
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the NARALO monthly teleconference call on Monday the 15th of April 2020 at 1900 UTC. On the call today, we have Eduardo Diaz, Adrian Schmidt, Alfredo Calderon, Bill Jouris, David Mackey, Glenn McKnight, Gordon Chillcott, Jose Lebron, Judith Hellerstein, León Sánchez, Marita Moll, and—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi, it's Jonathan.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you, Jonathan, for just joining as well. We have received apologies from Pierre-Jean Darres. And from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management. Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and to please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you very much. With this, I turn the call over to you, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, again, everyone, for taking the time of being here today. This will be a quick meeting. I mean, 60 minutes, but I think it's going to take less. First of all, I would like to know if anybody wants to make a change to the agenda or if it's okay with the agenda the way it is. Not hearing any objections—

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.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: León.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, León. Yes.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: The any other business section, I would like to just say a couple of words if that's possible?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, no problem. Just remind me at the end that you're here and I will take care of that. Is that okay?

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Except if you are in a hurry. If you have to go to another meeting, just let me know and we can do it here and now if you want to, if it's something that you want to add now.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: No, it's okay. I'll wait for the "any other business." Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Thank you, León.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Eduardo, if you're speaking you're on mute.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, I was speaking and talking to myself. I just wanted to start with the meeting. I was talking about the election. The election nomination timeframe started in April 9th so I encourage everyone to apply to any positions that are open. Judith is going to bring, also, an update on that so far.

We have several reports by several of the people here. Bill's going to tell us about a regional survey that is going around. I thank everyone here that has answered the survey. If Alan is around he will tell something about the ePDP or how is that going. Pierre sent a small note on the newsletter, not the report. If Dustin is around he can tell us about NASIG, give us an update on that. And so forth.

And also, I added a new discussion today. I see that Jonathan is in. I want to have this discussion topic current in the agenda. So, I don't know if you know but Jonathan and Olivier are the ones that are leading the Consolidated Policy Working Group that meets every Wednesday. We talk about policy, comment, and support.

I encourage everyone to participate. It's open to anyone and there are very interesting conversations and discussions there. I think you will learn a lot from participating, even if you are there only observing what's happening.

But I think it's important for every time that we meet here that Jonathan and whoever is in that committee can come and tell us a brief report of the discussions that are happening there and if there is anything that the region can jump in and help in those discussions because we meet four times between meetings. We do this every week.

Like I say, Jonathan is a key person there in leading that group. And for our next meeting, I suggest we do the second Monday, which will be May 11th. So, that's what we're going to cover in today's agenda. So, the first item is Bill that is going to give us a brief report on how the survey is going.

BILL JOURIS:

Since At-Large is supposed to reflect the interests of all of us who are in the group, every now and then we need to take a survey to find out what those interests are. The unfortunate detail is, if my e-mail is anything to judge by, this is the month that everybody has decided to take surveys. So, if the rest of you are having that same phenomenon, I hope you will at least make sure that ours is one of the ones that you respond to.

We've gotten a couple dozen responses so far and they're continuing to come in at a pretty good rate. But I'm hoping to get the responses all in so we can start running the analysis by this coming weekend. So, if you haven't responded already, I hope you all will. If you didn't get the e-mail with the survey in it, please write to either Eduardo or me and ask to get a copy of it. I think that's what I've got at the moment, Eduardo. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you so much. I don't know if anybody here knows that Bill is the leader of the small team to run this survey. Bill [inaudible] with Glenn and Denise are working on getting that going. They were the ones that put it together and [inaudible] the whole team jumping in.

I guess all of you have received a letter from me just to motivate you to answer the surveys. It doesn't take that long. It will provide us good information about what the expertise and interests are in our membership, which will help us eventually in developing plans going forward, especially on the policy side. So, thank you, Bill. Next is ... Oh, by the way, I have Judith. Your hand is up, so go ahead. Sorry.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. A couple of things. One is Jonathan will also talk about or I'll talk about the expansion ... Not only of the Consolidated Policy Working Group but we are moving a lot of the policy issues that have been in the Consolidated Policy Working Group into a finance committee, which I think may get a new name, but I'm not so sure.

