
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC monthly teleconference call on Tuesday the 24th of August 2021 at 16:00 UTC. On the call today on the English channel, we have Maureen Hilyard, Alfredo Calderon, Andrey Kolesnikov, Bill Jouris, Bram Fudzulani, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dave Kissoondoyal, Eli Khan, Erich Schweighofer, Joanna Kulesza, Jonathan Zuck.

Kafui Amamfu, Laxmi Prasad, León Sanchez, Lianna Galstyan, Marita Moll, Matthias Hudobnik, Pari Esfandiari, Priyatosh Jana, Raymond Mamattah, Roberto Gaetano, Satish Babu, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, Sébastien Bachollet, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Vrickson Acosta, and Yrjö Lansipuro. On the French channel we have Gabriel Bombambo Boseko and Imrane Souleymane.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Devan Reed, Carlos Reyes, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

We have received apologies from Evin Erdoğdu and Gisella Gruber from staff, Holly Raiche, and Daniel Nanghaka. We do have Spanish and French interpretation on today's call. Our Spanish interpreters are David and Veronica and our French interpreters are Aurélie and Camila.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name when taking the floor for the transcription purposes and also so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels. We also have real-time transcribing on today's call. I have just put the link in the chat so anyone can follow along if they'd like. Thank you all very much. With this, I turn the call over to you, Maureen.

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.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you so much, Claudia, and welcome, everyone. A special welcome to Cheryl. [Good while] I was talking to her this morning and, as well, in an e-mail last night at two o'clock in the morning for her. I'm very grateful that she has been able to get up in time for this special call. But we've got quite a full agenda today and special in respect to the fact that we have two sets of guest speakers to start our meeting off. Very pleased to the communications team with us today to talk about the ITI update and the new public comment submission process. So, we'll have that first.

And of course, then we have our regular guest but a very important one, of course: our very own At-Large Board director, León Sánchez. Glad to have you here, León, again. And then, we'll move on to reports, and that includes our policy reports as well as the liaison and working group reports, if there are any, before we move onto the final section of our meeting, which will of course be our any other business, but it very much involves our preparation for ICANN72. You know, who is doing what, when, and where, basically.

So, that's the agenda. If it doesn't seem very long when you're actually saying what's on ... But it's some very important stuff. So, what we will do: are there any comments or amendments to be made to the agenda? Does anyone have anything that they would like to add? I've just got to get my participant list up so I can see if you're in there. I don't see anyone. Great. Okay. Then let's get this show on the road. We will first look at the action items. All right. Okay. Okay. All right.

There was one from the last meeting when we had a discussion about the discussion about the new communications system that has been worked on by ICANN Org. We had a meeting and it was, yeah, to do with the metrics that we had assumed we might be able to get from the system. But we've had a meeting with Gisella, Heidi, and ... I've had a meeting with Gisella, Heidi, and Cheryl, and the issue is proving a little bit more complex than we first imagined.

So, this is still a work in progress but we will be prioritizing the full metrics issue and this is what we will work on. And we'll work around what we originally thought we would be able to do with the CRM. So, that's ... I don't suppose we can tick that off completely, apart from the fact that we have actually had a meeting, an initial meeting. Okay. So, moving on, then. Let's ... I'd like to introduce you to people you've probably ... I'm sure you will have been to the webinars that have been held with regards to the ITI, the information ... Was it information? Jana, tell me.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Information transparency Initiative.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Initiative. [inaudible] it's just 6:00 in the morning, probably not so clear. So, we've got Jana and Mike. And of course, we've had ... There has been a lot of discussion on our own list about the public comment submission process. So, Carlos will actually explain that a little bit more clearly. If you've got any questions or queries, prepare for them while

they're ... I'm sure they'll give you a bit of Q&A time at the end of it. But Jana, and Mike, and Carlos, the floor is yours.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

Thanks, Maureen, and thanks for giving us the opportunity this morning to talk about some of the work that we're doing on public comment and ITI. We're going to start with public comment. Our friend Carlos is here, as well, to go through some of the things that some of you may have seen in the demos that we've done to the community, and we have webinars available, as well, where we do the trainings that, if you didn't get a chance to see it live, you can access it recorded. And we'll show you the submission process, what the changes are.

So, I'm going to turn it over to my friend Carlos to talk about some of those things. I do want to mention that Tuesday is when the launch of public comment is happening, so obviously you'll see a blog coming out from David Olive. David will be sending a note to the SOAC leaders in advance and, obviously, we'll be promoting it on social media and on the homepage, letting folks know about the new, or, rather, the improved, public comment user experience. So, over to my friend Carlos.

CARLOS REYES:

Thanks, Jana. Hi, everyone. We've been working with the ITI team for two years, now, developing the new public comment feature. We worked very closely with focus groups. Cheryl Langdon-Orr was part of our focus groups. I think Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck. Maureen, I think you also sat in on some focus group sessions, to really

ensure that the new feature addresses some of the pain points with the user experience of the current system.

And these listening sessions were helpful to the team in building some of the new capabilities around search and the improved submission process. But also, this will benefit staff in the sense that it will provide the opportunity for targeted questions through guided forms. Some teams have been experimenting with this using Google Forms. But this helps structure the data that we receive and the feedback we receive via public comment. Of course, there will still be an option to upload comments through PDF, so that's still an option, there.

And then, at the end of the process, you'll be able to manage your submissions, your historic submissions, see a record of what submissions you have made, and also download the data from a proceeding. So, we're excited about a lot of these features. And as Jana mentioned, there have been a series of webinars, first to go over some of the user experience changes and improvements. And then, we also had a training specifically for the submission process.

Now, the submission process, as Maureen mentioned in the introduction, is slightly new in the sense that it will be behind ICANN account. So, if you don't have an ICANN account, please make sure to sign up for that. That enables you to manage your public comment work more proactively. You'll be able to save as drafts, you'll be able to download forms and also, as I mentioned, the data afterward, if you wanted to look at all of the submissions. And you also have an archive of your submissions over time.

