

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 16th of August 2023 at 1300 UTC. We will not be doing the 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 this call.

And to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Eduardo Diaz, Denise Hochbaum and from Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And from staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, present on today's call, and I will be doing call management for today's call. And as usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation providers. And on the Spanish channel, we have Claudia and Veronica and on the French channel, we have Camila and Dominique.

And before we get started, a couple of reminders. First one is as usual for the real time transcription service. Please do check the link that I've just posted on the chat. And one final reminder is that we will-- I'm sorry. One second please. I'm sorry for the delay. The final reminder is please don't forget to state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And 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. Olivier Crépin-Leblond Speaking, and welcome to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call, which is

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.

likely to be a bit shorter than usual. Hopefully, we can fit everything within an hour. We'll start with our work group and small team updates. And the only significant one being that the-- I hear someone who is speaking in French here. Would it be the wrong channel?

Anyway, yeah, the new gTLD next round subsequent procedures. There'll be 30 minutes on this. And then as far as all of the other updates, there isn't so much. Just an update that will come from Steinar, which is at the bottom of the agenda. You'll be able to see. And then we'll go through our policy statement updates with Heidi Ullrich and Hadia Elminiawi, the usual pipeline of policy work. And then we'll have At-Large session at ICANN78 with Jonathan Zuck and Gisela Gruber taking us through the scheduling changes and session proposals. That's really today. Are there any amendments, additions, deletions to be made to the agenda? Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yeah. Thanks, Olivier. This is Justine. I noted that it was a light agenda, so I'm taking the option to do two updates. So, I may take more than 30 minutes, maybe 45 or something like that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you for this, Justine. Thanks for the notice. I won't cut you off. You'll be able to continue then for 45 minutes or the time that it takes you to go and do as many updates as possible. Great. Not seeing any other hands up. So, the agenda is adopted with that change on the time for the new gTLD next round subsequent procedures, and we can therefore go to our actual items from previous weeks. There are a

number of them that still remain to be done. I haven't got the latest yet. So, there's, of course, the ICANN78 session proposals. Those ones have now gone into an updated actual page, which I'm sure we'll touch on when we have that discussion on ICANN78, but everything else seems to have been completed apart from perhaps one from an old call, but we'll follow-up with Jonathan Zuck on this.

Any comments and questions or are we good with the actual items? On the screen, you're going to see that they're unchecked, but if you reload the page, which Heidi might actually or the person who's running this page can do. You reload it, you'll see that magically all the boxes are checked now. Wow, technology. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yeah. I know it's checked, but can I just request for an amendment? The second one next to my name, I'm not responsible for the GGP applicant report. So, it's Recommendations 17.2 applicant report, not GGP. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. Noted. We'll update this after the call. Thank you. All right. Let's continue. Heidi's mentioned in the chat is noted. So, we can now go into our work group and small team updates and I've just mentioned a moment ago that the first one relating to the transfer policy review policy development process. Usually, Steinar provides us with an update but as he has done in the previous call, he's written just comprehensive few words of what's been happening in the meeting of August the 15th, which took place yesterday. And according to the

updated project plan, the PDP will be completed in June 2025. Yes. And we are in 2023, so it's a long process. This was the 100th meeting for the working group. So, there you go. And you've got a little page here, it links you over to the recording and to a little PDF about Steinar's little report.

So, are there any questions or comments on this? If there are not, we can then move on to the next one in our list, and that's going to be the-- Well, bearing in mind, we haven't got anything on the expedited policy development process on internationalized domain names. Nothing on registration data accuracy scoping team. Nothing on the registration data requests service. Nothing on the closed generics this week and nothing on the applicant support GNSO guidance process. But we do have a lot on the new gTLD next round and Justine Chew has a number of slides and things to present to us. And so, she'll have at least 45 minutes, but you've got plenty of time here to cover what you need to cover. Over to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Olivier. This is Justine for the record. So, I'll try not delay anything really because I actually want to go to bed. I'm not well. Okay. So, as I said earlier, given the lightness of the agenda today, I am taking the opportunity to provide an update on what we call the 38 Pending SubPro Recommendations. When I was writing up this presentation, I noted that I hadn't done one for a while because-- Yeah. Anyway. So, a lot of things have happened, so I thought I might just give you an update. And it also provides a little bit of background as to why we're doing the Recommendation 17.2 on ASP.

