
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group call on Wednesday the 13th of January 2021 at 17:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel, we have Holly Raiche, Vanda Scartezini, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Judith Hellerstein, Justine Chew, Marita Moll, Maureen Hilyard, Nadira AlArj, Raymond Mamattah, Ricardo Holmquist and Sébastien Bachollet. On the French channel, we have Aziz Hilali.

We have received apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Joanna Kulesza and Satish Babu.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogan and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management.

Our Spanish interpreters for today are Paula and David, and our French interpreters are Camila and Isabelle. A friendly reminder that we also have RTT services, and I am putting a link in the chat so you may follow along if you'd like. Please keep your microphone muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise and please state your name when taking the floor for transcription purposes and also so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels.

Thank you very much, and with this, I turn the call over to you, Holly.

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.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Claudia. Welcome, everyone. Let's start with the aim of today's call. It's got two particular aims. One is the beginning of that discussion on the operating and financial plan and draft fiscal year 22 operating plan and budget. The other is to hear from Cheryl, and that's to look at some of the further discussion on the subgroup workspace. So it's really items four and six particularly. Other than that, those are the two main items and both of them are very interesting and I think we have some good discussion.

Let's now move to a review of the action items, please, all of which are complete. So, thank you. And let's move to the next agenda item, please, which is review of the operating and financial plan and draft fiscal year 22 operating plan and budget. We have comments from people. I understand the workspace and the Google docs have not started, but there has been some discussion on the list, and we've had discussion from Judith, Ricardo and Marita. So why don't we start with actually Ricardo, and then Marita, and then Judith, and then open it up to discussion so that we can start ideas and start developing our response to the financial plan and operating plan and budget. So Ricardo, do you want to start with some of your comments that you've been making on the list? Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST:

Hello, Holly. Yes. I have some concerns about some of the documents there. Although I understand our comments should be for fiscal year 22 budget and operating plan and fiscal year 22 to 26 operating and financial plan, I have concern the budget is very comprehensive, it has a lot of documents, and those include some of the things we have asked

last year, like adjustment by inflation in the salaries and some of the cost of ICANN, because in some places, inflation is 1-2% and you might call this irrelevant, but in some places where ICANN offices are, places like Turkey and Uruguay, it's 9-10%. So that's not that irrelevant.

And also, that includes some funding, how the funding is going to be made, and it's very nice. Those give you an idea of what's the forecast they have for the next five years. I was waiting for the webinar from Finance to hear more or less what's going on and also the questions from some of the participants. I was happy to see, at least in my webinar, one of our At-Large members, Alfredo Calderon was very active in the meeting. But he's not here in this meeting, so maybe we can ask him to join us in [this, because he] was very active yesterday.

I have one concern about the funds that are there. I already asked ICANN about these funds, especially the new gTLD funds that they are handling, because there are some inconsistencies, in my view, with the funding. There is also some inconsistency—again, in my view—with the reserve funds because they told us about six months ago that they have completed the reserve fund and now we found out that it's about \$20 million left at the annual budget, so it's not complete yet. And then in my particular view, with if you have a mandate from the Board to replenish to the reserve fund through the one budget, it should be like that, and not to have numbers—for me, if you're going from 140 to 135, it means you have to reserve these 5 million and not 1.5, 3, next year it's maybe 8 and these kind of increases or decreases. It must be a fixed number. But that's what is in there.

And the last concern I have so far is in the budget, there is something called operating initiatives. There are 15 operating initiatives. What was mentioned yesterday is that there's some money placed for these initiatives in some of them, because some things are already in the budget, some are not. but I think it's a message that ICANN is sending when you say "I'm going to spend \$5 million or 2 million in the next five years for IDN." For me, sounds like a small amount if you develop universal acceptance- or IDNs and just got 2 million for that. For me, it sounds like very small amount. Also for the total operating [initiative,] it's [24.5 in five years,] so it's less than 5 million by the year. One of the biggest ones is multi-stakeholder model, and it's about 4.8 which is about a million a year in multi-stakeholder model.

