
YESIM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the second session of APRALO Policy Forum Town Hall meeting taking place on Thursday, 10th of August, 2023 at 06:00 UTC.

On our call today, we have Justine Chew, Shah Zahidur Rahman, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jay Paudyal, Suhaidi Hassan, Dr. Vladimer Svanadze, Hong Xue, Mohammad Kawsar Uddin, Abdulrahman Abotaleb, Samik Kharel, Udeep Baral, Nabeel Yasin, Bibek Silwal, Bikram Shrestha, Mabda Haerunnisa Fajrilla Sidiq, Aris Ignacio, Juliana Harsianti, Gopal Tadepalli, Jasmine Ko, Mubashir Sargana, Naveed Bin Rais.

We have received apologies from Amita Choudhury, Satish Babu, Maureen Hilliard, and from Gunela Astbrink.

From staff side, we have Gisella Gruber and myself, Yesim Saglam, present on today's call, and I will also be doing call management.

And before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes, please. And with this, and I'm sorry, I think I made a mistake while I was announcing the time of this meeting. It is 10:00 UTC. We had another session at 6:00 UTC, but thanks so much, Cheryl, for the correction. And I would now like to leave the floor over to Shah Rahman. Over to you, Shah. Thank you.

SHAH RAHMAN:

Thank you, Yesim. Good afternoon, good evening, whoever you are. This is our second session. First session we did it at 6:00 UTC. It was a good

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.

participation. And I see that a few of the people also again joined. I'm really happy. And some of the more people from different time zones and also seeing the new face. That was our purpose, actually. So to make that very inclusive, because due to that time back working hours, we may be not heard earlier some of the comments or necessary information.

So actually, this session [inaudible] on the update on the policy forums, how we can improve the policy forums and what are the priorities, all those things we need to hear from you. Town Halls is actually the open sessions. Here, we want to speak less, but want to hear more from you. Your participation is actively is very appreciated. I would like to request to take that floor during the open mic so that we can get all the points. Maybe you're one of the points that we are not in our mind, but it is really important. So that is the purpose we organize sessions in two time slots.

So not further more delay. I want to give that floor to Justine Chew, who will cover this whole meeting from the beginning, and not further delay. Please, Justine, come forward to take over the floor. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

So thank you, Shah. This is Justine for the record. Welcome to those who are just joining the second session of this meeting. And welcome back to those who are joining for the second time today. Nice to see that some people are gluttons for punishment, but it's OK. It's all good. It's all good.

So, OK, so the purpose of this town hall meeting, as Shah alluded to, is basically to cover a few things, namely to provide an update on the goals and objectives of the APRALO policy forum, as well as the priorities that we have currently and basically giving people an opportunity to see whether they need to update the priorities as they stand and how we might do that, in what aspect, what areas and also how we could better run certain activities to meet the objectives of the policy forum.

So just by way of background, I believe some of you are new and some of you are not so new. So if you could just bear with me, if I go through some of the history a little bit for the benefit of the newcomers, because I noticed there are at least three newcomers today.

So the policy forum, at least this version of it anyway, was launched in 2020. And so it's been running for a few years. And the idea of it is basically to have a platform where we can discuss within the RALO, as a RALO, policy issues within the remit of ICANN.

And earlier, when it was introduced, we only sort of had three aims, which is what you see on the screen now, aims one, two and three. Now we don't propose to change these three aims because they have been serving its purpose. What we're trying to do now is actually to add on more aims. And you see that aim four is something new.

So aim four came about from our implementation of a recent event, the ICANN 77 readout. And that was done because we wanted to introduce more cross-community regional engagement. So rather than keep conversations within just APRALO, we wanted to invite participants

from outside of the RALO, but within the region still. So reps from, representatives from GAC, from ccNSO, as well as GNSO. And we had Juliana as a panelist as well. She's a fellow from ICANN 77. So just to sort of spread the conversation out a little bit across the region and not just keep to our RALO silo. So that's why aim number four came about. And if you were an attending participant, attending the ICANN 77 readout, then you would have seen that happening, the lively conversations there.