So, in terms of just by way of background, I think most of you would have known this already. So, it's just a little bit of a recap. We know that at ICANN76, the Board had passed resolution, adopted resolution to adopt 98 of the recommendations from the SubPro PDP report and they also marked 38 as pending, 38 recommendations are pending. So, that's why you keep hearing the magic number 38. And in addition to that, they also requested a number of things from Council, one of which includes how are we going to resolve these 38 pending SubPro recommendations. And with that, the Board actually has been providing some insights into the concerns on why they have marked this as pending.

And since then, since ICANN76, the GNSO Council has set up a small team. It's called the Small Team on SubPro 38 Pending Recommendations, but we just call it SubPro small team. And they have been working with two members of the Board circle caucus to drill down and understand the concerns that the Board has indicated in terms of the 38 pending recommendations.

So, the latest as that Monday, 14th of August. Yeah, Monday. This is where we're at in terms of the small team work. As I said, there were 38 recommendations altogether, but the 38 spreads across a number of topics. So, you'll see that particular group of 38 has now been bifurcated into two parts. So, the first part is where both the small team and the Board caucus believe that a clarifying statement from Council would be able to resolve the concerns of the Board. So, I'm not going to go through specifics. The list is here and the topics are here. And I have taken the trouble to actually summarize the Board concerns.

So, that just gives you an idea of what the Board is concerned about in not straightaway adopting these recommendations.

So, now there is a clarifying statement a draft of it, at least, anyway. And if you want to see the contents of it, I have replicated it in my GNSO liaison Wiki. You'll see the link at the bottom of the screen. So, just copy paste that link to the browser and you'll get there. So, the thing is with this clarifying statement, it's still in a draft form. So, it's going to go to GNSO Council for consideration and approval before it gets sent to the Board presumably, if Council also approve it. So, the Council meeting is happening next Thursday on 24th. So, until such time, the small team continues its work on the other part of the 38, meaning to say that the ones that cannot be resolved by just a clarifying statement.

And which ones are these? If we go to the next slide. These are the ones that are still pending. All right. And as far as ALAC is concerned or At-Large is concerned, there's only two topics under the still pending which really concerned us. And this is where Applicant Support Recommendation 17.2 comes into play. Okay. So, I mean, by way of moving forward, we're still going to be participating somehow in this process. So, what next is, if we move on to the next slide, the last slide on this deck, I mentioned that the vote on the draft clarifying statement is going to take place on the 24th of August. It's when Council is meeting. And also, the small team is going to seek instructions on the remaining work. Meaning the ones that are still pending as you see on slide number 4.

I mentioned this before, the approach that is available for Council is actually 1 of 3 possibilities really. The first one being they can invoke

something called the Operating Procedure Section 16, just very simply put, which would trigger the consultation with a reconstituted SubPro PDP working group. The second avenue is for Council to come up with supplementary recommendation, but that one requires the Board to have not adopted the recommendation because that requires the supplemental recommendation can only be formulated once we know what the Board actual written concerns are.

So, in the process of that, the Board has to not adopt it, come up with their statement, which gets sent to GNSO Council and then Council looks at the statement and then come up with supplementary recommendation to address the Board's comments. The third one, which I have not listed here because it doesn't seem like Council has any appetite or councilors have any appetite to take up, which is to just let the recommendation die.

Okay. So, that's a very high-level update on how we're approaching the work, the small team is approaching the remaining work. And as far as ALAC is concerned, we will continue to monitor the developments and as far as possible, we would provide input to the-- I think you've jumped ahead too far, too quickly, Yeşim, I'm still on the last slide. So, as I was saying that we would just try to take the opportunity to provide input wherever we can. So, there is a current opportunity through the small team for a submission of a proposal on how to fix the concerns that the Board has on recommendations 17.2 applicant support, and that is the basis of this implementation.

