YESIM SAGLAM:
Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Regional Leadership Call taking place on Thursday 25th of May 2023 at 1300 UTC. On our call today, we have Greg Shatan, On the English channel, we have Greg Shatan, Alfredo Calderon, Natalia Filina, Sébastien Bachollet, Eduardo Diaz, Claire Craig, Amrita Choudhury, and Seun Ojedeji. Currently, we don't have anyone on the Spanish channel. We have received apologies from Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong. And from Staff side, we have Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, and myself, Yesim Saglam, present today's call, and I'm on call management as well. Just to highlight that we are also expecting Heidi Ullrich to join us shortly.

For today's call, our Spanish interpreters are Paula and Marina. And 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, in case someone joins the Spanish channel. And with this, I would like to leave the floor over to you, Greg. Thank you very much.

GREG SHATAN:
Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening all RALO leaders and leadership. So, we'll begin with the agenda approval. The agenda is in front of you on Zoom, and should be in your email as well. We did add an AOB discussion of the cross-RALO roundtable. Are there any other additions to the agenda?

NATALIA FILINA:	Greg, Natalia Filina speaking. If I can take, I don't know, less than one minute, I will as a topic about our RJF community suggestions, maybe during AOB.
GREG SHATAN:	Yes. Let's add that to AOB as well. Thank you, Natalia. Seeing no other comments, we can consider the agenda approved with that addition. And so, we should jump right into the next agenda item, which is the proposed agenda for the ICANN77 cross-RALO meeting. So, this is just a suggestion, and so I would like to take comments, questions, additions, corrections, amendments, addendum, extensions, clarifications, and any loose change that anybody would like to suggest for this agenda for in-person meeting in ICANN77. Sebastien, please go ahead.
SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Thank you. More than the end over at the end of meeting, I feel that it could be useful to have also some minutes to discuss how we want to be ready for the next ICANN meeting, ICANN78. Thank you.
GREG SHATAN:	Thank you. That certainly seems like a good suggestion. We should add that to the list, maybe make that Item 7 and move AOB to 8. So, Sebastien, you'll own 5, 6, and 7 at that point, more or less. So, let us see. Claire, your hand was up, but it seems to have gone down.

CLAIRE CRAIG:	Greg, sorry. Claire Craig for the record. I was just trying to figure out how long the meeting was. If it was a 60-minute or a 90-minute meeting, but I would put it out and I think it's a 90-minute meeting. Is that correct? At ICANN77.
GREG SHATAN:	Good question. Staff, I'm not sure what-- It certainly it looks like it should be 90 minutes because these numbers add up to more than 60.
CLAIRE CRAIG:	Right. Yeah. Because it seems like quite a lot that we're trying to cover in that short space of time. So, we would really have to manage the discussion.
GREG SHATAN:	Yes. So, Gisella has confirmed that it is 90 minutes, so we're not trying to fit 90 minutes of meeting into a 60-minute bag, so to speak.
CLAIRE CRAIG:	Right. Okay. All right. Thanks. Everything looks good for me.
GREG SHATAN:	Great. Thanks. So, we have one addition as suggested by Sebastien. I also see there's a closed parenthesis needed on number 5 after the 10 minutes. Any other comments, questions about the agenda or about cross-RALO meeting generally?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Greg, this is Silvia. Could you repeat the item to be added under which number, please?

GREG SHATAN: The item to be added is planning for ICANN78. And we can make that Item 7 and move AOB to Item 8. So, once we hand over to Seb, he has to do something with his hands.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: So, everything else seems to work. So, I think we can take the agenda as approved. Obviously, if something comes up or somebody has a bright idea or somebody who's not on the call believe that something else should be added, change, rearranged, we can be dynamic. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to know if we have already information if Sally will join us? And we may need to be flexible to welcome her when she will have time to come to see us. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: I will ask Staff if that is happening or if we have any other special guests.

YESIM SAGLAM: At the moment, the agenda doesn't include any other special guest, Greg. Yes, Sally may be able to visit us, to visit the meeting. We have the number three discussion topic with the CEO, so hopefully, we will be able to have Sally with us for that agenda item. So far, that's the only guest that we are planning to invite.