And aim five is basically to have a periodic point where we might consult with members, with RALO members as to whether there are new things cropping up within the ICANN remit again that we might want to add to our focus. Because for example, the new round, the next round of new gTLDs is something happening now and everyone seems to be very excited and talking about it. We didn't have that in our current priorities because that wasn't a priority two years ago. So this is what I mean by we want to give RALO members an opportunity to see whether we need to tweak or adjust our priorities moving forward in the next year or so, bearing in mind that the priorities that currently stand is for 2023 and 2024.

So how we attempt to achieve these aims is not rocket science. So it is about informing the community about the existing ICANN policy issues that are being discussed. It is about engaging the community in those discussions, probably across not just the RALO but also across At-Large. So an inroad into the At-Large consolidated Policy Working Group. It is also about consulting the community to formulate input on those ICANN policies discussions that we undertake and also about building the capacity of the members here, the APRALO community, so that they

may effectively participate. We often see newcomers come in and I can appreciate the fact that maybe some of the discussions are so well in advance that it's hard to follow. So we are trying to take cognizance of that situation and find ways to bring people in at a more manageable level so that you can somehow find the time and the ability to build your capacity in order to join those conversations at the more senior level.

And obviously, the forum is about also enabling the participation in inter-RALO discourse. So often we find that once we have our little silos, we tend to stick to our silos and that's not necessarily healthy. It's good, but it's not healthy. At some point in time, we need to also look at the other RALOs in the other four regions to see if there are commonalities and things that we might want to take up at the plenary level, at the At-Large level. And obviously, it's about looking at opportunities for creating an inter-regional discourse and cooperation, and especially to advocate for the individual end-users' interests. So those are the aims and the ways that we propose to achieve those aims.

And moving down, there will be time for questions if people want to pose questions, so just bear with us. And I should mention the fact that I'm not using any slide decks for this particular thing that I'm talking to you about because this is on a Google Doc, and we have this practice now to share the link to the Google Doc, and that link actually is on the Agenda Wiki. You'll see it at the far right-hand column next to my name, I think it is. And the idea about it is, so when I'm speaking to you about this particular document, you've seen it, so you're familiar with it, and you can go back at any time to make comments to express your agreement or disagreement or whatever. We're trying to make it

multiple avenues and multiple ways by which you can provide input to us. So sharing Google Docs is one of them. And mind you, you don't have to provide the input instantaneously at this call. You can do it anytime after this call or whenever you have time. So again, it's about opening more avenues for you to provide input.

And moving on, so the APRALO priorities 2023-2024 that you see on screen now was born out of a Hot Topics survey that we did in 2022, towards the end of 2022. And the results of that survey is what you see here. We have established priorities in four categories. The first category is in the context of ALAC and At-Large community. The second one is more policy-specific, so policy-related priorities. As you see, it's things like DNS abuse, internationalized domain names, and universal acceptance. The third category is about more our own internal organization, membership retention and engagement. It's about building capacity of members, building leadership, offering leadership development opportunities, mentorship possibly even, and improving participation and engagement. And at some point in time, hopefully to introduce activity metrics.

And the fourth category is related more to ICANN operations. This is part of the ICANN five-year operating plan that they put out and revise every year. The current one is financial year 2022 to 2026. So what we did during the Hot Topics survey of 2022 was that we asked members who took the survey, out of the 15 priorities that ICANN identified for their five-year plan, which top five should we as a RALO keep a finger on, keep the pulse on, so to speak? And the top five, as you see, is those ones under category four.

Now if you want to know a little bit more about what those operating priorities are from ICANN, there is a link at the bottom of the screen that will take you to the five-year operating plan, and then you can read up about the priorities itself. There is quite a little bit of detail there, so it's not just about what you see in that one-liner.

Okay, and then based on the feedback that we gathered from session one and hopefully session two here now, we're going to be looking at generating or organizing more events, activities that hopefully will meet the objectives of the AP RALO Policy Forum. And this is where we need your input on things like what has worked, what do you think would work that we have not tried, if you've got any ideas or any issues that you want to talk to us about or you want to discuss at a RALO level, those are the kind of inputs that we are seeking today via a series of polls that we're going to run later on. Now the polls is not about voting, it's just about getting the temperature of the room as to what people think, and it's always a good guide for leadership to run those polls and get the results from those polls to see whether we're on the right track, we need to change anything, we need to tweak anything, that sort of thing.

