YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 2 August 2023 at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing your roll call due to the increased number of attendees, as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on the Zoom Room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call. And just to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Alfredo Calderon, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Chokri Ben Romdhane, Marita Moll, Joanna Kulesza, and from Adrian Schmidt. From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, present on today's call, and I will be doing call management. And as usual, we will have Spanish and French interpretation providers. Our interpreters are Veronica and David on the Spanish channel. And on the French channel, we have Claire and Jacques.

Just kind of reminder to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. One last final reminder will be, as usual, we do have the real-time transcription service provided. I'm going to shortly post it on the Zoom chat. Please do check the service provided. With this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. Welcome, everybody, to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. We don't have the wikis today, as you know, so we'll have to do without them for the time being. But

---

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

I'm sure we can somehow go through our agenda. As you can see, thanks to our real-time text transcriber, we managed to get a copy of the agenda saved in time. And so our agenda today will be a review of the action items which we don't have, but we'll assume that they're all done. And then we'll have a workgroup and small team updates after that. And then after this—can we scroll further down from this page? There you go. So we'll have the usual workspaces with the different working groups and so on. Then after this, I believe if we scroll further down, the next agenda item is going to be our policy comment update with Hadia and Claudia and Heidi. And then after this, if we can scroll further down, we'll have the ALAC liaison and alternate, the Customers Planning Committee with Jonathan Zuck discussing this with us. And then after this, we'll have the At-Large session at ICANN78. Again, Jonathan Zuck will take us through those sessions at the forthcoming Hamburg meeting. And finally, Any Other Business at the end. Are there at this point in time any amendments to the agenda? Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Olivier. Not to change but just to bring up a point under Any Other Business, which is regarding Policy Transition Program. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The Policy Transition Program. Thank you. We'll have this as AOB. Thank you very much for this. I'm not seeing any other hands up so the agenda is adopted as it is on your screen with the added item from Justine Chew on the Policy Transition Program.

Quick thanks for our captioner, [Karavela], who has got this agenda sorted out.

Now, the action items from last week, I believe one of them was probably to conduct today's meeting at 13:00 UTC and that's happening. And all the others, let's consider them to be done for the time being. We'll move swiftly to number three in case … Well, does anyone remember an action item that they might have had to do and they haven't managed to do yet? I thought not. Okay, that's fine.

So we're now in the workgroup and small team updates. And the first one is the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. Steinar Grøtterød had posted an update on the agenda, but obviously that's not readable. So I'm going to have to call on Steinar to provide us with a quick update on what happened in yesterday's TPR PDP call.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi. Yesterday I posted two notes on the agenda. The first note is that the document that was At-Large questions and input to the Phase 2 Charter question about the possibility of the registrant to initiate a transfer dispute was well received. And the chair also announced that the staff is going to summarize all the inputs into one wiki site and we can therefore be distributed and taken up when we are going into the final discussion on that topic.

The working group continued to discuss the ICANN bulk transfers. From an end user point of view, I think this is more like something that has to be sorted out between either ICANN, the registry operators, or the registrars. There is one particular topic that has taken so much time to

get some sort of consensus about. It's what is called involuntary bulk transfers. That means that when a registrar has either lost his accreditation or terminated their Registry/Registrar Agreement, the namespace connected to that registrar is in kind of limbo. ICANN must have a way to find a new registrar for these domain names. This is not something that is very common. For the last decade, it was only two different scenarios within that area. The problem here is that the unwillingness from the losing registrar to actually support in that, because they're most likely out of business stuff has gone, etc., makes it rather complicated. Adding into that, if there is more than 50,000 domain names, there is per today's policy a fee to be paid by the registrar that has been selected to host the domain names for 50,000 US dollars. I do agree I find it unreasonable that a registrar that's actually doing the benefit for the community for the end users actually have to pay this. So it is a discussion mostly about whether ICANN should pay that, what's the fee, what sort of price level, fee level should be, etc. So this has taken some time. I do agree it's rather complex but it's quite rare. And I don't think the discussion has kind of foreseen that there will be more of these kinds of scenarios.