And then in terms of the recommendation 9.2 on of waiver or spec 11 (3a) and 11 (3b), I will continue to see what happens in this small team

and just provide inputs that way. And I'm sure that there'll be opportunity for me to report back on that anymore later on. Okay? So, I will just pause for a little while to ask if there's any clarification needed to what I've spoken to so far. Okay. Seeing none. Oh, Steinar. Yes, Steinar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, hi. This Steinar for the record. I'm just wondering the waiver of spec 11 (3a) and (3b), to single registrant. Will that be still valid if the proposed updates to the RA and RAA is being executed? Or is it--

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. It doesn't affect what's happening with the contractual amendment.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Okay. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Yeah. Because the contractual amendments apply to everyone, all the contracted parties. This one, 9.2 is specific to single registrant TLD. Which is typically the dot brands. Okay. So, any more questions? If not, I will move over to Recommendations 17.2. Okay. Cool. All right. So, this is a continuation of what I spoke to last week. As I said, there is an opportunity currently for the ALAC to put in a proposal on how to fix Recommendation 17.2, to put a proposal into the small team, the Council's small team on SubPro. And last week I discussed some

possibilities. I'm sorry. I am getting some background noise from the Adigo operator.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Sorry for that, Justine. We will sort this out.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yeah. No problem. I'm just afraid that my voice already because it's a bit low, it might get knocked a little bit more. So, as I said, there's an opportunity right now for ALAC to submit a proposal on how to fix Recommendation 17.2 on applicant support. And based on what I discussed with CPWG last week, I have refined the proposal down to two very high-level options. I can put it that way. I'm not sure I need to go through the motions of explaining what 17.2 is again. I think it's short enough for you to read off the screen.

I will just mention again that the Board's concern with this particular Recommendation 17.2 as stated or as written, is the notion that the words such as implies that the list of service providers that could be paid would be non-exhaustive. So, I have genetically termed this issue as complete. Meaning to say that the list of possible third-party service providers needs to be more complete. And the second concern that the Board has indicated is that they really need any sort of payments to third parties to be at arm's length. So, meaning that they can't be the ones that approve certain things and then pay that person at the same time.

So, if ICANN Org is vetting or evaluating a particular righteous proposal and then approving it, it's a bit strange for them to also pay them kind of thing. So, it's a little bit of a conundrum there for the Board as far as they're concerned. So, basically, the solution is that we need to have arm's length transaction.

And then moving on to slide number 3. So, I looked back and I listened to the recording from last week and also looked at all the chat notes. And what I have gathered basically is this on slide 3. So, the notion that the ALAC is obviously putting forward is that the ASP is very much needed. It's an essential component of the new gTLD program. And also, to make it very clear, that the recommendation for reduction in application fees stand and it's outside of the scope of the Recommendation 17.2. So, whatever we do with 17.2 does not affect an outstanding recommendation for a reduction of application fees to qualified applicant support applicants.

So, back to these two elements of completeness and arm's length. In terms of completeness, I think we had support for us to look at it from a holistic point of view and not just focus on application submission stage. We need to look at it more from a larger perspective, so not only through application submission, but also through the evaluation processes and up to approval stage. Because the ASP shouldn't be about just getting applicant qualify applicants through the door. it's also meant to somehow provide some buffer for these guys to succeed or survive at least in the short term, some buffer. And so, as I said, we can't look at it just from an application perspective. We have to look at it from an application plus evaluation up to approval and possibly even post-approval stage. If you want to talk about a holistic view.

And we noted that the service providers need to be well-versed with a bunch of things, including what the ASP criteria is. They need to be well-versed with TLB operations, also ICANN processes and policies and the legal framework in the applicant's operating jurisdiction. And all these things are needed to navigate the application process as well as the evaluation process up to approval, which is why I keep saying that we shouldn't just look at submission per se. We can support folks up to their preparation and submission, but I don't believe that At-Large believes that is sufficient. There has to be some support to take them through the entire process up to approval.

And in terms of the arm length element. So long as there is no necessity or request to make payments directly to the service providers. I think that will take care of the need for arm's length. So, what do we mean by a holistic applicant support program? And I alluded to the slate of services last week. I basically looked at the list of pro bono service providers that volunteered their services in the last round. I also looked at the list of services that we applicant support applicants sought in the last round. Did a combination and this is what I came up with plus a few additions here and there. For example, the IDN variant management and also the evaluation phases. Because some of these things are new. Like, for example, support challenges in the fields are going to be new.

