YESIM SAGLAM:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to APRALO Policy Forum call thinking place on Thursday, 2 February 2023, at 6:00 UTC.
	On our call today we have Shreedeep Rayamajhi, Amrita Choudhury, Maureen Hilyard, Jahangir Hossain, Satish Babu, Ali AlMeshal, Sushanta Sinha, Shah Rahman, Priyatosh Jana, Nabeel Yasin, Naveed Bin Rais, and Samik Kharel. We have received apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gopal Tadepalli, and from Holly Raiche.
	From staff side we have Gisella Gruber, Athena Foo, and myself Yesim Saglam. And I will also be doing call management for today's call. And before we get started just a kindly reminder to please state your name for the transcription purposes.
	With this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Shreedeep. Thank you very much.
SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI:	Thank you, Yesim. Welcome to the first call of February. And today we have a lot of things lined up. To be very specific if there is anyone who is new to this group or wants to introduce himself, then please feel free. You know, in the chat or you can just raise your hand and introduce yourself. Nobody? Then I guess we should start. So today we have a presentation by Maureen Hilyard on Applicant Support GNSO Guidance Process. Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD:	Thank you so much, Shreedeep. Can I have my slide deck up? This meeting has come up quite timely because we just had the CPWG meeting, and my time it was this morning. So you're getting an immediate feedback on the conversations that I've already had today on this, although because I used the last two slides of this particular presentation for the meeting this morning.

What I wanted to do—and I don't want to take up too much time—but I do want to first of all do a recap for anyone who's new here who's not sure of what the GGP is all about. And this is, again, acronym soup like the first three agenda items: the GGP ASP, the ODP, and the ODA. If there's one thing that I would like you to know at the end of this session is what they stand for and very briefly what they mean, and their importance to this particular study group that we've got at the moment.

Then I wanted to go over the report to the CPWG which I gave on 25 January which was after the last policy forum meeting that we did. And then just a brief report on what we did today. It wasn't very long. It's very short but at the same time it's what is essential to get some feedback from anyone who's interested in the next round of new gTLDs. Okay, so can I have the next slide please, Yesim?

Right, okay. Now this slide deck is actually in the agenda. It's posted there, and it's for your use. I'm going to be flying through these, and you can actually look at it all out later at your leisure.

But what is the GGP? I'm sure there's someone out there who isn't sure of what it means and what we're actually having to do all this work for. The GGP is sort of like the PDP and the EPDP. It's actually a process, but

EN

it's a specific process that was developed for this Applicant Support Program and it's to provide guidance. It's the GNSO Guidance Process. And this one is specifically for the Applicant Support Program, so there's your ASP. So that's something that if I'm ever talking about ASP, that's what I'll be referring to.

So the GGP for the ASP, going to the acronyms, actually involves representatives from across ICANN. And of course, ALAC and At-Large is involved. And our task is to basically produce a guidebook for anyone who is interested in applying for a new gTLD in the next round. And we're tasked with providing those guidelines.

At the moment, I'm the ALAC member. The GNSO runs a very different way of running things from At-Large as everyone can just join in. But in this GGP they allow a member and an alternate. The member is allowed to participate in all the discussions and the meetings and anything else related to it. The alternate is not allowed to speak at the meeting. Sarah is able to contribute any views and comments and stuff in the chat. But the alternate is really just there if the member is unavailable, then she can actually participate. And this is just a GNSO kind of process.

But the interesting thing is that the GGP, we as a group are only working from the recommendations and guidance that was actually produced in the SubPro, the Subsequent Procedures Final Report. In that final report, they listed—we're in Section 17—so everything 17.1 to 17.whatever is to do with the applicant support thing. We can only stick to those recommendations and guidelines as they are in the SubPro Final Report. We're not allowed to change any policy. We can't make

any policy decisions. So we could say, "Oh, why don't we do this?" If it's not in the report, we're not allowed to do it.

So that's basically the GGP. The reason why I'm bringing up the ODP and the ODA on the last meeting that we had we actually had a representative from the ODP who spoke on the ODA. And the ODP was actually formed…or you have ODPs on all the policy [inaudible] the GGP for your guidance process for other things. The ODP is the Operational Design Phase, and you'll hear this a lot.

