evolve or improve? But now that you provide an answer, the question that I have is whether any evolution or improvement might not be implementation rather than actual policy?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's what some of us thought we meant by, "It can improve, it can evolve," but we're getting pushback saying, "Adding a new use-case of one that we can add to automation would require policy process." So, those are the words that are being used.

Now, I'll point out we perhaps have focused too much on automation and not on centralization, and that's one of the changes that may be raised in the next day or two.

The difference is we could say something is the responsibility of the SSAD but it's not automated. It may require a human being associated with the SSAD to look at the data that they do have and make a decision. The problem is the SSAD currently only has the public data. There is no access to any of the redacted data and certainly no access to the customer data that the registrar holds.

So, we're in a position that, if you centralize some decisions without access to suitable data, you're in a position where you may have to refuse a lot of really valid requests simply because you don't have enough knowledge to know it's valid. Olivier, same hand, new hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Second, very quick question, then. You mentioned the board that might need to make some serious decisions. If the board decides on something different, and then what the GNSO Council has finally voted on, does it mean the board has to send it back to the GNSO for another PDP or some re-opening of this PDP? I mean, do we risk just being stuck in an infinite loop?

ALAN GREENBERG: Under my current understanding of how our world works, the board cannot decide on something different. They can reject and remand to the GNSO and the GNSO may choose to reopen a PDP. There is a process in the bylaws that the GNSO and boards have to go into a negotiation process. It's not clear if the GNSO has the right to make changes unilaterally or it must reopen a PDP in some way or another. It's a little bit unclear and we've never had to do it yet. Hadia, please.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to highlight what you actually said about maybe focusing on more centralization rather than automation could be a solution because, right now, we have only the automated cases within the central system and then, any other case, the decision is made through the relevant contracted parties. Maybe we could think of some of the cases that being centralized might be a decision made by the central gateway with human intervention. Again, this is yet to be explored.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. That has been talked about a lot in the past. It hasn't been mentioned a lot in the last couple of months. We, perhaps unfortunately, have focused on automation versus centralization. In any case, I haven't heard or seen in the comments anything that says the position that Hadia and I are taking at this point doesn't have the support of the people in this group. So, we will continue in this path and see where we go. I turn it back to you, Olivier. I see no more hands.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Thanks for the update. And of course, I was a bit abrupt earlier. I wanted to thank Justine very much for the work that she was doing on the SubPro. I hope this call is interesting for everyone. It certainly is pretty amazing as it's so full of information. And certainly, a lot of trouble ahead, isn't it? There may be trouble ahead. And for trouble ahead, let's go over to Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu. Let's speak about policy comment updates – something a bit brighter and happier, hopefully.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Olivier. I hope you can hear me okay. I did do a soundcheck earlier but I guess I'm coming through. Okay. So, recently ratified by the ALAC. There are two statements on the agenda, there, with executive summaries for both the draft proposals for NextGen@ ICANN Program improvements, which had a lot of innovative suggestions for the program, including more involvement with the At-Large community as well as the Name Collision Analysis Project, NCAP, to be one.

There are two public comments for decision, the first being the addendum to the initial report of the Expedited Policy Development Process, ePDP, on the temp spec for gTLD Registration Data Team Phase 2. This closes on the 5th of May.

Secondly, there are the guidelines for developing reference Label Generation Rules, LGRs, for the Second-Level, version two, and this closes on the 12th of May.

So, the current statements under development. Actually, the vote just closed yesterday for a statement that was submitted, the first-ever joint AFRALO-APRALO statement regarding the public comment for the Middle East and Adjoining Countries Strategy, 2021-2025. So, an executive summary up there soon.

And then, there are two more public comments to which the ALAC are developing responses to, first being the revised Community Travel Support Guidelines. There is a draft posted to the workspace via a Google Doc and we've requested a one-week extension on this so that the ALAC

Finance and Budget Subcommittee can comment on this, and the drafting team includes Judith and Sarah.

And then, finally, the Phase 1 Initial Report of the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs Policy Development Process. The drafting team includes Greg and Marita. I'm not sure if they're available to comment on this during this call but we also have, I think, a presentation by Jonathan regarding the public comments and how to filter them between the different working groups. So, I'm not sure what you'd like to go over to first but I'll just hand it over to you, Jonathan. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evin. There is a quick slide deck. It's just one slide, actually, that we could potentially bring up. There was a conversation among the ALAC around this sort of perennial discussion about what the boundary should be around the CPWG. The conclusion was to expand and develop further.