There are new mechanisms probably being introduced in the next round. We don't know yet because challenges in the field is one of those pending recommendations field, so Council has to sort that out too, but I'm including that in our consideration for now. And apart from these services, so let's put aside the fact whether it's pro bono or not. We just talk about ASP services. So, this is the slate of services that we

think is required for the full process application to evaluation to approval. In addition to the slate of services, there could possibly be additional financial and non-financial support.

So, things like if the applicant, and I'm talking about the ASP applicant obviously, if they are caught in a need for extended evaluation, then could the cost there be covered. If they were forced to file an objection or defend an objection, there's cost involved as well. There're obviously consultancy costs as well as filing costs. And if the AFC applicant were also applying for a community-based TLD and they get caught in a contention set, then they have the option to go for what is called the committee priority evaluation, CPE. But, again, there is cost involved in that. So, there could be some consideration for support of that. And a big credit, obviously, that's something that has to be there. It's in one of the recommendations.

And what I suggested last week is to contractually build in an entitlement to apply for reduction waiver or deferring of payment of annual registration fees based on set circumstances. So, this is from looking at the chat and the discussion and the recording from last week. This is the big picture of what applicant support should be or should encompass.

And then moving on to the two of that I have. Yeah. Sorry, Hadia, can I just get through and then you can ask questions later on? In terms of the two options that I thought I would like some temperature of the room checking is found on the next slide. Okay. So, again, this is not set in stone. This is just an indication of what the At-Large think might work better. I have to prequalify this to say that it's a proposal at this stage.

So, it's going to be when we submit this proposal, whatever it is to the Council Small team, it's going to be 1 of 5 proposals. And the Council's small team is already making arrangements to set up a call to discuss the 4 or 5 proposals or whatever they said that they are getting in.

And I mentioned last week that none of these things are really novel. So, I think there's some combination of things in the other proposals. I've not actually gone back and studied the proposal because it's in bits and pieces at the moment. The staff support is putting the puzzles together to make sure that it's legible and comprehensible. So, that's the process I'm trying to fit us into as well. So, in terms of getting a temperature of the room, I thought I might ask this question which is, do you think the applicant support applicants will be served better through an incubator type program or just a straight reimbursement? Okay.

And I put it in such a way as to try and decipher discrete elements, to make a difference. Otherwise, it's very difficult to just talk about hodgepodge of things without being specific about how you want to set up certain elements. So, I'm trying to get us to discern what is it that we think would work best for an applicant support applicant. So, in terms of the elements, if I can just contrast it too. So, in terms of the incubator, I'm thinking that it would be a third-party provider or a third-party operator. It wouldn't be the new gTLD program operator. With the reimbursement, it doesn't matter.

Now in terms of the third-party operator, that would provide an element of counseling because it wouldn't be approved by or the program itself or elements of the program would be approved by ICANN

necessarily or Board necessarily. In terms of the range of services that we're thinking or at least I'm thinking is for the incubator, we'll be focusing on pro bono. And it would be the full slate of the services that I provided in the earlier slide, slide number 4. And the idea behind having someone run the incubator would be that they would be responsible for attracting, vetting and then managing the service providers. And the service providers would have to be signed up to provide services pro bono. So, there's no fees that's going to the service providers necessarily.

Then it would be the operator's responsibility to effectively match the service provider with the applicant. And there can be confidentiality built into this incubator kind of model. Confidentiality to the applicant, obviously. Now if you contrast it with reimbursement, ICANN can still make a call for service providers, but at the end, I can't see them doing any matching. So, the applicants would still have to take responsibility to vet and select the service provider themselves.

If they don't want to take any service providers from the list that ICANN org compile, then they could choose their own service providers. But they will have to manage confidentiality obligations themselves. Confidential obligations of the service provider to the applicant. So, there is a distinction there. Now in terms of access, the incubator model wouldn't require any cash transaction with the successful ASP applicant. So, there wouldn't be any payment of cash or any form to the applicant itself because the provision is done through the applicant taking up the pro bono services.

With the reimbursement obviously, there's going to be some kind of reimbursement and we're thinking lumpsum payment with the production of receipt. And this means that the payment must have already been made by the applicant. I don't think there is a way to provide a reimbursement without receipts really, because it's a question of audit and other things. In terms of availability, the incubator, because of the range of services sets that is needed to be in to make up the full slate. That would mean that the incubator would be available throughout the program. And basically, obviously limited only by the availability of the service providers. Whereas with the reimbursement you're only talking about one-off payment really and fixed amount. And the fixed amount would be payment of services rendered by whichever service provider that they had used and paid for already and receipt received.