So that was the update from yesterday's meeting. I'll try to answer some questions, if any. You're going silent there so I think it's back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Steinar. Thanks for this good update. The next group is the expedited PDP on IDNs. I believe that there is no

actual update on this, if I remember correctly. Somebody from the group could please confirm if that is—

SATISH BABU: Correct, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Satish. Then that brings us into the RDA Scoping Team. I believe that for this one also there is no update on this because I certainly haven't seen any positive response to the requests made regarding that topic. The one after that is the RDRS Registration Directory Registration Services, formerly SSAD ODA. I do note that there was a question sent by—let me see. There are some documents which were shared. But no, that was a long time ago. So I don't think that there is any update on this either. I certainly haven't seen any response. Alan, could you please confirm?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. I have no update. I've been on vacation so I missed the meeting. But I don't believe there's anything of great substance. The work is proceeding. We'll see systems live in the relatively near future. I don't think there's anything specific to report at this point. But I do have to catch up with what's happening.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thank you very much for this, Alan. Are there any comments or questions from anyone who might have kept their ear to the ground

regarding this? We have a very nice strip now on there, that's gone. I'm not seeing any hands up. Okay. So fair enough. While Yeşim is struggling with her computer—oh, look at that. It's as though the wiki might be back on. The next one is going to be about the closed generics facilitated dialogue on closed generics. I do note that there hasn't been a response either from Alan or from Greg on this topic. Greg Shatan, you're on the call. You do have an update on this, please. Maybe Greg is not on the call. I'm not seeing anything at the moment. Oh, Greg. Okay. Welcome. Yes, we can hear you.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. Thank you. We had a meeting this week of the Closed Generics Small Team to review comments. It was a slightly prickly but ultimately beneficial meeting concerns and issues, trying to identify fundamental concerns with the framework that were expressed by the various groups that provided comments as opposed to things that we could live with, that is what the groups could live with. So in particular, that comments from GAC, At-Large, and the Business Constituency, and I think NCSG or NCUC raised a number of fundamental concerns. One of the issues and trying to drill down on what those concerns were and to get enough out of the comments to try to address them was that by design, none of the actual participants in the small group were the primary drafter of their team's comments. Mike, Alan, and I, they, in most cases participated, but they were not the primary drafter. So, to make a long story short, the small team is actually going to invite the drafters from each group, whoever they are identified to be, to come to the meeting and try to engage in a drill down or dialogue on the comments to try to get more clarity on what could be done to resolve

the comments or perhaps to find that there's nothing to resolve the comments, which would lead to different outcomes, of course. So that's where we're at. To the extent we discussed specific substantive items, we discussed the kind of what we're calling two prongs or track, roughly speaking for who the applicant is. One is some sort of a representative group, like perhaps a trade association or consortium. And the other would be an individual entity or an individual company, and even a competitor in the space, as long as they agree not to engage in anti-competitive behavior or more that they have to demonstrate how their model is going to engage in non-anti-competitive behavior. Not one of my favorite words or phrases, but that's what we've been calling it, non-anti-competitive behavior. By and large, most of the groups that expressed concerns were more about those kinds of the non-anti-competitive behavior prong and the idea in particularly the single company competitor in a space could take a term and yet leave us all comfortable if they would not be engaging in anti-competitive behavior, and of course, what that actually means to be non-anti-competitive and the like.

I see Jim's question in the chat. All of the commenters will be invited, whether or not they raise fundamental concerns or not. Because everybody raised some concerns, nobody said this is the greatest thing they ever saw. That was discussed to make sure that we're being fair. There are only seven comments, including ICANN Org, so it's not like we're going to have a parade of people coming through. So that's my report. Any questions? Any amplification from Alan on any points? All would be appreciated.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much, Greg. Yeah, go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, sorry. I have no specific comment. I have to listen to the last two calls, which I haven't yet. Certainly at the last call I was at, there was a somewhat of a reluctance to come out and say clearly that the opposition was not something that can be fixed with minor tweaks. And if it's not clear, we have a mechanism to find major tweaks or major changes, given that we have the same people who created this one. That was implied by a number of people but wasn't actually said. I don't know to what extent this may have been consciously understood. But other than that, I have no specific comment. I will review the meetings and try to get up to speed before the next one next Monday. I assume this one—

GREG SHATAN: Alan, you're in for a treat, of course. And just to pick up on Alan's comment, I think one thing that did come up a lot in the last two meetings or comments, particularly from Jeff Neuman but to some extent from John McElwaine, that these comments are nothing new. We've heard it all before. It's the same thing we heard at the beginning of the process, and to some extent, trying to be dismissive of the comments. My response was, well, our job in a sense was to try to address the comments that we were hearing at the beginning. And the fact that we're hearing them at the end is not a good thing. It doesn't mean that they're kind of stale and can be ignored. It's the exact opposite. It means that we didn't succeed. So that was that. I do believe

there is a meeting next week. I'm looking at my schedule. Let's see that. Same bat time, same bat channel, Monday, August 7, 20:00 UTC. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a reminder, these meetings are now open.