Although it's explained how this is going to be expanded, for me, it sounded like a small amount when you're saying these are the operational initiatives that we want to complete in order to fulfill our strategic plan for fiscal year 21 to 25. That was the original strategic plan. And then you're only putting 25 million out of 750. It really sounds like a small budget for that. These are more or less my major concerns on there. I just look at the numbers, as I usually do. I didn't look at the initiatives that they have, because I don't know how to look at this. [inaudible] some of them concern to us, but maybe not the [appropriate] ones to look at them. Thank you very much, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Cheryl, go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Holly. Ricardo, I appreciate your analysis of the numbers, as always. I'm unconvinced of the degree of concern on some of the issues, and on some of them, I actually don't agree with you at all. So, Holly, how do we go through what I think is a very detailed and useful analysis and either discuss, or in my case, counterpoint some of the specifics? Are you going to have this put into a table and ask us to comment on an item by item basis? What is your plan?

HOLLY RAICHE: Could I talk about my plan after I've heard from both Marita and Judith? Because at this stage, we're just gathering comments. But I think as Cheryl mentioned—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure, but I don't want to spend the next hour giving my comments. So [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: No, I would expect that there would be a Google doc, and this is s that that—Evin, could we have a Google doc where we can have comments made? And I would expect that Ricardo would be putting in his comments. Judith—

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: We already have one. Claudia set one up.

HOLLY RAICHE: Good. Okay. Well, I didn't have a chance yesterday to see that. And have we enabled people to comment in the Google doc? Claudia?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: It was Evin. Sorry, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Oh, sorry.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: And so far, it's only Judith, Marita, Ricardo, Maureen and Holly that can put something in there. But yes, that's a decision from Holly who can write or comment in the Google doc.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Thank you, Ricardo. Does that answer your question, Cheryl? Well, the Google doc is for the statement, Heidi, but what I would hope is the Google doc will allow people to make comments.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fine, Holly. I'll come back on the queue. Not a problem.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Marita?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I thought you wanted me to go.

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, I don't care. Judith, you're desperate to go, so let's go ahead.
Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I also took a look at the Google doc, and I do like that Ricardo mentioned a couple of my points already, that they filled in a lot of points in salaries and inflation and others. And also, what I thought, what I learned at the meeting is that some items were left out of the budget purposely because the Board has maybe not approved it or they're not finalizing it. Like they said they left out information on SubPro and auction proceeds from there because they're not approved yet so they're not moving to the next phase.

So then my question would be, if they're left out, then what if they're approved mid-season? How are they then factored into the budget? Because if they're not in there now, as I understood, so they would be then added later? Also, he said the reason why there was a larger contribution—I thought he said—to the reserve fund is that there was a lot of extra money left over because of travel, and since the expenses were not paid, there was no expenses so there was more money left over, and they can't move it to the next year, so all they could do is put it in the reserve. Which I don't really understand. I thought you could have sort of a rainy day fund that you could move to next year, but apparently, we can't.

So that was some of my issues. And I did think it was a lot more clarity where they explained all the budgets and they explained the different parts of the budget. And I really liked the new glossary they added. I thought that was very helpful. Although it's a huge document, I think it's very easy to go to your parts that you're interested in. And I would encourage people to listen to the webinar because they go through where the sections are and what you're looking at, and also explain all the annexes.

But I think I'm not as concerned with some of the other travel issues because we just don't know if we're going to travel or not. They're expecting by 2022 that we'll be fully confident, fully off COVID and that we're going to go. But I think those are my main comments on that.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Judith. Yes, certainly, that's what I got out of the presentation. Before we have a general discussion which will be very useful—and we can have a bit of time on that—Marita, you also had some comments on the list. Did you attend one of the webinars?

MARITA MOLL:

Hi Holly. Yes, I did attend it. It was really interesting.. On Judith's point about the stuff that was not in the budget per se, they were showing a different stream, for especially auction proceeds in particular that that money was coming out of a different stream. So it's not that the money wasn't there, it's just they had separated it from the main budget.