Now in terms of the supplements and tie ins, this is something that I just sort of came out, put together really. The way I distinguish it is with the incubator program, you really need to have something more to make it attractive for people to want to be in the incubator. As opposed to reimbursement, it's just a one-off one of thing, really. So, with the incubator, we're talking about on top of the pro bono services, we could consider asking for evaluation fees and filing fees. I already talked about that earlier. The big credit would remain. And I also talked about the built-in entitlement to apply for reduction waiver or deferring of annual registration fees. So, I would suggest we put into the contract itself somehow as part of the incubator sphere realm.

ICANN grant program. I've put that in brackets for both incubator and reimbursement. I think I prefer to look at it as a third-party avenue for

anyone to go and get a grant. So, it doesn't necessarily have to be tied to an ASP applicant. Now the key difference to me is the incubator model. The ASP fund, however much the Board is prepared to set aside for, would largely be utilized for the incubator operation. But the benefit would likely be more impactful because by getting a properly professional operator to run the services and to get the services, that makes it available to the applicants. But with the reimbursement, obviously, because reimbursement is in cash form, you'd want to preserve the ASP fund largely for the reimbursement. But then the benefit is likely to be less impactful because it's going to be capped and you can't really maneuver too much away from that.

Okay. So, I'm going to stop here, because the next slide is a poll anyway. So, I'm going to stop here and take questions. Okay. Well, I look at the chat. You guys are making it a little bit hard for me. So, I'm just going to go to the hands first. Okay? Hadia, you have your hand up.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Justine and thank you for this presentation and all you've worked on this. So, my first take is that both programs are actually needed. So, having an incubator, why does it need to be either or? And then when looking at the reimbursement part, I was wondering, is it possible instead of having the reimbursement of cash, that ICANN actually allocate a fixed amount of money that would be given to candidates or applicants who are found to be eligible for support. And then the candidate would use this money for any of the full slate of services. Whether the applicant puts the entire sum in one area or

whether the applicant chooses to use it for all areas. It's up to the applicant.

And ICANN in all cases would be just providing, in such case, the money would be provided by ICANN in advance once the applicant is found eligible and then the applicant has the freedom to use this allocated sum in any of the services. This is just an idea. And then again, I do see a benefit to both, and I don't know why it has to be either or. And then going to the incubator, I had a question. So, who will actually be recommending the incubators or how will the applicants allocate incubators? Is it going to be through an ICANN system or could an incubator come from outside the system? Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. So, that's a lot of comments and other questions, so I may miss answering some. Okay. So, let's go backwards. Let me refresh. So, in terms of the third-party operator, I don't have the answer for you. This is just a proposition. I think it's an implementation issue. At the end day, we are talking about developing a recommendation. So, the implementation details will probably have to be looked at by the SubPro IRT.

In terms of the reimbursement, you are talking about give the applicant a lump sum and they can use it for whatever. That is exactly what I'm saying. So, the only distinction I would make there is that they would probably need to provide receipt because ICANN understand the need for audit purposes. It's a reimbursement. It's not a grant. So, reimbursement means that you have to have spent the money. And if

you have spent the money, then you would get a receipt for it anyway. So that's not a problem. So, the reimbursement bit of it doesn't require you to-- gives the freedom to the applicant to select whoever they want as the service provider. So, that addresses your point.

I'm not sure. Okay. Back to the thing about why does it have to be either or. It doesn't. I am just suggesting that we might want to look at it that way because at the end of the day, I think the ASP fund is going to be limited. And I'm just trying to look ahead to see how we can best optimize the use of the funds. That would be my answer. Sebastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Justine. Sebastian Bachollet speaking. Just one question. In your mind, it is one incubator or it could be multiple incubators?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. Does it really matter? Because I think at the end of the day, it's going to be limited by the amount of funds that is applied to it.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: For me, it's a very important question because if it's an incubator in US, we are losing a lot of diversity purposes and we are not close to the candidates or the applicants. That's why I am asking this question. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. But the incubator operator can be anywhere. They have to go out and get globally dispersed pro bono service provider. So, it's a service provider that really needs to be close to the applicant, not so much the incubator operator, I think. Gopal?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you. Nice work and nice presentation. I'm just curious and wanting to know based on my experience here in India. All these application fee and examination fee, whatever we call, processing fee, will be segregated into some-- Are there implementation details? I just want to be educated. At no point in time the entire application fee can be reimbursed. Am I right?