And for the SubPro Final Report, after the report was published the Board asked all staff to analyze the recommendations that are actually in the report and to provide the Board with some further guidance to help them deliberate and consider whether to approve the recommendations that are in that report or not because the Board has the final say.

So that's the process, but the actual assessment, the report that Org gave back to the Board, was the Operational Design Assessment. So that's the ODA. So when we're talking ODP and ODA, that's what it is. So the actual report that the Org wrote on the GNSO policy recommendations is the ODA, the Operational Design Assessment.

So I'm not going to give you a test, or I might one day, but that's really important. And of course, I think I told for those who were here before we'll be preparing a draft in June and the community, public are allowed to comment on the guidelines that we've got and tell us what we're missing and what other sort of things we need to add.

And just as we in the GGP aren't allowed to change any policy decisions that were made in the SubPro Final Report, the ODA, the Org, the staff of ICANN, when they're doing their assessment, they're not allowed to make any changes to policy either. They're only to comment and to provide some advice to the Board.

Okay, so there's the recap. Next slide, please.

Okay, now the reason why I…like I said, there was an ODA update and apparently…remember I've only been to two meetings. And before I came on to the GGP, they had actually had a discussion with the ODA team. And so there were some issues that came up, and one of them was about the pro bono services that were offered in the last round.

Now of course, pro bono, what they did was they actually asked anyone who would like to support applicants in the last round to offer their services. And they got 24 people who—not just people. It could be organizations or companies, legal companies, registry companies, anything that could offer their support so that they could, for anyone who needed support, applicants when they were applying for a new gTLD. So these 24 people or entities applied.

Now what happened though was that a lot of people because the applicant support program didn't come out until the very day that the gates opened for the rounds to begin, a lot of people didn't realize or know whether they had qualified or not. Because you had to qualify on three criteria before you could access these pro bono resources and also [where they] could get funding.

And of course the three criteria were they had to be from an underdeveloped country. They had to be financially strapped, you know, they needed funding to help them make their application. And the third thing which two of the three applicants that did apply that they didn't try to consider in their applications was the public interest. And people just didn't realize that was, obviously didn't realize that was a criteria.

So what has happened, the bits in blue that I've got here are actually the sorts of comments that the ODA made. And also basically they may have made them of their own advice to the Board, or it may have been in the SubPro anyway and they were supporting it. But one of the things that they're actually saying is people don't have to qualify for applicant support to actually use these pro bono services.

In 2012, ICANN had budgeted $2 million toward supporting applicant support, and that was financial need and stuff like that because these guys were offering their services for free. But there were a lot of resources available for them at the time, and people just didn't realize. So they're taking away the condition that they have to qualify according to any criteria. There will be criteria, but not the same as what it was before. And rather than saying that they have to come from underdeveloped countries, they're saying people don't have to come from underdeveloped countries to be struggling applicants with financial need but they might have a really good reason for the application for a domain.

And one of the things too is that because there were no MOUs signed with these entities that actually offered these services, there's no

obligation for anyone to report on who had used the services or who had used it or who hadn't used it, like what could have helped them. So we're going to actually, this time, we're going to have to make sure that there's more tracking of the services that are provided. Who uses them, why they used them, were they successful, why were they not successful if they didn't qualify?

Okay, so you probably didn't need to know all that, but it's still important. The program is still an important part of the applicant support program. Next, please.

The second thing that they talked about, of course, was financial support. In the recommendations, and this is what we have to [inaudible], in the recommendations in the SubPro report it says that the next round we must expand the scope of financial support beyond application fees. And of course, the support that people were offered was reduced application fees, $185,000 it's going to cost if you want to apply. But if you can't afford that and you've got a really, really good reason, they can reduce that cost quite considerably.

And in the recommendation it says perhaps beyond application fees that might mean that if an applicant actually gets somebody else to write the application for them so that they—it's a very comprehensive form—and it costs them, perhaps cover those costs or legal fees because there's legal activities associated with the application as well.