And so, many issues that had been previously in policy are moving to another committee and we encourage everyone, also, to join that new committee and to participate in that one. It won't only be finance issues but it will be a host of other issues. It is not closed. It will be restructured and will no longer be a closed committee or only members only committee or something like that. I just wanted to emphasize that. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I do have a question for you, Judith. Is that group already formed? Where do we go if someone is interested? Do you have a link there where people can go and join the group?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Heidi can post that in the chat, or Claudia, or whoever is here from staff. Our first meeting is going to be tomorrow because we are looking ... For those who were not around for the presentation I did on the travel policy comment last week, we are doing another one this week at this new, reintegrated finance committee meeting tomorrow at 1800 UTC. This larger one is going to be a lot more policy issues. I don't know if it has a new name. But can Heidi or Claudia post the link for tomorrow's meeting in the chat, please? Thank you/

EDUARDO DIAZ: Glenn, you're next.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. I'm just concerned because Judith's comments about the survey, that Jonathan and the work they're doing is confusing what Bill is doing. The committee that I'm on with Bill and Denise is not the same. So, I just want to emphasize we've had 23 results. It has gone out. There are a number of people that need to respond, as well, so that we can actually start the analysis. So, I just wanted to go back to you, Eduardo. Why did you want to do the survey in the first place?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Oh. Why did we want to do this in the first place? You mean the survey? Well, we need to understand ... The last survey was done four or five years ago, or many years ago. That was when Glenn was the chair of NARALO.

So, I wanted to update. The membership has changed, has increased. We have more and more individuals in ALSes than before. For us, and for me and the region, it's important to know what kind of expertise we have in our membership and also what kind of interests people have, because I can be an expert in music but my interest is in DNS abuse. Totally different but they're there.

Knowing that we can count on some expertise if there is a policy development issue that is happening in the CPWG that requires consulting that kind of expertise in our region, and we know that we have it, then we can contact the person and say, "Can you help us with these respects?"

And that's just an example of one of the reasons that we are doing this. Maybe there are [other] things that are there. It's also if your interests are in DNS abuse, then again there is something that needs to be done with the DNS abuse, some kind of webinar or thing that needs to be done, then we can reach to the people that are interested in that type of issue and we can reach to them to get them involved in that issue going forward. That's, basically, what this is for, and maybe we can use it for other things. I don't know. Let's see what we get from the final report. Did that answer your question, Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah, thank you. It's just that I was wanting to make sure people didn't confuse with what Judith was saying.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yeah. I think Judith was referring to CPWG working groups, not the survey itself, but let's go to the next item. Thank you, Glenn. Let's go to the next item, Jonathan. If you can give us a brief report and if you can give us the ... I think this issue, [when we solve the issue from the] CPWG into finance, maybe he can tell us a little bit more about that because we know we have been talking about this for quite a while, there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Can you hear me okay?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes. The next time, I'm going to ask you to sing us a song, too.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, you got it.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just so that you know, for those of you that are on Facebook, I did start a Facebook group specifically for whoever wants to to go on and go live to sing karaoke. It's called "Cabin Fever Karaoke" if you just need an outlet

and you're having cabin fever during the lockdown. So, that's just a public service announcement.

I guess just a couple of things to talk about on policy. I'll have Evin remind me of things that I'm forgetting. But to talk about what Judith said, just briefly, what we found is that there are some issues that were better handled outside of the CPWG that were more like internal policy.

So, on the one case, there is DNS policy or the policies that get created via PDPs and the GNSO, etc. And then, there are internal ICANN policies that really have to do with the relationships between the At-Large and ICANN. And so, that has to do with the budget. It has to do with the travel policy. It has to do with the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model.

So, there are a number of issues that fall in that category of managing our relationship with the organization. And so, it's going to have a pretty broad mandate and be a pretty busy call, just like the CPWG call.

As Judith said, I don't know whether the name will change. Right now, it's called the Finance and Budget Subcommittee but it's going to become a regular call like the CPWG and have a broad range of issues. Maureen will be on every call. So, it's a very important one about how At-Large interacts within the ICANN community. So, that's kind of the broad definition of what will fall in which bucket, just to follow on Judith's thing.

And then, on the issue of surveys, I filled out the NARALO survey and it's very interesting. Everyone should take a look at that. The other survey that's out there that we're trying to finish by the end of the month is one that came out of the CPWG which is about geographic names.