JUSTINE CHEW: The application fee is not part of this discussion, Gopal. As I said, the application fee is outside of 17.2.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Yes. You mentioned that. What is it that you are reimbursing?

JUSTINE CHEW: The service provider costs. So, costs that are incurred by the applicant outside of application fees. So, for example, applicant wants to apply, they have to pay, yes, application fee. But they may also need legal services, they may need consultancy in writing, navigating the process. Those are costs which are not covered necessarily.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you. I just wanted to know the system. I was curious about it.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So, I think I've answered your question. Marita.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. Marita speaking. I'm going to say that I think we should just stick with one suggestion and that'd be the ASP incubator. It takes a whole lot of energy and trying the resources to set up one or the other of these. And if the incubator is what we really want, then we should be concentrating on that. In addition, people who know what they're doing and don't really need all incubators [audio glitch - 00:44:20] can just take what they need and take it from there. In that way, I think that, perhaps this is a learning thing. Right? So, there'd be learning going on to this whole thing to an incubator model, which is learning from the chapter. And I agree with the idea that maybe a distributed vision of this incubator model would be something that's necessary. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So, yeah. I mean, in terms of the way that I see the incubator is that the incubator has an operator that will get all the service providers in. Then it's up to the applicant to tell the operator, hey, these are the services that I require really, and can you match me with a service provider in your state. So, it's up to the applicant to decide which kind of services they want. And then the whole point about the incubator is

those services are and the service providers are available as opposed to just reimbursement, they have to go and still find their own service providers and stuff like that. And I take note on the regional reach so I will try to build that element in. Thank you for that. Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Justine. Excellent presentation. Just some thoughts to share with you and the rest of the group. I am currently leaning towards the ASP incubator model. And one idea that perhaps you could take under advisement, I've worked with the ITU in two situations. One, on behalf of the League of Arab States, when they applied for dot Arab. So that was clearly focused in the last round in one of the underserved regions, Africa.

And I also worked with the ITU, with the Colombian government in their rebid. So, what's interesting here is the idea of an incubator, perhaps ICANN could find someone like the ITU or other UN agency that has been involved and done outreach in these underserved regions because I really do think Sebastien's comments about having the locality and being able to address those local community concerns. That is something that in both of the projects I work on previously, the ITU had that local hands-on feet-on the ground expertise. That was invaluable. So, hopefully that helps and contributes to your future considerations. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sure. Sure. I mean, I'm not good to go as far as to suggest ITU in my proposal, in the proposal. But, again, I will note it on the regional

presence. So, that's something that I will go into the option. Gopal, I believe that's an old hand, and I see a new hand from Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Justine. Thank you again for all your hard work on this. This is Hadia for the record. So, I'll go back again to the incubator part. So, incubators are typically programs designed to support the growth of startups and early-stage companies. So typically, they provide all the resources, a range of resources and support services, mentorship. And I don't see why ICANN actually would put any kind of money if we actually adopt the incubator's model. What typically happens that we have one or two incubators and they will actually handle everything.

And in such case, ICANN would not be allocating any money. And therefore, I go back to the idea that we typically could have both. We could have the incubator model provided that we look for incubators who are interested in such early-stage companies. And also, we could have ICANN allocating a fixed amount of money to applicants who are identified as eligible for support. And, again, I see that maybe if ICANN allocate this money in advance, that's more helpful rather than reimbursing based on a receipt. So, in all cases, this would be a fixed amount of money that ICANN decided to support this candidate with in relation to those services. I'll stop here and thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. Noted. They are opposing the use in chat, Hadia. So, I can only note what you're saying. Given that people have diverse opinions, and that's great, by the way. It's not a bad thing. I do want to be able to

kind of let ALAC know that the CPWG is leaning towards this rather than that. And at the end of the day, it's up to them to decide which proposal or a melding or 2 or whatever they want to take and submit to the Council to me. So, at this point, I'm just going to move to the poll, which is the last slide.

