
YEŞİM SAGLAM:

Hi, Ashley. Can you hear the audio?

EVIN ASHLEY ERDOĞDU:

Hello, Yesim. Good morning. I can hear you loud and clear.

YEŞİM SAGLAM:

Thanks so much. Good morning. I will be on mute then. Thank you.

EVIN ASHLEY ERDOĞDU:

You're welcome.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Morning, Yesim.

YEŞİM SAGLAM:

Good morning, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:

How are you doing? Thank you for that. I was online with Heidi and Paul way too late. And then I obviously linked the wrong thing. Sorry about that.

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.

YEŞİM SAGLAM: No worries about that. Just a heads up, I did not receive anything regarding the CIP, so I'm assuming the current presentation hyperlinked is the correct one. So, we will go with that one.

GISELLA GRUBER: That's the only one I saw. I went on to the OFB agenda.

YEŞİM SAGLAM: Oh, then it should be the correct one. Yeah.

GISELLA GRUBER: From what we did last time. And I've asked it to check, and I don't know which one is the current one because that is what they had on the CIP working group page. I know if I get my audio is going to cut up a little bit. I'm not at the school yet. That's what they had on the CIP page. And it's a bit weird because it's got like, it's a blank-- it's like a template presentation for the representative to present to their community region.

So, I'll double check that the OFB page again, but that is what I had now. I know that there was another one, which they were actually laughing at on the OFB call a couple of weeks ago, because it started off with what we usually have at an ICANN meeting, which is like a front page with the standards of behavior or something really bizarre. I will double check and I'll ask. I have asked Amrita to check, but--

YEŞİM SAGLAM: Okay. I don't think it's this one. And by the way, it says April 2024 at the cover page. So, I'm assuming it should be the final version.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes.

YEŞİM SAGLAM: At least up to date version.

ALI ALMESHAL: Hello, everyone, I just wanted to say good morning and you can continue the discussion.

YEŞİM SAGLAM: Hey. Good morning, Ali.

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning. How are you doing, Ali?

ALI ALMESHAL: I'm good.

GISELLA GRUBER: Did I tell you that my best friend just moved to Bahrain?

ALI ALMESHAL: Really?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes. She's the head of sales for Gulf Air.

ALI ALMESHAL: Wow. We have a good connection now.

GISELLA GRUBER: I think she's probably more than head of sales. She's trying to put the company back together, put it that way.

ALI ALMESHAL: Yeah. I know that they are working on it heavily to restructure it again.

GISELLA GRUBER: She didn't realize it was going to be that big of a job, actually, to be honest.

ALI ALMESHAL: Okay. We have a good connection then. We have a good, as we said in Arabic, so if you need anything from GulfAair, we know where to go then.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes. And I told her I will come and see her in Bahrain because I didn't make it over to her house in Singapore nor in China. She said, "Okay."

ALI ALMESHAL: Just connect me with her.

GISELLA GRUBER: I will.

ALI ALMESHAL: Okay, great.

YEŞİM SAGLAM: Welcome all. Welcome, Amrita. Shall we turn over to you, please?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Sure, Yeşim.

YEŞİM SAGLAM: Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Yeşim, let's wait for the customary two minutes. Some people may be coming in.

YEŞİM SAGLAM:

Okay. Sure.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Morning everyone. Welcome, Amrita. Just a quick question. Could you just kindly check the email I sent you with the CIP presentations? I've got a doubt on the one that I sent through.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

I added it.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Oh, wonderful. Thank you. Sorry about that.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

No, as in you had attached the right one. It's just that the name was not there, so I just edited it.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Super. Thank you very much.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Okay, Yeşim, let's get started.

YEŞİM SAGLAM:

Okay. Let me start to record. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the APRALO Monthly Teleconference

taking place on Thursday, 18th of April 2024 at 600 UTC. On our call today, we have Amrita Choudhury, Adarsh Bu, Ali AIMeshal, Aris Ignacio, Ashirwad Tripathy, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dr. Vladimir Svanetse, Eranga Samarathna, Gunela Astbrink, Holly Raiche, Hong Xue, Jasmine Ko, Justine Chew, K Mohan Raidu, Maureen Hilyard, Mohamed Kawsar Uddin, Pavan Budhrani, Phyto Thiri Lwin, Prateek Pathak, Saima, Sarai Tevita, Satish Babu, Shah Rahman, Shita Laksmi, Suhaidi Hassan, and Vesmira Harutyunyan. We also have Priyatosh Jana, Nabeel Yasin, Shridi Brahmaji, and Samik Kharel joining us right now.