I know Eduardo has posted to the list on this but I just wanted to reinforce his suggestion because, as you'll hear from my next topic, us reaching some consensus on this issue of names of geographic areas being reserved for use for geographic purposes so that some random person doesn't try to get .egypt or something like that.

And so, I really encourage you to take the survey because then we'll analyze those results and, from that, establish our position on geographic names, which we currently don't have a consensus position on.

And so, third, what's important about that is the other thing I would really encourage you to do and, hopefully, Evin can post a link to this, is to look at the amazing scorecards that have been put together by Justine and her small team on the Subsequent Procedures Working Group.

It's one of the biggest, longest-lasting working groups in the history of ICANN and they're trying to come up with a new set of rules, a new Applicant Guidebook, etc., in the anticipation of there eventually being a new round of gTLDs.

And so, there are a lot of topics of interest to the At-Large in that report. Justine and her team have really laid them out in an easy-to-follow way for you to go and review. The comments that are in them include comments on which we don't yet have consensus like GeoNames.

And so, that's why it's critically important that we come up with a consensus on GeoNames but also that you look at these things so that you know what it is people are thinking of saying about Subsequent Procedures and help us catch things that might be more controversial or that don't seem right to you.

So, again, I am on a phone, so I don't see the chat, but hopefully there is a link to that page. There is a page devoted to this and you can click into those individual scorecards and comment on them. I highly recommend that you do so.

So, those were my big topics. The new committee for internal At-Large/ICANN logistics, a reminder about the GeoNames survey, and then also to really draw your attention to the SubPro scorecards where it would be good for you to take a look at the issues that we have identified as being important and the first draft of what we might say about those topics. Evin, do you want to remind me of other things that we should talk about?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Jonathan. Evin is not on this call.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I thought she was. I'm sorry.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No worries. I did post the SubPro workspace, where I believe that the scorecards are.

JONATHAN ZUCK: They are, yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And I think that you have covered, definitely, the FBSC, as well as the others. I'll go ahead and put the CPWG, our agenda, that is being updated right now. I'll put that into the chat, as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, perfect.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's really the place to go, as Eduardo notes, every month in the NARALO group. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Heidi. Does anyone have any questions?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I have David. Your hand is up. Go ahead.

DAVID MACKEY: Hi. Thank you, Eduardo. Thanks, Jonathan, for your report. It's always good to keep up to date with what's going on on the policy. The question I have, I've brought it up a few times, including at the end, I think, of the last monthly call. It's related to ...

Jonathan, you had mentioned consensus a few times when you were talking about the status of what's going on. I'm trying to get some information about, what is the At-Large consensus process?

Now, luckily, I was very fortunate to have gone to ICANN66, and we went through that wonderful exercise in the ATLAS III participants, and that was very good and hands-on. And then, as I've been observing the good work that goes on in the Consolidated Policy Working Group, I'm still searching for ... Is the consensus process documented anywhere for At-Large?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

No, it's not, because there is the consensus policy for the ALAC and the purpose of the CPWG, and also the new functions of the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, are to advise the ALAC. And then, they have voting procedures on which they make final decisions about all of these things. So, the CPWG is not a decision-making body.

And so, we do what we like to call a "rough scope of the room," and they're pretty well-attended. 50 or 60 people actually show up to the CPWG calls. And so, that's where we end up taking a rough consensus to form the advice that we then pass onto the ALAC for an actual vote.

So, we haven't established any kind of a voting procedure for the CPWG because it's open. There are no restrictions on who gets to be on the call, etc., how many people from the same company could be on the call. And so, every other solution would involve very easy stacking of votes on a controversial issue. So, we take a temperature of the room, and then it's really, in the last analysis, up to the ALAC to decide. Does that make sense?

DAVID MACKEY:

It makes sense, and it's consistent with what I have observed. The feedback I have as a new participant in this organization is the lack of documentation I find frustrating, in the sense that there is no guidance for a newcomer to know how to participate and what to expect.

