

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Finance and Budget Subcommittee Working Group call taking place on Monday, 24th of January 2022 at 16:00 UTC.

On our call today we have Naveed Bin Rais, Ricardo Holmquist, Marita Moll, Jonathan Zuck, and Sébastien Bachollet. We have received apologies from Maureen Hilyard. And from staff side we have Heidi Ullrich, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, present. And I'll also be doing call management for this call. As you know, we have French interpretation, and our interpreters are Claire and Camila.

Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your name before speaking not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes in case someone joins the French channel. With this, I would like to turn the floor back over to Jonathan. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you. I got asked this morning by Maureen to chair this call. But for the most part, it's just a discussion of the Additional Budget Requests that have been submitted, and so we can decide on which ones we're going to ultimately submit for budget approval. So if anybody has any questions or additions to the agenda or things they want to raise, go ahead and raise them now. All right. I'm not seeing any hands. Let's just dive into agenda item three and go over the ABR proposals that have been submitted.

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.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes? Sorry. I'm reading.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Should we have Ricardo summarize this? I don't know what discussions have thus far taken, Heidi. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: At the last call, we went over these and we added comments. The action item was for the group to go through all of them just this past week and add additional comments. And I do see now that Maureen has added several comments on these, including the ones where she explicitly supports them. So that's useful to look at those comments. Again, the aim of today's call is to do a final review any additional changes that were discussed last week if they've been implemented, and then really, to get ready for tomorrow's ALAC call which will be the final discussions, be the ALAC review. And then we'll go ahead and start submitting them. Today is really FBSC to make the decisions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's what I figured. So who has questions or comments? Ricardo, have you had the opportunity to look at some of the comments on this proposal?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Yes, I looked at the comments. Before submitting it as an ABR, I interchanged e-mails with Maureen about this. What I'm not sure is because the comment there is that we might get the staff to do it. And my concern is not actually being done. So not claim to the actual staff because they are [inaudible] there and the idea was to have someone to do this kind of stuff. My problem is every time you try to find information is not properly set in the different wiki page. And I don't know why they didn't like it because this is paramount to us to have this information, to have the information on time to have the correct information in the different groups. So if any other group looks at us or ourselves look at the page, will not find the information. Maybe it's not what it says in the different description. I don't know, my English is sometimes very rustic. But the idea of the ABR was to have some part FTE added to our staff so that she or he can look at the different things and have this up to date, at least up to this Fiscal Year '23, and from day on maybe staff can go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks so much Ricardo. I kind of agree the work is kind of a mess. One of the difficulties I think we face is that the ITI development is taking place in parallel. And I think the organization is closed to devote resources to improving one system with another system coming, but it

is an ongoing problem. Marita, I see you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, hi. Exactly, Jonathan. My question was how is this overlapping with the current ITI work? Maybe that needs to be finished before this actually goes forward? I realize they're not the same thing. But yeah, potentially there's a backlog there because this other thing is going on. Is that possible? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marita. Yeah, there's definitely significant overlap. And we haven't had a discussion with .org thus far what the future of confluence would be. There's wiki. In other words, once ITI is implemented nor have we gotten a timeframe for At-Large to enjoy the fruits of that labor, if you will. So there are a lot of unanswered questions about this and there's discussions that need to take place for the Org about what this migration path might look like. Heidi, is that a new hand, or is that from before?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It is from before. However, I just have heard from our Comms people who are very involved with the ITI and they've confirmed that the wikis are not part of the ITI. I know that Maureen and I have discussed this with the At-Large staff and it was a general thought that this was a priority for At-Large. This is something that could be done lightly with current staff and a small group of At-Large members who could first

determine what kind of changes need to be made, and then they could possibly be made in a long process. It's not going to happen overnight. But I think the first thing is back over to the community on what they are looking for for their wikis. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Heidi. Indeed, this isn't part of ITI. I guess the question is just there's a lot of unanswered questions about timeframes and such. Sébastien, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Jonathan. Yeah, definitely. Importantly, it's not within ITI. The question is that, can we wait more years to make changes within the wiki? It's a real trouble because if it's not in ITI, it must be done by whom? By staff? But At-Large staff is already with too much things to take care. Therefore, I would suggest that we support. Even if we know that it will not be accepted by ABR, it's one way to culminate once again that we need some changes within the wiki.