And Ricardo noted that Alfredo was there and he did ask some very interesting questions, one of which is, why is the NARALO meeting in Puerto Rico costing \$40,000 and the LACRALO meeting in Puerto Rico costing \$120,000? Or something like that. And kind of caught the team by surprise. I thought, woah, good for you. They're actually going to get back to him and come up with an explanation for—or change it. So really good catch on his part.

For my part, I asked a question about who was involved in making the projection—be involved in the process that makes the projection, the sort of strategic outlook team. Ricardo pointed out that this is one of the supporting documents to the budget. [There's nothing for us to comment on.] But he said there were [368] people involved in 21 sessions. So I asked a little bit about who was involved, but I didn't get a good answer. I went back and looked at the document and it's kind of 80% staff and 20% community. I think Maureen is going to ask some questions about where—how is the community reflected in this, because I think it's important that we're actually involved in those strategic assumption-making exercises.

So we might want to—I don't think there's anything wrong with putting a sentence in our response to the budget saying we think we should maybe have a larger part in that particular exercise. That's one thing I thought we could put in, although it's a little bit coloring outside the lines.

For me, Ricardo's looking at the numbers, I've been very much digging into the weeds about what's being said with respect to the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model. I don't have a particular issue with the

numbers there that they're proposing. It could be switched around a little bit, little more at the beginning, little more at the end. I think that's what we suggested last time. But it's really, to me, about asking them more about the process that they're proposing, how do they propose to evaluate progress on these things? How do we know what's going on? Is there any mechanism or tool by which we can evaluate whether or not we're moving ahead on these things? So that's kind of what I would like to focus on, at least for the beginning of this. We have quite a bit of time, we have about a month. But I'm at the moment preparing some comments just addressing the multi-stakeholder part of this. And I'll leave it there.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Marita. Marita, based on your comments and based on yesterday's discussion, the webinar, I think what you're saying—and I think I agree with it—is perhaps there are two parts to our response. One would be simply the numbers, how they get the numbers and some of the issues that are raised by Ricardo and Judith. The other is the strategic plan, and the operating initiatives. And I think it makes sense, if we look at the operating initiatives, particularly the ones that have been discussed by ALAC.

The ones I was particularly thinking about would be things like the improvement of the DNS ecosystem, the MSM, the multi-stakeholder model, evolving and strengthening community decision making—because we have certainly discussed that—and then the development of internal and external ethics policies. I've never seen that before. I

have no idea what that is. But I would suggest that's something we're interested in. And finally, universal acceptance.

So I suggest, Marita, it may be an idea to particularly focus on the operating initiatives that are of particular concern, and I would invite others to comment, to have a look at the operating initiatives in that overview document and to ask questions, how do we participate in the development of those and contribute to those, because those are the things that actually wind up gathering some budget or not. and then the process of that, the numbers that Ricardo looked at, that was for the document that exists, but in future documents, I think the point that you made in your comments—which is a good one—is that we should be involved in the discussions that particularly impact on our own operating initiatives.

At this point, are there other comments? And Cheryl, your hand is up. Go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Yes. Just at a very superficial level, a couple of things that I wanted to discuss and make sure we don't just pass through and become enshrined in a comment because we haven't all gone into and discussed it here. The first is, I guess, one of terminology. When I hear the word "irregularity" associated with budget numbers, that is a red flag for me. So unless you are intending to red flag—and by red flag, I'm talking at complaint and action to follow level—I would avoid using what I think is highly specific—very useful, but dare I say can be inflammatory—terms like "irregularities," which may be too easy to slip

through to a document. I just want us to be clever and cautious in what we say. If we're concerned about something, I'm not sure that that necessarily goes to the specificity of what the terminology "irregularity" means, at least to me. So I did want to point that out, and that term was used, I think I might have counted seven times whilst Ricardo was presenting his detailed analysis.