The fact that the CPWG gives recommendations to the ALAC to make official voting, I can understand that. But I'm not sure how you phrased it – “the temperature of the room.” That, in my opinion, leaves a significant gap in the ... The lack of documentation of what “temperature of the room” means is a gap in our process. That's just my feedback, so take it for what it's worth.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. Thanks, David.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Okay. Let's see what Marita and Alan have to say. Marita, you have your hand up on this. Go ahead.

MARITA MOLL:

Hi. I was not talking about consensus policy but I wanted to just, since we were talking about the Subsequent Procedures process that's going on. If I could just throw a little more about that into the mix, as I see that maybe we have a little extra time in this meeting?

There is a big battle, or always has been a big battle, in creating the Applicant Guidebook and trying to make sure that communities have some way of getting into the process. Much of this process, of course, is

dominated by large companies, corporations – people with the big bucks, and the registries. People with big bucks, in any case, but there are also communities, their hands in there – they need to get their hands on some of the names.

And devising the rules around which communities can get some kind of a priority is really a big, big priority for us and the people who are working on Subsequent Procedures. So, if you're going to look at some of that, Subsequent Procedures do try to focus on the evaluation of community and also community support process.

Those are two among the many topics that are in the Subsequent Procedures docket. Those are two of the things that particularly are concerning us, and in which we are particularly trying to make some headway. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you very much. I wanted to comment on the consensus issue, just to note that David's probably right. We probably haven't documented this, but it really has not been an issue. In the vast both of the occasions, whether it's the ALAC or a group like the CPWG, we tend to find one of two scenarios.

Either we very, very heavily have strong consensus that is not necessarily unanimous but close to unanimous agreement on any given issue, or we're very divided. Very rarely is it a situation where it's a judgment call

on whether we have consensus or not. It does happen on occasion, and certainly the ALAC has some real rules of thumb. We use an 80% number. But that's when you have members and you can count people and know that they're not all representing the same group, or something like that.

But to a large extent, in most of the issues that come up, we tend to be quite divided and we have very different opinions on things. In which case, a group like the CPWG can only say to the ALAC that we're divided, or there's really strong agreement. So although, technically, David's right, it doesn't tend to be a problem. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you so much. David, do you want to add to this or can we continue to the next topic?

DAVID MACKEY:

Yeah, I'll just add to it. Thank you very much to everyone who has spoken. I certainly appreciate the amount of time that we can actually spend on this because it is, I think, important to the core of this group, since policy really is, from my understanding, the core of the work that we're going.

I can certainly understand that, for the vast majority of policy issues, consensus is ... We're going to do the right thing. However, when I came in early last year there was a discussion that seemed confusing to me about allowing price increases for, I think, .org domains. I really was trying to observe what was going on. I didn't really participate much. But at that particular issue, I was left, as a newcomer, with confusion about how consensus had been achieved.

Now, there has been another issue that popped up with the selling of .org names and that is controversial in terms of that there are some very strong opinions about the way to proceed.

I don't want to get into that. I really was very confused, again, by the process of coming up with a recommendation. So, yes, going to what Alan's saying, the vast majority of these things, it's not that important.

But when it comes up to certain issues, and when you look at those issues over a period of time—again, from my perspective, and I'm just giving my perspective in the hope that my honest perspective might make some people think—without having even a minimal written piece of, “What is a temperature of the room, and how is it managed or how is it felt? How do we take the temperature?” I do think we might be missing an opportunity to make our organization better. So, that's, maybe, all we need to talk about for this particular meeting and I thank you for the time.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, David. I have Greg. With Greg, we're going to stop this discussion. We move forward. Go ahead, Greg.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I think a couple of points. As far as I understand, the CPWG is a relatively new phenomenon. It has predecessors, but as such it's relatively new. I think that, consistent with other groups that I have participated in, the chair or facilitators tend to gauge the temperature of the room.

I think that this is consistent. Even in a highly documented world of GNSO PDPs there is relatively little that is written, and what there is is fairly high-level. It would be hard to put. Every debate, every process, works out a bit differently. They're very dynamic.

I think that to try to force too much rule-making onto the process would stifle it. There needs to be a certain amount of judgment exercised to avoid results where the process somehow overruns the substance.

I'm thinking of situations, for instance, where we've had people who have not participated at all in At-Large for any reason, any purpose, sit silently on CPWG calls, if they participate at all, give nothing, and then, when some issue comes up for which they've clearly been a sleeper cell, all of a sudden they're Mr. Captain Fantastic Dynamic holding 80% of the attention, or at least the air, in the room.