We have received apologies from Gopal Tadepalli, and from staff side we have Gisella Gruber, Athena Foo, and myself, Yeşim Saglam, present on today's call, and I will be doing call management. Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your name before speaking for the transcription purposes. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Amrita. Thank you very much.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Yeşim. Hello everyone. Amidst storms, floods, upcoming thunderstorms and heatwaves, we from APAC are here for our monthly call for April. And I would like to welcome our two new ALS members who are here, one from Tonga, and the other is the ICT community. I can see Sarai in the call. Welcome to APRALO.

And since we have a few from Pacific, perhaps we may want to at a later date do some outreach to build a bit capacity of the new ALS members, how they can participate in our various initiatives like the policy forum or the others, and work on mainstreaming the Pacific community and

the other new ALSs into, yes, Samoa ICT Association. Sarai, thank you for mentioning the name. It just got twisted in my mind. Apologies for that.

And today we have an agenda where we would be giving you an update on the CIP CCG working group. We have shared updates in the past calls also, last two, but we would be discussing it more. We would be sharing the updates on the inputs received from you for the poll on the travel policy, as well as the latest developments where a lecturer has sent a mail. It is there in the agenda. You can read it. It's been linked. We will also have an update from the APRALO policy forum, and then staff would be updating on the upcoming APRALO elections. And under AOB, we would be discussing on the updated rules of procedures and the next steps.

So, this is the agenda. In case anyone wants to add anything else under AOB, you can put it into the chat and we will try to accommodate it into the agenda. And we have 60 minutes, so we will get started. So, we will be starting with the presentation from the CIP CCG group. For those who do not know, I will be sharing more on it. This is a group which is called the Continuous Improvement Program. And this was started, I would say, somewhere in January or February. The full form is the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group. This is a working group which was created from APRALO.

I and Justine are part of this working group. And Cheryl here is representing ALAC along with Tommi. So, obviously, while I would be making the presentation, Justine and Cheryl can intervene and share more on it. It's quite an extensive one. I would be very briefly going

through this. And you can go through the presentation. It's linked to the agenda later. If you have any queries, you can leave it with us. So, basically, can we go to the next slide, which is on the purpose.

The primary objective of this presentation is actually to give you an update on what the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group has been doing. It is a representative group from the community or from the various SOs and ACs who are collaborating together in a community-wide initiative to implement the ATRT3 recommendation with 3.6, which actually seeks improvement of the ICANN processes. The idea is so that you know about what is being done in terms of the principles, criteria, indicators. You can ask questions about the framework which is being developed, as well as give your feedback, because your feedback is the most important thing out here.

So, if we go to the next slide, this is what the ATRT3 3.6 recommendation is, which talks about evolving the organization. So, it calls for the evolution of the organizational review conducted by the independent examiner for the CIP. It was led by the ICANN community and the Board deferred upcoming organizational reviews until 2025, so that the recommendations which were made could be implemented. The ICANN community actually showed interest in contributing to evolving the organizational review of the CIP, and so the work began in January.

The CIP CCG group is actually tasked with developing a framework for continuous improvement which after it is being created, drafted, it will be published for public comment. And after that, after based upon

comments, etcetera., it will be adopted by each of the SOs supporting organizations, advisory committees, and NomCom. And the CIP actually plans to have an annual satisfaction survey of members, participants, with regular assessment. Once the framework is developed. So, the next slide talks about timelines.

I will not go much into timelines, but you can see the timelines out here. But one of the salient, important points out here is after the draft is made and the results of the assessment, and the community puts in their inputs, and once it is finally adopted, the first CIP assessment period would start after that in 2024, and it is estimated that at least it will take three years. It is estimated to last three years, including a survey of each of the organizational structures and their stakeholders. And the results of the CIP's assessments will feed on to the holistic review process. And obviously, your input into what we feed in is important. And in June 2025, the ICANN Board will evaluate the progress made towards the organizational review, which it had deferred. And this is how the process would be.

Obviously, as we suggested, this is a community-based work. And this is a picture from the ICANN79 meeting. And there was a blog also posted on it. And if you want, we can share it later, but the link is also there in the presentation, which you can click and see. So, at that meeting, which was a hybrid meeting at ICANN79, we had a collaborative work. But even before this, if you recall, from APRALO also, we shared the areas in which we feel we made improvements. We spoke about the APRALO policy forum, what is being done out there. We spoke about the work being done at the rules of procedures, updating the rules and

procedures. And we also spoke about the annual general assembly, which we had in September 2023.

Now, based upon that, we had a homework of looking at, and this is, we had a collaborative work, which we did using GAM at the ICANN79 meeting, primarily to look at the different, and brainstorm on activities, which each of the SO/ACs or NomCom could do to improve it. So, these were based upon the principles, which stem from ICANN bylaws, and we will be discussing what these principles were. And for that, we would go into the next slide.

And after 79, we had one meeting wherein we were tasked with sharing this presentation and all the updates with our community, which for us is APRALO, and then gathering feedback and working on the metrics, the criteria, et cetera, for progress. So, when we talk about org, the idea is to develop principles, criteria, framework, and this actually consists of three aspects. One is the principles. These are primarily the objectives of this continuous improvement program, and they actually define what the CIP is trying to do.