But Aaron pointed out that when the Board was first looking at it they said, well, application writing and attorney fees aren't charged by ICANN. It's not as if ICANN is charging them application writing or legal

fees. So they said that may not be appropriate that we'd be subsidizing this by paying them. So the ODA suggested that perhaps they need to look, but they still need to look at other ways of helping struggling applicants still carry out the goals that they actually have we regards to applying for a new domain.

So what they're going to be doing is they're going to be working with Org staff to look at ways of finding, researching how other organizations who offer similar sorts of options, grants, opportunities, how can they help. So they're going to be looking through those, keeping track of anything that they can find, and try to be as helpful as they can for applicants. Next, please.

One of the things, and the third thing, that came out in Aaron's presentation to us was that remember I said that in the last round the applicant support program started on the day that the new gTLD program opened? This time they're saying that's not good enough. People needed time to actually develop their applications, talk to people, to work with the pro bono providers. They needed to know if they qualified for support, all those sorts of things. And so the ODA actually recommended that the applicant support program should be opened 18 months prior to the opening of the new gTLD round. So that was a major change from no days to now 18 months to get ready.

If you've ever seen, read through the last applicant guidebook, the application form is quite comprehensive. You think you need legal advice, you need advice. You're developing yourself as a registrar, registry, reseller, whatever, you're going to need to be able to provide and support is very costly to get involved. And so there are expectations

in the application about how much money you must have in order to be an applicant.

Okay, let us speed through this because I know I'm going overtime. After our last meeting, at our last GGP meeting, this was the framework that we were given. We were given these topics that are actually in there in the SubPro. We were given these topics and we were asked to comment and provide some advice. It was open for about a month and, honestly, I think probably three of us actually made some comments and it was very difficult to do. The criteria that we had to [inaudible] down on the right hand side, it was really difficult to provide guidance comments. And I remember taking this, of course, to the CPWG and they came up with a whole lot of ideas basically around the main topics Awareness and Education program and Implementation and stuff. Next slide.

So in the next week after our last GGP meeting one of our members suggested a more appropriate way of making comments on each of those areas was to look at the lifecycle of an application. So looking at outreach and awareness. And helping them with their understanding and determining needs in relation to an application. The third one which you don't see "3" because I've hidden it, but 3 is how can ICANN Org, the staff of ICANN, help the applicant support program? What do they need to be doing to make sure that it works for them? Looking at application submission, delegation of a new gTLD if they're successful, and then of course how are they going to carry on with the operations of their gTLD.

So this made sense and in the last CPWG meeting, as I said, I got a whole lot of ideas. And, Yesim, I don't suppose you have access to the…no? Chantelle had access to the workspace.

YESIM SAGLAM: Which one is it? This one on the wiki [inaudible]?

MAUREEN HILYARD: There should be…yeah. No, she has not [inaudible]. Anyway, there is a workspace. No, I actually gave her a word document and it had all the suggestions that I had actually gotten from the CPWG. I inserted them into this new framework. We haven't discussed. I had to tell the CPWG. We don't have our meeting until Monday so we haven't actually discussed the comments that were made by the CPWG yet. But by the next meeting on Monday we will have something for the next Wednesday's CPWG meeting. But that's progress.

So that's where we are at the moment. I'm really grateful to be given this opportunity because there will be lots of people I would say who are interested in the applicant support in the new gTLD round. So if you have anyone who's interested, bring them along so we can get them updated on where we're at with regards to supporting any applicants who want to apply for a new gTLD. Okay, thank you. Yours, Shreedeep.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you. Thank you, Maureen, for that excellent presentation. I think we had a few questions. Samik, would you like to ask the question, or should Nabeel read out the question?

SAMIK KHAREL:	I can ask it. I think I'm pretty much clear about my first question. [inaudible] actually put in the indicators, so [inaudible] be a problem. But I would like to know what were some of the good reasons to give these reduced prices for applying? And by what percentages could it be reduced? Some examples would be really helpful to understand this. Thank you.
MAUREEN HILYARD:	Hi, Samik. I just wanted to…from what I understand the [inaudible] $185,000 is the total cost of making an application. And I do understand it was someone who was really strapped I think it went down to about $40,000. That was just an example that I happened to see somewhere. But of course, only one group qualified.
	But then again, when it comes to criteria about whether they qualify or not, this is where after advice if you were an applicant what are some of the criteria that you would consider would be appropriate to be able to qualify for pro bono services? So exposure to experts and that in the domain name industry. And what are some recommendations that we get?
	So we need feedback. We need feedback from people who are interested in the topic of applicant support and who would like, who might like to apply or who know people who would apply. Because I mean, it's not just something you can just decide to do. Because I think one of the things is you have to show that you've actually got at least a