GREG SHATAN: Yes, they're open. You now see why you wouldn't want to. Just joking. You're welcome to this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Greg. Could I just have an action item please then that this meeting be publicized on to the CPWG mailing list because I see a number of people asking about how to join it, etc.? So if staff could find out, we can then publicize it and we'll have more representation on that call. I guess at least more people listening in. You meant that the meetings are no longer under Chatham House Rule? Are they actually open for—are the participants—

GREG SHATAN: Only observers. So you must be mute.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just like me.

GREG SHATAN: Alan, like a particularly popular character who thought would only be in one or two shows with a sitcom. You've gotten a speaking role in almost every movie.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I just got cut off in the middle of my sentence. Sorry about this. Can you hear me?

GREG SHATAN: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Sorry about that. I can't remember what I said. I think I said yes, action item for staff please to publicize that call onto our mailing list. These calls are now going to be open. But are they open just for observers or opens for people to participate?

GREG SHATAN: Observers only.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Observers only. Okay. Well, at least that's one step forward. Thank you very much. Thanks for the update. And let's then continue in our list. The next one on the list is the Applicant Support GNSO Guidance Process. It looks like there's no update on that, which means we can swiftly move on to the new gTLD next round, the Subsequent Procedures. And for this, Justine Chew has a small update for us, not

necessarily related to Section 17.2 but a bit more general. Over to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. I'm actually going to try and cover three segments under this particular area because they're kind of interrelated. So the first segment is about the IRT, the Implementation Review Team, of which Cheryl and myself are on that team on behalf of ALAC. I believe Cheryl provided an update last week so we haven't had a call since then. So there's nothing new to report from that front.

Second segment is about the announcements that were just released on 31st of July. So that was two days ago. It's basically coming off the back of GNSO submission to the Board. What has happened is, as we remember from ICANN77, the Board had a resolution that required GNSO Council to submit three particular work items to the Board for consideration, and then the Board was going to instruct ICANN Org to come up with the implementation plan of sorts for Subsequent Procedures. At the last GNSO Council meeting in July, the Council came up with a revised plan or revised submission, which included among other things, an update to the IDNs timeline, basically shortening the project time for the IDN EPDP. But that's not what I was going to talk about, essentially. So what happened is after GNSO Council submitted that revised plan to the Board, the Board had a special meeting, I believe, in which they resolved to acknowledge the new plan, and then they instructed ICANN Org, as I said, to come up with the implementation plan for Subsequent Procedures. So the Board actually has announced that particular plan. I believe it's called the New gTLD

Program Next Round Implementation Plan. And if you go to the agenda wiki and look under the—okay. Thank you, staff, for bringing that up. What is interesting to note from this particular announcement, and it's actually a blog by the ICANN Board chair Tripti Sinha, is that based on this new information that's been provided by Council as well as ICANN Org—and this is merely a suggestion obviously subject to intervening things happening or not happening. But the plan now is that the next Applicant Guidebook is expected to be finalized around May 2025. Because that is an ongoing process, it's being undertaken by the Implementation Review Team, the first segment that I mentioned, one of the tasks for the IRT is to actually come up with the next Applicant Guidebook. So now based on Tripti's announcement, the timeline for the finalization of the AGB, Applicant Guidebook, is May 2025, which then, according to her announcement, enables the next application round to open in targeted quarter two of 2026 with a goal of April 2026. So now we have some more information about timelines as to when to expect the next round to be launched. But of course, again, subject to any delays that would affect this timeline would be any kind of things cropping up within the policy implementation work stream. Okay. So that is the second segment. I'm happy to take questions later on.

The third segment that I want to touch on is actually related to Recommendation 17.2, which is the only pending Subsequent Procedures Recommendation to do with Applicant Support. Because it's pending, it hasn't been approved by the Board and we're still working on it. What has happened is the small team out of Council is relooking at this particular recommendation to try and address the concerns that the Board has with regards to this recommendation.