And that, Holly, is what prompted me to put my hand up the first time because I've wanted to ensure that we can go through each of those very useful points he—and now others—have raised, although some others have already countered some of those without just basically letting some of this go through to the paper, which is what all too often happens in the development of statements.

Now, a couple of things then. You pointed out—thanks, Judith and Marita—about the separate sources which are—I think that makes sense. I am not concerned about that as long as the funding and support is there and the proper accountability and transparency is associated with it, things like the subsequent procedures funding and the auction proceeds, etc. are handled in that way. So I immediately would be not as concerned, which is what I also said, as Ricardo is by just a numbers analysis on a number of things. They are certainly an example.

And the other thing was, with the contingency fund, the necessity to have, wherever possible, at least one year's operation in the financial supply cupboard. The second—and that's what Judith referred to—session did make very clear that that was outside of what is the standard finance and budget process for ICANN at the moment. We can certainly say, as Judith would have been suggesting, that she doesn't

see why for example excess funds or residual funds from for example savings in travel could not be applied to the following year where in fact the current ICANN mechanism does not allow that to be the case, and so that would go in to actually top up and in fact increase the reserve fund beyond its minimum amount.

We can say that again, but that's not actually a budget and finance cycle issue, that's a budget and finance management at the Board working group level issue. So us actually making that comment in response to this document won't have the same power as raising that as a point when the ALAC is talking to the Board.

So I just wanted to make sure that we're putting our points forward to the most effective places as well. And you might want to separate some of those things out in this exercise, particularly because this is the beginning of a five-year strategic planning piece of work. We have had some shift and change for the good where we can have some carryover planning, etc., so things do change, I'm not saying we can't get them changed, though I don't think they necessarily get changed by public commentary at this point for all of the issues we're interested in.

That'll do from a superficial level from me at this stage. Thanks, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Cheryl. And I think, to pick up on Cheryl's point, there are comments on the documents themselves. We need to distinguish between comments on the documents themselves, comments that are things we can make to the Board, and Marita, to pick up your point, comments about how we participate in particularly discussion on the

strategic issues, how the operating initiatives are developed, so that we can talk about the general things about operating initiatives and the ones that concern ALAC, and then some of the monetary stuff as well, which is terrific.

So from here, if there are no further comments, I would suggest that everybody on this call read the documents, in particular if you're interested in the strategic framework, start with the operating initiatives and then go through and see how the expenditure is allocated, and perhaps pick up some of the points that Judith was making, and was making in the webinar.

I would note also that the link to the webinars is in chat. And Evin, could we, after this, also send around a link to the webinars to everyone on this call so that if they were not able to attend either of the webinars, that they can have access to the recordings? That would be very useful. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Yeah. I think Claudia's got it on the screen. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

That's good. And if we can send it around so that if people aren't on this call, they would nevertheless have an opportunity to listen to the webinars and comment. Okay. if there are no further comments, could we go back to the agenda, please? Thank you.

We've looked at and had comments from Marita and Ricardo and Judith. Thank you very much. And some discussion. And the next steps

will be a Google doc—Judith makes a very good point. The best way to comment for people just using mobiles will be Google docs. So, Evin and/or Claudia, could somebody set up a Google doc? And it's important that people have access. Ricardo was saying earlier there was limited access to that Google doc which has been established already. If we could expand the access for people so that they can start making comments, I would be very grateful. Thank you. And just a reminder, public comment closes on 15 February, so we do have an opportunity to discuss these issues, but it would be a very good thing if people start reading because they are extensive documents, getting your head around them. and I would expect we would spend more time discussing the document at the next meeting.

That brings us to agenda item six. This is recommendation prioritization, and it's on the prioritization subgroup workspace. Cheryl, if you'd like to go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It'll be my pleasure. Thank you, Holly. To begin with—and I do hope you'll all take the time of visiting the workspace and having a look at where we're at in terms of status and comments on the spreadsheets there, and noting that at this stage, our focus is on the Work Stream 2 recommendation prioritization. And we have not convened since the end of the calendar year and my last report, but I do want to perhaps just remind you of what we're doing and how we've gone to date, and ask a question of you all.