half a million dollars or a million dollars or something in your bank account so that you can actually run a registrar business. Thank you.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Maureen, for that answer. I guess, Samik, your questions are answered. Any more questions? Absolutely wants to ask anything? Yes, Satish, you have the floor.

SATISH BABU: Yes, thanks, Shreedeep. So, Maureen, I had a question for you. We have been raising these issues here in the APRALO policy forum as well as CPWG. But the Asia Pacific region is very vast, and you just mentioned that you need people to provide feedback. So at some point we probably would have to reach out to the interested people outside the formal APRALO structure and the ALAC structure so that we can get the comments. They are the ones who can really tell us what went wrong and what can improve from the last round experience. Do you have any plans to reach out to the domain industry in Asia Pacific?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, well, I think that this is one of the reasons why the ODA actually recommended that we have 18 months before the new gTLD round actually starts. And in that 18 months, [inaudible] implementation review team who is actually looking at how they mean to implement things. So this is like we're guiding the applicants but also if we get recommendations that might help the implementation review team look at how they're going to….

Because I've asked questions like what does outreach mean to the applicant support team, to the implementation review team team? Who's going to give the information? Are they going to be using At-Large ALSes? I have a feeling there's going to be experts involved. There's going to be lots of…it's going to be a big thing and it's going to happen, like, if we can do it over 18 months, it just shows you that they're actually putting a lot of energy into ensuring that the next round is successful.

I mean, the key question that we're asking is what makes, how do you measure success? And so everything that we do and every suggestion that we're making we're going to be ensuring that there's a metric that actually will show that it's going to add some value to the whole process.

Amrita, I see your hand up.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Maureen. And thank you for this excellent presentation and making us understand from the scratch at least what to do and the background information as well as what you are looking at as a group for the future.

So we have a lot of participants here also. The question is, while the GGP group is going to be working on finetuning what are the metrics, etc., is there any kind of input you would want from the APRALO policy forum community, etc. and if so, what with?

MAUREEN HILYARD:	Thank you, Amrita. Yes, Chantelle set up a GGP workspace, and on that there was the new format. And really, the new format for feedback, I'd really like people to have a look at that. And if you've got any ideas or any questions—questions too because I mean that would be helpful for us to set some kind of direction—but put them in there because we will be, Sarah and I, will be checking that before the meeting, before we go to our next GGP meeting. And we'll be using that to support the sorts of needs from within the [inaudible].
	And the things that you've mentioned now, I mean, Satish has mentioned and Samik about funding and about outreach, those are two things that we can impress on them that this is a concern. And also, that there's a real interest and that over an 18-month period, would that be enough to get around the whole of the Asia Pacific region let alone all the other regions that are going to be using, wanting new gTLDs? Thank you.
SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI:	Thank you, Maureen. As you rightly said, this community, we need to work on ourselves and we have to comment and help people to build the policies. And it is our community and it is our policies, so we have to step in. And please do feel free to comment in all the documents that are there. Please do go through. We all have gone through it. We all are new. We all are learning. So please go through the documents and if you feel there are specific things that you want to know or want to comment or that relates to you, then please do comment because that is a very important aspect of what the community engagement is all about.

So thank you, Maureen. And now we have Amrita with the Operating and Financial Plan and Draft. Amrita, the floor is yours.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Shreedeep, but first of all let me give you a disclaimer. I have not been following this. It is Holly and Ricardo who have been working on this document. I was just reading it last night and today morning. Because Holly is engaged I would just like to have a discussion with you on this. So in case I am wrong somewhere, please, anyone can come in and correct me.

So in the last APRALO policy discussion, those who had attended, Holly had presented on the ICANN operating budget for the next five years, FY24-28, and also the operating plan budget for FY24. Basically, these documents actually provide an overview of how ICANN would be allotting funds, what kind of inflow they're expecting vis-à-vis what kind of outflow and which [inaudible] they are expecting.