And then you have criteria, and these are actually what the conditions that need to be met in order to comply with what the principles which we want, we are trying to achieve. And criteria actually define how a principle will be achieved without themselves being measured of performance. And then there are the indicators, which actually define what the CIP will measure to assess whether or not, particular criteria are being met. And these indicators could include metrics, assessment, or a new process put in place to meet these criteria.

So, this is the framework on which we are supposed to work. We need to have principles, we need to have criteria, and these criteria need to be measured by indicators. But obviously, this needs to be flexible so that each stakeholder group can prioritize their criteria they want to work on, developing their own customized indicators. But overall, there would be a broad, I would say, main framework on which we would all be working.

So, the recommendation 3.6 also states that the ICANN org shall work with each of the SO/AC NomCom to establish a continuous improvement product that shares a common base between all the SOs and ACs and NomCom but will also allow for customization so that it meets each individual SO/AC and NomCom requirement. So, there would be a broader framework, but it would be customized to our requirements.

So, the current objectives of the organizational review, and this is as per the Article 4.4 of the ICANN bylaws, is that whether that organization, council, or committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure. If so, whether any change in structure or operation is desirable to improve its effectiveness, and whether the organization, council, or committee is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholder groups.

So, these objectives provided under the Article 4.4 provides the foundation for the shared principles which this CIP is trying to build for the community. And so, here are the DAS principles on which it is going to be developed, and historically the ICANN organizational review has asked whether the SO/AC and NomCom have a continuing purpose

within the ICANN community. And some of the principles are, is the SO/AC or NomCom fulfilling its purpose? This is the principle one.

Second is, is it effective? Third is, is it efficient? Fourth is, is it accountable internally stakeholders and externally to the wider ICANN community and whether the ICANN community collaborates to further the missions of ICANN and the effectiveness of ICANN multi-stakeholder model. So, these were the five principles on which the continuous improvement is based the discussion.

So, what was next done is whatever inputs we had placed was actually translated into principles, criteria, and indicators and by SMART it means Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time bound. As an example, for example, if we take principle three that the operations of the SO, AC, or NomCom are efficient. Some examples, the next slide please.

YEŞİM SAGLAM:

I think you've jumped ahead quite a few slides.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Yeah. I was not looking at it, sorry. The next one please. The next, yeah, so this is an example. For example, if we say that if the principle is, say for example, principle three and we say the SO, AC, or NomCom is efficient, some examples of criteria could be like each structure has a process for planning and setting priorities, or each structure efficiently assesses inputs related to the scope of responsibility. Each structure efficiently develops and recommends outputs relevant to their purpose

or each structure's output are implemented efficiently and implementation of outputs is monitored.

So, these could be criteria as in these are suggestions which were given on saying that, if we say these SO/AC structures are efficient, these could be the criteria and based on that you again have the indicators made. Another example would be, say for example, if these are the criteria, what could be the indicators? The same thing which we were talking about.

For example, if we take the criteria one, that each structure has a process for planning and setting priorities. Now, an example of indicator would be, if we are saying yes, each structure has a process for planning, we could always list it and if it is a no, then perhaps you need to develop a process which is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound. So, if we are saying this is the criteria, we also need to have a potential indicator as in, how do we measure that. So, technically this is our task.

So, the first question is like there were five principles shared. I know for many of you it's like too much of information overboard, but if we consider the five principles which were shared earlier, do you think it serves as a common base across all structures? This is a question which, I would ask and perhaps Yesim, if we can go to slide 10, people would be able to see the five principles. Do you think that these principles that the SO/AC or NomCom is fulfilling its purpose, it is effective, it is efficient, it is accountable internally as well as externally to the ICANN community and the ICANN community collaborates to further the

mission of ICANN and the effectiveness of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model?

So, are you comfortable of these being the common base across all the SO/AC, NomCom is the first question for all of you. In case you feel there is something else which should be there, you could share, but or if it is too much and you say hold it, we need some time to deliberate, I could add, but Justine, Cheryl, in case I've missed something till now, please add in or if I've rushed into something and not explained.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I might just jump in for a moment if you don't mind. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And I do have a very parental interest in all of this, having been involved in each and every one of the accountability and transparency review teams. And as Amrita outlined, the recommendations that generated this Continuous Improvement Program was the last ATRT, but also and probably most importantly, having been involved in not only our own ALAC and At-Large organizational reviews, which is what currently happens in the pre-continuous improvement program world, but also in each and every one of the other organizational reviews that has occurred across all of ICANN's history.