I am in a little bit of a conundrum situation because I see problems as well as benefits on both sides. What I'm trying to explain is at the Council small team level, there have been no less than four proposals as to how we might rework Recommendation 17.2. And according to these proposals of the four proposals, it is in one way or another, an attempt to address the Board's concerns. I believe I've already gone through before in the past about what those four concerns might be. If there's a question about it, I'm happy to answer that question. But what my concern is now is that because Recommendation 17.2, there are two paths that are still being considered by the small team, which ultimately Council is going to make the decision anyway, which is, as I mentioned before, either a Section 16 procedure which would require the reconstitution of SubPro PDP Working Group, or the other path would be something called the supplemental recommendation by the GNSO Council. So we know that if they take section 16 path and reconstitute the PDP, there would obviously be cross-community input possible because that's the nature of the PDP. If it goes by way of supplemental recommendation, then it's unclear as to who actually gets to participate in the reforming of any recommendations that the GNSO Council might want to put up to the Board. And hence the conundrum.

So the four proposals that are being bandied around in the small team level, they range between, I would say, like a total revamp of the Applicant Support Program, to tweaks to the recommendation text which is basically trying to clarify and try to just close off the door on the two concerns that the Board has. It's interesting because the small team doesn't seem to be converging on any particular path. So I'm not quite sure how to take that forward. My strategy with the input that I

sought for Recommendation 17.2—and you all remember this Google Doc thing—is that if it so happens that we were going to go by the way of Section 16 and the PDP is reconstituted then, as I said before, there will be ample opportunity for ALAC and At-Large to participate in the PDP and provide inputs that way. But if Council decides to go by way of the supplemental recommendation, then in my position as liaison, I am attempting very hard to make sure that there is some kind of cross-community input into that process somehow, because we know both ALAC and the GAC are interested in Applicant Support.

Now, coming to the conundrum and the concern I have is that, as I said, the proposals that we have now ranged between almost a revamp of the program to just a tweak of the recommendation text. The concern that I have is that I think it's kind of going out of hand, the discussions at the small team. Because if we're talking about a total revamp of the Applicant Support Program, that is not what the Board is looking for. And if we try to push that forward, then the Board may just decide to not adopt that anyway. So I think there needs to be some kind of rationalization and pulling back of all these proposals to make sure that they are still feasible. And at the end of the day, they won't just be dismissed by the Board because they are not purporting to actually address the two narrow concerns that the Board have. Okay. I will stop there for questions. Oh, no questions. Well, then I will hand the floor back to Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Justine. I think we are all thinking about questions. We have a bit of time before the next round starts. So that

might be the reason why people are not rushing the questions in at this very moment. But certainly the points that you've raised are interesting. I think it might take a little while for us to digest, so no doubt there will be questions in future calls. Thank you for the updates. Now, we can—

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: You may want to note there was a comment by Avri in the text, in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, there were so many comments. Where's that?

ALAN GREENBERG: She said the Board will not just dismiss.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Good to know. Okay. Thank you for the comment, Avri. I see even some thumbs up for this as well. Hadia and Jonathan, thank you. And thanks for pointing this out, Alan. It's good to put it to the record.

That's it for the workgroup and small team updates. We can now go to the policy statement updates with Claudia Ruiz, Heidi Ullrich, and Hadia El Miniawi.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Hi. I will start and then give it to Heidi and Claudia. Recently ratified by the ALAC is the ALAC Input on Closed Generics Proposed Framework and At-Large Workspace: ALAC Input on Transfer Policy PDP Charter Recommendations. We have two new open public comments. One is the GNSO Guidance Process Applicant Support Guidance Recommendation Initial Report. We have two volunteers for this. I believe Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Christopher. This closes on the 11th of September.

The other one is the ccNSO proposed policy for a specific ccTLD-related review mechanism. This is about the final policy recommendations of the ccNSO PDP on the introduction of review mechanisms for specific decisions pertaining to the delegation transfer, revocation, and retirement of country code top-level domain. This closes on the 28th of September. So, maybe you would like to look at the Initial Report and maybe we could decide if we need to comment on it or not. So we would need volunteers to look at this PDP.