I'm sorry to take my example. When I try to find something link with my day-to-day job as the chair of EURALO, it's very, very often that I can't find where it is because the links are not done or updated, because the calendar, for example, with meetings it's a long, long list and it needs some changes. I am not sure that it's At-Large staff who need to update that. Therefore, I would suggest that we support this ABR. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. Ricardo, please go ahead.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Jonathan. Just an update on what I said in the last minutes ago. I understand the ITI project and I understand the wiki. The problem is, my concern is that the information is wrong in the wiki will pass wrong to the ITI. My concern is with the information, not with the wiki itself. If you're going to pass something from one system to the other, the most important thing that you need to pass is the information. So it doesn't matter what the system is, it's not the power of wiki, it's the power of the information that is in there.

If we have the commitment from staff to solve these problems by the staff itself, maybe a working group or something like that, this will be great. The problem for us, as [inaudible] says, to have these solved, not to have an ABR. By having an ABR is just to have this done so. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Ricardo. Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: I could see a reason for some staff time allocation to contact whoever needs to be contacted to have that information updated, if that's what needs to happen. I could see an ABR, some budgetary thing on that side. And maybe don't we also have a technical committee, maybe working with that committee in trying to update what needs to happen? Because Ricardo is indicating that his problem is with the information on there, not how it's organized, is that correct?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: May I jump in?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, please, Ricardo. Please go ahead.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: As an example, we are discussing right now the Fiscal Year '23-'27 Operating Plan and Budget. I have received like five e-mails from staff saying that this particular comment is being developed by Holly Raiche and [inaudible]. But if you enter the page of the Fiscal Year '23-'27 Operating Plan set for ALAC, what it says is there is no pen holder, there is no information there. We are not developing anything. And this is the information for the comments. So I think there is information that is not linked. I think the information that is incorrect for the OFB Working Group, most of the information there is not correct. So it is a mire of information. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Ricardo. I can tell you from my experience with ABR is limited. I've only gone through one cycle. And the proposals I made that involved staffing were not accepted. So I think if this went forward, it would be, as Sébastien suggested, kind of a signal of the urgency of this request generally and not likely to be accepted as an ABR. It is something that we'll need to find a way to take up. There's probably not a harm of submitting it as an ABR, but raising concern over the issue, this is one way to raise some visibility. Any other questions or

comments on this? Heidi, do we have a limit as far as the number that we forward to the ALAC? Can we just say yes or no on each one? Or do we need to just choose top three or whatever?

HEIDI ULLRICH: There's no limit. It sounds like the majority here are thinking to go ahead and submit this. I'll just put into the FBSC notes and decision column that the group suggested that this be submitted. Is that okay?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Does anyone object? Go ahead. Sorry, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, I think if it's submitted, as Sébastien noted, then if it's not approved as an ABR, then it could possibly also right up the agenda for the ALAC and then we'll turn staff's attention to that. But it might also be combined with not only getting a small group organized but also raising the awareness on how things are organized on the wikis for everyone in the community.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. It sounds like we should do both for sure. Okay. So we'll move ahead with this ABR. Let's move on to the next one. Okay. So I guess in brief right now we have the real-time captioning in English only in our Zoom meetings, and due to this proposing an ABR to extend that to Spanish and French. Does anyone have questions or comments about

this ABR? I see that Maureen has expressed support for it. Heidi, is that a new hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. Just to explain this one. So this current fiscal year, FY22, there was an ABR approved for French and Spanish RTT for various reasons. They're working on the technical aspects of that. So this one is pretty much the same except with the important addition of, well, if they're not able to add Spanish and French RTT then they would have more English. So I just want to raise that point.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you. Marita, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

MARITA MOLL:

Yes. I put my hand up to support this but I'm not entirely sure that I understood what Heidi said.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I can probably clarify. It was a previously approved ABR, and then they were looking at technical issues, because it's not entirely clear how they would do the RTT in multiple languages in Zoom, I think, at this point. So this is a little bit of a rollover, which makes it seem like a no-brainer to support. The one addition is that Judith is often the advocate for RTT being available in more situations, if you will, like during ICANN meetings when it's not always available. So I think Heidi is mentioning that it's just a little bit more expansive in terms of supporting higher

frequency of RTT for English. But besides that, it's a basically a rollover of an already accepted ABR so it seems good to support. Sébastien, you have your hand up, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Don't take that to be against, but I want to be sure that we ... There is a survey after each meeting using RTT. Do we have somewhere feedback and data about that? Because it could be very useful to support RTT rollout in more calls if needed. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. Is there any objection to forwarding this on to the ALAC with the recommend? Naveed, I see a question in the chat. The subcommittee is not really empowered in any way. We're just trying to provide a set of recommendations for the ALAC that are the ultimate decision makers on which ABRs to submit. So I don't think that getting this out to a wider list is as important as getting a list ready for ALAC to appraise in the very near term. I don't know when that is. It might even be tomorrow or something. Heidi, when is the ALAC meeting?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The ALAC meeting is tomorrow. So that's when the Maureen expects to just show them this. Usually this is what they are. This is what the FBSC has decided and any objections.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, sounds good. I hope that answers your question, Naveed. I think time is too short to go broader than this call. So I guess this is an approved. Let's continue on to the next one.

Also from Judith. This is an accessibility check on the ICANN website generally. Does anybody have comments, questions? I see that Maureen has supported this. Any objection to supporting Maureen's endorsement of this ABR and moving it toward the ALAC? Okay, great. I think we're on support for this one as well. Let's move forward. Sébastien, do you want to say anything about this?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's just to make an additional we'll say tool to be used within our call as it is used during the ICANN meeting to be able to go from one language to another one, and to be able to use just one tool and not to have your phone in one side and your laptop in the other. It will be a pilot to try that and see whether they're inconvenient and additional possibility for our participants to be more using the different languages. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. If I recall correctly, the TTF brought this up with ICANN staff. And I think you and I brought it up in one of the ICANN Planning meetings, and I remember there being some pushback from staff on making this multi-language interpretation within Zoom feature broadly available. It wasn't unclear what that was. But at phrasing this as a pilot, I think suggests let's push them to try to make that functionality available outside of the ICANN meetings.

Any other questions or comments on this ABR? I think I read your silence as support for this pilot Sébastien has suggested. So without objection, I think we'll pass this on to the ALAC. Let's move on to the next one.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: So this one is new. This was submitted on Friday from AFRALO. And you'll see that it is a conference for a topic of e-waste. And from my reading of the ABR proposal, apparently the ITU had a discussion or meeting on e-waste, and that is continuing this in a way. So, you'll see that Maureen makes a note that she's not sure that this actually is within ICANN's remit.

If we can scroll down, Yeşim, just a little bit, you'll see what they are looking for. Just a little bit more. It's outreach and training. It's primarily in developing countries, primarily Nigeria. We can scroll down just a little bit more. I think they're asking like 7000 or something. We can scroll all the way to the bottom of this. Right there. Yeah. Okay. Yeah, about 5000, pretty much. So the thing is, I'm not sure what they mean by administrative support, about language services support, SME support. If this is a topic that is of interest in AFRALO, it might be something that they wish to work with GSE and do a webinar. I mean,