So first of all, let's give you the good news. And it is quite a bit of good news, actually. The good news is that at least in the session I attended from the finance part of ICANN, they certainly made very clear that funding for the implementation of the Work Stream 2 recommendations was specifically earmarked and will be being provided for. So from a strategic point of view, that is good. It is also useful because it would therefore appear that there is no budgetary impediment to what we believed would be the case, and that is the ongoing and continued implementation of the Work Stream 2 recommendations—and they are numerous—over the coming three to five years. I'm assuming some of them have already been completed and some are near completion as well, because this has been going on for at least 12 months.

So that's good news for modern man, certainly in ICANN at least, but it's interesting, those of us in the shepherding of the Work Stream 2 Implementation Review Team have not had a meeting with ICANN Org for some time now, and we would expect that the reasoning there is until this budget, it is in fact an approved budget, the first year of it—so the five-year strategic plan and the first year of the budget cycle, is approved, that the next degree of expenditure on those recommendations will be not paused but be primed, ready to run at that point. So we will assume that we will also be able to come back to our community with more information once we have that. Anyway, what that means is the money should be there regardless of what order we prioritize them in.

Going to that order, then—and this is what we've done in our spreadsheet, just as a reminder for you all—we have listed from the end

user perspective what we believe are the running order, the order of service, so to speak, of the Work Stream 2 priorities. There's 54 lines in our spreadsheet, if memory serves me.

One of the things I would like to have you instruct us on, however, is how you—and eventually Maureen and whoever is in the room and around the table arguing the point with the other ACs and SOs—what is the most useful mechanism for giving you this data. A whole lot of words is not going to be helpful. We suspect that something as simple as a first, second, third and fourth type line will also not be as helpful as giving you perhaps a three-part response.

So we show you whether or not in the opinion of the At-Large community, that we would be ranking these priorities from that perspective, from the end user perspective, as high, medium or low, or that could be numeral, one, two or three, or A, B and C—we want that feedback from you all—and also, in addition to that, give two more levels of information, and that is how great an effort we think it is—in other words, this is one of those very large, over several years, and complicated tasks, and whether or not we think there is an extreme or urgent nature to it.

So what we would be looking at—and what I'll do is put an example or a few in the chat. So you might, for example, end up with a ranking that looks like one-three-two, meaning that whilst we think it is a first or most top of line priority, we think it is a simple and quite uncomplicated activity, and we don't see any incredible urgency, it is however of moderate importance. So that would be what we would be saying if we

were to give you a one-three-two rating, but it could just as easily have been an A-C-B rating.

So if you see what we're asking, you tell us, and we will take that into account in our next step and come back with a more fulsome report at our next meeting there, Holly. Sébastien and a few of us who've been working on this on the call, before you take the reins, it would be excellent to hear any more from them as well.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. Do we have comments from Sébastien or anyone else involved in this task? Okay. If not, Cheryl, are you—

[EVIN ERDOGDU:] We have Alan.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm just going to make a nitpicking comment that my preference, instead of using one-two-three, A-B-C, would be using some very short terms that have meaning in the context. So the middle one might be easy, hard, moderate or something like that, just so when you look at it, you don't have to do a table lookup to see what each of the items is, and is three very easy or very hard? These aren't intuitively obvious to

someone else looking at it who isn't the one doing all the rankings. So just a consideration. I'm not going to make a big fuss over it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alan. I was actually thinking along those lines. So it becomes urgent-desirable-whatever.

ALAN GREENBERG: Keep them short, whatever you do.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, if in the chat or in the next day or so, you'd like to suggest three terms for—remember there are three categories we've got. We've got the topline, whether it's priority, whether it's simple to do, and whether it's urgent.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll do words. Leave it to us.