So moving on to the next page, you will see a very skeletal planning calendar where we have just a few entries at the moment, because as I said, based on the input that we gathered from session one and hopefully from you guys today in session two, we would be able to populate this calendar a little bit more in terms of the activities that you want us to run. And again, this is part of the Google Docs, so if you have things that you want to suggest, by all means, you can pop it in here or

you can contact any one of us in leadership or staff to suggest an idea and we're happy to talk to you about that.

So that is my 15 minute wrap and I will move on to the next agenda item, which is basically Q&A on what I talked about in terms of the priorities for 2023 and 2024. So are there any questions about what I have spoken about? Any clarification that is required? Okay, I don't see any. I think things are pretty straightforward, really. We're trying to keep things very non-rocket science, very basic. So it shouldn't be very difficult for you all to follow the conversations here.

Okay, so seeing no question—and by the way, this is not the only time when you can ask a question and hopefully get an answer. So throughout the polling process, please, if you do have a question, you can pop it in the chat and we'll try to attend to that. Or if you want to just raise your hand and we'll give you the mic because as Shah said, this is about this open mic session. So everyone gets to speak if they want to speak. And we're not judging anybody. So if you want to ask something, please go ahead.

Okay, so moving on to the next sub-agenda item, which is where we start the poll session. So I talked about the three priorities, the policy-related priorities and the internal RALO priorities when I talked about the 2023-2024 priorities. So just to refresh, we were talking about internationalized domain names, universal acceptance, DNS abuse. And one was the ICANN governance and global public interest monitoring that we just put it under that general category.

So these are the three top, you could say top three priorities that we have on our radar at the moment. So the question then now is, do you think we should change any of these three priorities? So Yesim, if you can run the poll, and I will speak to the poll because I note that some people may have been confused as to the way the question was put in the poll. So it's not about supporting which one should stay. It's about marking which ones you think we should change. So if you think that we should change our focus away from DNS abuse, for example, then you will check DNS abuse mitigation. But if you think that DNS abuse should stay on our radar, then don't check it. And if you're not sure, then by all means check, "I'm unsure." And if you think all three that I mentioned should remain on our radar, then just put none of the above. Okay, so as before, Yesim, I'm going to rely on you to check on the response rate and when you're ready, just show us the results.

YESIM SAGLAM:

Thank you, Justine. I think we need to wait a bit more because currently only 58% of the participants have voted.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sure, no worries. Again, if people have questions before they want to put in their answers to the poll, by all means put something in chat or just raise your hands and we'll give you the floor. And by the way, this is a multiple choice poll, so if you think we should change two out of the three top priorities, then you can select those two that you want to change. So you're not limited to just one answer. How are we doing, Yesim?

YESIM SAGLAM: I think we're fine. 70% of the participants have voted. Would you like me to end the poll and share the results?

JUSTINE CHEW: I think so. I mean, if people haven't voted by now, then presumably they aren't going to say anything.

YESIM SAGLAM: Yeah, I'm not receiving any more response. And it has been two and a half minutes, so I think it's good to be closed.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. Again there's no forcing. If you don't want to participate in the poll, that's entirely your right. But we do hope that you will because your input is important to us. Okay, so as we see on the screen, some or at least one person thinks that we should drop DNS abuse. That's interesting. A couple more think that we should have less focus on ICANN governance, but majority thinks that we should stick to the three. Okay, so that's kind of pretty clear cut. And I guess there's two people that are not sure, which is fine. So thank you for that.

Moving on to the second poll. So as I said before, part of the purpose of this exercise is to have an intermediary point where we ask members whether we should change our focus or even add on to focus. So I said before that we have these three existing priorities, but we also know that the next round is coming, next round of new gTLDs is coming.

So we're asking you now, do you think that on top of the three that we already have, and people obviously in this room overwhelmingly support to retain, apart from those three, do you think we should have also a focus on anything else? And there are some suggestions here in the poll already, which is certain aspects of the next round of new gTLDs, registration data accuracy, internet fragmentation, or what is commonly termed as Splinternet. Or any others that we have not identified for you right now. And if you do vote other, then hold on to that thought, and we will come back to you further down the poll, when we actually ask you to put in what you mean by other.