And obviously, the funds are spent based upon the particular plan which ICANN has [chosen] for that particular year or period. Of course, even if it's a five-year plan, there are changes being made as and when there need to be changes made based upon the understanding of the year.

So this is a document which Holly, Ricardo, with ICANN staff have prepared. The last date to submit comments in the process is 12 February. However the RALOs or any member from any RALO could comment on this internal document of ALAC by today. So this is what the document is all about.

If you look at the document, and I saw Jahangir making some comments on this particular piece of document, one of the things which has been raised in this document if you go to the next in terms of the comments section, yes. If you look at the comments, there have been some initial comments which have been made wherein what has been said the concern is about funding.

While the text introduces a plan forecast, a sharp deceleration and prolonged slowdown in growth. However there seems to be a clear projection in the budget figs that the following years will have. So this is a question that while they are saying that there is going to be a slowdown but the projections in the budget are same. However if you look at the financial planning, it is an average which they have taken. They have taken a worst case scenario, a best case scenario, and then they have averaged it out.

And then what is mentioned in the draft is the remaining of the numbers seems a check and balance numbers. For example, it is good to see that inflation has been taken into account for personal. However it appears it has not been taken into account for travel because post-COVID the travel expenses have been rising. And the professional service and administrative costs are also planned to be decreasing.

So you can go to this document. Wherever you feel you should be making some changes, you could do so even now while we're talking. The link is there in the agenda.

And then it talks about the fund management and its explanation which has been given, and there are two concerns which have been expressed.

One is with the Supplemental Fund for implementation of Community Recommendations. These are funds allocated specifically for certain recommended activities and the Full-Time Equivalents.

So the first concern which was raised is the cost of management of the SFICR and the auction proceeds. While the SFICR has been created with a fund of $20 million for FY24, it is planning to allocate an $18 million USD. But the handling of this fund is going to cost about $4 million, which is about 22% of the fund. And the same situation is with the auction proceeds where the grant is of $10 million of which $4 million is for managing the fund. So that seems to be a bit high, and that was pointed out.

The other thing which was pointed out is the expected income from the auction proceeds funds and the reserve fund is at approximately 1% which is quite low coming from a year where the sovereign bonds would be yielding about 3-4% yield from the bank interests.

And they have also mentioned that the FTEs in the budget are divided into five groups which are ICANN's operational costs, grant program, gTLDs from 2012, the new gTLD subsequent procedures, and review implementation. And that the new round gTLD programs have their own source of funds. And the new FTEs are required to handle only the subsequent procedures, and that is why they can understand the increase. But the grant program has its own source of funds. And ICANN's operation and review implementation have only the ICANN incomes as their source. And with the 2% of income, the planned increase of 2% seems high.

EN

And then what it does is the draft speaks about what the operating plan initiatives are. For example, the determination of activities that need support and ICANN activities to support initiatives, the mechanisms, and to identify the evaluation process. So in terms of operating initiatives for the supporting and strengthening the root server system and root zone management, there are certain points written. What are the risks? How the IANA team has to be able to have sufficient design requirement settings to inform about developments. Also, it points out that this particular piece relies heavily on the IANA and PTI budget and it seems to lack the additional FTEs for this.

[inaudible] if you look at the domain name system from At-Large we know is happy that this has been included specifically because there has been a lot of emphasis from At-Large on the DNS abuse issues, etc.

Similarly for strengthening the multistakeholder model [inaudible] parameters on which ICANN is supposed to be working on or putting in their funds. The draft talks about prioritization, the complexity of issues, and how these complexities of the multistakeholder system need to be addressed or looked into.

And also says how the capacity building can be built apart from the ICANN Learn, etc. And obviously the roles and responsibilities of ICANN Org and community and how to evolve and strengthen the ICANN decision-making process, and certain considerations which the At-Large has made.