So, this really enables a lot more use out of the system. This does not replace the ALAC and the At-Large advice development work that takes place. , public comment is an open system that invites participation from all stakeholders. However, if you as an individual want to submit something, you're still able to do that via public comment. Or if you want to participate in At-Large via the Consolidated Policy Working Group and their process for submitting advice or statements to ICANN public comment proceedings via the ALAC, then that process remains the same.

So, there are no changes there and that's not something that is being impacted by the new system. So, at a high level, as I mentioned, please make sure to sign up for your ICANN account, and then you can set up all of your alerts and subscriptions and customize all of that information so that the public comment feature is serving you and your community the way you want it to. The policy team will be setting up accounts for all of the supporting organization and advisory committees.

This way, there is a way to manage the public comment submissions for those groups, as well. I'll pause here to see if there are any questions. I dropped the ITI page in the chat and that's where you can access recordings of the various webinars and trainings, as well as a step-by-step guideline document that the ITI team prepared. We really have a lot of resources and we're excited about this new feature. So, please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Carlos. Are there any questions from anyone at the moment? I don't see any hands. So, let's continue then, Jana.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Sure. I do want to ... Again, as Carlos mentioned, we put the link in the chat there so you'll see it, icann.org/iti, where you'll find the manual and the training webinar. And I also want to second what Carlos said about everyone that participated in these feedback sessions. You guys were absolutely amazing and wonderful. We hope you see the changes that you want reflected in what we're going to be launching on Tuesday. But obviously, we have been sharing with you what you'll be experiencing, so that has been helpful. So, nothing should be a surprise.

I do want to emphasize signing up for alerts if you're interested in public comment or in particular public comment proceedings. You can get those alerts now like you do with announcements and blogs where it does send you an e-mail when new content is added to a specific proceeding or to public comment in general. And obviously, the RSS feed that I know ... I think it was something that Cheryl had requested that we put in place is available, as well. Okay.

We do want to show you a couple of things that we're working on because I know Heidi had mentioned that you wanted an update on ITI in general, posts, what are we working on after public comment, because that launches on Tuesday. Obviously, after we launch, there may be some minor bugs here and there. We've gone through an elaborate UAT testing and we think we've mitigated any major issues, but there may be some things that come up.

So, we do encourage that if you see on Tuesday anything that you think was missed or not working quite right, that you e-mail us at informationtransparency@icann.org. That e-mail address is available on the ITI page that I had put in the chat. What we are working on is a lot of back-end work, starting ... We've actually, obviously, already started it, but we're continuing on. What we're going to show you right now—and Heidi, I don't know if you can give me access to share the screen ...

Because some of the work that we're doing, again, is not something you will actually see but the benefits of it will be on the front-end. So, what we have now, obviously, the way that we have conducted how we would start tackling the UX and being able to do that kind of filtered search that we're seeing is we had to, obviously, audit all the content. And what we built was this thing that you're seeing right now, which is an audit interface. It allows us to ingest all of the content into this audit interface and put the appropriate taxonomy tags on it.

So, for example, let's say I wanted to look at ... And there's obviously a lot of content. So, let's say I wanted to see this one and audited it. It's just taking a few seconds. It allows us to select the taxonomy field. You're allowed ... You can see the actual content on the right and actually use the interface to select the ... And this would be the structured taxonomy, so these are fixed taxonomy, not like folksonomy, which is to just add a [recur] tag. These are structured taxonomy. What we needed to do, though, is marry it with what we have here, which is the authoring interface that we built.

So if I wanted to do, let's say, a new announcement, I could select it here, click "announcement," put in a title ... I'm just going to call it

“test” for right now. And then, here, this is what our audit interface looks like, and it allows us to put in that ICANN taxonomy while we’re selecting things from a drop-down, selecting teams and topics. They have a series of cascading values that will come up when I select something.

So, if I selected this particular department, it would bring up a specific team that has a set of topics belonging to it. What this does is provide that content governance that we need, because the issue that we were having with the previous site was that there was no content governance, there was no specific taxonomy that you had to apply. Because it does need to be fixed and it does need to be changeable.

Now, the thing that we’re working on now is ensuring that there’s one taxonomy service, because right now these two things are separate. This is where the audit interface is, where the taxonomy is, and then there’s a separate one for where the authoring takes place. Obviously, we will not need to do auditing once all the content is on icann.org, but you will do it for the success of SOACs once they start being integrated into ITI.

So, what we’re building now is a taxonomy service that, when we apply a new taxonomy value, that it is replicated across all the platforms that we need it to. So, on the audit interface, in the actual authoring, and then you would see it on the front and reflected on the front in any of the drop-downs. Does anybody have any questions about that? I see that somebody had raised their hand.

MARITA MOLL: Yes, hello. My hand was raised earlier. It's not specifically about this. So, can we finish this?

JANA JUGINOVIC: Yeah. I didn't know if anybody had any questions about what you're seeing now. So, we're focused on this, as I mentioned, on this taxonomy service. So, this is back-end work. Again, once we have the taxonomy service, it will be so helpful, because that means that we won't have to update the taxonomy in three different platforms, and that will mean adding new taxonomy structures for each of the SOACs. It will be a heck of a lot easier because we don't have to have a developer do it. Our team can do it ourselves because we built in, basically, requirements for the development team to be able to give us the ability to do it.

So, that whole back-end work will take some time, but, again, it will pay off huge benefits. Because, again, we do need to get that content governance around that and the taxonomy is the backbone of that. The other thing that we're building is a translations thing. So, when you request a translation, as you see here that I'm showing you, it automatically sends the translation ticket to the language services team. When the translations are back, you don't have to have somebody manually publish it. It will automatically be published if the English is already published.

So again, it's cutting down this manual work that we're doing right now and automating a lot of things. Because, obviously, it allows someone to requests translations and then get that translation back into the system, our DMS. And then, obviously, upload automatically the translations and marry it with the English on the front-end. So, again, a lot of this stuff is

in the background, like foundational work, but you will see the benefits on the front-end. So, before I address the question, does anybody have any questions about what I've just shown you in terms of this update? Any thoughts? I can't see if anybody has, so if somebody is ...