Again, this is a multiple choice question, so feel free to select more than one answer. But obviously, it has to make sense. You can't select the top three and then also select none. Because that doesn't make sense. So this seems to be a quieter group than session one.

YESIM SAGLAM:

So currently, 73% of our participants have voted, and it has been like two minutes since the poll is open. So please let me know when you would like me to actually end the poll and share the results.

JUSTINE CHEW:

"It doesn't show in my mobile." Yeah, okay. So that's probably a technical challenge at your end, Abdulrahman. So I'm not sure whether we can help you with that. Okay. So if you want to, you can try and pop something in the chat and we can try to include it into the poll results somehow, if that works for you. Having said that, I think we can close the poll now. Yesim, just use your discretion. If the response rate

doesn't keep rising, then you can probably just cut off the poll and move on.

YESIM SAGLAM:

Yes, sure. I think it's good to be stopped. We have 78%. I will end the poll and share the results.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. So this is interesting. I'm trying to remember the kind of responses we got in session one. And I think we had a lower response rate for registration data accuracy. Okay. So, but at least one person noted an "other". So it'd be interesting to find out what that "other" is down the track. But okay. So we're looking at, obviously, the possibility of increasing our topic range. That's going to be interesting and exciting. More work for some of us, at least.

Okay, cool. Right. So moving on to the next poll question, which is... Let me have a look. Right. Okay. So we have done a number of activities in 2022 and also 2023. And this on screen lists some of them. I would appreciate that some people here may not have attended any of these activities, being new, or they may have attended some. So just as best as you can, just make a judgment. Right. So those of you who have attended any of these or all of these events, activities, then I'm sure you know what I'm talking about. But we've tried to provide some description of the activity itself. It's not rocket science, so I think most people are familiar with what a webinar is and what a fireside chat is, but possibly not in context of how we've done it within the APRLO and

the APRLO Policy Forum. So again, as best as you can to just indicate to us what you thought worked, or what you think would possibly work.

So as the poll goes, I might just elaborate a little bit. So for example, surveys, we normally conduct surveys using Google Form. We would send out a link to the Google Form and then people just respond to the questions in the survey. That typically takes longer time because we want to actually have better quality responses. So the questions may be a little bit longer and have a bit more context to it because of the nature of the responses that we are trying to acquire.

Now ICANN Meeting Readout, I mentioned earlier that we ran the first one for ICANN 77 back in early July, and that was very well attended. I think people basically had fun. I had fun anyway, at least. And based on that, I think we might try to do another one for ICANN 78 down the line. But basically that opened the opportunity for, as I said, conversations across the community of ICANN within our region. So not just sticking to At-Large people, but bringing in ccNSO people, GNSO people, GAC people, and fellows as well. So I think it's a richer conversation to be had there.

Fireside chats, the basic difference between a webinar and a fireside chat is, I would put it this way, webinars, we would typically have a slide deck where a speaker would speak to the content, and then they'll go on and then there'll be a Q&A session at the end. A fireside chat is more informal, and we typically ask that the speaker don't rely on slide decks because we want it to be a very high level, very informal. And the difference there being that we think fireside chats is a better way to introduce a topic to newcomers because it's high level. It doesn't go into

in-depth per se, and it's an eye opener, a stepping stone. And if we find that that particular topic generates a lot of interest, then we typically would go on to see if we want to do a webinar where we go into more details and we get a proper speaker with the requisite knowledge to come and talk to us about that particular topic and study a bit more detail.

Single topic consultations is slightly different. That is more targeted to ongoing policy development processes, PDP working groups, where the PDP is going on, and then our reps there would bring back questions to the RALO to ask them about what they think is being discussed at that particular PDP. So it's very focused and it's very phase-oriented, per se. And some of the ones that we've done is mainly on IDN, the EPDP, the current expedited policy development process on IDNs, which deals with IDN variant management. And we've also had a couple on applicant support. I remember Maureen running at least one of those. So those are very topic-focused, as well as in tune with what's happening with the PDP, inside the PDP working group. Okay. Yesim?