So this is what has been drafted. In case you have any questions, comments, you can go to it. And I can see Maureen's hand. Maureen, please, add. I am just a novice on this. You know more about it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think you did a fantastic job, Amrita, actually. I just wanted to draw people's attention as to why we're actually…oh, and it's quite a comprehensive document that they've been putting together. And one of the things that's really important and I would like to see more APRALO people actually involved in it is the operations and finance and budget working group.

Now this was developed while I was the chair, and it's really, really important because ICANN selects, this whole budget is all focused around the operating initiatives that are important to ICANN. And Org develops these initiatives and how it can enhance the work of ICANN.

Now we decided to create an operations finance and budget working group so that we could support the work that ICANN's doing and support their operating initiatives. And so you will see that a lot of the comments that are made here relate to operating initiatives that really do impact on us as end users as the At-Large community.

So it would be really…and if you think as you're reading through these comments that there's anything that you feel that could be enhanced or you could add a few more bits and pieces or emphasize some bits that might be missing from your personal perspective, it's really important for you to put a little comment down on the side so that Holly and

Ricardo who are the co-chairs of this group can actually have look and see how they can incorporate it into the document.

It's at public comment and if you have anything more to add, please participate. It's really good for us. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Maureen. Does anyone have any questions, comments, or even want to say something which has been missed? Because it's a discussion. I guess not. Oh, Maureen, sorry.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I just said thank you. Oh, Nabeel has his hand up.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Nabeel?

NABEEL YASIN: Yeah, thank you. Carry on, Maureen. Yeah, after you, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, no, no. I'm done, Nabeel. Your turn.

NABEEL YASIN: Okay. Thank you, Maureen. Thank you, Amrita. Regarding the financial plan and this thing, I just wanted to add that to understand more about the plan and the budget if someone wants to know more he or she can

refer to the strategic plan of ICANN and the five maybe objectives and so on so it will be clear how this plan is drafted. And this will assist everyone to make comments and if they have any ideas or something to add. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Nabeel. I see Jahangir's hand up.

JAHANGIR HOSSAIN: Thank you, Amrita. And thank you, Maureen, for sharing lots of good and informative information. I found that the document, I read that document thoroughly of the presentation and [ALAC] draft [inaudible] that I found [inaudible] operating initiative. And until now today we have commented in draft letter on five points, and it still [inaudible].

One of the points I would like to add to comment from our side as [inaudible], the [ninth] point [inaudible] implementing new gTLD [inaudible] process recommendation as approved by Board. I think we should input comment on this issue, and especially there is some [inaudible] I found that some service, some public interest is required for the new gTLD [inaudible] process.

So can we make some comment on this issue on behalf of At-Large that there is some survey or analysis, regional or other communities about the new gTLD [inaudible] process or the new gTLD program, the upcoming new gTLD program? [inaudible] comment is [inaudible] or not, but I think we should make comment especially on the [ninth] point.

[inaudible] it is required for [inaudible] community [inaudible] new gTLD program or not, there is some [inaudible] study or research or some kind of [inaudible] required. I think we should put comment on this [point nine]. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Jahangir. Perhaps you can put in your suggestions as suggestions that I think it's [inaudible] and let the penholders look at it because they would want to link it to the [inaudible]. We should not lose sight that this is commenting on this financial budget. So that could be tied.

And I'm not sure, perhaps GNSO or the different working groups within GNSO may have been looking at, have been studying this because the subsequent procedures, etc., has been going on for years now. But I'm not sure. You could put it down there just in case that has been missed by anyone. And if it is already there, it could be overlooked. Yes, Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, I just wanted to mention, Jahangir, please if it's anything to do with the new gTLD program, and Gisella put in the link, it's in the chat, the link to the workspace where you can make comments. And if you've got a question, please put it in there so that we can ask the rest of the team. Because the rest of the team come from all over the ICANN community, so there's a lot of…I have no idea about how registries and registrars actually work, but I'm learning a lot from the conversation. So please do put those down. Thanks.

JAHANGIR HOSSAIN: Thank you, Amrita. Thank you, Maureen. I'll put my comment on this [inaudible]. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Jahangir. Then Shreedeep, over to you now.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Amrita. Thank you, Maureen. Thank you, Jahangir, for raising all these points. And thank you, Nabeel, as well. I think it is the way how our community should go in. And regarding the newcomers, what I would suggesting is with ICANN Learn we have a lot of policy courses especially for newcomers and people who are new. You can always go there to have the desired course that you want and learn more about the policies and things.