GISELLA GRUBER: Greg, this is Gisella.

GREG SHATAN: Oh, yes, Gisella, please go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: I do apologize. I have a technical problem. So, yes, we have been invited to Sally as per the call that we had a couple of weeks ago. And just to say that her support team are aware of it, and she will try and drop by, as Sebastien said. We will need form of flexibility just to allow her on the agenda, but as we get closer to the meeting, we're likely to have a little better information. I know the interpreters must be hating me. I do apologize. So, we'll keep you posted. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Gisella. And I hope you get a glass of water. Anything else on the cross-RALO meeting? I'm seeing nothing.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. Greg, I'm trying to raise my hand again.

GREG SHATAN: Heidi, welcome.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Thank you. Apologies for my slight delay. Just on the NomCom, the regional distribution rebalancing. I'm aware that many of your RALOs are developing the individual responses. I believe the approach--

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We are not yet at the topic, Heidi. We are finishing the third. But go ahead, I guess. But we are concluding with number 3.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, I see. I did not see that. It's on 4. I was looking on the agenda. I just wanted to stress. I'll make it short. I just wanted to stress that it is June the 30th. At that point in the meeting, it will only be about two more weeks to go. Thank you.   But that'll be a nice segue, Greg, for you to join to Item 4 then.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Heidi, for the segue. So, we have wrapped up Item 3, which moves us to Item 4, which is, in fact, the preliminary discussion of RALO views on the NomCom Rebalancing. And I'll open with a question which is whether there would be any purpose in a cross-RALO response in addition to the responses of the individual RALOs, or if we'll just let the individual RALO responses speak for themselves? Certainly, it doesn't mean we can't coordinate, and we are coordinating right now, indeed, in this Item 4. So, I'll open the floor to discussion. Amrita, please go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Greg. Amrita for the record. I see merit in both the RALO submitting as well as a joint submission, just in case there are some diverse different views from different regions coming out. And the reason why I see it is most of the other SO/ACs select one person, mostly from the Global North to represent in the NomCom. Whereas, it is only At-Large, which has representation from the five geographical locations to bring in certain diverse views. So, these views are important.

And I think when GNSO to some extent is trying to have more people coming in, and those who have been in NomCom really know how things happen, I think we need to emphasize on the diversity of regions also and how we bring in a balance. So, I think the more we have submissions from each of the RALO, as in all the RALO submit as well as a joint, I think that would be good. The more the better it is. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Amrita. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. I'm not sure that we will have so different views on that, but definitely it's good even if we say the same thing that we send a different point of view or come from each RALO. One of the questions I have is that if we do a cross-RALO or maybe we can do an ALAC cross-RALO answer and not just an ALAC one. That could be also a good way for us to be more involved in some, I'd say, policy issue or discussion at the level of ALAC.

In fact, the questions were asked to us, it's rebalancing and it seems that the question of rebalancing is more internal at the GNSO. We can end up to have one more or no more people, but just the change of fit or hat. But then is a question, from my point of view, what could be the future because if GNSO add new constituency or new stakeholder group or new house or whatever, how it could be handled in the future. And with the fact that that liaison will be voting members, we are more and more in minority.

And from my one-year NomCom participation, I feel that we didn't coordinate well within the RALO at least this year or the year I was. I am not saying that it's the case each time, but. And everything is done but we don't coordinate. That's for me a topic much more important than the rebalancing. It's how we keep our five seats and how we try to have more coordination. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Sebastien. In my thinking, it's first that we should have a coordinated response in addition to our individual responses I think will emphasize our common ground. And we can talk additionally, whether that coordinated response should be from the RALOs plus ALAC, assuming ALAC will also put in its own response without us. But that if we have the five RALO leaders or the five RALOs and the At-Large, the committee, all speaking as one, that I think also will be powerful. So, we can certainly broach that with ALAC leadership. Seun, please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: All right. Thank you. Seun, for the record. Yeah. So, I definitely agree with having a cross-RALO submission, but I think we also if we are thinking that we should also have individual RALO submission, I just want to understand the goal. Are we trying to have more numbers in terms of the submission? Do we feel that the cross-RALO submission is not going to be strong enough?   And then having individual RALO submission would make it stronger? Because I think that this particular one would not have diverse opinion a cross-RALO. I mean, I don't see us having significant differences on this particular one.