YESIM SAGLAM:

Yes, I think we're good to end the poll and share the results. Here you are.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Oh, okay. That's quite a spread. Okay. Well, interestingly enough, some people still think surveys work. That's good to know. But okay, so then it's a more relatively equal spread across the other activities that we've run. So I think generally, people don't have a real issue with the things

or how we've run things so far. That's the way I see the results. Okay. Good, good.

Moving on to the next poll question, which is to do with key challenges. So we also want to get an understanding of the key challenges that you face when you attempt to participate in any of the activities, whether it's here or in ICANN, even across ICANN. And these are, again, the obvious ones that we could think of. If you have some others that are not listed here, then by all means, bring it up later. And you'll see that in terms of if you have a lack of time to spend on ICANN matters, then that's really something we can't do very much about. And I would just advise that you use your time wisely and pick to just concentrate on one thing in ICANN or something along those lines.

Lack of knowledge and topic and complexity of topics is something that we can certainly help you with. And that's why we want to know whether that is something that affects you. Timing. We normally have, in our RALO, we normally run activities at 6:00 UTC. And this is probably, I don't know, at least in my memory, the first time we're doing two sessions of the same thing at two different time slots. And that's just a try, a trial, to see whether different time slots actually work better for different people. And we might, based on the response and the participation here, we might try to replicate this for certain things. I can't promise you that we would be able to do it for every single activity that we run, because it's just not feasible. There are time constraints on people who will be running those activities. And for example, if we were to invite a speaker from a different RALO, for example, because he or she is the knowledge person there in that area, then it's pretty hard to impose them to appear twice, two different time slots. And even then,

they may be in a different time slot and they are graciously attending our time slot at a very weird hour for them. So those are the considerations that we need to take into account when we organize things. So as far as possible, if it's not resource intensive and it's not too burdensome on the speaker that we can try, or the facilitator, whoever, that we can try to do two slots, the same activity over two slots. I think I've spoken enough, Yesim.

YESIM SAGLAM: I'm just looking at the responses. We have 60% participated.

JUSTINE CHEW: Just on the English point, I'm pretty sure that everybody realizes that we have translation services. So if English is not your first language, and because of that, you may have difficulty catching up to what is being discussed, then please do use the translation services. That's what it's there for. Sorry, Yesim.

YESIM SAGLAM: No worries. I think we're good to end the poll and share the results.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, so obviously topics and complexity topics range as a key factor of the greatest challenge. Lack of time is also obviously a high one. As I said, lack of time is not something that we can help you with, but certainly lack of knowledge and complexity of the topics is good. It's something that we can certainly help you with. Okay, timing, 40%. Okay,

that's something to note. And I'm pretty sure Shah will have that in his little notebook to remind me on things.

Okay, moving on. So no one has questions. I've noted that some comments in the chat, and thanks for that, Jasmine, to say that the timing is okay. So if there's no questions, then we can keep rolling on.

Okay, so the next question is about whether—we want to know based on the other earlier poll questions, your challenges, and also the activities that you thought worked for you, didn't work for you, or whatever, we want to know now that if we were to run these kind of activities going forward, would you participate in them, given your time constraints and given the lack of understanding or whatnot?

Single topic consultation is what I described earlier, so I think that should be pretty clear. Webinars and fireside chats, I've talked about already and contrasted them. The periodic short surveys, I think this particular group had a better affinity to surveys than the earlier group, so that's an interesting difference. So we could look at doing periodic surveys too, which is always a good thing.

The one-on-one informal conversations is something entirely new, and I don't want to put my colleagues in leadership, including Cheryl on the spot. Cheryl claims that she's not leadership, but as far as I'm concerned, she is. And as I was saying, I don't want to put people on the spot, but I have openly acknowledged that there needs to be some kind of way to transfer knowledge across the participants and the members of the RALO. It is becoming very tiring and very untenable for just a few of us to be holding and juggling all the balls, so I really want to find a

way to make sure people have the ability to really participate at the level that they aspire to. And I realize that sometimes RALO activities or even APF, the Policy Forum activities, may be at a level where it doesn't suit newcomers, and that is something that we always have a challenge with, and that's something that we will try to counter, but it is very hard to run an activity that suits all levels of participants. So if you have a high knowledge in a topic, then typically we won't see you coming to the activity. If you have a middle level, then we will probably see you, and then you'll be probably asking questions hopefully. But if you're a newcomer and you find that you're totally lost and you're not quite sure what to do, then I would suggest you reach out to us, to the leadership, to try and find ways of having conversations with us and find out how to really get into the motion of things.