MAUREEN HILYARD: Jonathan? Jonathan has got his hand up. And Marita.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi. This is all very welcome. I mean, as somebody who did this for a living for over a decade, it's exciting to see the [inaudible] structure, and elimination of duplication of effort, and all the errors that often creates, in addition to just plain work that it creates. But this is more of a general question, which you mentioned the rollout to SOs and ACs. Has anything happened to create a more concrete projection for rollout schedule for some of this? There has been a lot of resistance to make projections but I'm hoping that you're honing in on when this stuff might be done and more broadly available.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Yeah. No, I completely understand the question. First, I want to thank you, Jonathan, because you have been really, really helpful throughout these last couple of years in giving us good feedback and making sure we don't screw up. So, I really appreciate all the extra time you have put

into it. And yes, this will completely save a lot of work. In terms of the rollout to the SOACs, I will say this. And I'm not trying to hedge, but I do want to give you a realistic background on some of the challenges. Because we have the CMS, the DMS, they need to be integrated, and we need to get some of this complicated foundational stuff out of the way, the taxonomy service, the translation service.

We also have a file management service because, as you know, right now, if there are different versions of a file, like a PDF, it's hard to find out which one is the definitive file, meaning the last one in search. And same with some of the HTML pages that we have. So, again, we have a version control service that we're also putting in place. So, those are three foundational issues. Once we get those three foundational issues out of the way—which, again, are pretty complicated and they're taking a little bit more time than ... As you know, with any kind of development issue, your best estimates sometimes don't go as planned because things sometimes take longer, especially with the fact that our content is so unruly and has never had any governance.

We do have to make a lot of accommodations for some edge cases. Once we're able to get those three kind of foundational elements out of the way, we'll be in a better position to say, okay, when can we tackle each of the SOACs? What I will say is that we are starting some work with the ... We did do, as you saw, I think, in an announcement that came out ... Or, sorry, a blog that came out a couple of months ago where we did apply the ITI style sheet, which was a lot easier to do now that we have one, to the GAC site, to make it more aligned with it.

Now, while that doesn't fundamentally change the features of the GAC site, it did prove out that having it in .tms, which is the content management platform, and being able to just easily apply the style sheet is not going to be complicated for other SOAC sites. Now, the other thing that we're doing that we're ... This is why we need the taxonomy service completed. It's we do have on the next project that we are tackling in parallel to finishing icann.org, which is a massive site, as you know, over 100,000 pages, is tackling the ccNSO.

So, we are going to be able to, once we finish the taxonomy service—and I don't anticipate that happening until the new year because it is going to take ... It's quite complicated to do because you're dealing with three different platforms and making sure that those are translations of those taxonomy values ... Is tackling the audit for the ccNSO. We can't do the audit manually. We have to do it through the audit interface because they have around 5,000 pages and we obviously want to make sure that we do it correctly.

So, that is the next thing that we're doing. But I do want to say to you, Jonathan, once we get those structural things out of the way, I think we'll be in a better position to give a more realistic estimate, because I don't think it's fair for us to give you an estimate that's completely wrong without knowing when these foundational things are going to be done. Does that make sense?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

It does but it sort of speaks to a fear of being wrong as opposed to help with planning. We've had this conversation and I apologize for being a broken record about it. I guess even order of magnitude projections put

us in a better position to figure out what kind of advocacy we should be doing for interim tools, for example, for content management, which is something that's of a particular interest to us as a distributed ecosystem, or much more distributed ecosystem than any of the other constituencies.

And so, it's okay to be wrong, as Cheryl puts in the comments, and we've all been there. But even coming up with something that says, "Well, the earliest would be X, Y, Z," or something like that would put us in a position to make sound decisions about what we might want to be doing in the interim. Because, if it's three years away, there are probably other things we should be doing besides just waiting, if that makes sense.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

100%. I 100% agree with you. Now, in terms of ... The one thing I do want to say is, as you know ... And because you're completely familiar with all of this, so I'm speaking to the converted here. It's that even with that estimate ... So, for example, if memory serves me, and I'm actually just trying to remember, I think the ALAC site has around 12,000 pieces. That's just off the top of my head. I could be wrong. I don't have it in front of me.

But it's not an unsubstantial amount of content, right? So, even if we were to say, "Okay, you're doing it at this X timeframe," in order to say how long it would take, you do want to do a bit more planning to say how long it would take because it does depend ... What I am a huge advocate for is that we have to do the audit of the content first because you have to know what you're dealing with before you start doing the

UX and actually determining what kinds of features and templates that you may need to have for your specific content, obviously through a requirements-gathering with the At-Large community, and then determining how long it would take to develop those things.

So, even if one gave a roadmap of when to start, the ALAC say on this date, you still may need more time to actually do that audit work before you would determine how much level of effort it would take to actually do the site. But I do agree with you on a timeframe. Obviously, once ... We hope we can get those foundational elements out of the way in the next eight to ten months, and once we know that then we'll be in a better position to provide more clarity to the SOACs on when those SOAC sites would be able to be tackled.

So, I mean, if it does involve a ... I totally understand that you don't want to wait forever, and I think not signing up for three years is not acceptable, but I'm hoping that there will be some flexibility in allowing us to try and complete the foundational work before giving an estimate. Does that make sense? I know it's not an ideal answer.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I mean, it does. And again, I don't mean to beat a dead horse, here. It's more like ... So, to this point, I'm not sure that we even have another of a—as I said in the comments—menu of features that we could choose from if we were trying to design a ... If, in parallel, we were trying to begin the requirements analysis for our own site. And so, really, this is about kind of making assessments about whether or not we should be

trying to improve the systems we have in place in the interim, even though it's not ideal. And so—

JANA JUGINOVIC: No, I agree with that. I mean, because then you need to kind of balance ... Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That is unfortunately a decision that just keeps getting put off, and I feel like that's not the right approach.

JANA JUGINOVIC: But I think that ... Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And so, even the suggestion that it will be X before anything can happen, it will be this long, and then we can sit down as the ALAC and say, "Can we wait that much longer or should we put some interim things in place?" Even knowing that they'll be eliminated or ... I mean, at one point, we had a conversation about understanding what kinds of inputs you needed so that anything we put in place ... We had an easier migration strategy, etc. And so, I feel like there have been some conversations we had along the way about somehow facilitating work in parallel that falls to the wayside. And I don't envy the position that you're in. I guess I just want to continue to stress the position we're in.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

Yeah. And I think that there is a ... I mean, obviously, there are always [reverse] challenges in terms of prioritization, because one means to focus on certain things to get done before trying to tackle too much, because then you know ... Obviously, once you make a development mistake, redoing it takes a lot more effort, and a lot more money, and a lot more resources, and, obviously, we're cognizant of that.