Now, I'm kind of into reviews. Now, these reviews, as they are written at the moment and before recommendation 3.6, as you've now all learnt about, was a matter of consultants being brought in to look at and establish the fitness for purpose, the efficiencies, make recommendations, et cetera, et cetera, which may have been just okay

when ICANN first started doing this, but by the second round, and remember by that I mean every single AC and SO, with the exception of the GAC, had had one of these reviews done.

So, by the time we around for the second lot, some of the first lot's recommendations weren't even being implemented. Some of them were still unsure what the intention was. It was an absolute disconnect between external parties coming in and going, oh, just do it this way. Everyone has to wear purple socks and all will be fine. And then none of us being able to decide what colour purple it's going to be. So, there was a real issue.

Now, with the second round that we've now gone all through ourselves again, it got even worse, where we had some consultants who simply, I mean, I'm sure they could spell ICANN, but one did wonder by the time one read their report. And I'm only slightly joking there. The reports were unimplementable and in some cases rejected, certainly in the case of the last ALAC and At-Large review, we rejected the very expensive consultant's report outright.

And we made our own recommendations and nearly every single one of those, with the exception of one, has been fully implemented now. So, that was the reason for shifting from this necessity to pay very large amounts of money for outsiders to come in and tell us how we should be doing things, to having developed a reasonable, stable set of practices, start improving them ourselves. So, it's really important that you understand that.

Each of the ACs and SOs will be on their own pathway, slightly different timelines, but what we want is to have some sets of principles that are applicable across all of ICANN and then specifics, which are sort of the next layer down, that apply or are very much bespoke to just the ACs and the SOs. Each and every one of us, and some which will only apply to a particular AC or SO, or in fact, their component part.

And you're in a RALO and a RALO is a component part of the At-Large community. And so, get bundled in with the ALAC reviews. That's more than enough for me, but if there's any questions, I'm happy to give gory details later. Thanks a lot.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Cheryl. And this was very essential. I think we should have started with that historical thing and come to this. I think we did everything and we went back to that, but I think we should have done it differently. Justine, do you want to add anything to it?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yeah, sure. This is Justine for the record. So, I think the reason why we're choosing to go a little bit of a deep dive into this is because part of the impetus for this is that we're supposed to be seeking, in our case, APRALO's input on the things that we are talking about and the things we're developing. So, insofar as what Amrita was talking about in terms of the high five principles and then below that criteria, and then below that criteria would be indicators as to how you would measure the criteria.

So, if you look at that framework, I believe that it's only the five principles that are meant to be agreed to community-wide, okay? So, not just APRALO, but across every SO/AC and group that is participating in this program, okay? But when it comes down to criteria and indicators, that's where the flexibility lies for each group to develop their own because it would depend on the nature and the activities that the group does.

So, again, the five principles are cross-wide to be agreed to cross-wide, cross-community-wide. So, if, and I noted that Amrita had a point about principles. So, if there are questions about principles, then we probably need to discuss them, but those are, again, cross-community-wide. Anything below that, which is the criteria and indicators, we can do that as a RALO. It is really up to us to be that way. So, that building flexibility for the RALOs. I believe that the leadership team is mooting the setting up of a small team to actually, go more in-depth.

So, if you want to discuss a specific principle or you want to discuss the development of a criteria and the indicators to correspond to the criteria, then I think we can do that at the small team level rather than, do it at a plenary meeting because that will take too long. And we probably need a lot of time to discuss certain things. Okay. So, those who have been asking questions in the chat or pointing out or making comments about certain things, we would ask you to hold that, and bring that up at the small team. Hopefully, you will join the small team where we can have a more robust discussion about those things. Thanks, Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Justine, for this. And can we go to the second last slide? And so, these are the five principles, and this has a phase we will have to work and get back to the CIP CCG group. Yesim, would it be possible to go to the next document which is linked? So, as I mentioned, we have work to do. And as Justine mentioned, yes. So, this is a document where we would have to work. The principles are laid. Whatever we had mentioned, and just scroll through it to give a feel of it and increase it. Whatever we had inputted earlier is there. And we want a small team where people would be interested to work with us.

We have five criteria, so at least, even two persons per team. And if you want to work on two or three criteria together would be good. Thank you, Bu and Shita for volunteering. We will have a call for a small team to be created so that they can work with us on this, so that we can improve it. Then we will share it with the APRALO community, take the final input, and then submit it to CIP CCG group. I hope everyone is in agreement. I don't see any disagreements to it. So, yes, if you are interested, yes, but please do work on it. Anyone who joins has to work, not for names. I'm bad at that.

Yesim, if you could take the names out here, it would really help. And, Cheryl, you need to be there, Justine, to kind of guide on how we work on this, the metrics, etcetera. Thank you, Barkha, Sarai, and the others. So, we have some names. And with that, we will get into the next agenda item, if it's okay with you. And we'll put it in the mail. So, Fahim, thank you for saying that you want to participate in it. That's great. So, we will talk about the policy poll.