Yeşim, it's the At-Large Working Group slide deck. Yeah. That one, there. And that we would expand and develop the role of the Financial and Budget Subcommittee. It could end up being renamed or something like that but that's not so much the issue.

We look, now, to have three main development committees within the At-Large. The CPWG that you're on now would focus on GNSO policy, security, and stability, consumer trust, contractual compliance, and, of course, [inaudible] PIC reform, and probably others. This was meant to be examples.

We've already got the Outreach and Engagement folks and they're focusing on creating ICANN Learn courses, webinars, social media presence management, the web, the blog, Facebook, etc., in the Fellowship Program.

And then, what's really new is the development of the FBSC beyond its periodic meeting of just dealing with the budget when it comes out, and people looking after their individual proposals for additional funds, and instead make this a meaty committee, a substantial committee, with a decent portfolio and regular meetings much like the CPWG, and play a similar role in terms of coming up with really solid recommendations, and drafts, etc. to present to the ALAC for approval.

So this would include, again, finance and budget as it has before, but also organizational reforms like the At-Large Review Implementation, etc., the multi-stakeholder model, travel policy, and then, I think, probably Auction Proceeds would be in this group, as well.

So, that was a conversation that took place in the ALAC. I just wanted to share it with you, here. We'll be working on the transitions, etc., but one of the first things we did, as Evin mentioned, is push out the deadline for the travel support so that Judith can make a presentation to this sort of reconstituted FBSC to make recommendations to the ALAC on the travel policy proposals, for example. So, this is the layout that we're currently looking at. It looks as if there are a couple of hands up so, Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I think it's a great idea but I think we need to, then, change the rules governing the FBSC and not make it a closed community – make it an open one like the CPWG and encourage as many people to come. Right now, it's just appointed representatives.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're right. You're exactly right about that. It would become an open committee but there might still be members for the specific issues related to RALO-based funding requests. So, it might become like a hybrid between the two but you're absolutely right that it will involve some modifications to the charter so that it becomes an open committee like the CPWG. And so, there will be a lot of overlap in membership between the CPWG and the FBSC.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. Jonathan, I was just going to say that because, also, on our travel council we have Sarah. This is her first time ever writing a policy comment. And I don't think … If we had it in a closed community, we wouldn't get new members. And so, people are coming to CPWG and then feeling, "Okay, I can comment on things," and if we don't present to a much larger group we won't get the new people coming and writing policy comments, which is what we need.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. You're absolutely right and that's part of the plan, as well. Thanks, Judith. Abdulkarim. Oh, yeah. Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you, Jonathan. I think this is a wonderful idea. I think it's something to look up to [inaudible] moving forward. However, I just wanted to … Yes. Judith mentioned the fact that FBSC needs to be open. Yes, that is one way.

Before she mentioned that, I was actually thinking, "Why multi-stakeholder model?" I was thinking multi-stakeholder model is something that needs to be looked at critically and I was thinking it should still remain on the [CPWG community] whether it's on the FBSC because yes, we need to have the division. But at the same time, it needs to be done in a way that we will understand what is where. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. We'll take that under advisement. The idea is just to give a decent and substantial portfolio to the FBSC, so forget about what your previous thoughts were about it, structurally. That's no longer relevant. We will find the ways to accommodate what needed votes to happen, but beyond that it'll be an open committee.

The idea is that the FBSC would be the group that worked on policies that were, essentially, to do with the At-Large relationship with the ICANN Organization. That's essentially the overarching notion behind the new FBSC. Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Hi. I think it's a great idea. I think one needs to happen in order to make this all look right, changing the name of the FBSC. It's not just finance and budget, anymore, and so people think that it's only about that won't

come there when it's actually about a whole lot of other things. So, a name change which has got something to do with structure and organization, I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: that has definitely come up, as well. Thank you, Marita. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just for the record, my recollection is, although the FBSC currently has members and, should things come to a vote, those members vote, there never was a restriction on who could participate. We rarely had many applicants or many people who wanted to, and I suspect if people had wanted to know about the meeting, come to the meeting, even if they weren't on the mailing list, I don't think there would ever have been a restriction. So, maybe things have changed but that's just my recollection of history. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And you're right. We're just going to have to clarify all of that, and the difference between the members, and the context in which membership is relevant, which is only going to be in a certain case. The rest of the time, it'll be an open group, just like the CPWG. Justine, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks. Just two points. One is on the FBSC. I agree with the comment that it is open to the extent that participants are welcome. That's

confirmed by Heidi and a number of other people, as well. It's just that, in terms of voting, then we will rely on the appointed members.