And you have to have some judgment that shouldn't be taken too seriously or can't be allowed to pervert the system. But you can't control for that and you can't create rules around that. You have to talk on at least three subjects in the last six and attend 70% of the calls. There is somewhat of an art to all of this.

I know that's not entirely satisfying. There is a lot of background writing on this, which I think we follow, generally; precepts that have come up around multi-stakeholder consensus-building. And so, I think that informs us and maybe [inaudible] in such processes before and understand how they work. But I think that there is a lot of background and I'd be afraid to try to codify too much.

I think you're right that we could probably codify a bit more but I think it has to be high-level and selectable. And to some extent, we have to trust that, with having a large number of witnesses in the room, we're not going to do something bad. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Jonathan, is this in relation to this or something new?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It is, but I just wrote it in the chat. I know you need to get on with the agenda so I'll lower my hand.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Thank you so much. Let's continue with the agenda, so see if we can finish with this. [Judith] has a lot of information to provide us. Pierre is not here to give an update on the newsletter but he sent a report which says, "March newsletter is in staff hands and should be out soon. Thank you to Evin for the help. Content requests for April newsletter will be sent on April 20th."

Pierre sends this note to the region and the idea is for every member or every ALS to put whatever events you're doing, whatever things you're doing. Remember, the newsletter is a concatenation of things that we're doing in the region.

We just want to publish this so everybody knows what other people are doing what. So, it's a tool that we have. Use it. Thank you. Alan, can you

give us an update on the ePDP? I know something happened there which you mentioned in CPWG.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yep. Thank you very much. I did give a report on the last CPWG meeting. Those who have an interest might want to go to the agenda for the last meeting and look at the report that is posted there. I believe it was posted onto the agenda by staff.

We are getting toward the end of the process of specifying the standardized system for access and disclosure. There are some concerns in some parts of the community, including At-Large, whether what we end up with will, in fact, be satisfactory or not.

We're working through the procedure with the understanding that some of us may well object to the final report when it is issued, but we're still going through the procedure and trying our best to get it modified so we don't have to do that. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you so much, Alan. Any questions for Alan? Greg, your hand's up. Is that an old hand?

GREG SHATAN:

All my hands are old hands.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. So, Judith, take the next three items, agenda, and just talk about them. [All aware of] the elections. Go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Oh. Are we skipping over Dustin?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Where is Dustin, here?

DUSTIN PHILLIPS: Yeah, I'm here.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Oh. Do I have Dustin? I don't have you here, but yes. Give us a little update about the NASIG.

DUSTIN PHILLIPS: Yeah, sure thing. So, yeah. Things have been slow-moving, understandably, with the NASIG and the world is a different place since when we started discussing it. But I just sent out, today, a Doodle poll to get together the committee in order to discuss how to proceed with that planning. And so, we're hopefully going to have that call two weeks from now, pending availability of everybody. But with limited travel, it seems to be easier to find times that work for everybody, these days.

I did have a few potential questions. I haven't heard back on the FY21 community request for additional budget request funding, but I didn't

know if there was any information on that. It doesn't need to be on this call. I'm happy to get more on that later.

But other than that, we'll probably just be figuring out if we should try to figure out if it's going to be in-person or virtual because there is the possibility that things in the fall may be canceled, as well, and we're dealing with similar dilemmas for the planning of the IGF USA, which is in July, and trying to ... So much is uncertain right now. Things are pretty much closed down for the next month, but who knows if they'll get extended after that?

So, not too much of an update but I'm interested to hear about, as we proceed, how others that are planning conferences, and especially what ICANN is doing around, obviously, when it comes time to consider the fall meeting and any related travel. It'll be good to see what direction people are trending in. But that's pretty much all I have for the moment.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, Dustin. Any questions for Dustin on NASIG? If not, Judith, take the next three items.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. Okay. So, the next three items are NARALO discretionary funds, the CROP, and the elections. So, on the NARALO ... I'll do the CROP first because it's very simple.