Okay. So, if I can just get a temperature of the room in terms of what people think would work better, then at least, I and ALAC have some guidance on how to move forward with this. And bear in mind, again, I qualify. This is probably going to be a preliminary-- No, Amrita. I don't want complications at the moment. So just put in your answer. So, at the end of the day, when the Council starts or small team starts talking about the proposals, there could be eventually a melding or something. So, I don't know. We have to look at that point in time. But at the moment, we just want to put something in. And this is your chance to put something in. Yes, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Hi. Yes. Judith Hellerstein for the record. So would ICANN be putting out an expression of interest for incubators in every region to have one incubator--

JUSTINE CHEW:

I don't know. It's an implementation issue, Judith. We haven't come to that yet. So, all we can say now is if you're interested in the incubator model, we will say that it needs to have regional presence.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. Yeah. Because I think that was a lot of what people were commenting is that--

JUSTINE CHEW: I noted that, Judith. Thank you. Noted, Sebastien. I don't know how you're not going to defer it to ALAC, but. How are we doing with the poll, Yeşim?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: So, I'm looking at the poll. It's 52%. Oops dropped to 50% of the participants. voted, but I'm not actually seeing any further progress on the number of participants voting. So, I think we're good to close the poll whenever you would like to. Shall I close it?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, please. Okay. So, 46% undecided. 35 for ASP incubator. Okay. Yeşim, if you could just send me a snapshot of that, call me up. Thanks. Okay. So, I guess that's it. And I'll hand the floor back to Olivier. Thank you for participating.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Justine. The results here have surprised me, but then not surprised me either because it's not an easy question, and it's definitely not because it's complicated, but because there are many advantages and disadvantages for each one of those. And we're moving a little bit in a dark direction as in not a bad direction, but a direction that we haven't really thought of before. Has ICANN got any experience

with incubators and with the business side of things is a big question mark when it comes down to when it's done in the past.

But that said, the organization is evolving, so it's interesting that there are also some thoughts being given about this. And hopefully, maybe we need to think about this a little more and maybe think about continuing this discussion next week, if anybody's got some ideas until then. But, yeah. So, that's where we are. Thank you very much for your update.

We are now going to go to our next part. I know that Greg passed by earlier. I didn't have time to let him know that we didn't do any updates this week on the closed generics. So, I think that he's probably just moved on. We didn't get any pre-notice that there was an update on that. But that means we can go now to our policy statement updates with Heidi Ullrich and Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Hi. This is Hadia for the record. So open for public comments, the amendments to the base gTLD registry agreement and register accreditation agreement to modify DNS Abuse contract obligations. This is extended to the 31st of August. We have the GNSO guidance process applicant support guidance recommendation in a share report. And Cheryl Langdon-Orr presented on this on our last call. So, the pen holders of this are Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Christopher Wilkinson, and the advisors are Maureen Hilliard and Satish Babu who are ALAC appointees to the working group. So, the public comment is structured as questions that and the ALAC will provide answers based on the

Consolidated Policy Working Group discussions and calls. So, if you click on the link, you could actually find a link to the questions. And please provide your thoughts on the Wiki page.

Open also for public comment is the ccNSO proposed policy for a specific ccTLD related review mechanism. This policy allows ccTLDs and applicants for new ccTLDs to review a decision by the IANA naming functions for ccTLDs. The policy is directed at ICANN and the IANA function operator, the PTI. So, also, take a look at this and let's decide if we act actually want to comment on it from an end user perspective. So, I guess we need volunteers to look at the policy, suggested proposed policy and tell us if we actually need to provide a comment on it or not. So, again, if you want to volunteer for this.