Thanks, Jasmine. Great to have you here too. Okay, Pranav, good. Yes, we have the young people working, and I like it when young people engage. Not that it is bad when old people like us also engage, but we want to encourage younger people also. Great, Priyatosh. And keep it coming. Yesim will take in the names. Yes, Cheryl, mix is the key. So, that's okay. We are always young.

So, let's go to the next one. And can we go to the poll? So, if you recall, we just sent you a poll some time back that we want to create a travel policy, which is effective, efficient, accountable and we have people traveling. The travel slots are utilized in a way that it makes us more effective, efficient, etcetera.

So, just to clarify, we didn't have any travel policy so far, but what would happen is, from the RALO perspective, at least from APRALO or any of the RALOs, each of the RALOs had two travel slots, and the ALAC members, the three ALAC members used to travel from the ALAC, and there were two or three additional travel slots, which the ALAC would be using based upon requirement or-- There were no fixed criteria in which it was used. However, it was felt like we are talking about continuous improvement, even the travel policy, it was felt that needs to be enhanced or improved so that people who need to be there in the meetings are there, etcetera.

So, that's the background. The small team was formed by the ALAC chair to discuss on the travel, what could be the various parameters on which travel policy would be decided. And it was progressing, people felt that, yes, metrics need to be there, indicators need to be there, but they have to be flexible. For example, what fits the ALAC may not fit a

RALO, and engagement also needs to be looked, and it needs to be flexible, reflecting the RALO.

So, we had a travel policy which came in with the ALAC chair shared with us, a pilot travel policy wherein, there were people selected based upon requirement for a meeting, and the travel slot for each of the RALOs was reduced from two to one, because AFRALO wanted to accommodate some of their people for the ICANN AP meeting at Rwanda. Obviously, it was not discussed with the RALOs or with the ALAC.

So, there were concerns which were expressed, and APRALO also raised our concerns, not concerns, we said, okay, we can go ahead with the pilot, but the process was not inclusive, and it was a top-down process, and any deliberation needs to have the RALOs and everyone involved into the discussion. And the RALO seats of two should be under the purview of RALO and not just generally taken away, etcetera. So, AFRALO and EURALO also gave their statements, ALAC RALO also gave, there were statements made to retract it.

So, we shared our position and there were 34 responses, most felt that APRALO's position, the leadership took was agreeable and some said no, which is justifiable, we need to have all kinds of views. Then there was a discussion, there was a question whether we should reject the pilot proposal. Many said, yes, some said don't know, because obviously there are many things there and we must know, and some said, no, we should not reject the current pilot project.

So, then there was a discussion on whether we should have a metrics on how the two travel slots are used. Most said, yes, few said, no, and few obviously said they need more information or don't know about it. So, the question was, should APRALO be empowered to set our own metrics for our travel policy, which is predictable, accountable, etcetera. So, most said, yes, a few said, no, and then the next slide, and then we asked what should be the metrics or parameters which APRALO needs to look at. So, I just took up, there were many texts written, but I took up what most were saying out here.

So, engagement and participation equity, was something the level of engagement, participation, etcetera. Impact assessment of contribution of the person at the RALO or the community level, there were suggestions of including diversity and inclusion using the travel slot as incentive to engage, and then prioritize travel slots for RALO members who have proposed specific sessions or topics or workshops or initiatives that align with ICANN's strategic objectives and interests of the At-Large community.

So, large, people do feel, whoever has responded that, yes, we need metrics, they need to be flexible, but we, and it should be, I would say, an amalgamation of various issues, aspects such as engagement, participation, contribution, inclusion, prioritizing who needs to be at a meeting from a strategic level also at ICANN or even APRALO or At-Large. So, these were the comments which came in. Thank you, Yeşim.

Can we go to the next, Jonathan's letter? In the meantime, what happened, and yesterday, many of you may have seen, and if you could increase for the ALAC chair also wrote back retracting the pilot project

and suggested that the current process will follow, because there was a lot of objections to the way that, I would say, it's not only to the pilot, but also the process which was followed.

So, anyways, there would be new processes being set up to discuss further. There would be an external person from ICANN itself who would be engaging with the RALOs, etcetera. Melissa, who is a member of ICANN org, who specializes in conflict resolution, who would be facilitating these discussions on how it has to happen, etcetera. And then, work progressively to have a travel policy drafted, which is a good move, but I think internally also from APRALO, we need to kind of have these discussions on what is the kind of travel policy we would want and I see Justine's hand is up. She may be wearing her white chair hat at ALAC and sharing some of the perspectives from there. So, Justine, over to you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Amrita. This is Justine for the record, and indeed, I am putting on my hat as ALAC vice chair. As you can see from the Jonathan's letter, which is up on the screen at the moment. So, the basis of us, and when I say us, I'm talking about the ALAC leadership team, to revert back to the conventional allocation of what we have been practicing so far, is on the basis that because APRALO retracted their request for five additional slots to bring African-based delegates to the Kigali meeting, which is one of the main reasons why we acted upon proposing a pilot travel policy.

