| YEŞIM SAĞLAM: | Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement call taking place on Monday, 1st of December, 2022 at 18:00 UTC. On our call today on the English Channel we have Daniel Nanghaka, Natalia Filina, Laxmi Prasad Yadav, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Lavish Mawuena Mensah, Glenn McKnight, Maureen Hilyard, Eduardo Diaz, Laura Margolis, Marita Moll, Jonathan Zuck, Aris Ignacio, Naveed Bin Rais, Robert Jacobi, Sarah Kiden, Shah Rahman, Shreedeep Rayamajhi, and Frank Anati. |

On the Spanish channel, we have Lilian Ivette De Luque Bruges, Harold Arcos. We currently don't have anyone on the French channel. We have received apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond. From staff side we have Heidi Ullrich, Rodrigo De La Parra, Naela Sarras, Patrick Jones, Baher Esmat, and myself Yeşim Sağlam, and I'll also be doing call management for today's call. For today's call, we have Spanish and French interpretation, and our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Veronica and David.

On the French channel, we have Isabelle and Camila. Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. With this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Daniel. Thank you very much.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:	Thank you very much, Yeşim, for that great introduction. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. from all respective zones of this planet. It's a pleasure to have this call right after the IGF. I know a good number of members having some bit of trouble, and others have some kind of fatigue, but that's very fine, you can be able to listen to the recording.

I'll be chairing this call together with Natalia Filina, who will be running the second section of this call whereby there'll be discussions of the respective regional strategies. I'll proceed right with just a brief feedback from the IGF that transpired in Ethiopia. I'd like to say that there are total of 16 sessions that were organized by various ICANN members, right from staff, and from the community. On Monday, we had Joanna Kulesza lead the session on GigaNet Annual Symposium, whereby the very interesting discussions about the internet.

Also had Dr. Andre giving a session of meeting online activists from society's democratic decisions and lack of effective institutions. We also had a Amrita, who also chaired the session on augmented reality, new horizons, and a different trust. During the opening ceremony, we had the ICANN president and CEO, Göran Marby, among the panelists of the top leaders, which was quite exciting and very much engaging. On Monday as well, we had another interesting session of Universal Acceptance and special thanks to Ram Mohan, Satish Babu, Hadia, who gave at least a very interesting insights into the session.

For those who missed the sessions, kindly go on to the IGF website, and you'll be able to listen to the recording as all the sessions were recorded. Shah led the discussions on connectivity at a critical time, and

after a crisis, which all sunk well into the IGF agenda. [00:04:17 - inaudible] sessions included Edmund Chan who was in the session of the avoiding the internet fragmentation, as this was one of the key discussions among the corridors during the IGF.

Also, there was another session on the small island, developing states on the Internet economy, which we had Tracy Hackshaw online, and Maureen Hilyard and Letitia Masaea who were participating remotely into this session. So this was really quite great because we saw various kinds of engagements. For those ones who would want a detailed session, you can always click on that link. I'm going to request staff to share that link right over there.

Some of the challenges that came up during the IGF was that the At-Large participation, we didn't have an outline of booth, but at least we had an ICANN booth, which was there, and at least Adam Peake was able to be there, and also other staff from Africa region, including [00:05:26 - inaudible]. The challenge this time was that the booths were far from the rooms where the sessions are, so they did not attract a lot of attention.

My recommendation is that probably during the next IGF, or such big gatherings, their potential to attract individuals, and higher civil stakeholders, who could be able to at least contribute to the various policy development process. Despite the fact that there's, I'll call it a complaint, or not a complaint as such, but argument that the IGF brings together human rights players, but still, I feel that some of these human rights players are a very good fit to perspective in various policies that affect the end-user experience.

Just monitoring the chat and seeing Bram writing that the both was quite a waste of time. Absolutely, you could be right, but also they became a center of engagement for a few people, despite the fact that most of the people were deeply engaged in the sessions. If you had to come to the booth, you would walk a distance of approximately 150 to 200 meters to the booth, and of which they did not provide substantial value, probably the IGF organizer would take this into respective consideration.