But be it as may, if we prefer to have individual submit, and also cross-RALO submit, I think that it should be good for us to have some clarity on timeline of when the cross-RALO one is going to be finalized. So, some of the things that we agree as general principles can also be rehashed or re-uphold in the individual submission. Again, the point I'm

making is that the individual submission should not go against some of the things that are going to be submitted, are going to be said at the cross-RALO level.

The other thing I wanted to say is that Sebastien touched on a very important aspect of this in terms of the future of NomCom. If the GNSO is asking for more seats or more voting power, which is currently seven at the moment, which is actually high compared to what At-Large has, I think we also would need to be very, very strong [audio glitch 00:19:08].

GREG SHATAN: Sorry. Seun, we lost your audio in the middle of that sentence, after the word strong.

YESIM SAGLAM: Seems like we have an issue with the bridge audio. We will try to redial back to Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Sorry about that. I don't know when my mic went off. At what point?

GREG SHATAN: I think it was in the middle of the word strong. Welcome back, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Oh, okay. All right. So, I was saying that for us at the moment to some extent, after GNSO, we can say At-Large has some kind of voting power

in the current formation. But if we're asking, if GNSO is asking for more power or more seats, as the case may be, I strongly feel that Sebastien's comment is very, very on point. We need to make sure that the comments that we are making is also telling about the future.

The weighting of the voting should not be affected. I mean, if it's going to be affected, it should be to be positive for At-Large because we should not actually entertain a situation whereby the weighting of the vote at the moment then gets affected. I don't really care much about the number. If the number increases, but the weighting across the voting needs to be proportionate across the SO/AC but for to my own interest, of course, as far as I'm concerned, it's At-Large.

I personally still think that the cross-RALO submission would carry more weight. I think that that needs to be agreed upon prior to us making the individual one to avoid individual one going counter-- I mean, what is the right word to use now? Going against the ones that you're actually going to write in the cross-RALO one. So, it should be good for us to discuss at what point do we write the cross-RALO one and agree, and at one point do individual RALOs actually submit their thing. But for us, from AFRALO, we're already gathering feedbacks from our members and we should be able to have something by ICANN77 in terms of the views from AFRALO. So maybe that will be a good time or maybe not. Just to ping that for now. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Seun. I'll turn to Claire next.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Thanks, Greg. Claire Craig for the record. I like the idea that Seun said.
                                      We should have some time frame for determining when we arrive at
                                      this cross-RALO submission. I think the primary submission should be a
                                      cross-RALO submission, but I think if individual RALOs want to submit
                                      their own statement, they should be free to do so as well. I really also
                                      want to find out what the RALOs are doing to gather that kind of
                                      feedback and advice from their community, because I want to share
                                      with you a little bit about our experience.

                                      We at LACRALO had constituted a small ad hoc group to get some ideas
                                      together. And so far, we've had one meeting. That meeting produced
                                      nothing. We talked for the entire hour but at the end of it, we have not
                                      arrived at any kind of consensus or answered any of the questions, but
                                      there was quite a lot of discussion. We also set up a Google Doc with
                                      the question, both in English and Spanish, and so far, there has been no
                                      take up and no comments on that Google Doc. And so, I just want to
                                      know if the other RALOs are having the same kind of experience that we
                                      are having or what are you doing to gather that kind of feedback from
                                      the community as well as what's the time frame that we are going to be
                                      looking at for completing the cross-RALO submission. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, Claire. I put myself in the queue next to speak from the
                                      NARALO position or at least my NARALO position. First, I note that
                                      Tripti's letters went individually to each of the RALO chairs. So, my view
                                      is that we should take advantage of that invitation for each RALO to
                                      have its individual voice. So, I think in my view, it's important for each
                                      RALO to respond directly. I think that there doesn't necessarily need to

be a hierarchy between cross-RALO response and the individual RALO responses and that one is primary and the others are secondary.