So now going back to the agenda, we have APRALO Policy Plan and Calendar. So that is where I will be further talking about the plans and the policies. So the working document is there, and please have a look at it. Please do comment if you want a specific topic for the March call or if you want a specific speaker or if there are specific questions regarding any of the sessions that we are going to do. Please do send it to us and we will probably put it into and work with our team to make it more possible.

And apart from that, there is a link for suggestions and comments. Please, I will probably copy it and paste it here somewhere. Yeah, I will paste it here. And if you have any suggestions or any plans or any

interest of the topics, you can put it here. Can we have the working document, please? Yes. The document.

YESIM SAGLAM: Shreedeep?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: [inaudible]

YESIM SAGLAM: Oh, thank you, Amrita.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: So we have [laid it down]. If you have any comments, this is a working document, please do put in your comments. Your comments are always relevant and we will probably work into it. Next page, please. We have…yes. So regarding the topics also, APRALO the hot topics survey was done previously and those topics are here. And if you consider any [of the] topics important, please do write to us or comment in the form so that we can focus on that as well. And there are specific plans that we have devised. And if you want any specific topic or any specific speakers also, please do write to us.

So now going back to the agenda, this time what we have done is we have created a poll. A poll just to evaluate how this meeting is going. So, Yesim, can you run the poll right now?

YESIM SAGLAM:	Yes, sure. Oh, please go ahead, Shreedeep.
SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI:	I'm sorry. So the poll is there. Please do evaluate us. And it is a learning process that we will move ahead. And if there are any specific suggestions, the form is there. So please fill the form.
YESIM SAGLAM:	Okay, I see that more than half of the participants have completed the poll. I think it's good to end, if you're okay with it, Shreedeep.
SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI:	Yes, sure. Now probably we will ask Nabeel to summarize the session. Nabeel, are you there?
YESIM SAGLAM:	By the way, I see Nabeel is trying to rejoin Zoom. And meanwhile as we are waiting for him, let me share the results here.
SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI:	So thank you all for that survey. And I guess we will further be working on [getting] your comments and suggestions and [inaudible] the desired sessions and discussions that you want to have to this comment.
	And if there are new people, especially for new people and for leaders who want to be active please if you have ICANN Learn account, go to that and start engaging with the courses that are available there. We

EN

share a lot of the documents are shared and do comment on the documents that we share in. And specifically for the topics for next month, please do suggest us.

Yeah, Jahangir, you have your hand up.

JAHANGIR HOSSAIN: I just want to add some comment. We can also discuss some point about the CPWG working group, some meeting. We have meet two times on [eleven] issue, and sometimes we [inaudible] [eleven] issue [inaudible] [eleven]. So we can also discuss about an important issue in this round in [eleven] [inaudible] topic [inaudible].

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Yes, for sure. For sure, that is an important aspect as well, and we will probably work into it and have a certain slot for it. And certainly, thank you for your comment, Jahangir. I think Nabeel is back. So, Nabeel, you have the mic.

NABEEL YASIN: Yeah, thank you, Shreedeep. Yeah, today actually we had a great meeting, presentations and sessions. We had the first session by Maureen about the GGP and the guidelines for the new gTLDs [inaudible]. And also we had Amrita [inaudible] the financial draft. Also, [inaudible] we have also the policy forum what our [inaudible].

So we had three homework everyone, so I hope we get…I mean, you can go to the workspaces and read it and if you have any comments,

and everyone we all have to share and to write any comments that will help in this process of the policymaking. So we have three workspaces for today. And also, we have the [inaudible] for next month call. So I hope we get some comments on these three things here, the three workspaces.

So this is just to summarize what we have discussed today. Back to you, Shreedeep. Thank you.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Thank you, Nabeel, for that. I guess we are right on time, exactly on time. And I hope next month we will have a [inaudible] on the first Thursday, you know, first week. I guess having said that, please do comment. Please do share your thoughts about what we want to do, what we can do in the next meeting as well. And thank you all for joining. Special thanks to all the speakers and thank you and see you in the next meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]