Then on behalf of At-Large, it will be a very good thing that at least the At-Large participation should be strengthened during this. So in case there are any members who would like to add on, making respective add ons in reference to the engagement of ICANN At-Large, I'm going to open up the floor for members on the call who were there. In case someone would like to give an input into the IGF, I'll open up the floor currently.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Daniel, it's Glenn.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Absolutely. Yes, go ahead, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, one second. Let me put my headset on. Okay. So I just want to clarify, I didn't say the booths were a waste of time, I was saying that virtual booth. If you are not attending, two were asked by IGF staff that send your documents in digital format, so which we monitored. So from

my point of view, from the digital, the virtual booth, which is a good concept, but it didn't work. I didn't get any response back. We did have an actual physical booth, and that was for all the schools of internet governance at the event.

So again, I monitor the people who scan the QR code in the card we have, and there was little activity. Apart from that, we did a session on the DC coalition of schools of internet governance, which was co-chaired by Sandra and Avri, Satish participated at the airport. Very good remotely. There was a number of us, Raman was very active with that, as well. So I think that session went fairly well, there was not enough time, but there was a substantial interest on new schools that were-- particularly from Africa that were interested in information.

So from that point of view was quite good. I also participated with the DC coalition of networking, community networking as a human rights enabler. So that session went very well as well. There was no one else from At-Large at that. So there was two sessions that I did. Again, I thought, lots of interest, I did all the dynamical coalition, Jonathan. So there was a lot of great stuff, you can watch all from remotely. The great thing is that the depot did summary notes the next day of each of the sessions. So that's my report.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thanks again. Just to get more on the boots, despite the fact that there was less engagement or the boots or the virtual boots have great match, I'll tell you one thing is that Tom, right at the venue of the IGF,

the impact of the booths was so minimal because I moved around the booths, I moved to the ICANN booth, and at least some staff.

The first day, there was no one attending to the booth, the second day, there were at least some young few attendees coming to the booth, and this showed that the level of engagement that booth was totally not substantive enough. Also, one key session. Now before I will speak about the session, let me give Cheryl the floor. Cheryl, please, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was just going to say with regard to the utility of booths, professionally, I spent a good more than a decade, more than 30 years ago, in booths in international conference, trade shows, and those sorts of things, because that's how you booked your goods. So military, medical, and all those sorts of things I was doing, and even then you had to give away goodies or singing or dancing, literally sometimes some places dancing girls, the bar or whatever, the raffle to just get people to come by.

The actual return on investment was -- it was better the tax write-off. The real reason why we were in those places was for the side events, the meetings with other people around the [00:11:30 - inaudible]. The return on investment on booths really needs to be looked at very carefully in my view.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:	Thank you, Cheryl. You're absolutely right, because if you look at the promotional materials in the booths this time, they were mostly reading materials that were being given out and there're a few goodies or souvenirs that are being given out. Probably there's need to review. I can see Heidi just posted it on this agenda, our first discussion of the booth of ICANN76. Absolutely. Shreedeep, I can see your hands up. Shreedeep, please. Shreedeep, you have the floor in case you're on mute.
SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI:	Thank you, Daniel. Shreedeep, for the record. I was there, and as Cheryl said, there were no goodies. I had a booth myself, and I think there were materials limited. I didn't see any At-Large or any kind of [00:12:37 - inaudible] there as well. So I was there. I mean to say, I have few of the time, but the engagement there was none to my experience, to what I was there.
	So it was very limited, and I think as Cheryl said, the engagement strategy was not there. I had seen the staff few of the time, but most of the time, the booth was empty. I think it could have been better really managed with better goods and PR materials and all this stuff. So that is the point, I think. Thank you.
DANIEL NANGHAKA:	Thank you very much, all that regarding to the booth. One of the key takeaways that took place at the IGF was that we had the launch of the Coalition for Digital Africa. This was a very good session, whereby we had input from various stakeholders during this launch, and was kind of

engaging, and it showed that Africa is being considered so much in the DNS space, and for the good thing.