My view is that each of the individual RALO should develop their response, and then at ICAN77, we can discuss and compare those views, and hopefully, we will, I think, in terms of time frames, have a draft response from each RALO available for ICANN77, and then discuss how to meld those into an additional joint response. And I think none of these should be submitted until all of them are ready to go, which probably means submitting them all on June 30th or directly before that rather than submitting significantly before that. And that way, I think it's important for us to have this diversity of response that I think underlines the idea of a diversity of voices from the regions as being important in the NomCom.

I think it's also important to go through Tripti's letter and also, through the meat of the board resolution, and how that played off of everything that came before. As noted, the only really substantive thing that's happening is that the liaisons are being elevated to voting membership, also, the two-year terms as opposed to one-year terms, which makes perfect sense to me, and something we've heard from our representatives on the NomCom past, present and future. Then I think the idea of this empowered body of current and former NomCom members, I'm not sure what an empowered body means, although it sounds like it's sort of a I would think of it more as advisory than empowered personally. I think that in terms of--

The other part of it is that looking at Tripti's note or letter, overall, is that it's very much forward-looking. It's not merely asking us to

comment on kind of where things stand. Indeed, it's not primarily asking us to comment on where things stand or these present proposals, but really on the future of the NomCom, on the future of rebalancing. And I think we've already made some good points here that the RALO voices should not be, or really the voices from other regions represented by the RALO should not be diluted, the end user voice should not be diluted. So, rebalancing should not be a-- An expansion would be something that would need to be very gingerly considered, and the issue of diverse voices would need to be considered as opposed to some sort of consolidation of power among the already powerful.

I think one other thing to consider it seems that the idea of rebalancing was initially rather bold, and it seems to have been pulled back too so that there really is no rebalancing at all. That is actually on the table. The GNSO rebalancing has been, if there is going to be one, it has been assigned essentially to the GNSO itself. As far as I understand it, if there is kind of an actually pregnant issue within GNSO, it's the question of whether the NPOC which is the other constituency within the NCSG, whether NPOC should have a dedicated seat. It does not. And also, whether the current allocation of two seats to the business constituency, one for large organizations and the other for small organizations, should be terminated, and business constituency should be drop down to one seat.

Whether we want to comment on that hornet's nest as a cross-RALO group or even individual RALOs, I'll leave to discussion from the floor, but that's probably that's the actual rebalancing issue that's out there as far as I know. There may be other thoughts about whether there are

any other stakeholder groups that are not represented in the NomCom or other issues, but ultimately, I think the comments need to deal with Tripti's list of topics head on with reference to the history, at least, with knowledge of the history behind. And I'll stop there. See if anybody else has any comments on this topic. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Greg. Just to say briefly that, yeah, the history started in 2000 with the direct election of five, supposedly nine At-Large number of the board and the subsequent decision not to hold the second round of election, but to create two bodies, one was At-Large and ALAC, and the second was the NomCom. I have the impression that everybody has forgotten that, in fact, the ICANN board was supposed to have nine At-Large end users having the majority in the board of ICANN. That's why I think we when we talk about history, it's not just the number of seats of the business constituency NPOC, but also at least to be sure that we didn't lose our five seats from the RALO. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Sebastien. And I think the point that this isn't just about even the RALO seats or the seats on the NomCom itself. Recommendation 27 provide clarity on desire for independent directors and designate three specific seats for unaffiliated directors. Now is referring to the seats that the NomCom puts on the board. We certainly could mention or should mention that we're the only group or really, At-Large is the only group that's, or not the only group, but that we only seat a single person on the board. And I think that there should be

some-- We should consider how and whether that could be mentioned and certainly, I would mention that the constituency of the board was originally thought to be considerably different.