I'm not sure whether having face-to-face or hybrid meeting would add to the objective of this, to the educational and raising awareness objective of this ABR.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Heidi. My first reaction is it seems outside of ICANN's remit as well. Marita, you've got your hand up. Please go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: I think this is a very important topic but I do not think it fits in here. So I would not be in support of this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is there anyone that would like to speak in support of this? I don't want anybody to be unheard. What this looks—it was the absence of hands that we have a rough consensus in this group not to forward this ABR to the ALAC for a number of reasons, but I think principal among them, Maureen's indication that it's outside ICANN's remit. And while important to many within the At-Large, it's not a topic within the At-Large remit. So absent any objections, I think this is a no. INPT Enterprises—who is that? Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, I see what you're saying. I didn't know who that was. Yeşim? I'm not sure who INPT is. I'm not sure who that is.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I just want to make sure everyone's heard. Oh, Aziz. Aziz, would you like to speak on this proposal? I don't see icons for microphone for you. Are you on?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Aziz is on the French channel and I'm now checking with interpreters if Aziz is speaking. It seems he is not at the moment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can the question be asked of him on his channel, whether he would like to intervene on behalf of this ABR? Or does that already get translated?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: I'm sure it already did, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Jonathan, this is Heidi.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: So there is the question of whether it is in the ICANN remit. I think that's the main item. The other item is looking at it again, they do point out that the carbon footprint that ICANN has for the traveling. So my thought was, well, if they are wanting to also travel, that's not defeating the purpose of this. So if it was in ICANN's remit and they did want to continue to hold this, a virtual webinars might be more appropriate for this one. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Yeah. I guess there are arguments in its favor. I wanted us to hear them before we went final on it, but I don't I don't see anything. So absent intervention here, I think we're not forwarding this to the ALAC. Okay. Thanks. Aziz, let's bring this up in another context and find other ways to address this issue, or at least the overlap of this issue with ICANN's remit. Let's go on to the next one.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: May I?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Sébastien. Sorry, I was reading. I should have just asked you to speak. Go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You can read it. In fact, it's a follow up on current ABR where we have some difficulty to go ahead because of timing. More than anything else, at least I am waiting for feedback from staff, not At-Large staff but from

ICANN staff. The idea was to follow this work specifically on the Board diversity to take other leadership bodies and to work on that. And yes, I didn't put any figures for money because last year, it was in fact done by staff. But if I need to add that, just ask me, I will put the same amount that it was accepted last year. And it's something I hope that we can go ahead with, but I am available for any question. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. Marita, you have your hand up. Go ahead. Oh, Heidi, I see your hand up. Did you have something you wanted to add, Heidi? Marita, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. Old hand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Yeah. I think this is definitely an important item but I am also seeing that it's also collecting these kinds of stats around diversity is a big issue or big item in the current budget and strategic objectives, etc. So, we are going to, in our response to the budget, add this business about making sure we know what's going on in the leadership if they hadn't already intended to do that. But I'm wondering whether or not we actually need an ABR for it. That's my question. This is part of the work that should be ongoing with respect to the integrity and the

effectiveness of the multistakeholder model, and it's a big part of what they're proposing to do. So I would suggest that that is already being taken care of.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Marita, if you take into account what they are doing for diversity, they are doing diversity of the participants. Nothing is done for the leadership bodies. It's why I am struggling for the study since a few years, not just this year or last year. It's a very longer story, this one. And it was never taken into account in the budget. I don't think it's taken into account in the budget today. It's something I would be very happy if it's done within the budget. But as it is not, I still feel that evolution of the leadership bodies within ICANN is also an important point of view. What is done today within the budget is the diversity of participation of the working group in ICANN meetings and so on and so forth. But it's not the same thing. It's why I am proposing a second ABR on this issue. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL:

Right. If I could just respond to that. I completely agree with you, Sébastien. But we are asking them in our response to the budget to fine tune that and add the leadership part to it. If you want to go into our Google Doc on budget response, you might want to elaborate on what was put down there already. I don't have a problem with this going forward. I just wanted to bring that in. I'm kind of hoping that they're going to take it on Board through the comments, but maybe I'm overly optimistic.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I suggest that we have to—how do you say [inaudible]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Bite to the apple.