On the panel, we had Pierre, the VP for Stakeholder Engagement in Africa, we had [00:13:50 - inaudible], we had also the Secretary General of Association of African Universities, we had also Barrack Otieno, and this session was being moderated by Anne-Rachel, who is the current Director for Africa at the ITU. I think this was a great session.

Looking at this, for more aesthetic feedback regarding to engagement of the IGF, at least we're happy to hear more feedback, which can be discussed on the mailing list, and you're all welcome to that. Allow me to proceed to the next item on the agenda. Let me give Jonathan the floor to be able to speak about the discussion, the ALAC priorities for the FY23. Jonathan, please. You have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Jonathan Zuck here, for the record. I can lounge a little bit less I guess, since I'm on the camera, but I think this is more of a discussion. I don't have a presentation for you so much. Outreach and engagement is what I consider to be one of the more convoluted aspects of the At-Large activities and infrastructure because it's ostensibly the responsibility of the RALOs to do it, but there's also an ALAC subcommittee on it, and all of it seems to be done without much synchronicity, it seems to be a lot of randomness and not much in terms of measurable results.

I'll say to Cheryl, since I'm looking at your video feed right now, that whenever I have a conversation with Sebastien about a metrics for our

recent engagement, your name comes up, he mentions your name. So that may be something that we need to revisit somehow with all of these disparate efforts associated with outreach and engagement. So I think we need to be clear on what our objectives are for outreach and engagement so that we have some sense of whether or not we're accomplishing anything.

I think that I share people's frustration with booths. I have much like Cheryl, similar experience, spending a lot of time at booths during my time as a software engineer. The most useful booths are the ones that had offices built into them. So you could have your meetings on the trade show floor. They could be good for demos of new technology and things like that, but that's not much of what we're able to do.

I think the most powerful thing is to have an aggressive initiative to get on the panel discussions that are happening, because then the things that we say in those panels lead to conversations in the hallways, and leads to interest. So riding on the coattails of the things other people want to see is, I think a powerful concept at conferences and where more of our focus should be.

I think, pretending that we're innately interesting is probably not going to bear much fruit, but being a part of a conversation and saying something insightful, for me, has always been the best type of outreach that I've seen. As far as outreach and engagement for the coming year, there's a number of different things that are going on, and figuring out some way to house them all in a central way and understand them as a single initiative, and perhaps measure their success, I think should be one of our objectives.

Obviously, there's this new transition to GSE-managed outreach and engagement of the RALOs, and I'm very curious and somewhat cautious about what the implications of that are, and what the messages are and how they're constructed. Because some of the messages that slip out or things like ICANN great, and things like that, as messages that GSE has to try to push out at that level, and those aren't necessarily At-Large messages.

So we also need to figure out what how we manage messaging through all of these different outlets. That's something that even Sebastien has agreed should be centralized, that the messages themselves isn't something that should be just made up on the spot by so many different folks, but instead something that we agree on as our priorities.

I am almost ashamed to admit that I have a plan to try and discuss another way of thinking of how we Outreach and Engagement given that we already have so many, but I'm formulating something that I'm trying to call the loop, which is an idea of the back-and-forth communication, up and down the At-Large infrastructure. I've always likened it to a call tree that I have associated with my elementary school days, they had something called the PTA or the Parent Teacher Association, where you had to get information out to the community about a snow day or parent teacher conferences or something like that.

There'd be a small number of parents that would get called, and then each of those parents had a small number of parents that they would call, and each of those parents, and on and on, and you'd never make more than four or five phone calls, but you'd reach everyone through this tree. In my mind, there's something along those lines that we need

to be thinking about in terms of an idealized reality with respect to the RALOs and the ALSes.

In many ways, I think it has the potential to be more effective than the changes we made as a part of the At-Large review, which is to allow the At-Large to speak directly to the members of the ALSes. I'll be curious to see how that works in practice, because as we heard at both NARALO and EURALO assemblies, people feel like they're on too many lists and things like that.