And, yeah, the end users have typically been squeezed as composition has changed rather than flourishing. We don't necessarily need to rehash old wounds, but it's supposed to be forward-looking, especially good for someone like yourself, Sebastien, who's been around since the beginning, to be able to cite to the history in the context of end user representation. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to add one word. I think it will be difficult to talk about the two seats from At-Large in the board. But just to tell you, it's one of the reasons, not the only one, but I am really pushing to have this holistic review. I feel really alone in this, even with my colleague from the other RALO or from At-Large, to push to have a real holistic review as soon as possible. For the moment, we end up to have discussion about how the next holistic review will be organized and so on and so forth. And that's a topic we may wish to discuss together one day. I don't know if it's of interest for you, but I am very concerned with what is happening there. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: I'll agree with you, Sebastien. A true full scale holistic review couldn't come soon enough for me. I think it's important. I think a lot of things have been stuck in the same way for a long time. Issues are really-- There's not been in my participation, which goes back to at least 2013

and really all the way back to 2007, a real holistic review. I think people are scared of it. Given that even the non-holistic reviews sometimes raise interesting and sometimes wacky ideas, but I think it's necessary, it's overdue, and it can't be shied away from. So, you have you have my support in that.

Whether that gets mentioned in this particular context is a different question, but I'm absolutely firm believer that holistic review it should be a top priority. I know that there's going to be a pilot holistic review. I guess we'll see how that works out. I'm not sure how holistic it will be if it's a pilot, but that seems somewhat contradictory, but I guess we'll see. Any other comments either on how we will progress the cross-RALO views or any other discussion of actual views on the NomCom Rebalancing?

Oh, and I'll also answer Claire's question, which is that you are ahead of NARALO. We have not yet had a Google Doc or a first meeting or a serious discussion frankly yet. So, we need to assemble our small team and get cracking on that so that we have something to present and circulate as a draft, obviously, at ICANN77. And I think that should be the timing. So, we should each have a timeline to develop our document but I think that being able to circulate it among the other RALOs, at least by day zero or day one or really day zero of ICANN77. I think it'd be important to give people a little chance to look at what the other RALOs have in mind before we actually end up sitting down together.

I note Silvia in the chat noting that we need to develop a timeline to develop the cross-RALO document. My view is that we can't really start

developing it until we have a sense of what each RALO wants to say. Heidi, yes, I think, Workplace would be a good idea. So, we'll have somewhat of a scramble, if you will, to go between the 15th, which is the end of the ICANN77 plus travel, which really means people won't be anywhere other than the 18th. And then the 30th. But, hopefully, having the constituent parts from the RALOs will be helpful.

So Heid is asking in the chat, which other RALOs still need a Google Doc for their responses? And noting that Staff can create a table with the five RALOs and the cross-RALO documents, total of six Google Docs that are linked from the Workspace. That all sounds like a good idea. Any other comments on the NomCom rebalancing? If there is not, and it sounds like we have logistics underway as well as a general sense of direction, we can go to the AOB. And I'll turn the mic over to Sebastien for the cross-RALO roundtable discussion.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Greg. And I guess we have all access a good chance, [inaudible - 00:40:33] today Google Doc. We agree on the date, we agree on the timing. I am in discussion with Staff about interpretation. Now why I wanted to add that as a topic today is that I think it's a time for each of the RALO to try to find one, two or three speakers. I know that for region, it will be different. Just to take one example, in the first board of ICANN, to try to find people there, there were three regions from Asia-Pacific, Europe and North America. Therefore, we will not have somebody from Latin America and from Africa in this first board. Therefore, those two regions need to find

maybe someone from the second board or to try to find a way to have somebody.

For Europe, it's a little bit tricky because there were three, two passed away already, and I am chasing the last one who is a French woman, but I don't have any clue yet how to reach to her. Therefore, I will maybe be obliged also to find somebody outside of this first board. But what I wanted to stress is that it's really time for you to try to sync and to select two, three people, and then we will see how we arrange them in the meeting. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Sebastien. Could I ask Sebastien or Staff to just clarify when and where, what the cross-RALO roundtable is and what topics we have or topics we've put on it?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Definitely, I can do that. I put the link to the Google Doc. The idea was to celebrate the 25th anniversary of ICANN. The 18th of September will be the date. Some people may discuss about that, but it seems to be when I was looking the day. Therefore, if you will go the timing, if we go a little bit down in the document go, go, go, there is a list of go, go, go list here of people. It's not to say that it must be inside this list. It was just to give to the reader this information who could be go and I add some other ideas and please add your idea also.

And if we can go to the program for the agenda for the meeting, the draft agenda here, after some discussion, we want to keep two hours.