HOLLY RAICHE: Words would be very helpful on that one. Thank you for the suggestion. Do we have any further comments on that? Okay. Cheryl, how are people going to comment? I trust there is a space for people to review and make comments, if there is a table that people can just simply fill in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, the subteam has already made its comments, so that work is done and was done before the end of the calendar year. What we're suggesting is that we create now—with words—the table that will give this group the clarity on what our recommendations are. and as I also mentioned previously, we are going to be effectively bundling several of these subsections of Work Stream 2 in with what we believe will now be superseding other activities, such as some of these things will be picked up or scooped up when the implementation starts on the ATRT3 recommendations. And we've already made those assessments in the document.

So the report and presentation you will get at whatever meeting you want to have it as an agenda item on, one would assume the next one—or perhaps the one after that, no later than—would give you what the topic is. We can certainly show you what the comments or prioritization conversation was. But what we will give you in the third column—which is the critical one—is three words that will give you the specificity of how high in the priority ranking we believe it is from an At-Large perspective, what is our predictive level of effort that we believe will need to be put into it, and also what is, again from the At-Large perspective, any sense of urgency. And that will be done, as requested, in simple words.

So, once you have that in your agenda and at your meeting, you can do with it as you wish.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl. So we're looking forward to that. Should we leave some space in the next meeting to review that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. I would suggest it takes at least 20 to 25, if not a full 30-odd minutes for that activity. It is a significant activity and it's an activity that, with this group's understanding and endorsement, would empower whoever is sitting at the table debating those points to have that material in hand and perhaps adjusting where things fall in the scheme of things, but at least with the additional good news that it should not be an argument over the availability of funding, but rather, the how, the when and the how complicated in the opinion of the other ACs and SOs.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. We look forward to that. Now, Maureen, you are the next item, and it's review of the ABRs. And by the way, I hope people have noticed that there's a new deadline for the ABRs, and that's 18 January, if people didn't see that in the e-mails. Maureen, go ahead, please.

MUAREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Holly. Yes, we've been rather slow getting the applications in, and I must admit I have been rather tardy myself. But [we've still got two applications in so far,] and it's one of the reasons why [inaudible] we decided to extend it, because I understand AFRALO is having a meeting on this particular issue on the 14th, which was after our

earliest closing time. So it was extended out. We just want all the RALOs to use this extra time to put their requests in. And at least we can talk about it. The Finance and Budget Subcommittee can discuss it and make some recommendations perhaps, give a little bit of extra time for people to make their suggestions.

And I understand that because there's a lot of uncertainty about what is going to be happening later on in the year, do they really need to go to the extent of making—what is required is quite a comprehensive expectation of completing the application form, [especially compared] with other sections. And I can appreciate that people are wondering whether it's going to be worth going to all that trouble when it's going to be virtual anyway.

So let's [look] positively, put in the application, concept note at this stage is accepted, just to get an idea, is it possible that this application may be a reality? But at least it would give us something to talk about. At the moment, we're looking at two applications that are—well, Judith's one in regards to the expansion of the current RTT from English to include other languages is something that we've been pushing for ages, and we're putting it in again. And I don't think there's anything wrong with that. So that's where we're up to at the moment, and I'm just encouraging everybody, all the RALO reps to encourage your teams to get something in so that if there's not many others putting in theirs, we might be able to sneak a few more in. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Maureen. DO we need to discuss further the ABR issue in this meeting?

MUAREEN HILYARD: I don't think so, because we want to get more applications in. The FBSC will be the ones who actually will do most of the discussion once we—and then we can bring it back to the OFB.

HOLLY RAICHE: All right. Should there be an e-mail going out to everyone reminding them about ABRs?

MUAREEN HILYARD: There has been an e-mail that's gone out, yes. And Sébastien's got his hand up.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Sébastien, go ahead, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Just to inform you all, we had a EURALO Board meeting yesterday and we took some decisions. The first one is that Ricardo Holmquist will be a member of the other finance group. I always can't remember what is the name, BFC, because I want to share the load, therefore, the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, EURALO will be represented by Ricardo now going on.