So, it's a bit like CPWG sending statements to ALAC for voting. We could have people participating in the open FBSC but, when it comes to actually endorsing the statement itself or voting on it you can put it to the committee itself, the committee members.

The second point I wanted to raise was something that I had a chat with Joanna in the chat itself. NextGen is missing and she suggested that we include the Capacity Building Working Group in this table somehow. So, that's something for you to consider. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, definitely. Thanks, Justine. And then, Judith again.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. So, one is we could change the name. But my suggestion is we could have, as Justine was saying, a smaller committee within the FBSC just to deal with the finance and budget, and the appointed members on there, but the main committee would have no, per se, chosen members or selected members. It would be open to everyone.

And I think, if we do it, we want to give the impression that it's not only finance and budget. We want to give the impression that it's everyone. And so, I think we could do that. We could have a smaller subcommittee within this larger one that just deals with the finance and those are the members and participants.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yep. Makes sense. All right. Any other questions about this? I mean, we'll be working on this model to iron those kinds of details out but the idea here is to make this a committee with enough of a portfolio that justifies regular communication because that has been part of the success of the CPWG, that it had regular meetings.

And so, we don't want this to be as periodic as it was but, instead, have a sufficient portfolio to be a regular thing. And so, let's not get caught up in "open or closed." There is a very specific case that involves voting, and that's it. We'll figure out how to deal with that exception case but everything else is going to be open, just like the CPWG is today. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I just wanted to point out that the FBSC … And again, I'm talking "was." What happens in the future may happen in the future. FBSC is an ALAC subcommittee. It's not a working group. That means, among other things, it may be empowered to take action.

So, for instance, historically the outreach and engagement subcommittee, which it was, would establish regional strategies and stuff like that, and it didn't go back to the ALAC. So, the subcommittee part implies that it may. It may. It is not always empowered to take action but it may.

And certainly, the FBSC was very active in establishing the discretionary budget requests and things like that. So, that has to be covered in any

structure going forward, that we have to be able to do that or we end up having very much significantly larger work that goes back to the ALAC, and the ALAC probably is not in a position to handle that on a regular basis. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:　　A good point, Alan. Thank you. Any other questions or suggestions? All right. Thanks. Then that's all I wanted to do, just give people a notion of where that conversation was headed and that travel policy would probably be the first thing to move over, and the date has been set to accommodate that. Staff, did we set up a time when the first meeting of the new FBSC version 2.0, etc., would meet, or just that it was next week?

YEŞIM NAZLAR:　　Jonathan, if I may, we are planning to hold the first call next week. A Doodle will be sent out shortly.

JONATHAN ZUCK:　　Great. And so, I encourage everyone to think about it in terms of the topics being discussed, instead of whatever your legacy or memory of the FBSC is. So, if you're interested in travel policy, for example, that will be discussed on the next FBSC, so please show up to that meeting for that discussion. That's it, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. So, I gather that the revised community travel support guidelines are going to move to the FBSC, so we don't need to touch on them today. Is that correct.?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, cool. And then, the Phase 1 Initial Report of the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs Policy Development Process, I guess we can move until next week since this is a long public comment close. Is that correct, too?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, that's my impression, as well. No one has submitted … Neither Greg nor Marita has asked for a time slot to present where they are on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Jonathan. So, we'll have an action item to just let them know and ask them for a presentation for next week. We can now move to agenda item number six, and that's the At-Large videos and the post-ATLAS III policy activity. I believe that, again, Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I don't know what that topic is, necessarily. So, let's push that, as well. I think that looks like too big a discussion for the time that we have left.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maybe it's Evin. I see Evin Erdoğdu has put her hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thanks, Olivier. Yeah. Actually, this was just briefly noted earlier this week in the chair chat but we just wanted to note—and perhaps we could discuss further on a follow-up call, as Jonathan noted—that the At-Large videos will kind of fall under policy involvement of the 2020 At-Large plan activity, and just to reference the space where this is all listed, because it's helping the At-Large policy activity effort. I'll make that an action to bump to the next call to discuss further. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks, Evin. And this, just to be clear, is the post-ATLAS III activities. So, that's all the things that are going to take place with all the people that went to Montréal and met face-to-face. And finally, we now have a good plan of things to do as far as policy is concerned with some beautiful graphics, might I add, on top of that. Well done. Okay.