Also extended to the 31st of August is the amendment to the base gTLD Registry Agreement and Registrar Accreditation Agreement to modify DNS abuse contract obligations.

So I will stop here and give the floor to Heidi and Claudia. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Hadia. I have no further updates. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. So, current statements. We don't have any current statements. But item number five is the ALAC liaison and alternate to the Customer Standing Committee, Jonathan Zuck. So we have 10 minutes for this. So, Jonathan, I give you the floor. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot, Hadia. This is a role to pay attention to what's going on with IANA and how IANA functions are being handled by ICANN. It is a monitoring role that receives regular updates from IANA and then just assesses the job that ICANN is doing. Today has been pretty straightforward job. We've been lucky to have that role played by Holly Raiche who will continue in it. But I'm looking for someone to be a second and alternate on that role anytime that she's not available so that we keep coverage on that. So it's mostly a listening role and to give you a little bit more insight into the numbers side of ICANN. So I wanted to raise it here, just because this is a big collection of people, to see if people would be interested, if there's somebody that would be interested in taking that role on a being the alternate on the Customer Standing Committee.

I'm overwhelmed by all the hands. Feel free to reach out to me after the meeting as well. If you've got more questions about the role and you don't want to ask them here, let me know. But we are currently in a

search for an alternate on the Customer Standing Committee. Greg, please go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: I'll throw my hat in the ring since I was present at the creation of the Customer Standing Committee. We'll be happy to dust off my brain cells in connection with that and to backstop Heidi. Obviously, if there's competition for the role, I'll step back if need be, but I'll only step forward at this point because I think I'll be a semi natural fit based on my experience.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, sounds good. Thank you, Greg. Alan, go ahead. Sorry, I think I missed your hand before.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's okay. People always ignore me. I was trying to put my hand up to say something comparable to what Greg said, that I'm certainly willing to do it. I have lots of background knowledge of it. So we can talk about it later, I guess.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. That sounds good. Thanks, guys, for raising your hands. Again, if you are normally one of the silent people on this call, which is the majority of people on this call, and you just want to learn a little bit more about the inner workings of ICANN, I think this is a good opportunity. I sometimes hear from people that the usual suspects do

everything and nobody else is allowed to do anything and I don't know what to do with that comment. So like I said, if you'd rather address this offline with me, etc., please let me know and then we'll go processes this formally to the ALAC. Thanks, guys, for volunteering. I appreciate it. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I often hear from volunteers their concerns about the amount of time that it takes to take on any official position as such. Would you know if this position is something with like biweekly meetings, like a couple of hours a week or more, or for those people that might have a concern, they're putting their hand into something that will take over their life?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, I really believe it is not that type of situation in terms of taking over their life. It's like a monthly meeting, and as I said, it's largely listening to briefings about something that at least to date is being done well. So it's not lever that's had to be hauled with any frequency up until now. Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: I just wanted to mention that I've actually had a silent but ongoing role in connection with the Customer Standing Committee because of the trademark license for the IANA, which for the IANA trademark which is actually owned by I think it's the IETF Foundation in order to avoid an imperial ICANN or something. This goes back to the original design, in

any case, because I was part of that, I have had an ongoing kind of background role monitoring the performance for quality control purposes under the trademark license. Because if there's nobody monitoring the quality control that's been designated by the trademark owner, you can actually end up abandoning the trademark. So I've been receiving monthly reports since the beginning of time from the CSC. And as you say, it does its job well, and I've never … quality concerns. I have occasionally popped in on meetings in order to exercise that quality control function as well. Fairly passive function. Passive because I haven't had anything to react to. Other than that, my experience is just general. I've also participated in the past in the Financial Committee with Xavier. But that's a different thing, but also a nuts-and-bolts focus. Not that I'm sitting here running for this job, but just to answer what was a question in the chat.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Thanks, Greg. I appreciate it. There's also this issue of time zones was raised in the chat and largely answered that there's three rotating times. It's a monthly call. But given the time zone Holly is in, it might in fact be beneficial for the volunteer to be in the northern hemisphere to more easily hit those rotations on the calls to be in a different place than Holly is. Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The question was asked of time commitment. Although the only thing that you could be held to is actually attending the meetings, which there is attendance kept. The ALAC rep is expected to do their