Now, in terms of providing a menu of options, because there is this ... Because ITI is meant to be the work that we're doing, there is ... The templates that we have created and the features that we have created, we have created it in a way that they would be able to be used as you suggested, a menu of options or like, "Okay, here are the templates available to the SOACs. Here are the features available to the SOACs." One could pick and choose and say this would work for this, like, for example, something like content subscriptions if that was something that ALAC wanted for their site so that, obviously, folks that subscribe to particular content types that are on the At-Large site would be able to use a content subscription feature to alert folks.

And again, a lot of the things that we had heard feedback from the community is that they didn't know when things were happening because they're not alerts. Well, the subscription feature obviously solves some of that problem. Also, the work that we're doing in terms of the various templates that we have, so a lot of work won't have to be redone for translations. So, there are a lot of features that we would be able to provide you guys, hopefully in the new year, to say, "Okay, this is kind of like the menu of stuff that we have available," getting you to look at your content in advance. The only thing is, you don't want to do it

too, too soon. You want to do it a little bit closer to the development part because you don't want to do a lot of rework.

So, there is a balance between doing it too soon, doing too much work in advance that will then have to be refactored because of changing circumstances. So, I completely agree with you and I think that we are able—and I know Carlos is on the call—to hopefully, in the new year, put together a document where we can share it with the SOACs and say, “Hey, here are the templates that are available. Here is a feature that we have already created. These are the kinds of things that you think about using and how you might need to modify them to fit better with your particular site.” So, to your point, seeing what's even available would be a good step.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. Thank you, Jana, and thanks, Jonathan, for raising those issues. I think it's really great we've got this. We've got a team who is very committed to ensuring that we're working efficiently and effectively. And I know, just reading through the chat, everyone is really appreciating the work that's being done by this section. And we can see the benefits, it's just not soon enough for us, or some of us. But I'm being very mindful of the fact that Marita has been very patient and she will have to finish off our session. Marita, your question.

MARITA MOLL:

Okay. Thank you, Maureen. My question is not about this at all. I'm glad Jonathan's up on it because this all just makes my head explode. I want to go back to, actually, the submission of comments on the new forms. I did attend the sessions, the webinars, and they were great. I know ... I am concerned about the added level of difficulty this presents for the people who are working on and writing these comments.

In the past, all you had to know how to do was work with a Google Doc and comments into a Google Doc. Most people knew how to do that. Now, we have to know how to use that form and how to optimize our use of that form. Those are kind of two different things. And I appreciate that it is going to make some work easier, especially when it comes to analyzing the input that's coming [on-screen.] I know from the webinars that we will still be able to do our Google Docs. It's unclear ... I guess, worst-case scenarios, one could just submit the Google Doc and don't do any of the other forms, but that probably wouldn't be optimal for us.

So, that's just kind of a concern that I have, that people are going to relearn a new thing and there is already enough. I don't know if it makes our life easier. The other question—that's not really a question but a comment—I have is about setting up accounts. I understood from the webinars that, yeah, if you were going to put in an individual comment on something, you would have to set up an account to do that.

But if you're doing a comment on behalf of a supporting organization like ALAC, an AC like ALAC, staff is setting up an account for that. And I guess the people who are working on it would be entering the information or ... I'm not exactly sure how that process would evolve. I would imagine that we're still doing our Google Docs, and somehow

taking that, and then inserting it into the form. I can't imagine that we would try to fill out those forms cold because there's no way to comment on them. Anyways, that's all I'm going to say.

CARLOS REYES:

Thanks, Marita. I think how Cheryl captures this in the chat is a good characterization. The formal submission process, whether it's uploading a document or filling in a guided form, that will be handled by our team, by the support team. And this is what we're setting up for all SOs, all supporting organizations and advisory committees. Your informal process, or, I guess, whatever internal process you have for reaching that point, that's all up to the ALAC and any other group to decide how to handle.

So, I cannot comment on that. I really don't think it impacts anything too much, other than with the guided form platform that we're using, you'll be able to download that form as a Word Doc or as a PDF. So, staff will be able to set it up for the group to work to find the best way to work on it and collaborate on that document. So, whatever it is you're doing now, I don't expect anything to change. It's just that, as Cheryl characterized it, that formal step at the end, it will be done by staff, which is already what happens now in Mailman. The support team submits the approved ALAC statement to the proceeding.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you for that clarification, Carlos. I hope that helps, Marita. Alan, very last word.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. I guess I'm responding to Marita. I really don't have a lot of concern. Marita was talking about the Google Doc as the good way of doing it. From many points of view, we've reviewed the Google Doc as a real pain in the butt because it's yet another step from transitioning from what we develop as a comment to submitting it. However, staff has been really good that, if we choose to cut and paste to fill in the Google Doc, fine, we've done it.

And if we choose to submit a PDF, they'll do it for us. And I'm assuming we'll end up with staff being just as flexible going forward. So, I'm looking forward to this new system and, presumably, if there are any glitches and bugs in it, it will be refined as time goes forward.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you so much, Alan, for that. It certainly does give a great ending for this part of our meeting. And thank you so much, Jana and Carlos, for your input here. It has been ... I think there is a light at the end of the tunnel for us, especially as Jonathan says: communication is really important for our community. And so, thank you. We'll be keeping in touch with you. We'll probably have you back as you make more advancements into the system that can actually help us. So, thank you very much for coming. We will now move onto León, who has been waiting very patiently. We would like to hear an update from what's happening on the board and how we can help. Thank you, León.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thanks, Maureen. Hello, everyone. It's good to be back again with you. You might be aware or might not that the board took a three-week break. It's not usual that we do that but, this time, the board decided to take a break for three weeks. So, it was a silent three weeks in many aspects. As I was telling my board colleagues yesterday, I kind of suffered a bit of withdrawal syndrome. So, I jumped into some of the At-Large calls to mitigate that withdrawal syndrome.