Because that main reason has now been withdrawn, we have gone back to the original, as I said, allocation by practice. And important to note is we have now reached out to all the RALOs offering and even suggesting that we engage in regional listening sessions. So, Amrita talked about Melissa Algood-Peters coming in as a facilitator for this listening session. It wouldn't actually be a discussion so much, well, okay, the RALOs could be discussing amongst themselves, but the ALAC leadership will be attending and just merely listening.

So, we will not be responding in any fashion at these sessions because it is about us listening and you telling us what you think about whatever. So, it's great to see that APRALO again, has got some inputs already to bring forth to this listening session and I would encourage all of you to attend that session and have your voices heard. As to when that session has happened, I think that's up to the APRALO leadership team to decide whether they want to put it as in place of a monthly call or part of the next monthly call or whatever, but we should do that soon so that we can move the process forward quicker, okay, so that's all I have to say as the ALAC vice-chair. Thank you very much.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Justine. And I see Cheryl's hand up and before I pass it on to Cheryl, Phy, just to respond to you, we will not end our work here. From APRALO, all of us always felt we need matrices, we need indicators, we want to be questioned and we want to have a mirror before us that if we are going to a meeting, are we effective, do we need to go there? So, we don't shy away from that just because we are

leadership, we need to be there. No, that's not how it happens here, at least that's how I feel.

So, the next step is we would be sharing our responses to the entire At-Large community that when we say, we don't say it for ourselves, we take feedback from the community and come back and then whatever has come in, for example, if you're saying inclusion, performance, etcetera, we will put it into a document and see which all can be measured, what works, what doesn't, and also build in the flexibility because this flexibility is also important so that when we say someone is going, we at least agree roughly to what it is and Cheryl, over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Amrita, Cheryl for the record again. And I just want to remind you all to start with these fits perfectly in continuous improvement because it is time for a travel policy to be formally developed and the best mechanism of doing that is now being decided upon, pardon me, you understand why there was a pilot to meet the need of what was requested from one RALO. We can forgive everybody for trying to do the right thing. I think now we have the luxury of getting it done in a way that everyone is going to be more happy with. So, that makes it more resilient but that's going to take a lot of work to get it there.

Can I compliment you all on gathering the information? Because even with this small amount of data that you've shown today, there's some really important things to bring forward in the listening section and to contribute to the development of a proper travel policy. But can I share

with you very quickly the actual history of how travel support ever occurred for any of At-Large. We were the only community when the interim ALAC was created that had ICANN pay for its interim ALAC members to attend meetings.

So, we were quite the exception. There was a very different time back then but that's where it came from because we made the point that as people who are not necessarily involved in any sort of industry interest, or commercial interest, it was very difficult for the At-Large advisory committee members to pay for themselves. So, that was where the initial constituency travel funding happened and it was deeply criticized by the rest of ICANN. That had a sunset where it was to stop once the ALAC was no longer interim and it was a Board resolution on the formation of the ALAC that it had to be self-funding by a certain point in time.

We were able to make the argument back then and by we, I mean me as chair and a couple of other individuals in support of me as chair with the Board to say that our community does need more support and we got additional support to bring two people from each newly formed as they were being formed RALO along. So, that's the history, that's the precedent. There is no inalienable right here and in fact, it's only because lots of other parts of ICANN now benefit from constituency travel because the wisdom of what we fought for has now been seen by GAC and others that we are in a safe place to even bring up a travel policy because what we really should have had happen is all the funding taken away years and years and years ago. There you go, got what you wish for.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you for sharing the history because that's also interesting and Justine over to you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Amrita. So, now I'm putting on my hat as APRALO, ALAC member, no longer vice chair of ALAC. In terms of the travel policy and what we want to do for the APRALO travel policy, I think that's essential and a timely move because it is in line with the work that we've done in updating the rules of procedure. So, those of you who were involved in the discussions of updating the rules of procedure will remember that we have certain adjunct documents that talk about criteria of candidates who want to vie for leadership positions and then also in terms of responsibilities and what they're supposed to do when they take office.

So, in line with that, this travel policy discussion that we're going to be having with the ALAC leadership, is complementary, because at the end of the day, we want to move away from entitlements based on any leadership position that you hold to meritocracy, that you need to be at a meeting because you are actually contributing something. So, that is the bottom line, and I'm very proud to say that APRALO, probably amongst all the other RALOs, actually recognize that because in the survey results that you see, it's embedded in that.