Therefore, the idea was to give each RALO chair a spot to talk, but at the end to go looking forward. Therefore, I will just do a quick intro. And the idea is to invite Sally Costerton to do either the introduction or the conclusion and the chair of the board to do either the introduction or the conclusion, and then to have, let's say, one person by region if it's feasible to talk about the period before the creation of ICANN and then the first period of ICANN, and open a discussion with the participants.

Therefore, what I am asking you is on the red where there's the name of the region is to pick up one. My idea is if we have two by regions, but maybe three for the two time of the roundtable, I will say, will be great. Then we open we open a discussion with the participants, and then each of the RALO chair will have a three-minute talk to say what they want, but looking forward and then a conclusion. All that could be evolved. It's a draft. But I feel that it's really not enough time to invite people. Eduardo, [inaudible - 00:45:47], it's no problem. I feel you will have to decide if they can fit with Becky Burr, but that's the discussion we may have. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you for asking. That definitely answered my question. I'll put this in context. Eduardo notes ICANN really start it in 1993. Of course, started. We can discuss the pre-history before the first ICANN1 meeting took place, etc. Amrita, please go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Sebastien, for sharing all this outline. I am good with what everyone agrees upon. My only thing was since it's an online meeting,

attention span these days are short. We will have to be very precise and brief. And as a moderator, you will have a huge task in actually keeping everyone on time. I think the briefings to the speakers also need to go accordingly. That everyone may want to speak a lot, but they need to be very concise. Perhaps sharing questions beforehand would also help. I know everyone has a lot of history they want to share, but I think as a moderator, you will have a very important role in ensuring it happens within time frame.

About the speaker from Asia-Pacific, I think I'm okay. And if you are okay with it, yes, Heidi, I think a press call or a briefing is very important. And if it is okay, can I share the name of the APAC person with our leadership team just in case they have some suggestions? And I completely agree with you that the invitations need to go at the earliest so that we can block people. Thank you. And apologies. I will have to leave. There is another GDC discussion starting in another nine minutes and I am the backup speaker for the policy network on AI from the IGS. But Aris will be here.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. Thank you, Amrita. Claire, please go ahead.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Thanks, Greg. Claire for the record. Sebastien, I congratulate you. A lot of work seems to have gone into this already. I'm just wondering if you have a team working with you, how are you organizing this? Because as Amrita said, this is an online event and very significant online event, so I think it should be marketed properly so that as a wide cross-section of

RALOs and community members and next-gen and those kinds of people are able to attend and are aware that this is happening. So, this looks really, really good. I hope that you're not doing it on your own and that you do have a team of people working with you.

One suggestion is that Don Way says looking forward to the future. I am just wondering if since we are currently in the process of by the end of the AGM, the new leaders would be in place for the different RALOs. At least I know that's the case for LACRALO. And maybe you may want the new elect leader to speak instead of the current leader since they will be speaking into the future. That's just my suggestion. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Claire. Sebastien, let's keep this going for maybe another two minutes?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will be short. It's just to say that, Claire, the team is here. You are the team. And thank you for your support and your help. It's why it's important to share this document and please add your ideas. Who will be speaking on behalf of the RALO? Frankly, it's meant to be your decision, it's the decision of each RALO. I put the name of the current chair, but it could be the future chair, it could be the future secretary, it could be-- It's your decision or it could be somebody else but just somebody who will try to go for in the future. And if we agree with that, it's a good time to start to communicate and market around that and to have better people than me to do that, I am sure that you will

help me. So, thank you for your support and looking forward to organizing that. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Sebastien. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you. I just wanted to point out my comment in the chat. This does seem to be the kickoff for all of the At-Large anniversary events, most of which will be happening at the AGM. So, if you agree, this might be like the kickoff and then the other ones that are-- Because by that time, we'll know what's happening at ICANN77 in terms of the anniversary event. So, all of these could be marketed as this is what At-Large is doing in celebration. And we could have a page set up for all the anniversary events. We could add other materials so it would be a nice source of information the anniversary, all the activities and the history, etc. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Heidi. I'll note that this is the cross-RALO event. It's entirely possible that ALAC may want to have its own event, but certainly will be happy to be the kickoff. And I'll suggest, given that that result or that posture that we should focus on having both the end user perspective and the geographic perspective that comes from the RALOs and from this At-Large structure and members, we are at the bottom of the bottom-up. So, we should pass history from that perspective to the extent we can. Obviously, not a straightjacket to put people in but to

focus. So, with that, unless there's any other comments, I will turn the mic over to Natalia Filina. Please go ahead. You're on mute, Natalia.