MARITA MOLL: Two irons in the fire. Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I wonder—this might just be also in a question of clarity. This ABR could be refashioned as a study. A study is something I think is easily—because it looks like there’s a lot of data collection, analysis, etc. A study might be something that is easy to justify using outside resources for, as opposed to just a kind of an effort, which is what this seems to be described as. I haven’t read it in detail. I don’t know what you think, Sébastien, about taking a—

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It is a study. It’s not the title, it’s not study. But it is a study of the evolution of the diversity within ICANN leadership bodies. Yeah, definitely, it is gathering data and analyzes the data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Excellent. Maybe let’s work on the language. I’m just taking my chair hat off here for a second because I’m just an emergency chair. I wonder if

we should just be more explicit that it's something more discreet like a study that we might hire someone to do. It looks like Maureen's comment comes from a place of not really understanding the proposal, if she's talking about the leadership getting together to talk. That's not really what you're proposing if what we're proposing is a study.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, Jonathan. There's two things—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just work on the language and put it in front of the ALAC, I guess, is my suggestion.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If you look at the old text to the whole text, I think it's clear and what the budget could be used for. But it's always a problem when—I have to put it under EURALO but then it's the impression that it's a RALO question. No, not at all. It's ICANN global question. And for me, it must be an ALAC suggestion. But it doesn't matter where it is. I don't want to change that. But if you think that there are some were to be tweaked, just tell me and I will I will change them. But it was accepted last year. I don't see why we can't do a second one that we'll say on this work. This work, it's a study, and what we needed somebody to help us to fulfill the study. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I'm personally inclined to push this through for the ALAC to submit as an ALAC level ABR, rather than RALO level ABR. Are there any objections or further comments on this ABR? It seems like an important issue and attacking it from different angles seems like a fine thing to do as well, as Marita and Sébastien mentioned. Are there any objections to advancing this to the ALAC? All right. I just got my reminder for the ICANN73 Planning call coming up. So let's continue to move on. We'll call this accepted.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Jonathan, this is Heidi. Did I hear correctly that this one was supported and it's going to be submitted as in ALAC level? Is that correct?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, perfect. I've captured that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. All right, folks, this is another example where I tried to make a course happen through ICANN Learn during the last ABR process and it was rejected because there's already sort of an internal system for getting these courses done that folks would like to stick to. But if somebody would like to speak to this proposal in favor of it, then I welcome you to do so now. I think we can take it on as a to-do item because I think there's a lot of interest in making more use of ICANN

Learn. But putting together a small team and creating a course as we did with the two that we have seems like the path forward on this. I'm anxious to hear other points of view. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. Did you wish to make this also an ALAC level? This is going to be for all of At-Large. This might be either an ICANN Learn course or—

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think I was suggesting that we not advance this to the ALAC, actually, myself.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That we in fact make it a priority to do through the normal mechanisms that we do that we produce courses today.

HEIDI ULLRICH: ICANN Learn course probably does need an ABR because that does include funding.

JONATHAN ZUCK: ICANN Learn course does require ABR. Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Well, then that's interesting. Because that was Maureen's objection. Marita, please go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: I find the description of the proposed course to be just way too vague, the perspective of the current situation of things. I'm unopposed, of course, but I just would like to have a much better description and delineation of what that would be about. There are a number of courses about what ICANN does already in ICANN Learn, and there's plenty of stuff going on outside Internet governance things. So I'm not sure exactly what this course is about. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marita. Ricardo, please go ahead.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I have the same feeling as Marita. I think this kind of courses—the purpose is very vague. And I think this is the kind of courses that they're already in the ICANN Learn or in any ISOC or related things. It's very similar to this. It's supposed to be there. I think if we approved this, there is no outcome—sorry. Let me find your page. I'm sorry for that. There is no metric, no evaluation for this in the older ones. It doesn't seem to be completed, this ABR. There's one or two more from LACRALO, very similar, that I think are more clear than this one.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Ricardo. Heidi has noted in the chat that these could be provisionally approved with greater clarification about what they consider to be new about these and what it is specifically that they're proposing. I don't know what the actual deadline is for submitting them to ICANN because that's provisional support by ALAC is what would have to happen tomorrow. I see we've got six days.