I don't think there's going to be an automated solution for this, and this is part of what I was trying to get across when talking to the EURALO general assembly is that I think if done right, this type of communication platform is very retail. In other words, you know the five people that you're emailing, and you're making a personal plea to them to email their five people or to get feedback on a particular initiative, et cetera.

I think that having people understand the truly retail nature of this, and the non-automated nature of this, that there isn't going to be one mail that we're going to be able to send out, and it's going to magically result in anything happening, I think it's going to be part of the objective for this time going forward.

Part of what I'd like to do, when we have a meeting with the NomCom reps about the kind of reps we're looking for, I think it would be really good if we're trying to think outside the box to seek out potential NomCom appointees to the ALAC that have experience, both in grassroots mobilization, and potentially in commercial product distribution. Because what we kind of have is a wholesale distributor

retail kind of structure with the RALOs being a distributor, and how to manage that distribution channel is its own art form, and I think that that's something that we need to get better at doing.

So those are some initial thoughts from me. I'm working on a little baby white paper on what I mean by this loop, and how it might be used. The things that I want to see it used for are either feedback or message amplification, I think those are the two primary things that we want to use our infrastructure for. So if there are in fact issues that we can boil down to in such a way that fairly down that list and infrastructure that can be made to be understood. I think there's only a few issues that fall into that category, but they might include generic names, they might include, sorry, geographic names, close generics, application support, et cetera.

I think there are areas where issues can be made to be understandable, even by non-internet fanatics that are what we sometimes refer to as typical end users. I think in that case, the more that we can do to get feedback on the decisions from a broader group of people, the more that we will have credibility in the positions that we take. So I think there's a feedback loop, which is where that loop concept comes from.

The other is message amplification, and the message amplification, I think one of the things that we might want to -- there are areas where we want to get word out and help get word out, and one of those areas is Universal Acceptance, for example, and can we create a situation where we set an objective to have 2000 social media posts or something like that, come out of our infrastructure, and what would it take to make that happen? Maybe that only needs to happen two times

a year or something like that, but that's something that I think if we were able to demonstrate that where there are in fact, a kind of measurable result, it will have a dramatic impact on how we're perceived internally.

I had [00:25:03 - inaudible] and Avri over to dinner during the who's and the what's of the contracted parties summit that they had in Los Angeles. Avri said that she thought that the world would be blown away by the At-Large pulling off something like that, like a real grassroots mobilization around social media, I want to say tweets, but Twitter may be about to die, but something along those lines, whatever the next thing is, and broadcast a message out there, or getting widespread feedback on an issue on which feedback is useful.

Either one of those things, or both, hopefully, I think can go a long way to increase our credibility within the ICANN community, and therefore our influence. The more that we do that, the more that we can stick to a single message. There's an old saying about economists, that if you put three economists in a room, they'll come out with four different opinions. It's a funny joke and everything like that, but at its core, it suggests that there's no unity, that there's no answers in the context of economics. I think we really want to avoid that joke being applicable to us.

In other words, you put three members of the At-Large community into a room, and they come out with four opinions about end user interests, then we are really undermining the At-Large as the voice of those interests. I think there's a growing, I forget what the word is. There's some sentiment among the RALOs that they want to be heard from

independently, and I think that that's a dangerous thing, because the more that we present the rest of the ICANN communique community, and in particular, the board with multiple points of view, the more we're abdicating our own responsibility and telling them, go figure out the end user interests yourself.

I think we fall into a trap of believing that we have special insight into end users, because we don't, we're not special. What makes the At-Large special is the rigor with which we discuss those issues, take them seriously, get feedback from as many people as possible, and entertain as many opinions in the formulation of that consensus. Then operating from a consensus, I think becomes critical if we want the At-Large to be taken seriously in the broader ICANN community.