So by way of a gesture, I am opening up sessions. If you are interested to talk to me, I'm going to open up like 15-minute conversation slots on a particular day a week. So if you are interested in talking to me about something, then please reach out to me privately and I will give you a link to my Google Calendar to book a time slot with me. And in the earlier session, I encouraged my colleagues in leadership to do the same to the extent that they can. Again, this is me doing my thing. I certainly don't expect anyone else to be doing the same thing. Welcome, but no expectations.

Cool. So we have Cheryl taking the lead as well in doing open-door sessions. Well done. Okay. So I presume the response rate for the poll would have been stacking by now?

YESIM SAGLAM: Yes. We have 70% participated. I will end the poll now and share the results.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So single topic consultations wins the day. Okay. So we will definitely be doing a lot more of that. I can see a few sessions already for the IDN side of things, as well as SubPro or the next round. And I'm going to need your help, Cheryl, on that. And the rest are pretty even.

Okay. So there is quite a demand for the one-on-one informal conversations. Okay. So I don't know who voted. Right. So as I said, if you want to talk to me, find a way to reach me and I will get back to you. Same with Cheryl. I think most of us are pretty easy to detect. So thanks for that.

And moving on, which is the last question, really. So remember that we had a couple of polls where you had the option of putting in "other". So this is where you tell us what "other" means to you. Because obviously we haven't figured out all the options for people to put in "other".

Right. So again, no judgments. There's no silly thing, no silly suggestion, no silly questions, that sort of thing. So it's supposed to be open-minded. Don't worry about a thing. Just feel free. We understand that if you're particularly shy and prefer to talk to someone in private, that's why I'm encouraging these one-on-one conversations where you have a little bit more discretion if you want to find out certain things. And also, by the way, "other" also includes if you had a topic in mind that we didn't list in our poll earlier, this is your chance to tell us what you think we should also consider running an activity on. And by the way, if you

believe you are a subject matter or knowledge expert in that particular topic, then by all means, reach out to us if you want to run an activity. For example, if you want to run a fireside chat, if you want to run a webinar, please do reach out to us. Because we can slot in activities, but so far it's always ended up as a leadership team running the activities. We would like to see a fresh breath of air coming and having other people talk to us, not just us talking to you.

And don't worry about how to run something, if you're interested. Just have a topic in mind and work out the scope of it. Because we have practices that we can share with you, and part of that is also about leadership development. So this is how we do things, and it's not like you're doing it for the first time. You have guidance, and we can help you structure certain things. And this is how you would learn about leadership in the way as well.

Yes, so Cheryl makes a good point that—and I will be blunt a little bit here, you may think that you're a knowledge or subject matter expert. That remains to be seen. So we typically disdain anyone who comes along and spreads incorrect facts, or what they think is fact when it's not. So that's something that we try to guard against, because I think that's part of leadership's responsibility. So that's to say that if you want to run an activity, we would also need to check whether that is suitable or not.

And by the way, the topics really need to still fall within ICANN's remit, because as I mentioned earlier in the earlier session, it's less value to talk about something that ICANN has no control over. Something like that may—internet governance is a large topic, and what ICANN is

involved in is only one part of internet governance. So there's little value in talking about parts of the internet governance ecosystem that ICANN doesn't control, really. And we have obviously limited resources, so we can't simply apply those on what I would say irrelevant topics.

Gopal.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

The point that I wish to make is we need to have the regional representatives speaking in APRALO forum. We don't have much of an idea at the ground level on the Asia-Pacific region. So kindly consider creating a slot in every APRALO monthly meeting for a regional representative to enlighten us on what is happening in that region. Hong Kong is a vertical country. What are the issues? What are the concerns? Singapore, Malaysia, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, they're coming in. Japan may not come, Australia, [inaudible]. So each country representative for 15 to 20 minutes to enlighten us on the reality in those areas, and [inaudible].