CROP. ICANN is still banning travel. As a result, even if we did find an event that was happening in June, we likely could not get to it because,

unless we hear by the end of April that ICANN is allowing travel again, then we can even use the CROP to fund it.

Also, the funding for that year, and maybe León can answer that question later on, is that we lose the funding. We start from scratch again next year, where all the events are pushed forward. And so, there will be hundreds of events and we will only still have three slots. But maybe León can answer that later, on whether we're going to roll over that money or whether new money will be issued, whether CROP will be doubled. Who knows? But León, your hand is up, so maybe ...?

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Yes, Judith. Thank you. So, I don't have a definitive answer at this point. My feeling is that there will be no rollover, but I can't tell for sure. So, I guess when the time comes for commenting on the budget for next year, it will be very useful that you raised these concerns and these proposals. But as we speak, I don't have a definitive answer for you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Right. Thanks so much, though, León. So, we also probably will only get our three slots and that will be difficult, to choose slots, because we won't get extra slots. But hopefully, that will be answered. So, that is the CROP issue.

Discretionary funds. Okay. I wanted to remind everyone about the rules on discretionary funds. One is that, if you have an idea, please run it through Eduardo and I to make sure it's a good idea. Then, we'll direct you to a form. The form needs to be filled out. And hopefully, staff has

fixed the form so, now that Eduardo, and I, and staff will receive a copy of the form, as well as the person who filled out the form.

Then, once that is approved, and we see it, and then we approve that, staff will approve it, as well. And then, after staff approves it, you can make your purchase.

But we do have a significant amount of funds left for the next year. One idea I had which I haven't put forward yet is that I'm thinking, out of all the stuff we would love to get, I would like to get more tabletop banners, which are easy to transport, and we don't have to ship around, and they're not very expensive.

I did find some but it's like \$200 each, or something like that, plus tax, so it's pretty cheap, or maybe \$200 for a couple of them. I forgot what it was. But we need the artwork. But anyone who has different ideas of what we could use within the RALO only. Not cross-RALO. Cross-RALO events are very complicated. But within the RALO, please let us know. And then, I'll ask Heidi or staff. Do you know, is the form fixed so that Eduardo and I, as well as the person who filled it out, will get a copy of the form? Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi. Thank you, Judith. So, I thought that the fixing was only to make sure that the staff actually get a ping, versus having to go to the form and see if someone has submitted a request. What we normally do is we ...

Again, as you noted, the process is where, if you are interested in making a request, you first go through your regional leadership. And then, if they

think the idea or the event is a good event to go to, or the resource is a good resource to purchase, then you go ahead and fill in the request.

Staff normally always send the request form to the leadership, anyway, so that process, regardless of whether that form is actually sent to the regional leadership, you'll have it before any decision is made. So, I wanted to state that.

Regarding the tabletops, Claudia is telling me that NARALO ordered only one. Just to let you know, other RALOs ordered a lot more than that, so that might be a useful product to have. They are less than \$200. So, that is something that you may wish to consider with your remaining funds for this fiscal year.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes, Heidi. Thanks so much. No, I think the idea was also, just like when we do the RGT forms, the participant who fills out the form gets a copy of the form back to them, and that's also what we want as an action item—make sure if you can put that as an action item—so that the participant filling out the form gets a copy of the form back to them. Heidi? Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Sorry. I will look into that. Thank you for making that an action item, Silvia. Again, the rules for the RALO discretionary funding are within the regional leadership. So, a single RALO would need to take that request for discussion to the regional leadership meeting, rather than making a unilateral request for that.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: We haven't had a regional leadership meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, but there is one next week. So, that's why, if you do the survey, that will be your best chance.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: If we have it next week, I will raise it. So, that's it. Okay. Yeah, the tabletops are a great idea. I was looking at three of them and distributing around the region. Maybe we could even store, since they're so small, one in DC, in the ICANN office in DC, and one in L.A., or something like that. It would be easier because they're very small and they don't take up much space. Okay.

So, next item on the list is the elections. So, the process has begun. Everyone should have gotten an e-mail about the elections. Nominations started earlier this week and they continue for 30 days. The election page can be found—let me just copy it—here. I'm just posting it in the chat. And so, already you'll see the roles and you'll see that some members ...