So, the principles are embedded in that. The only sort of divergence would be that APRALO thinks that they should have the say in assessing their own people in terms of the travel, but there is no argument that

the travel policy is needed and it should be more reliant on meritocracy rather than entitlement. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thanks, Justine, and thanks, everyone, for at least those who could participate in the poll. I know it was very short, two days. Many of them may have missed it, but whoever has, that has been very helpful for us. We can go back. I don't think any other RALO has done this poll at this point of time, as in even I'm proud that APRALO has done it, and we always try to follow processes and do things newly. So, yes, and with this, we go to another thing which we do in APAC region at APRALO, that is the APAC Policy Forum, and over to Justine and Shah for a brief update.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. Just very quickly, because we're sort of running out of time, I just wanted to make one announcement and probably just give a few updates. The first thing is I'd like to announce that the leadership team has agreed for Shah to become vice chair of the APRALO Policy Forum. So, applause to Shah for that. And then in terms of updates, you will see in our planning calendar that we're trying to put together a couple of activities, maybe one in April, although we're sort of running against the clock here and probably a couple more in May.

In terms of what the activities are, it's still in flux, but we have in mind something like maybe a discussion or a fireside chat or something to talk about internet fragmentation again, so part two, internet fragmentation, but more on the lines of what our role is in terms of

combating or deterring internet fragmentation and in light of all the discussions that's happening at the NETmundial 10 and WSIS+20. So, in that context and so we're trying to get to put together an activity for that, so that we bring it down to a more comprehensible level and make it open so that people can ask questions about what is this and what's going on and so forth, so it's more informative and more, yeah, consultative at the same time.

The second activity that we're trying to organize would be helmed by Shah, and it would be to do with the UA Day activities, or in particular, the UA Day projects that are undertaken by the RALOs, sorry, the ALSs in our RALO. So, we're trying to do kind of like an analysis of what has worked and what has not worked, and I think at the end of the day, there should be some kind of report out back to the UASG from the APRALO perspective about how to do things better. So, again, kind of continuous improvement, but from our perspective back to UASG. So, more on those details later on.

The third thing that I wanted to talk to you all about is that, I would like to reignite the project ROSI. Okay, ROSI stands for Register of Skills and Interests, so R-O-S-I, that had been stopped. That project had a small team took the work to the extent possible, and we were all waiting for the rollout of the community engagement system by ICANN org to be able to run the things that we need to run for this particular project, but because the CES, the community engagement system rollout has been delayed for such a long time, I don't particularly want to wait anymore. So, I would like to reignite project ROSI, but in a small scale, so that it's manageable. Probably, we have to do quite a little bit of manual work, in putting that together.

We could look at possibly doing another call for additional membership to the APF, because we have some new ALSs joiners, and then maybe look at possibly having a small team, or maybe even do the exercise with the entire APF to look at how we can structure something like a survey, and I'm thinking of a Google form, to collect from members who are interested in telling us what they are doing in terms of what they possess in terms of skills and interest around the work of ICANN.

And the idea is to collect a database of this, so that we can draw upon that as needed, when you want to set up a small team, for example, to do certain things. So, we've seen that the small team model has worked quite well. It works very well with the APRALO commands to the draft applicant support handbook, and it seems like there is a lot of interest in a small team to do the work of the continuous improvement cross-community group project. So, I think the small team model works.

So, the idea is that the project ROSI, the register of skills and interest, is something that all members of APRALO can contribute to in terms of what they have, as I said, possess in terms of skills and interest. And then the leadership team can look at that database and start pulling people, tapping people on the shoulders and saying, hey, we're going to do this piece of work, would you be interested in engaging and contributing there. So, that would allow members to understand what work is being done and to find ways that they can engage in, in terms of the work that they're interested in. Thanks. Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thanks, Justine, for this. And since we just have six more minutes, we may want to extend it by 7 or 10 minutes max because we have the election update coming up from staff, and perhaps last, an AOB schedule may want to share a bit about update on the rules of procedures. Very briefly, but over to Gisella who's going to share on the upcoming elections of APRALO.

GISELLA GRUBER: Amrita, yes, thank you very much. And with regards to the elections. I hope you can hear me. I do apologize, not in the best place. We have the elections page up and the email has been sent around to the list with the main dates and I'd just like to point out that the call for nominations period now is from the 15th of April to the 26th of April, and then further to that, the nominations accepted for 10 days, and the deadline for nomination acceptance is the 3rd of May 2024. So, we'll be keeping a close eye on that as well.

Then we have the call with candidates, if desired, by the region, depending on how many candidates are positioned, and then we will have the elections running from the 10th to the 24th of May, and the new person, persons will be seated at the AGM in Istanbul after the Board meeting on the 14th of November. And now going to more specifically to the AP region.

If we have the page up on the screen, we have the positions listed on the table, and so far, we have the ALAC member, which is Satish Babu, he is eligible for reappointment, and he has already been nominated. We have the position of chair, Amrita's position, which again is eligible

for reappointment, as well as the vice chair, Aris Ignacio, and then we get down to the ALAC delegate to the NomCom, which is Maureen, and she is unfortunately not eligible for reappointment.