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, on topics related to ICANN, I presume?

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

Yes, of course, yes, in that region. Let's just focus. APRALO is a big exercise.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So that is something that we could possibly take back to leadership because you mentioned the monthly meeting.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: I'll leave it to you where to plot it, but we need to know our region in terms of ICANN perspective.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So maybe we need to have a more one-on-one conversation to flesh that out a little bit more, Gopal.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Okay. No problem at all. We can do it.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Yesim? Okay, eight responses and people stopped. That's fine. Let's just close the poll and see what we have. Okay, so capacity building. And I'm not really sure here. Okay, free flow discussion opportunities like this. Okay. So whoever said that can provide feedback to Shah in the next part of our agenda. Using [inaudible] input at the same time. Okay. Yeah. I presume [inaudible] is a crowdsourcing kind of app. I was actually looking at [inaudible] to run this session, but I thought maybe I'd keep it for another time. Yeah, but noted, we might try to use more real-time tools.

Session may need balance, need to design balance way considering experienced and non-experienced participants. Okay, fair enough. So as

I said before, it is often a challenge to run an activity that would cater to all levels of understanding. So you have to bear with us. Sometimes we can, sometimes we can't. Just depends on the particular activity and depends on the time that we need to get the inputs on. So for example, something like a single topic consultation, it's typically tied to a timeline that a PDP has. So we may not have the luxury of running a lot of background things in order to get people up to speed. And that's where the side conversations might help.

More discussion on substantive policy issues. Yes, okay, fine. This particular one is not the forum for that, but yes, noted. Speaking as from a newcomer standpoint, I was wondering if there are possibilities to hold offline activities to allow... Okay, I'm not quite sure what we mean by hold offline activities. So if the person who put that isn't shy and wants to take the mic and explain a little bit more, that would be appreciated. I will just go through, while you decide, I'll just go through the last one. I want to focus on the region interoperable or other railroads, stakeholders. Okay, so this is the one that Gopal was talking about. All right, so we will have a side conversation then. Right, so unable to submit response. Maybe, okay. Sorry about that. So the person who suggested hold offline activities, would you be able to elaborate what you mean by offline? If you don't want to speak, just pop something in chat. How ALS attract more local stakeholders, especially end users? Need to ensure regular engagement. Okay, so that aspect of it is engagement and outreach. Right, it's a good question. I don't have an immediate answer for you. The policy forum is more concentrated on policy discussion rather than outreach to your

particular ALS members. That aspect of it is done through the outreach and engagement side of things.

So the idea as I would have it is that, for example, you come to a policy discussion of the APF, and then it's kind of incumbent on you to take the discussion back to your members and enlighten them as to what's happening, and then get their feedback so that you can bring that feedback back to us. That's how the loop is meant to work, right? And there is nothing stopping you from inviting your members to come to our activities to get a firsthand grip of what we're talking about. And I would strongly encourage that.

So part of the general assembly thing, I don't really want to get too much into that, but we are trying not to limit engagement with just the primary representative of an ALS. We're trying to also engage directly with ALS members, right? And as I said, there's nothing really stopping them now, even from coming to our activities. If they aren't part of a mailing list, then get them onto the mailing list. So I would throw a request to you, [Mabda], if you know of your colleagues who would appreciate this sort of discussions, then please bring them in, whether ask them to get subscribed to the mailing list or just tell them about a particular activity and they can join in on the spot. There's no restriction in terms of who can join our activities really. Mabda.

MABDA SIDIQ:

Hi, Justine, sorry. I was the one who suggested the suggestion on offline activities. So I was just wondering if there are possibilities to hold offline activities. And by this, I mean, is there any sort of contact points or

activities or support by APRALO to hold activities that allow members at the local level, so I would say nation level, to [inaudible] with each other? Because I would say that one of my struggle in entering spaces that are relevant to [inaudible] speaking from an Indonesian standpoint, is that there is an absence of ISOC community in Indonesia. I know that there was one, but I'm not sure if they are as active anymore. So is there any sort of support that can be provided through such forum that would allow, I'm not sure, like what sort of activities that could enhance communication at the local level? So I was thinking of offline activities because I think that is one of the most effective ways to sort of get people connected to each other, but is there any sort of like ways to sort of enhance or reactivate platforms at the local, national level?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, so I'm going to throw that question to Cheryl, since you have your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Justine. I hope you don't mind me nosing in on this one. Thanks for that, Mabda. I hear what you're saying, but a couple of things need to be, I guess, recognized in both this exercise and what we will be able to do that may fit into your desire.