homework, that is to review documents, to be in a position to discuss them, and participate actively in the group. We're not talking several hours a week. But there is a component other than just attending the meetings that certainly when the group was designed was taken very seriously. This was not just someone who was going to sit in because they were appointed to it but not do any work. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. All right. Thank you. Thanks, everyone, for your input on this. Again, feel free in the next day or two to reach out to me if you have more questions or want to discuss the possibility of being a newbie in this role and what's required. I'm happy to discuss it further. Thank you, everyone. Olivier, back to you, or Hadia.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Whichever. We can just ping pong it back to you, Jonathan, for ICANN78.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thanks, Olivier. The ICANN78 Planning Committee had its first meeting yesterday and began to talk about a number of different things related to the upcoming meeting in Hamburg. One of those areas are the sessions that we might want to have. There's been some proposals so far from Marita Moll on what to do next since the plenary on WSIS+20. In other words, what are the actual roles of the players in the multistakeholder community in terms of preparation and advocacy

surrounding WSIS+20. There's definitely room for Phase 2 of those discussions that took place a couple of meetings ago.

There are some celebrations that are taking place because it is the 25th anniversary of ICANN and the 20th anniversary of the ALAC, GNSO, and ccNSO. So there will be some ICANN-organized celebrations around the Org's anniversary. And then there will also be a session specifically for the GNSO, ccNSO, and ALAC to celebrate their anniversaries together, which will be a timeline of ICANN but with milestones reached those groups being highlighted by relevant players and then some discussion of the future. We will have our own anniversary session that we need to think about what we would like to have happen as part of that session. That's just talking about the ALAC and the At-Large generally. We need to give some thought to what would be a good program for that. That conversation hasn't started yet. Again, if you have ideas about that, feel free to let me know or drop in on the Planning Committee calls.

We should have a party on Thursday night as well to celebrate our anniversary. I have a surprise that I'm trying to cook up with Gisella for that party. As you all know, I throw a good party. Anyway, those are some of the conversations that are going on. We're expecting session proposals from Judith and we've received one from Joanna that I have not yet read. There's a number of, obviously, community-wide sessions that are going on. But there are no plenaries planned at this point. This is still a topic of conversation, because so far there's only been one meeting of the Global Planning Committee for ICANN70 as well. Right at this moment, there aren't any plans to plenary discussions. There's obviously some questions about whether it makes sense to get a plenary back in.

From Joanna, she proposed the title Multistakeholder Governance for the New Internet Infrastructures, SpaceX, IRIS2 and Equitable Internet Access for All. We'll circulate that before too long. Sebastien, who is probably on the call, is working with his cohorts to plan some EURALO or Euro-centric activities. He's looking at a possible European-centric policy topic to take place at ICANN78 as well. Questions for ICANN78? Sebastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I was trying to get back to my computer. But if you can hear me okay, I will pull from my phone.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No problem.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. We are, at the EURALO level, trying to see what could be the topics and you make some proposals. Therefore, the proposals on the table are DNS for EU. But importantly, the wiki was down this morning then I didn't do my homework, but we had organized a call on that two times already at EURALO monthly call. I don't know what we can bring more but I will check on that. The other one was about NIS2. We also organized already some monthly roundtable but an update could be of interest. I put on the table also another topic more for At-Large and maybe more for the OFB Working Group and this group. But it doesn't matter. I feel that we really need to find the time to discuss about the reviews and where we are with current implementation on the ATRT3

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That topic is more link with At-Large in general, but I feel that could be a useful topic also for us to discuss. That's all. I just wanted to add one point. When you talk about the 20th anniversary of ALAC, here I will not tell anything. It will be the 20th anniversary of ALAC and not of At-Large. As At-Large was created by the RALO in '07 in Portugal, in Lisbon. Therefore, it's 20th anniversary of the interim ALAC, and then we add the full ALAC later on.