So that's my vision, and I don't know if it's the 22, 23 vision as much as it is maybe a four year vision for At-Large Outreach and Engagement, and I don't even know if Outreach and Engagement are the ideal words to use. Feedback and message amplification, I believe, are the key aspects of this, and then we do some recruiting as well, which is the third thing, and that may be the area in which we want the least centralized kind of control, but for this feedback and message amplification, I think that is something that needs to be more centralized than it has been historically. Those are my starting thoughts, and I welcome more discussion.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. You bring in very strong insights here, and I believe that it has created some kind of pragmatic thinking that

will be coming in from the respective RALO's strategies. I think, in the respective items, I have to rethink how they're going to be able to align the priority areas in reference to your presentation. Previously, I saw Maureen's hand up. Maureen, would you like to say something?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, thank you. Thanks, Dan. I don't want to say anything more. I think that Jonathan's explained, and I like his vision, and I think that's important. I did put in the chat just reminding people that this Outreach and Engagement now is actually changing to be a little bit more pragmatic.

It's looking more at like having the Outreach and Engagement Working group working in with the RALO strategic plan, and also developing resources as explained and shared with shareholders that those resources and the ideas that come through them must affect the brands that were actually select promoting within At-Large is like that, and that the talking points have actually been the way in which we're actually still like trying to get those ideas into the communities, but the message has to be clear, the message has to be what is coming from At-Large.

A lot of times when presentations are made within the communities that have been a personal view, and have not really reflected the ideas that we're actually been trying to promote within At-Large. So this is something that we're actually promoting, and also it would help to -- choosing a topic and everybody working on it, it will help to develop again, some understanding within the members who don't attend CPWG or OSA meetings, this is an opportunity for them to -- using this

as an opportunity for a little bit more [00:31:35 - inaudible] something as well. I don't want to take up more time because I know we're already got a full agenda, and I'll leave you to it instead. Thanks.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, thank you very much. Absolutely, Maureen. You are right, I'm going to speak about a policy and the new focus of Outreach and Engagement. One thing is that policy discussions are becoming a nucleus of how we're able to engage. So if we can be able to push out the message of the key policies that are being discussed within ICANN At-Large, and how they affect the end users, I think this is a great thing.

One thing I'd like to tell Jonathan, please, don't get tired of telling us and reminding us that we need to focus our outreach and engagement towards policy, and also reaching out to the grassroots, because we have to tap into the untapped potential that lies within us. In looking at whether the introspective input, I'm not seeing anyone's hands up, I'm going to still ask you, Jonathan, to give us at least a glimpse of ICANN76.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. One of the things that we're trying to do with ICANN76 as it's a community forum is make it as community oriented as possible. You can think of it as being two parts to the meeting. One is the weekend where primarily internal conversations are taking place, and then there's the week days that are the main part of the meeting.

What we're trying to do is pack a lot of our own internal discussions into that weekend so that we have a fairly light schedule for the weekdays,

and even so, it won't always feel light because there's a lot of face to faces and scheduled meetings.

We want to keep the number of At-Large only sessions to a real minimum during that time, because we want folks to go around and participate in the other aspects of ICANN that are going on and the other meetings that are taking place, and even go so far as to be able to engage or participate or intervene into those other conversations that are happening.

So just as we've made a point to engage in policy development much earlier than in the advice stage by engaging in workgroup activities, we need to do the same thing at these ICANN meetings, which is the active participants in these cross community sessions, and making sure that we're aware of what's going on in them, aware of where the At-Large stands and what the objectives of the At-Large community are, and be prepared to advance those objectives in each of those forum.

So that's really the vision for ICANN76 is to minimize, particularly on the weekdays, the sessions, where we're just looking at each other and really create as many openings as possible to go out and participate in a meeting as a whole. So as far as things that are in this little outline here, one of the things that we talked about doing, and scheduling them can be a little bit of a challenge, because we're trying to avoid these conflicts.

We're thinking about having a deep dive into both CPWG priorities and LFB priorities over the weekend. That goes a little deeper into what were previously like a half hour of talking points. We've had a welcome

speech, the last several ICANN meetings that included 20 minutes, 15, 20 minutes to summarize the topics we thought would be of interest at the meeting, and talk about what our positions were for those discussions.   If you truly weren't completely intimate with those conversations, it really wasn't enough.