So, it's like Marita has already posted her statement of interest, as well as Glenn McKnight, and Eduardo is also still interested in continuing. But we welcome everyone to put in their statement of interest. It will close 30 days from Tuesday.

We will then have a call of the candidates so that members can hear from the candidates and we'll have a series of questions and answers. But

that's all we have. So, that will happen then. Glenn will just brief us on NomCom and what that will be, but that is the election things. Marita, you have your hand up.

MARITA MOLL: It's not on elections, Judith, so go ahead and finish it.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Oh, okay. Sorry. And so, that's, basically, [inaudible] about it. If anyone has any questions on elections, please let us know. Our RALO has different rules than others, so that's sort of why I wanted to make it clear. But if you have any questions, I just posted the thing in the chat, so let me know. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Judith. Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Eduardo. There's something developing on the chat. I'm getting a little confused, here. There is a meeting tomorrow of the finance committee, or the newly reorganized finance committee. If you're on this list, you won't get a notice about it because the notice is not generally circulated. Jonathan, maybe you can clarify this. I don't think the changed committee is yet set up so that people can actually go into that meeting tomorrow, that we're in an interim period. Can someone clarify that [cross talk]?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: You are 100% correct, just as I was trying to tell about earlier in the meeting. The meeting has gone out. The only thing we're really discussing tomorrow is the travel policy. Oh, I did it on the ALS, I didn't do it here. So, sorry. I've done so many different calls, I didn't mention it. Yeah.

So, having a meeting of this new finance committee, meeting tomorrow, and it's at 1800 UTC. If Heidi can post the thing in the chat? It is pretty much open to everyone, but yes, it only went out on the finance and budget list. Maybe Heidi can answer that question. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Thank you, Judith. Yes, we'll go ahead and post that in just a moment. This call is an interim call. The first item and the longest item on this agenda tomorrow will be a discussion on a draft set of comments for the new revised type of group that is being planned. So, that'll be your chance to comment on that.

And then, following that and the results of those discussions, a new type of group will likely be formed. So, please do join that. Again, staff always note upcoming calls on the At-Large Skype chat. So, even if you're not on the FBSC mailing list, you will see that on the Skype chat. Thank you very much. I'll put that link in.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Heidi, thanks so much. Because this is a new call, is it possible to send it out on the CPWG list, to encourage people from the CPWG to sign up to this new list? Maybe we could put that ...

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. So, Judith, I'm happy to do that. But again, this is really for a review from the current members and participants to add their comments so anybody can join. And then, following the results of that, and possibly up to the ALAC, then we can start inviting the CPWG members and everyone else formally. But for the most part, yeah, we can get that out to, maybe, the ALAC announce list as well, just to make sure people are aware of that.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

I would really like that because I want to give the ... It was moved over to the finance because these are administrative and not policy comments, the governing comments and other types of comments. But they're very important and we want to encourage as many of our people to come and make these comments and comment on these documents. They are governance policy or other types of policy.

And so, that's why we moved it to this other mechanism. But it really should be, I think, open to all, and I really encourage others, like Marita and others, to be able to be sent out. And that's why I'm suggesting it be sent out on the CPWG list. But Marita, do you have any other comments? Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Marita, you have—

MARITA MOLL:

Yeah. Yes, Judith, I would second that. If we're going to have a discussion about setting up a new group, current discussion has already gone on with some discussion on the CPWG.

It was not an open call for people to come to the meetings and, I mean, that's a very limited discussion that's going to happen tomorrow. There is some asynchronicity in this process that I'm not quite getting. Anyways, I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Okay. Well, thank you. Judith, thank you so much. The conversation will eventually ... Like Heidi says, there will be a future call with this group will change whatever it's going to change. So, thank you, Judith, for the update. Glenn, you can give us an update briefly about the NomCom?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Sure. Hi, everybody. We're into the soft-dive stage. It's actually the graphic supplied by NomCom is a little off. Actually, we're going to be doing this evaluation for probably the most of April. We started it a little bit later so we did not have a face-to-face in April. It was canceled, so it's a bit tough to do all the evaluations.

We shortlisted down the 75 in our board lists. We haven't touched the other ones, yet. So, we are plowing through them. It's a very long process. We have two other three-hour meetings, each, this week. But, all the ALAC/At-Large members, all five of us are dedicated, so we're putting the time in. We're all given the task to evaluate individuals and we have great candidates.