The second point about ABR, it's not too much about what's in the future but what's in the past, because there's one link with the general assembly of EURALO who is supposed to take place this year during the EuroDIG meeting in June—that means in this fiscal year—but if for any type of reason—and you know some of them—this meeting is not happening there, we will have to postpone it to the next fiscal year and we will have to postpone the budget for the general assembly, but we will have also to ask for a postponement of the ABR who was [inaudible] to EURALO for this year. Therefore, it's one point I wanted to raise with you.

And if for those reasons we're not going to have the general assembly in June this year, we are planning to discuss whether we have it during the IGF in Katowice in Poland at the end of this calendar year, and if not, if we postpone it one year at the general assembly to the EuroDIG in June 22. That was the three points I wanted to raise with you. The last one is that we're working to make some proposals about ABRs. I hope that it will be ready for the 18th. It's at least what we are trying to do. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Good. Thank you, Sébastien. Are there any other comments or questions?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Heidi, go ahead, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a really quick—I've been working with Maureen and Sébastien as well as internally about the EURALO GA situation. Very much hope that it will be face-to-face in June, but as Sébastien noted, if it is the case that it does need to be moved to fiscal year 22, the best way to do that would be within the ALAC comment on fiscal year 22 draft budget. So I will be preparing some text to add to that budget.

And the ABR for the training, this was an extra day for the EURALO members. even though that wasn't an additional budget request, we're going to include that into the request for the movement into fiscal year 22 so there's no need for an ABR on that point. And I'll be in touch with Ricardo, Marita and Judith on the text that will be included in the comment. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Thank you very much. It's a good way forward for comments on the fiscal year budget as well. Okay. Are there any—Seun, go ahead, please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. Sorry for coming late. I just wanted to flag that AFRALO will be sending our own requests tomorrow. We're having a meeting tomorrow to finalize some of the requests that we have received. I hope there'll be time for that. I don't know whether this has already been mentioned, but I thought I should just flag that. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Just a reminder that the deadline has been moved, it's the 18th of January for ABRs. Judith, go ahead, please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: My question is I guess to either Sébastien or to Seun. I know there was some talk about putting in for the French transbot, and I was wondering if that's one of the ones in the record, on your proposal. And hopefully we can, because that's another thing we've been trying for years to get, now that the transbot for LACRALO is built, it'll be much easier to do a transbot for French. But we didn't get approved last year. Maybe, hopefully, we can get approved this year. So I was hoping if that was also on your plate for EURALO—for AFRALO. Thank you so much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Judith, why don't you discuss that with Seun? Thank you. Okay. Are there any further comments or questions? If not, I think we're down to the next meeting, and Heidi, I think you've already noted that for the next meeting, Cheryl was looking for about 25 minutes on the agenda. I think we also are going to spend the bulk of the time looking at any additional comments. And just a reminder, Heidi, if we could have the link sent out for people to make additional comments on the budget documents, and I expect that will take the rest of the time for the next meeting.

Now, Heidi, what would be the best time for the next meeting of this group? Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi. I believe the group meets every two weeks or so.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. Every two weeks.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So it's up to Cheryl. I would think that if next week, we could get a call [seven to ten days,] I believe, so WS2, then we could have this next call in two weeks. Claudia, is there a rotation for this call?

HOLLY RAICHE: No.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So that would put us into the week of the 25th, on the 27th, it looks like.

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl, is that enough time for the presentation that you're giving?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've asked in chat for the AI regarding the small team to have a Doodle put out for a meeting between seven and ten days from today's date, which will be before that meeting. So yes, not a problem at all.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Thank you. And a remember, everyone, please, there'll be a Google doc which has been established and we've already talked about giving other people access to make comments. Even though it's the 15th of February, in the next two weeks, please have a good look at those documents and add your comments which will be discussed at the next meeting. So, is there Any Other Business?

I don't see any hands. In that case, I can wish you all a good day, good morning or good evening. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye for now.

HOLLY RAICHE: Bye. Thank you everyone.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Bye everyone.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Bye everyone. Thank you for joining.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]