So, upcoming public comment proceedings, the NCAP study to draft report, the technical check review, those will both be-- and the highest PCP constituency charter amendments. All three will be the Consolidated Policy Working Group. And then we have the pilot holistic review revised terms of reference. Those will be discussed in the OEC working group. So, I'll stop here and, well, I do ask for volunteers again. And, yes. So, Michael, I see your hand up.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Mike Palage for the record, Hadia. I'm just trying to juggle time. What is the time commitment for the ccTLD? It says to be determined. Or is there a public one? If I'm inclined to volunteer, I just want to be careful of internal time commitments and deadlines to see whether I'll be able to honor that commitment.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Michael. So, this is Hadia for the record. So, the public comment closes on the 28th of September. So, I guess we do have more than a month.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. I volunteer.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you so much. Thank you, Michael. So, I see no more hands up. So, back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Hadia. That was very quick. I wonder if Justine is still on the call actually. I did ask her something on the chat.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, I am.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You still are. Okay. I asked you on the chat, actually. I completely forgot when I moved on to the next agenda item and closing off on the item that you were touching on. What are the steps on this? Because you mentioned that the vote was taking place tomorrow. Is that correct?

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, last week, I presented a tentative timeline for next steps, and that included whatever outcome from today's poll to put the proposals to ALAC to decide which one they want to submit to the small team of GNSO Council. I can't come back next week and talk to this anymore because I really want to get it in. I don't want to miss the boat. Okay. So, according to the timeline, and Heidi is also asking me, so I will amend the option one to basically say the multiple third-party operators with regional presence, and then I'll put the two proposals through to ALAC together with the polling results from today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Yeah. Thanks. That's a good next step. Thank you very much. We'll let you run that. Michael Palage, you still have your hand up?

MICHAEL PALAGE: My apologies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No worries. That's fine. Okay. I think we can then swiftly move to the next steps, or the next agenda item. That's the At-Large sessions at ICANN78 with Jonathan Zuck and Gisela Gruber.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. We have been having regular meetings of the ICANN78 planning committee. And as a result, there's been a number of proposals that have been made for possible sessions that we would

hold, most of which are intended to be cross-community sessions. There isn't specifically a plenary this time around at the ICANN meeting, but we're looking to hold some potential cross-community discussions. What you see on the screen is the different proposals, and we can give you a link to see the descriptions of them. But those are the folks who submitted them and the titles of them.

And there's currently a poll out to the community to kind of rank order these proposals so that as we figure out or narrow down how many slots we'll actually have, then we can insert them in preference order for the community. So, if we could circulate the links to these proposals into the poll, that would be great. Oh, hi, Zachary. The poll's only out there. I guess the first run of this is just at the committee, but I guess I'm actually interested in having that be wider, Heidi, potentially, to see what people are interested in and so that the committee can take that information back to make a final determination as we go through. So, if we put up with those links, we can post them here. We'll put them out in the CPWG mailing list. Are there questions about them?

All right. Well, could you, staff, if you could post the link to the page that you're currently looking at so the folks that want to learn about the details of the sessions can do so, that'd be great. And then check-in boxes for the poll. All right. Olivier, that's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. That was a very swift. Just to let everyone know, there is an action item on the previous input, the ccNSO proposed policy on specific ccTLD related review mechanism. It's

currently marked as being under review. We will check with Liana Galstyan, our ccNSO liaison on what she proposes, how she proposes this to be handled. Right. I'm not seeing any hands up on this, so we can move to our next agenda item, and that's going to be the any other business. Not seeing any hands up. Okay. We're finishing early today, but we did have a lighter agenda than usual. But it's certainly been very helpful, very interesting. Then we just need to go into our next meeting. When will that take place?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Thank you, Olivier. This is Yeşim speaking. Looking at the schedule, our next meeting will be next Wednesday, on 23rd of August at 1900 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

We're using our usual rotation. Thank you very much. Wednesday 1900 UTC. Wednesday, 23rd of August ,1900. Goodness. Time flies very fast, doesn't it? We're two- thirds, we'll be two-thirds of the way through August. Right. Well, thank you very much, everyone. Hadia, is there anything else we need to add?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

No. Thank you, Olivier. Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. Well, very good. Thank you very much to all our interpreters, to the real-time fixed transcriber today, and, of course, to our staff for having put this agenda together. And all the people have

provided updates and especially Justine because she always comes up with huge, huge updates with tables and it's really great to have the GNSO liaison who is as active and make things understandable for us mortals, mere mortals. So really a big round of applause for her. And I think you need to get some sleep. Justine, because in your part of the world, it's very late, very, very late. With this, have a very good night. And for everyone else, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or indeed night if it is night in your part of the world. Goodbye.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, everyone. Bye-bye.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]