Any other thoughts on this? It sounds like the sway of this group is against supporting this and sending it back for perhaps more work before we advance this. Anyone opposed to not forwarding this to the ALAC? I think, Heidi, this one we're not going to go forward with.

Let's see. This is a course on Universal Acceptance. Ricardo, go ahead.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST:

LACRALO does have a course on UA last year. Also, if I can recall, it's NARALO that is doing a campaign this year. I agree with Maureen in her comments that this should be something that is across RALO because UA affects us all. So maybe this course can be with the base of NARALO, the same base of LACRALO or maybe something from APRALO and have a complete course.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Ricardo. I'm inclined to agree as well that it should probably be an ALAC level ABR request if we do it. I'm not clear on how this is distinct from the materials that have already been produced by the Steering Committee, however. Does anyone else know? Any other

thoughts? Marita, you have the same sort of “not ready for primetime” feeling on this. Again, I actually don’t know the answer, in this case, whether or not there’s a course out there or materials that are necessary for this. Because it’s less like a course where you want people to take a quiz or something and more just instructions for people that are already motivated to make a change to their systems, I think. I think this one might not be ready either, unless anyone else has an objection. I think we probably don’t forward this to the ALAC at this time, given the short timeframe we have. Any objection to that? Okay. Heidi, I think this is a no. Let’s move on to the next one.

I welcome thoughts on this. We’re running out of time. I feel like this is part of a much bigger issue related to travel and COVID and things like that, and hybrid meetings. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Jonathan. I agree. This one includes actually very much a face to face. It’s four meetings in four different occasions, four different locations corresponding to the LACRALO’s four regions, 16 air tickets, 12 days total, and they’re asking for \$25,000. That is a big amount of funding for travel right after—we still don’t know when and where we’ll be going back, too. I just wanted to raise that might be seen as a challenge. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Do other folks have any thoughts on this request? I’m as anxious as the next person getting back to face-to-face meetings. Heidi, would you say that under normal circumstances, this would be a normal request? That

we're not in the middle of a pandemic or at the tail end of a pandemic, wherever we are?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

In my past experience, these types of activities with that kind of amount of funding are normally not approved. But what they might do is say, "Well, this could be something that you could work with GSC on. This could be a webinar or a series of workshops, etc." This also might be something that LACRALO would want to include in their general assembly, which they already have now. If it's not this year, then it will be next year. So that's something they could again incorporate into their GA.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. Marita, please go ahead.

MARITA MOLL:

I would also suggest that there are other ways to incorporate this kind of activity. To do it as a stand-alone at this point just doesn't feel right. It's not the right way to go. I wouldn't support it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Is there anyone that would like to speak on behalf of this or in favor of it? Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. Then, Heidi, I'm going to say this is a no as well. This looks like a proposal by Eduardo who has been doing experiments with doing restreaming to Facebook of NARALO meetings. I see Maureen has a question about whether or not we know that this is

needed. I don't know the answer to that. Sébastien, I see your hand up. Please go ahead. I was reading.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I would like to support this proposal because I think it's not just restreaming what is done by EURALO, but it's restreaming others. And I think it could be a good way to improve the work done by each RALO to be more worldwide scene and it must be something done not by one RALO by the chair, one RALO, but much more embedded. Therefore, I suggest that we add a pilot for that, the word "pilot," and we suggest that ALAC support it. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. Ricardo, please go ahead.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I have support in this. I can't see it on the screen but I understand they are not asking for much money. It was very usefully in prior events of EURALO, not NARALO, they would transmit from their Facebook to each one and then these are recorded so you can see it later. It's very nice.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks, Ricardo. Is there anyone that wants to speak against this ABR? I'm seeing a majority of support in the chat and the two verbal interventions. Heidi, I think we would pass it through.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That might be the end of the list.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's it. That means that we have six for support.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thanks, everyone. I really need to jump because I'm chairing another call right this minute. Thanks for supporting me in my last-minute chairmanship. I'll see you all on the next call. Bye.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you so much, Jonathan. I appreciate that. Thank you, everyone. Thanks. Bye, bye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]