So, thanks for having me in those calls. So, as a consequence of this three-week break, there happened to be much to update you with, mainly just go through the most relevant resolutions that we passed in the most recent board meetings. And I think that one of the most relevant has, of course, been that of COVID-19 on ICANN72, as you well know. The board decided to turn ICANN72 into a virtual meeting again.

I think that the most important part of the resolution is the second to resolve, which the ICANN Board is directing the CEO, [inaudible], to coordinate with the ICANN community in order to push for exploring ways in which we can have, maybe, smaller, hybrid meetings in different setups to try to transition from this virtual setup into a hybrid, and then totally a face-to-face meeting. There are many aspects to deciding or to taking the position on whether we go for a face-to-face meeting, so hybrid meetings.

As you know, one of the [comms] that we have received—and we discussed this the last time that I was here with you—is that if we switch to face-to-face meetings there will be an important part of the community that will still not be able to attend those face-to-face meetings as a consequence of the many travel restrictions that are in

place. There is, of course, an ever-shifting landscape. It is shifting as we speak. So, it is a very big challenge for the board to make their position. And as I invited you all in my last intervention, all the input and the guidance that we can get from you is very important because this will help us make a more balanced and informed decision.

Other than that, Maureen, I think that's all of the resolutions that we have passed. I have [updated you] on that. And maybe one other thing that is important to update you with is that, as a consequence of this years' NomCom process and other processes, we will be having an important turnover in board members. We will be losing Ron da Silva, who will be replaced by Alan Barrett from the ASO. We will be losing Lito Ibarra, who will be replaced by Edmon Chung.

As you know, Edmon has been appointed by the NomCom this year. Edmon will be joining the board, replacing Lito. And Marika [K] will also be leaving the board this year, and she will be replaced by James Galvin in the SSAC. Finally, we will be losing, also, Nigel Roberts from the ccNSO, who will be replaced by Katrina Sasaki. So, it is a turnover of four out of 20 members, which is 20% of the board, if my math is not failing me. Well, of course, it's something that we, as Martin at the chair and myself as vice-chair, keep an eye on and try to bring continuity into what we do with the board.

So, I think we have a challenge this year in trying to get up to speed the new board members and trying to keep the ball rolling as usual. Well, I think those are the two most important issues at this point. Maureen, of course, I invite you to start the conversation with me, keep the ball rolling. And, well, of course, also congratulate these newly appointed

ALAC members. Happy to remain here and open for questions, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you so much, León. Yeah, are there any questions from us all? I haven't noted any hands. I'm looking at the two spaces on my screen that I should be looking at for any hands. But thank you very much, and a well-deserved rest, I am sure, for the board members, especially with coming up with the new members. It's so sad to lose some of our friends, people who have been friends on the board for such a long time.

But at the same time it's, I guess, times change. We do need to ... Refreshing the board and bringing in new perspectives. So, I think that this is going to be ... It's a great challenge for the board but I think that it's a challenge that we can all contribute towards, making sure that things happen within ICANN as the board expects. I can't see that there are any other hands. No one's coming up with any questions for you at the moment, León, but thank you so much. We do appreciate your continued presence at our ALAC meetings and all the other meetings I know that you attend. So, looking forward to more of that in the future. So, we can now move onto the second part of our ... Oh, Sébastien. Just in the nick of time. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah, thank you Maureen, but it was not to ask a question to León, but just to say that, if you have a look to the NomCom selection, you can see that there are different people in different SOs and ACs who are selected

who know very, very well At-Large, and that's something that I am sure all your representatives within the NomCom try to push for. I am quite happy with [the sum of the selected] in that regard. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Sébastien, for that. Right. Now, we will move onto the policy update, and I understand that, with Evin not being available today, this will be up to Jonathan and Olivier.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Maureen. I can follow León's example, possibly, and turn my camera on, I guess. Hey, everyone. So, there are a number of topics of discussion that are going on. There has been a little bit of a slow-down because it's summer, and I think that's okay. There are some periods of less frenetic activity, especially since we have ICANN meeting planning going on to keep us on our toes. But there are some work groups that are in progress.

I wanted to give the ALAC a short summary of what's going on with them, and there are some that are on the call here that may want to provide additional color/commentary, but I'm trying to just sort of bring people up to date because most of the people on this call are actually involved in the CPWG meetings where these issues are discussed. There is a relatively new ePDP on IDNs that just began its work since the last ALAC meeting.

The ALAC members to the ePDP on IDNs include Satish Babu, Lianna Galstyan and Abdulkarim Oloyede. They'll coordinate in the coming days, provide regular updates to the CPWG, and develop

At-Large positions. A lot of what has been happening in the world of PDPs is a movement toward a so-called presentational model, which is kind of where we were moving within the At-Large, anyway, which is to create this kind of virtuous cycle whereby our volunteers in the work groups are sent into the fray with our best attempt at priorities and consensus positions, and then they can come back to us to discuss new issues, or obstacles, or challenges, or compromises, as they arise, to again get more input so that there's this kind of back and forth that happens within the CPWG and with the representatives, with our volunteers, to these various PDPs.

There are lots of kinks to iron out but we are headed down that path. There is the IGO work team. Since the ALAC monthly meeting, the ALAC representatives to the IGO work team coordinated a CPWG presentation on the potential charter change being considered of the GNSO Council. For those that aren't aware, the IGO team got a little bit orphaned in a strange rule problem, but there are some solutions on the table to allow that IGO team to keep going on.

There's a follow-up presentation to the CPWG that will include the scope and problem statements and the proposed solution being considered, including a draft initial report. So, one thing is really just kind of a step that we need to take from a bureaucratic standpoint but the group itself has continued its work. There is also the Transfer Policy Review PDP. Since the last meeting, the ALAC Transfer Policy volunteers that include Steinar, Gertrude, Daniel Nanghaka, they've provided regular updates to the CPWG and have been coordinated with the group to come up with consensus positions on a number of questions.