If you look under the table, we would like to point out that there has been a change in the NomCom rules. And I hope I am expressing myself correctly with these changes, but the long and the short of it is that there will be positions with a one-year term and a two-year term for the NomCom. And I just touched base with my colleagues last night because this is new to all of us, but I wasn't 100% familiar with this. And we will be discussing this, what we call the random selection for the one- and two-year positions on the ALAC call next Tuesday, which is scheduled to be held at 1600 UTC. So, that covers the elections. I'm just checking if there are any hands up, or if there is anything I may have missed on this.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: There are no hands, Gisella, but I think Cheryl may want to add something on the rules of procedures.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much, Amrita. Over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just because I also had my fingers in NomCom reviews, which resulted in this. This is a transitional place only. That is, as we're changing to a new set of rules and term limitations and how many terms in total you are in your lifetime with ICANN able to serve. A

whole lot of changes are happening. You've got this interim first coming up set of appointments, and it means that some will need to be what will be then going on the normal two-year term and the other will need to be a one-year term, because the last thing you want is for the full NomCom to be spilt at the one time.

So, it's splitting up the NomCom, the voting seats of the NomCom, so you've got at least half of it continuing on, so then the next lot come in and they get two years. And someone who gets a one-year is probably not going to be able to necessarily have the seat go on. So, there's a little bit of complication there. But random assignment is up to the ALAC, because these are ALAC appointments. The RALO recommends the ALAC does not even have to follow or select someone who is recommended by the RALO. So, it is absolutely ALAC's business as to who it appoints, we're just making some suggestions of the best of what we've got. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Cheryl, would you also like to add what our new rules of procedures say in terms of for the elections, etcetera., in case interested candidates may want to look at those annex documents, though not adopted yet?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Certainly, not a problem at all. Because our rules of procedure, as recently reviewed, will come to pass, they will be, we assume, approved and being fully implemented, probably before these people take the seats. You need to make sure that if you are a candidate for these roles, you are able to comply with the new set of assumed criteria and

metrics. So, just make sure if you are someone whose name is being put forward to one of these leadership roles, including the NomCom representative from our region, then please review the new, still draft, but about to be voted on, rules of procedure.

So, you can assure yourselves and the rest of us that you will be able to comply and follow those requirements. Otherwise, it's going to be a very, very short selection because you'll be in and then you'll be out again once the new rules come in. And just on those rules, just if you can indulge me for one moment, we've heard back from ICANN Legal via Heidi, and there are just a couple, and I mean three in total, tiny little tweaks in language that we now need to make before you will all be getting a final cleaned up version for then the leadership team to proceed with the process of voting on. So, well done, all of you. Thanks.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Cheryl, and most of the heavy work was done by you and Justine. So, well done to you and Justine. And yes, it would be shared after the three tweaks are made, and those are very tiny stuff. And obviously, these drafts were shared with all of you. It's not as if it was not shared even before we sent it to ICANN Legal, it was shared. The final version of the draft would be shared, which obviously would then go in for voting. So, that's how it is. And we are good with time. We did finish in 12:32. Is there anything else anyone wants to share, ask, etcetera.? Anything urgent? Yes, Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

Thank you, Amrita. This is Gunela Astbrink for the record. Yes, I just wanted to say that in the outreach and engagement plan, there was an item about disability and accessibility awareness training for APAC staff. And Jeroen has now confirmed that their training, well, it's a one-hour introduction will happen on the 28th of May. And this is being done by Scott Hollier, who is the CEO of the Centre for Accessibility Australia, and is blind himself. He's an excellent speaker. And we look forward to how staff will respond and if that could be the beginning of maybe an expanded training in regard to use of accessible online documents and sites and so forth. So, we look forward to seeing how that goes. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you so much, Gunela, for this update and welcome initiative. And with that, I think we should end the call. We have three minutes over the time. Thank you so much for indulging us and hearing. We would like to hear from you. We've taken, I'm sure, Yesim would be looking at the chat and taking whoever is interested in the small team, we would share the final list. And in case anyone is interested, they could join in.

Obviously, we will share the next steps of how we want to go with the travel policy, etcetera, when the meeting would be there on the listening call, etcetera. And obviously, Project Rossi is something where your input would be wanted. We want you to engage in APRALO Policy Forum. And if you want to know more, just ping Shah or Justine on this. Election is something that you've heard about. Nominations, obviously, can start coming in now. Now is the period to nominate, etcetera. Yes,

that's about it. Thank you so much, everyone. And have a good rest of the day, evening, etcetera. Thank you and bye.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thank you, Amrita, and everyone.

YEŞİM SAGLAM: Thank you all for joining this meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]