NATALIA FILINA:

Sorry. Thank you very much. Natalia Filina speaking.   So, I will be very shortly with this topic. It was submitted and successfully adopted by the board. As I understand correctly, our project to which was born in EURALO but will service for full At-Large community. It is a project about a digital tool welcome package. So, it will be some kind of a book guide for new and existing members to help to find the information and mentors to apply, I don't know, as members, as members of working group and streams, etc. And I hope it will include history topics about our community.

And you know now I have not so much news about it. I don't want to repeat what it was already described about this project, but maybe I would-- Thank you very much, Heidi. Thank you for your help and support. I would like to say more and I think also we need to know. And it might be some instruction and information what will be the next step from the participant of this project because if I understand correctly, we need to create a team because we will do a lot of things. Even if part of information for this welcome package already is gathered, but I think we need to have a new look and new approaches to this document because we need to be more not just more digital because it looks like it will be like a page, a web page, a landing page. So maybe less than website but something like this.

And I think I'll ask via email maybe but, Heidi, how we can manage this project, which kind of responsibility we can share between us, what will be done by ICANN staff. So, I just need to understand because I have no experience how we can move forward with this. And thank you very much again for all of your support. I think it will be a really great project and a great result for us, and it really will help to attract much more participants into our work. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Natalia. Heidi, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi. Thank you, Greg. And I know that we just have a minute or two. First off, a huge congratulations to Natalia. That was a big lift and it is a significant project. I just wanted to let you know that. Take a look, it's on the fiscal year '24 implementation workspace. There are some details that I'd like to work at first with Natalia. So, I'd like to maybe set up a call with you when you're back home, Natalia, and just go over some of the details and how I think that we need to just have some flexibility on what the approval text is and what your vision is, which I think is much more forward-looking, frankly. So, if we could first do that and then maybe sometime around the 77 time period, we can start moving forward with the way forward, do you want to set up a small group, etc. Okay? I want to just get your ideas on it first, and then we can go forward with a smaller group. Thank you.

NATALIA FILINA: Just one question to you, Heidi. It looks like I saw another page on the wiki about, with your explanation, how it will be with your project. Because it was the information about that each RALO will create an own welcome ticket.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Yes.

NATALIA FILINA: It's interesting because I don't remember this was an idea.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's not. So that's what I-- Yeah, I didn't prepare that. And so, I've already raised that internally that this is not what the project initially was. So that's why I need to have a talk with you, because I do understand your vision. And I think there is flexibility, but I need to just make sure that everyone's on board internally and with you. So, let's do that first, and then we can move forward.

NATALIA FILINA: Oh, thank you very much.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you.

NATALIA FILINA: Okay. Next time next call.

GREG SHATAN: I think we've covered that, and that's helpful certainly. It seems to me it'll be an odd project to have five completely different packages coming out of this. Obviously, there'll be some customization for each region, including languages, but we need to have some coordination. And Natalia has the vision. We'll all line up behind her and support her just as we'll support Sebastien in getting the roundtable into existence. Sebastien, I see that's your arm for a second. I thought that was a baguette. Sorry. I just finished a bagel, so I guess I have food laundry on my mind.

In any case, we have reached the end of our call. Thank you. Great call, great contributions from all. Looking forward to seeing everyone, mostly, hopefully live in Washington, DC, in a few weeks and to hosting you at the various NARALO events, and generally speaking, in our fine capital city, the home of the finest insurrection in North America, thankfully, a failed one. In any case, I will call this meeting adjourned. We can stop the recording and stop the call. Goodbye to everybody.

YESIM SAGLAM: Goodbye, Greg, and thank you all for joining today's meeting. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]