Let's move on, then. And so, number seven we've touched on. We're on AOB, now. Seven, the At-Large Working Groups and CPWG, Jonathan has already spoken to this. There is also a reminder to take the At-Large GeoNames survey. I think an additional number of people have taken it.

As I mentioned last week, it's fun. It's also challenging because, sometimes, you have preconceived values about things and then, suddenly, you think, "Ah! But in this specific situation, how would I respond?" So, please take this. The more responses we have, the better it is. That's until the 30th of April. Hopefully, you have plenty of time on your hands to be able to take that. It doesn't take much time, anyway.

Are there any other "other business" discussions for today's call? I am not seeing any hands. Thank you, Evin, for putting the survey link in the chat. I just, before closing, wanted to remind you again of the series of issues that we're going to be addressing in the Subsequent Procedures—how should we call this?—pipeline, train, never-ending-topic-list. It's absolutely huge.

And so, today, as you will have seen, we've spent a bit more time than we originally anticipated on these issues. We're going to also have some single-issue calls. We will be advising the Capacity Building Working Group about these but we're still working out the exact timings for them for a couple of reasons.

One, the material needs to be ready and we need to circulate some of the material before the call takes place because there is a lot for people to read before the call. And fun stuff, sometimes, well-presented, and things. But certainly, tons, and tons, and tons of issues where we have to formulate a decision for ourselves and for the ALAC in order to be ready for that final countdown when we'll end up writing a comment on all these issues.

That's likely to be either in the end of the summer or in September. And that might fall at the same time as the public consultation on some other issues. For certain, the ePDP Phase 2. So, we've got a potentially busy second part of the year.

But in order to be prepared, please read through these. We will be coming back to you with a good timeline on how we'll have those single-issue calls in addition to the CPWG calls. And with that, I wanted to ask, Jonathan, is there anything else that we need to cover today?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't believe so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thanks for this. I'm not seeing any other hands up, so no further issues. Please answer the real-time text, the subtitles affecting the closed-caption survey that you'll receive in your mailbox. See if it was helpful for you. I'd like to thank our interpreters for spending that additional time with us and, of course, the real-time transcript team. And someone needs to speak, or someone wishes to say a few words. So, you have the floor, whoever you are.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Sorry. I'm not able to raise my hand as I'm the host. So, before we end our call, just to confirm the next meeting for next week, if I may?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yep. Please. Well, that's the last agenda item so, yes, we need to discuss that.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Yeah. Sorry for interrupting. So, next week, next Wednesday, 15th of April at 1900 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 1900 UTC. Thank you very much. Thanks, everyone. Thanks, Yeşim, for reminding us of that. So, 1900 UTC next week. And until then, please follow-up on the mailing list. There is not that much going on on the mailing list and there are so many interesting topics that we could discuss. So, thanks, everyone, and have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Yes. And if you want to send comments to the Wiki or the Google Doc for travel policy, we've gotten a bunch of comments and I encourage others. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Judith. Sébastien? Oh, Sébastien has put his hand up, now. Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. I am sorry, but I guess there is a policy forum program planning committee at the same time as you plan to have the CPWG. You might

check because the leaders of this one, I feel, at the same time, will be meeting; the RALO chair, the secretariat, and the chair of ALAC will not be able to if it's at the same time. But that's staff who need to look at that. They know more than me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sébastien, for pointing this out. We'll follow-up after this call and see if we might have to amend the time of the CPWG call. So, there will be a confirmation about the time of the CPWG call. Thanks for pointing this out. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night, wherever you are.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day and stay safe. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]