So we're thinking about having on the weekend, a real deep dive, like a 90-minute session of going into some detail about the topics we think are going to be discussed over the course of the meeting, and what some of the background is and some of the explanation, what's currently going on with those issues. Probably one of the biggest ones is subsequent procedures, because shortly we're going to see a couple of webinars on the recently completed ODA on subsequent procedures, and the board will be voting on so subsequent procedures, recommendations, immediately following ICANN76.

So I suspect that's going to be a topic of quite a bit of discussion at 76. So we're thinking about devoting a whole 90 minutes to subsequent procedures, and the five or six topics within that that have been the focus of our interventions and advice, and gain an understanding of what it is that we-- what we want and where those requests stand post ODA, what assumptions did staff make as part of the ODP process, where's the board and it's conversations, where it's community these conversations, and making sure that folks are really aware of the issues that matter the At-Large, and not the whole of subsequent procedures, which is largely about application processes for new gTLDs.

Instead, the things that we think affected users like DNS abuse, closed generics, geographic names, applicant support, community priority

evaluation, auction multipliers for communities, things like that, that we have commented on in some detail. Understanding where those things stand, how they got reflected in the ODP process, and what still needs to be done, I think would be the importance of one of those sessions.

We think it'd be great to also have another OFP centric session of that type, but we're not exactly sure what the topic of that should be. It might have to do with discussion surrounding the strategic plan, if that's happening at ICANN, then prep for that would be very important. I think we'll look at what the most discussed aspect of OFP work at ICANN76, and then do a deep dive into that.

So those are some of the sessions we're going to have on the Sunday. We're going to also have the LACRALO General Assembly that's taking place during the ICANN76. So we're trying to find a couple of sessions in that GA that others from outside of the region might want to attend, and sessions that are going on in a broader ICANN meeting that folks from the GA, it's only two days long, might want to attend outside of their meeting room.

So there's a couple of different sort of bi-directional participation issues related to the LACRALO General Assembly. Probably a LACRALO's sponsored social events that most of us would want to reach as well. Then we're doing normal things in terms of trying to figure out what social media should look like for the meeting and outreach and what our objectives are there and who we want to try to get interested in the meeting and in what sessions and how best to do that.

I think a lot of social media that we do happens just as the session is starting or something like that, which isn't probably going to get more people to pay attention to it, we probably need to find a way to get people to commit to come into a session sooner rather than later, but those conversations will be ongoing. I don't know if staff, was that about what you were thinking or Daniel in terms of an overview of ICANN76?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, absolutely, you're right, and you gave us just a quick intro into what Lilian is going to be speaking about. She is going to give us updates on what social media plans for ICANN76, and she will speak about the LACRALO General Assembly and the outreach booth. ICANN76 is going to be hosted by LACRALO this time, and at least Lilian has been working on something, probably the intro that you have given is really great. We shall hear from Lilian. Let's give Lilian the floor. Thank you. Lilian. Lilian, just in case you're on mute, please unmute yourself.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Daniel, this is Yesim speaking, so we actually have Lilian on the Spanish channel, and we're waiting for her to speak.

LILIAN IVETTE DE LUQUE BRUGES: Hello, this is Lilian. Sorry, can you hear me?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Great. We can now hear you. Please, proceed.

LILIAN IVETTE DE LUQUE BRUGES: Lilian speaking. Good morning, everyone. This is Lilian for the records. As you said, we have been working to organize the LACRALO GA, and as you know, this is going to be held on the weekend at ICANN76. We're now holding a meeting every Monday. This is a 60-minute meeting.

We have an organizing committee and there are three other subcommittees. There is one committee in charge of the content, there is a subcommittee in charge of promotions and communications, and there is another committee for social activities. We have identified the At-Large sessions where we would like to participate, and we will be participating in the welcoming ceremony in the At-Large and GAC joint meeting, the ALAC and board joint meeting, the policy forum, among others.

Additionally, we are going to have a new edition of black digital event. The session content is well advanced. Today we have a new meeting and we're now focusing ourselves in working on the GA, and we're focusing the GA on our promotion in three keywords. These keywords are the following: Reconnection, Revolution, and Reboost.