One of the big issues that have been faced by this Transfer Policy Review PDP is whether or not there should be a notification and approval from what they call “the losing entity.” In other words, if you request a transfer of your domain name from one registrar to another, there is a proposal on the table to only get a confirmation from the gaining registrar, from the one where it’s headed, and not one from the registrar from which you are moving it. And the At-Large community, as representative of the CPWG, seems to be in fairly strong consensus that we should try to maintain that notification that comes from the losing entity, as well.

And our volunteers for the team have also produced a document, a request for comment, from the team on what we think are some of the end-user priorities, and this losing entity notification is certainly one of them. And they have been continuously updating the CPWG and we’ve been keeping this kind of virtuous round-trip in place.

Finally, the never-ending Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification or on TDPR Compliance ... I don’t know if it has an official name. It’s currently in Phase 2A. Our volunteers coordinated with the CPWG in drafting and submitting an ALAC statement to the public comment on the initial report. We recommended that the board reject the SSAD as being an overly complex solution to a fairly narrow attempt to address what needs doing from an automation standpoint. Again, Alan or Hadia might provide some color/commentary on this.

But, basically, the thinking is that we could probably [gin] something up in Salesforce to create a kind of ticketing system, which is all that the SSAD has turned out to be, rather than making a whole new

development project around it at great cost and time/expense without very much return on investment. So, those are the big headlines, if you will, from the PDPs. I'm happy to take questions or discussion and also I'm going to re-maximize my screen and see if people have their hands up. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, and I'll turn my video on. A couple of comments. First of all, on the comment that Jonathan just made on the rejection of the SSAD, I'd be a little bit careful about making glib comments that it can be implemented in Salesforce. There are some complications associated with doing that that I'm not an expert on, but I think all we should be saying is it can be implemented in a simpler way and not presume what the tool is. And I won't go into details as to why but I think we need to be careful on that. In terms of the never-ending ePDP, we're holding our last meeting two days from now on Thursday, so it will end.

The report will be submitted to the GNSO Council on the 2nd of September and we will have until the 10th of September to add minority reports to that report, which will be updated as the reports come in. We are predicting that we will ... We are suggesting that we do support/provide a minority report and I won't go into details. Hadia and I need to do some talking about that and perhaps make a presentation at the CPWG tomorrow. In terms of progress, the one thing we hoped to get out of this process, we're not getting out anything near what we wanted to and the reasons that we asked for the Phase 2A, but we did

hope to get agreement on the creation of RDDS element to specify legal versus natural.

With some meetings of the small group the last couple of days, we do have ... I think we have agreement on that. And what we ended up with is certainly not a requirement that contracted parties use the field but there will be fields created to both indicate legal/natural and to indicate whether there is personal data or not. So, it's a rather small bone that's being thrown to us but it's something that we felt was really important.

And if we had had the kind of dialog, a real dialog with people listening to each other for the last several years that we had on the small group, I think we would have ended up with quite different results coming out of this whole meeting. But we are where we are. So, the ePDP will be wrapping up. We have still ... The ALAC still has some more work to be done but we're getting close. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Alan. Anything more on that, then, Jonathan? Can I move onto the next one? I think—

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I want to make sure that Olivier doesn't have anything he wants to add or that any other participants have anything, but I don't see hands up, so I think probably you can move on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I just hoped that you were going to hand the floor over to me. I was just going to say one thing. In light of the ITI update that we had earlier, as you know, there is an opportunity for individuals to go and comment directly into the policy statements, but that doesn't mean that you should stop contributing to At-Large policy development. And I think it's particularly important to reemphasize the fact that our own processes remain the same and it's all working with wikis and with Google Docs, etc.

Which might not be ideal, but at least there is a time when we are able to achieve consensus and send the consensus statement that bears much weight in the consultations. And I think it needs to be reemphasized every time because it's together that we're able to produce statements that have both the impact and the effect that we actually want at the end of the day. Thank you so much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Olivier. I think it has been pointed out a couple of times in the chat already that that's a very important point. Because our CPWG is our key conduit for our statements and comments from the At-Large community. Thank you. Okay. Are there any other—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maureen? Sorry. My only response to that is that it could very well be that there will be some structural changes to how we manage our public comment workflow because the new system is much more around addressing individual questions than it is about long paragraphs of prose about how we feel about a report. And so, there is going to be much

more structured requests for comment and, therefore, much more structured inputs or commenting themselves.

And so, we may need to explore the best way. And it might be sections of a Google Doc or something, or it might be some other kind of form, but it might very well be that we need to make some evolution to the way that we structure our own discussions in order to accommodate this more structured comment process. But I think, on the whole, it's a very positive way forward, because the work groups benefit a great deal from structured responses.

And in the absence of them, they rely on staff to create that structure, which means that we're creating prose but what the work groups are really looking at are staff summaries instead of our comments. And I think the extent to which we're making submissions that directly answer the questions being posed by the work groups is the extent to which our words are getting directly to those work groups. So, I think that's ultimately a positive evolution in the public comment process.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Jonathan. Yes. As we've stated before, there are ways and means in which we will eventually work out for ourselves whether ... Like what you decide within the CPWG and how you select it/achieve what is important for At-Large. But at the same time, still enabling individuals to make their own comments on individual aspects, not the total policy discussion that might have been taking place. Alan, was that a new hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it is a new hand.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. There we go, then.

ALAN GREENBERG: The world that Jonathan was describing with structured questions is one we're already in now because the Google-Doc-type formats that have been used by the GNSO for most of the PDPs for the last year or two are just that and are structured. However, note it's a well-understood phenomenon that if you're doing a survey or a questionnaire you can strongly influence the outcomes by how you ask the questions. And let's not be naïve. The questions that are being asked very often for the PDP are structured so that they do not really allow us to state our real opinion and we have no choice but to do it through more subtle ways than just answering the question, and that's something that we're going to have to continue doing because we don't have full control over what questions are being asked by PDPs.

We're just one of the many inputs and not necessarily the one that controls the process. So, yes, they will be increasingly, as they are right now, asking targeted questions. But we have to be very careful that we're not just answering those questions and we make sure that our real opinions are getting through. So, something to keep thinking about. Thank you.