About the 25th anniversary of ICANN, we are with my colleague from the other RALOs working on call on the cross-RALO monthly call, let's say like that, about this, and we are trying to have people who are participating at the creation of ICANN and the first step of ICANN. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot, Sebastien. Any other questions or comments? All right. That's going on. It's early stages for the planning. But that means it will come up quickly, especially since August is often the last month, particularly in Europe. So that's what we're working on and that's what's awfully coming up. It should be a great meeting. Thanks, everyone. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Thank you for this. Now we can go back to our agenda. And the next item in there is going to be the Any Other Business. For this, we actually have one any other business from Justine Chew with regards to the Policy Transition Program. Over to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. This is something I picked up from one of the regular updates that ICANN actually pushes out. I thought it was quite interesting. I don't know the actual details per se, but I suspect it's a program that's done by ICANN staff, and it's called the Policy Transition Program. I should provide the link in the chat. It looks to me like it's a staff-supported capacity building kind of program. And they are starting with the topic of gTLD registration data. They talk about this being an opportunity for newer ICANN Community members to cultivate substantive knowledge on a specific policy topic while hanging out with experienced ICANN community members. It's not a long-term program. It runs from September 2023 to March 2024. I believe they will go through a series of document reading, webinars and some quite substantial access to resources. Interestingly, I think it's being targeted at SO and ACs and it has to go through an application process. And it also mentions that anyone who's interested in applying needs to get endorsement from their community leaders. I think this is something that maybe ALAC wants to or have an action item here to put out a call and have some kind of assessment maybe in order to provide

endorsement to any candidate that we think is worthy or is interested in joining this program. I was going to put in the link.

I was trying to also find out from staff what other topics might be coming up the year for this program, but it's starting with gTLD registration data. I suspect it's got to do with the impact of GDPR and then the application of the Temp Spec and where that has led to. So anyone who might be interested in nuances or getting their capacity built around issues of gTLD registration data might be interested in applying for this. I will put the link in the chat if I can find it. That's it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Justine. The Policy Transition Program, there's a link now in the chat indeed. And maybe that can also be shared with everyone else. Very interesting, very quietly announced, as Jonathan mentions. It should also be the time to remind everyone of ICANN Learn, which I believe is still running. I was just checking it as Justine was speaking. Many people might not be aware of the ICANN Learn. It's got lots of policy courses. It's an online course platform with introduction to ICANN in various different languages, by the way. I can see some courses in Russian and some in Arabic as well. And Spanish. Is that Portuguese? I think that's Portuguese as well. Anyway, lots of different courses. In order to access this, it's learn.icann.org. I believe you have to log in to it. You have to create your account and so on. The great thing about it is that it's extremely inexpensive. What I mean by that is it's actually free. It's really interesting. I remember when this was in everyone's mouths that it was a lot of people were testing it out and

we all tested it out. And I even actually learned a number of things myself on this. One thing to mention, in addition to this Policy Transition Program. Are there any comments or questions, by the way, regarding this?

ICANN Learn is on learn.icann.org. Not quite the same thing as the Policy Transition Program, but also seeing the number of new comments that we have on the call and so on, it's something that a lot of people have used and been really helpful for them to catch up with what's been going on with ICANN. I'm not seeing any hands up. So thank you for this. Now, Heidi has sent me a note separately regarding an earlier item. Could you please take the floor, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Olivier. Just an update from the staff support for these Closed Generics Small Group. Only the mailing list is open for observers. Observers are not being asked to join the actual meetings. However, the recordings of the meetings are open. And observers can now listen to them after the meetings. Please do take note of that important direction. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Heidi. That's something to note. And of course, everything will be amended accordingly. So if you're listening to the call, I hope that you're reaching this part of the call as well. Okay. I'm not seeing any other hands. Any other other business? I'm not seeing anybody else put their hand up. Hadia, do you have anything else to add?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Nothing from my side. Thank you so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's find out when our next meeting is going to take place.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thank you, Olivier. As per our rotations, our next meeting will be next Wednesday on the 9th of August. It's 19:00 UTC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much for this, Yeşim. I note that the week after the AFRALO monthly call will be at 19:30. So we are actually under correct rotation to avoid a conflict with the AFRALO monthly call. Just looking ahead at our rotations.

So thank you very much for this. We're actually ending early today. Absent any other topics to discuss on today's call, I wanted to thank our interpreters, of course, and [Kara], who is the real-time text transcriber and who saved us today with that temporary agenda that we have in the beginning of the call. Of course, to everyone who has taken part in today's call, both in participating just as a participant and of course, those people that have provided updates. Always very helpful. Let's get some volunteers for these positions when we got Jonathan coming up with some proposals here. That's it. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night, wherever you are, and continue to work on the mailing list. Goodbye.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. Bye-bye.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]