So this is very much about policy and policy development, not capacity building and individual ALS or member development. That being said, as was very successfully shown with the exercises that went around the UA Day recently, where there is some off the shelf and facilitated and supported opportunities. So, you know, funding for biscuits and tea and

coffee and things to have local gatherings and use pre-designed material to impart important information. In that example, it was about universal acceptance, but we could use the same sort of example for other sorts of policy aspects. And in those local outreach and engagement activities with a policy flavor, then the answer is yes. Part of that fits into a project that is being kicked off in this financial year called the Campaign Playbook. And to feed into the Campaign Playbook, which will be a repository of good practices and successful processes to help these sorts of things that you're describing go on. We're also looking at from the eight large advisory committees, from the ALAC, more holistic perspective about things called loops. And Justine, you used that term earlier about a loop. And so the more we, within our region, use those looping activities and fit into this burgeoning Campaign Playbook, the more what you're describing will become commonplace. But from this group's perspective, it would be through the filter of policy. Thanks. –

MABDA SADIQ: Great. Thank you so much, Cheryl and Justine as well. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you for the question, Mabda. Always welcome curious people and people wanting to find out more and do more, really. So very welcome. I hope we are able to sustain your interest and help you along.

Okay. So, we're down to our last 15 minutes. So we have pretty much gone through all the ideas that have been posted. Thank you for them.

Thank you for participating in all the polls. And I would hand the floor back to Shah to kind of take us out. If no one else has any comments or questions.

SHAH RAHMAN:

Thank you. Thank you, Justine. And thank you everyone for participating the polls. Yeah. once again, to remind you that you, by this time you participated in the polls and the questions and answers. We tried to formulate it in a practical way. So whatever was in our mind, we thought that it could be the possible answer, but really we appreciate if you think that any questions answer could be indifferent, we'll take it in account. Because it is important for the future. So how we will design our policy forum and your expectations and what may need to improve. So that's the purpose, was for the open forum. I was expecting to keep that the audience busy in sharing mics and hearing from you, but it's okay. Some of you have given very good points and also have discussed, but it's still a few things that you couldn't share here. You can still mail. This is the second session was. So the first sessions we did. So second session, if you could share that later, you might think that it may be a suggestion you could offer. We are very open to accept your suggestions because this is the meetings for you, how we can improve and how we can engage you. And really do want to bring some of you to engage with the policy work so we can go ahead further.

So not further explaining, I just want to know that, anyone just like to share any things that you right now want to share, because the forum we designed maybe from our concepts, but how do you feel? Can you give me some thumbs up or down? I don't mind how it went out, but if

you think that it's a good, at least give some, yeah ... [inaudible] And how often do you think that—yearly we meet and policy forum, like town hall, six months, in a year, so that we can balance our engagement and we can align, maybe Justine can help us to align the topics and then within the ICANN remit, we can fulfill our requirements that we need to be in here.

So thank you everyone. I have nothing more to say unless any participants have any questions. I'll get back to Justine. We have a limited time. So just a few minutes. -

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks. I'd like to say a couple of things. One is, do people like this kind of town hall meeting concept? Does anyone hate it? I just want to know whether—we can do a lot of things, but if we don't get positive feedback for the things that we do, then we're just wondering whether it's worth the time, worth your time, worth my time, worth Cheryl's time. So if you think that you really enjoyed something and you would like to see more of it, we need to know. And open mic is about giving you the opportunity to say what you want to say. No questions asked, no judgment, whatever, right?

And I will also mention that after the session, we probably try to collate the results of the polls from both the sessions and see if we can come up with a plan of how we want to take your inputs forward. And yeah, I think we have to take a photo. Shah, over to you.

SHAH RAHMAN: Thank you, everyone. I've taken the photos. So thank you very much.

YESIM SAGLAM: Thank you all for joining. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]