And by the way, if my comment implies that there is nefarious work going on behind the scenes where the questions are structured to make

it hard for us to state our opinions, I don't think that's nefarious. I think that's part of the game that we're all playing. We all try to ask the questions that get the answers we want to hear. So, something to be aware of. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thanks, Alan. Any other last comments on this before we move on? Okay. Right. So, further reports following policy. We're moving onto further down the page, I think, looking at the ... Great, thank you. Right. I think Heidi is going to give us the membership update.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, thank you very much, Hi, everyone. Since Evin is not on the call, I'll quickly give this update. So, for ALSes, we have a total of 251 currently. If we click on the next tab, application status, you'll see that there are no current votes or any applications [awaiting advice]. There are a few on the due diligence and four on hold, currently. If we move to individuals, we'll see that we have a few new ones. Individuals, we have 152, currently, in the application status. We have two new individuals from EURALO, if we click on the next tab, Claudia, please. And then, one from APRALO, as well. So, we have some new individuals coming in, there. That's it, Maureen. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Very good. Very good. Okay. So, the numbers are slowly but surely increasing. And for those of you who can access the agenda, the tabs will give you a really good picture of the development of our membership. So, that's cool. Right. Moving, then, onto the other

reports. We have, first of all, liaison reports. Is there anyone, any liaison members, who have something that they actually would like to raise with us? Yrjö. You may have the floor.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Maureen. Yeah, my report about the last ALAC meeting we had is there for you to read. That meeting was special in the sense that we tried ... There was an effort made to make it more lively, especially to get more people from the GAC side to speak. Because our meetings, our joint meetings, have developed into a sort of expert, detailed dialog about ePDP and SubPro for some time.

So, the effort was made to find new topics and also to engage more people. I think that we succeeded partly but I think that experiment also showed that it's very hard to get GAC members to speak spontaneously on something that they see [at the first sight]. So, what I have done is that I have sent a message to Manal and to my counterpart on the GAC side asking for topics for the next meeting and pointing out that it's really important to start preparing these meeting at an early date. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Yrjö. Marita.

MARITA MOLL:

Thanks, Maureen. It was just about the OFB update.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. I know Holly is not here but I did want to let people know that this group has a meeting every week and we have been getting an amazing short course from Becky Nash on how planning is happening and being revised and revamped at ICANN. And yeah, we had two full sessions with her. In the second one, just last week, she discussed new ways that the planning department was working on prioritization, that they had investigated all sorts of systems and tools to help prioritize more outside, in the outside world, and, as usual, ICANN being such a unique beast, are cobbling something together that might work for us.

They are asking for some community input in how this is working. They're going to be running a pilot process. So, this is really important work and we're there to help participate in it. We are going to be moving on in our meeting this week, following up on ... We've been studying the operating initiatives that are in the budget and figuring out what we should best focus on and exactly how our focus should be framed. So, plenty of work going on there. Yeah. That's a quick report that we've been busy.

MAUREEN HILYARD: You certainly have. Thank you very much, Marita, for that. Is there anyone else who would like to give a report on ... We just ... Before we move on? Not essential because I know that those reports are actually online, anyway. Oh, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. If Siva would like to school me as to how poorly designed the wiki that I'm currently in charge of is, thank you for that, Siva. Yes, it is a huge amount of information, which is why the top of the material ... I'm not sure why I'm being spoken over, but there you go. I don't want mushrooms. I'd prefer to have people muted. However, that we always, or at least I, in my time as GNSO liaison, put important issues at the top of the document.

There is a callout space I always report both to the small group meeting and the ALAC meeting so that the regional people who attend those know between the month, and everyone else should know at the end of the month, of any particular issues that have happened or are likely to come up in a GNSO Council. But I suggest that all of those terrible design errors and faults are raised with whoever takes my place in the future.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. I'm sorry, I missed that comment in the chat. I'll check it later. But yes, every liaison reports as they think is appropriate, and I think that there is some very interesting information that is in those reports, and I'd advise you to have [an explore] through them because they ... Especially in relation to the comments that we have to be involved in and those reports are very important to us. Okay. So, if there is no one else, and I think those two hands that are up at the moment are going to be coming down, unless they're new hands? Marita? No?

MARITA MOLL: No, sorry.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. okay. So, moving on, then, to the final section of our meeting, looking at ICANN72. And I'm passing this over to Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you, Maureen. Again, Gisella is not able to be on the call so I'll be trying to do my best to cover this. We have about two months to go before ICANN72. As you know, it will be a virtual meeting. We do have the workspace linked to the agenda. Please, as you know, that is really the key workspace. All the work, all of the activities related to ICANN72 and the meeting in the weeks prior to that week will be posted on there, so please do bookmark that page.

Then, for the preliminary schedule, there will be three weeks, three separate but connected weeks. The first one is the Org prep week. That will be from the 12th and the 14th of October. Generally, again, those are updates from Org. There is the policy update briefing and a few others from the community. Now, the next week after that, which was previously known as the intersessional week, we're revamping that to the At-Large. And the reason being is that the Planning Committee has decided and agreed to have that week really be the focus of a lot of the At-Large work sessions.

So, there will be the welcome sessions, there will be the policy sessions, there will be likely a CPWG, the Consolidated Policy Working Group, perhaps an Outreach and Engagement Working Group. So, there will be

a lot of activities in that week for At-Large, and that will open up time for people to participate in the actual AGM, the Annual General Meeting. The week, again, the revised dates were recently announced, would be from Monday the 25th to Thursday the 28th.

So, a bit shorter than the regular meeting. And the reason we wanted to make a lot of that work before that week is to allow you to participate in the plenaries that are still being discussed and some of the other work sessions. For At-Large, that week will have the meeting with the board. It will also have meetings with other SOs and ACs, for example the GAC, and other possible meetings. So, that's the [structure now] for that. Where the planning is right now is that the ... You can click on that 9c.

You'll see that there were six ICANN72 plenaries proposed, four of which were from At-Large. I think that's likely the largest number we've had out of ... So, again, four out of the six. Where we are right now is that the SOAC leadership is looking at all of those that were submitted, including the two updated sessions for At-Large. And they'll make a decision, hopefully ... I think that's this Thursday. And so, once those are decided, then the At-Large Planning Committee will move forward with their policy sessions.