I think there were two firms that were hard to do outreach, and particularly to developing countries. They did a great job finding fantastic candidates. So, I could tell you the list is great and that we're finding it's a great team to work with. So, I think it has been quite successful. And that's it, if there are any questions.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Any questions for Glenn? Thank you so much, Glenn, for the brief update. The next item is with Joe from the GSE. He doesn't have anything new in the calendar but if you have any questions for Joe, just put in the chat and he will answer any questions there. I'm just aware we're almost at the top of the hour and I have León to tell us what the additional business is. So, León.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thank you, Eduardo. I just wanted to make everyone aware, if you are not already aware of it, that there is a public comment sort of request on the PIR transaction and the proposed public interest commitments. There was a blog posted on April 8th. In this blog post, the revised public interest commitment sent by Ethos Capital were published. Org and the board are requesting that you please comment on those published PICs so that we can, of course, continue to evaluate these PICs.

As the blog post clearly states, the ICANN Board continues to have reservations regarding the enforceability of PIR's proposed PICs, so this is an important process.

Why seven days and not 30, as per our usual custom, is because we have a deadline in which we need to take action and make a decision which is, as of now, April the 20th. So, we are continuing to evaluate this transaction. There is nothing said, at this point, and it is important that you kindly provide us with this feedback.

The second issue that I wanted to comment on is that there has been another document published, which is the update from the office of the ombudsman. I think it's important that you get familiar with this document. There is also a blog post on the ICANN website, so you can read about this report on this blog post. It's published there.

And the third last-but-not-least issue, if you are not already aware, is that the meeting for Kuala Lumpur has been decided to be virtual in the same fashion we did with Cancún for ICANN67. The board decided that we would go virtual with the Kuala Lumpur meeting, so we will, of course, not be meeting face-to-face in Kuala Lumpur.

And of course, we'll look forward to try to go back to Kuala Lumpur in the future for another ICANN meeting. But as it stands with this pandemic on COVID-19, of course, it was felt that the right decision was to go virtual, as we did with ICANN67. And I think that that has shown that it was the right decision and we believe that it is the right decision to make this time, again.

On Hamburg, we don't know what's going to happen. Of course, it is too soon to tell. We are far from making a decision on Hamburg but I will keep you posted and updated as events [fold]. So, those are the three updates

that I wanted to provide. Eduardo, thank you very much. I remain in the call if you have any questions or comments.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Muchas gracias, León. Alfredo, you have your hand up.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Yes. This is a question for León. I was looking at the upcoming meetings and I noticed that the community meeting that was settled for 2022 San Juan, Puerto Rico, is not there anymore. Does that mean that the meeting committee is evaluating the cycle of the meetings again? Thank you.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thank you, Alfredo. This is the first notice that I get so I need to check with the meetings team. We as a board have not made any evaluation on rehashing the cadence of the regions for our future meetings. But it will certainly come to us if it is, in fact, something that is being considered. So, I don't have an answer for you at this point but I will look into it.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I know we are at the top of the hour but, Judith, be brief so we can close the meeting.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks. Yes, this is brief. So, León, what did the meetings team mean when they said it would be a different ICANN68? Because with that

virtual Cancún, they were able to do it all from L.A., but not they're not.
What do they mean by that?

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

So, the meetings team is still evaluating how they are going to set up this meeting. I mean, of course, it will be virtual, but there are certain factors that need to be decided along with the community like, for example, which time zone are we going to use?

I have been told, and the board has been informed, that there are meetings going on with community leaders so that, in those calls, in those meetings, they can decide. When I say "they," I mean the community. The community can decide on these specific topics, which would, of course, impact the way we set up the virtual meeting for ICANN68.

So, at this point, there is no definitive plan that we can share with you. Again, I am aware that it is being shaped by the community along with Org, and once we have a definitive plan, of course, it will be shared with you all.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Your dog, León. It's calling you.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Yeah, the dog is going crazy. Sorry for that.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Okay. Well, I'm going to adjourn this meeting. Thank you, León, for the information updating on the board's decisions. I hope to see you in a month. Remember, we can continue any conversations offline. Thank you so much for being here today. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]