Additionally, let me tell you that when it comes to the promotion aspect, we are going to have the support of Alexandra Dans from the regional office and the Social Media Working Group. We are creating a team to work on the social media and promotional aspects for the GA. Let me tell you on the sum up that we're strongly working every week, and in addition to the weekly meetings that we have, our

subcommittees are still gathering to be able to have the GA already organized.

So, we will be reporting you on our work. This is when it comes to the GA, the LACRALO GA. Now, when it comes to the Social Media Working Group, we have a draft working plan, and we had a meeting with regional teams so as to be able to rebuild a plan and to add content.

We have something very clear, and this is that we'll be focusing on the work prior to the GA to strongly promote At-Large sessions for people to get involved and for participants to be able to participate in these sessions. Additionally, we would like to request a stronger commitment from our community so that they can help us through their social media profiles.

They need to post all these promotional materials and all the information for At-Large and ICANN76. We also have two activities, we're working with the Capacity Building Working Group. [00:47:01 - inaudible] to hold a webinar, we're thinking about the topics. Of course, together with the Outreach and Engagement subcommittee, because we would like to work on the booth, the idea is to have a very dynamic activity and to resume some of the activities that they both had before the pandemic.

So, between today and tomorrow, I will be sending several emails, first to Jonathan, because I would like to get his comments on our plan, to Hadia to organize this webinar, to Daniel to start organizing the work at the booth, and I will be contacting Sylvanus and Deborah because we would like fellows and next gen to be able to participate in our At-Large

sessions, but we would like to have the Latin America and the Caribbean fellows and next gen to participate in the digital event that is going to be held on Tuesday.

We want them to participate in the polls for them to be able to engage and learn about At-Large. I will also be circulating the workplan link with all the observations being made in our prior call to the regional liaisons so that in our next meeting on December the 15th, we can have an approved work plan ready to start working in January or February.

That was the first summary I wanted to give you regarding the GA and the Social Media Working Group. Now, I am open to your comments, and of course, I kindly ask your support for the success of these events. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Lilian. Since we're going to be focusing on the next meeting for Outreach and Engagement to the ICANN76, I'm going to request let's at least prepare our questions and our engagements and our feedback on how we can best make ICANN76effective. With this, allow me hand over to Natalia to handle the next session of the agenda, the regional RALOs. Natalia, please, you have the floor.

NATALIA FILINA: Thank you very much, Daniel. Natalia Filina speaking. So I see that we don't have enough time now for updates from each RALO, and we should decide now we will be so quickly with this now or we can continue this via mailing list, and maybe we may put some short reports

on our wiki. We plan that till the end of December, we will meet with Outreach and Engagement liaisons to discuss our work, calls, coordination, and our needs for capacity building conclusion and trainings maybe. I will kindly ask staff to help us to set up the doodle and to decide which time will be comfortable for this. Daniel, we will continue now with reports or we've come to the end of the call?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Just for more clarifications, I think there was a premeeting that was meant to be held between the liaisons to be able to discuss the various updates. So I think this meeting did not take place, so I would suggest that the meeting with the liaisons takes place, I think by either the first week of January, then they scheduled for e-meeting in January, we shall be able to have these respective updates. I think that sounds like a good plan. Is there any suggestions on this or any rejections?

NATALIA FILINA: I agree with you, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you. Seeing that there's no absolutes reactions. From the chat, I'm seeing agreement on this. Thank you very much for that. So action point is that staff to be able to schedule a RALO leadership meeting for the first week or second week of January, and we also discussed this initially with the schedule that. Thank you all for your respective support.

So going into the next action for the Q&A, since time is not our best friend, is there anyone who would like to make quick additions on this? Okay, seeing that is now no comments or questions coming up, I'm going to adjourn this call, and I wish everyone a merry festive season and a happy new year. I'm looking forward to the next year, and for more options engagement. Thank you all. Bye.

NATALIA FILINA: Thank you very much. Bye-bye to you all.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]