It's very likely that any of those sessions that were not accepted for the proposal, for the plenaries, will then move to At-Large sessions, policy sessions. So, they'll get to those sessions [like with regards of the] which format they're in. And I think that is it. I don't know, Maureen, if you wanted to go through the various proposals right here. I think we did that at previous meetings.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yes. Yes, yes. Are there any questions, now? One of the things that we've got to do, we've got a meeting tomorrow, Thursday, or something, where we're going to probably have some kind of vote on which of the three ... Well, currently three, because I know that's very interesting, that we've actually had ... The ccNSO have proposed that we ... Because of the shorter meeting that we've got, that two plenaries ... And an interesting comment made by Sébastien that we should have one a day, so that would be four plenaries.

So, I think that that is going to be an interesting discussion, then, that we're going to have at the ICANN production planning meeting. But this is ... There is ... I think there's going to be a bit of a ... Have we seen the poll out, yet? Were we going to send a poll out? I thought we were. To ask people what they would ... To choose their top three of these six. That is the four from the ALAC and the two from the GAC.

And the GAC sessions, this one was on we're moving into hybrid meetings, like what would be a successful hybrid meeting? What are the criteria that would make for a successful hybrid meeting? And the second one that they recommended was to do with, I think, GDPR, an update on that. Anyway, they're on the list. They're on the wiki. There are the sessions that are ours and sessions of the GAC. So, we have to choose three, and I thought we were going to put out a poll for the—

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, Maureen? Yeah. So, Gisella did send that out. I believe it was sent to the At-Large Planning Committee. So, yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'll have to look for it. Right, thank you. You'll have to give me the date of when it was sent out. And probably, if you can give us a date of when it was sent out and put it in the chat, that might be handy for everybody. But I know that, for example, it was definitely going out to the At-Large ICANN72 Planning Committee and the [inaudible] members. I'm not quite sure if it was going to go beyond that. Okay. So, we need to get a decision made.

As Heidi said, everything that doesn't make the plenary, depending on, of course, what other SOACs choose, we'll definitely include into our program because they're already well-planned sessions. Right. So, are there any questions, or queries, or anything like that? Please, we do want to have some input into the ICANN72 planning meetings, just to get some opinions about what people think about what to include. Sébastien, you have a comment or a question.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, because you put some words in my mouth. And yes, definitely. But I feel that when we look to the meeting format, if it's four

days we will have ... I think it's important to have one session each day with the whole community. And as the fourth day, we have a public forum and a board meeting, but public forum, essentially. I feel if we can keep with three, it will be great. I really think that we need to push for that because, if not, I feel that, at the end of the day, the reason why we have an ICANN meeting will disappear.

Because to have a meeting with the ccNSO, we can do that next week. With the board, we can do that in two weeks, and with the GNSO in three weeks. There is no need to have one specific week. And I am still struggling with the fact to have a three-week meeting. I don't know how we can deal with that but I feel that it's too much. It was what we tried to avoid. But it seems that it's where we are going, at least for At-Large, and that will be very, very heavy, whatever the time zone is, and for the people from all around the world it will be a difficult time. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yeah, thank you, Sébastien. I'm just explaining again the At-Large week and I think that, for example, when we put the At-Large activities into the main program, we had to fit in with the other program, and the program can actually be for ... Depending on the time zone and in other meetings that we've had, it could have been from 9 PM until 5 AM the next morning, and our sessions are spread amongst that. Now, that is actually really, really difficult for people who actually don't fit the time zone of the region of the meeting.

So, I just felt that if we do the ... If we hold our sessions within our normal kind of meeting time zone that we have for our normal meetings. It just means that we can condense them into shorter time

zones or more appropriate time zones, depending on what the topic is or whatever. But then, it suits those timeframes—actually, suit us rather than us having to fit in with the ICANN program. So, that's ... I just felt that that's something to trial, something that we can look at being more effective for our community, that there would be the sessions that we have just focused on our community are held during a week that actually suits us.

And then, with the AGM, if anybody wants to stay awake in the middle of the night, if that's the case, to actually see anything that is of interest to them, they can choose. They're not having to sit through something in order to wait for one of our sessions. Although we are involved, of course. We may be involved in the plenaries.

And of course, the cross-community groups that we're involved in are probably ... With the GAC, for example. That will be in that session. The board meeting will actually be during that week because we're not pressured by the sorts of other activities that we're involved in so much. So, yeah. I mean, we're just testing it out. Is your hand up again, Sébastien, or is that an old hand?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

It was an old hand but, sorry, I don't want to argue with you, but just take into account, if somebody is taking one week of holidays for a meeting, here, he will have to take two or even three, and that's part of the trouble, how we organize the work. The time zone, as we change time zone for each meeting, I consider that at the end of the years it will be equal for everybody. Therefore, I have trouble to get that because ... Yeah. That's an argument I wanted to give. But I understand your point

of view. I don't feel that it's the best way to go but we will see. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yeah, yeah. Well, let's try it. We'll see how it goes. And as Abdulkarim has said, the time zone is one issue and burnout is another. And I can see your point with regards to the three weeks thing. The three weeks is outside of our control. But at the same time, how do we manage those three weeks so that it isn't so onerous on everyone? So, yeah. We've just got to share the pain, I guess. And, yeah. Recommendation, anyway.

So, if you get one of those notices that are asking you to choose your plenary topic, please respond to that so that we can have something to take to the meeting on Thursday. We're nearly at the end of our meeting. My gosh, what good timing. And our next meeting is going to be on the 28th of September. At the moment, it is 02:00 UTC, which is not going to be good for some people. But again, that may change. It depends on who our guest speaker is. We haven't actually decided on that, and if anyone has got any recommendations of someone that the ALAC and At-Large community should have as a speaker, please let me know.

And so, that could change depending on the availability of the speaker. Otherwise, it will be two o'clock in the morning for people in Europe, sometime around then. [Joy in] the rest of the world. Okay. So, if there's nothing else from anyone else, if I can stop the meeting now, we'll have two minutes of your life back. Thank you, everyone, for participating. We've had a really good attendance and really good conversation today, and also from our guests. Much appreciated. So, thank you. Have a great

morning, afternoon, or evening, wherever you are, and take care. Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Thank you all for joining the call. This meeting is now adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]