
YESIM NAZLAR:

Of course, let's please start the recording. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Subcommittee on Finance and Budget call, taking place on Thursday, the 9th of February, 2017, at 17:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Daniel Nanghaka, Javier Rua-Jovet, Ali AlMeshal, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Erich Schweighofer, Alfredo Calderon, and Glenn McKnight.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, and myself, Yesim Nazlar. Excuse me – Silvia Vivanco has just joined us as well.

We have received apologies from Alberto Soto and Kaili Kan.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

Finally, if I could please remind everyone to state their names before speaking, not only for the transcription purposes but also for the interpretation purposes as well.

Thank you very much, and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I note we still, for the record, do not have anyone from LACRALO on the call. The two formal members are Humberto and Harold, and I hope we are trying to reach both of them. There are some issues with LACRALO proposals, and it would be unfortunate if we made decisions without anyone from LACRALO on the call.

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.

We have, as you can see in the summary – it’s also attached to the agenda – 24 proposals in total. There is a 25th, which could be added at the last moment. You’ll recall that last year we put a request in to use liaison travel funding for any other use if it is not needed for the designated liaison. The answer we got was, “Sure. Go ahead.” But the wording in the formal answer was, “No. You can’t.” We’re looking for clarity on that. If we cannot get it by today or tomorrow, we will resubmit the request. That will be essentially verbatim from last year’s.

There have been substantive but often not very major changes to a number of the requests. Those are the only ones we’ll be looking at today. Forgive me – my voice is not very stable right now. I have a call with the CEO immediately after this at the end of the hour, and Heidi has to leave early to brief the CEO on my call. So we have a very strict time constraint, and we’re going to try to make it.

If we could go to the ALAC document, please. The first three have not been changed. Those are the ALAC leadership team real-time capturing and the [GNSO] funding of RALO activities. The first one with a change in it is the IGF funding, which starts at page 14.

If we could scroll to 14, please. I think we’ve gone past 14. We’re not looking at the page numbers. We’re looking at the page – that is it – within the document.

Essentially, if we scroll down a bit, please – okay. Essentially, the change in this one, [R2] tried to coordinate the request for the global IGF one, which is this one. Hold on. Let me get to the right place in my document so I can see what we’re talking about. It’s to try to coordinate the request. As you’ll see, I’ve added a note saying, “This one is being

submitted in parallel with the three RALO requests for IGFs for workshops.

At this point, we have no knowledge of whether this request will be accepted. For the individual ones, even if they're accepted, they're still contingent on IGF acceptance of the workshop.

So we're in a rather nebulous state in terms of not knowing how these fit together. If all three – or even a subset – of the RALO requests are approved and go through, then they clearly overlap with this. The RALO requests ask for a total of about 11 people or something like that, or maybe nine. This one asks for another 5. There's no way we're going to get 15 or 16 people. So they overlap, and this is simply a disclaimer saying we understand the overlap and we really have no other tools under which to do this, other than to submit them like this.

It also says that the intent is to make sure that there is a presence of At-Large at IGF, regardless of whether we fund a particular workshop or not. We know we have a lot of people attending, and we need to treat it seriously as an ICANN activity, not just funded through other sources, even if the individuals may be funded through other sources.

What we're trying to do is, essentially, get our foot in the door and make sure that it's accepted that there should be an At-Large presence at IGF, and this might be a multi-year effort to wrap it up.

So that's the substance of what the changes are. If anyone has any concerns, then let me know or speak up right now. I guess that's the answer.

The only other minor change is... Hold on. No, that's it. Oh, I took off Adobe Connect for preparation purposes. That's a standard At-Large function. We don't need to specify that.

Any comments on this before we go ahead?

Hearing none, seeing none, the next one that we need to look at is the next one, and that's the policy document – the effective policy development and tracking system. That starts on page 20.

Now, unfortunately, we only had a PDF for that. I don't know if Dev is – Dev is on the call. We really need the Word document. The substance of my comment on that one is that this paper makes reference to policy advice. That's based on the title of a web page we have, which is called Policy Advice. This is something which came up in the At-Large review. That page is misnamed. We changed the title on the At-Large homepage to point that we have not submitted 200 or 300 policy advices in the last several years. We submitted 300 statements, of which a few of them are formal policy advice.

The use of the incorrect title has gotten us into big trouble in terms of the At-Large review, and we have to fix that now. There is still an error on the website, which will be fixed within hopefully a few days. This document needs to be adjusted so we're not calling the 300 items policy advice. There is text that is on the homepage, which says the At-Large Advisory Committee has developed over 300 documents, including statements, comments, correspondence, proposals, briefings, and advice or declarations and formal advice. This paper needs to be very quickly adjusted to align with that wording. I don't think it's

problematic, but without having the Word document, I couldn't tentatively make the changes. We need to get that done very quickly.

Any questions or comments on that?

Yes, go ahead, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Alan. I did send the Word document first thing this morning when I saw the [older] message from Heidi. So it is available now to input.

I understand what you were saying. I guess it is a little bit confusing with the different nomenclature being used. So by all means, let's align it to how we want to align it. But I think the policy itself is sound.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I wasn't questioning that. If you could make the changes as a first cut with tracked changes, I would appreciate it. I've been on calls for the last several hours already, and my day is pretty well-filled with calls. So if you could do changes with tracked changes and send it to Heidi and me, we'll get it on with [inaudible]. I really would appreciate that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I'll give it a shot.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If you look on the homepage, there's a paragraph that I just read out that talks about all of the different kinds of things. I'm not quite

sure what the Policy Advice page will be renamed to, but it will be renamed so it's not just called Policy Advice.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Great.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. That's the last of the At-Large ones. The only other changes: we moved the public media initiative out of NARALO and put it into ALAC, as we decided last time. Everything else is essentially unchanged. There are some formatting changes and things in some of the other documents, and they're online right now, but there are no other substantive changes.

If we can go to AFRALO, please, there's only one change here. This is the AFRALO request for support for an IGF workshop. The change is the sentence which you can see on the screen right now. It essentially is the complement to the change in the At-Large IGF funding one, simply noting that this is being submitted in parallel and, if both are funded, there will have to be some coordination to make sure that they fit together.

Any comments or questions on that? That same statement has been added to the other IGF request. We'll note them but I will not put them on display unless someone finds a reason why they need to.

Yes, Cheryl. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just wondering if it's a typo. It's [promulgated] through all of them, but I'm assuming that it shouldn't say, "if both be fund." It should be "both be funded," as opposed to "Bob would be funded."

ALAN GREENBERG: I love autocorrect. Noted. Will staff please note that all three IGF requests have that changed to fix that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, Glenn has a question or a comment in the chat. He says, "I assume these proposals are moving forward."

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, there's nothing that we are not moving forward on – nothing we've already talked about that are not moving forward. So at this point, we have eight ALAC, two AFRALO, and we're about to go onto APRALO.

Any comments or questions? Then let's go onto APRALO, please. The first one to display is the third one for the India School on Internet Governance on page 8. There are no substantive changes that we made. There have been some changes that were made by the RALO. I still have some concerns about asking for funding for an Indian school of governance adjacent to a meeting that's not being held in India, but I'm willing to bow to the wisdom of the RALO once submitted as is, although I'm a little bit dubious it's going to get funded, other than perhaps a nominal sum from GSE because they do tend to put small amounts into schools of governance on a regular basis.

The only other change in the APRALO one is the same comment in their IGF support, and I don't think there's any reason to display it. We will change "bother" to "both."

Any other comments from APRALO? I'll note that there's a lot of travel there, almost all of which is aimed at the leadership. I don't know how well that's going to be perceived. I do understand the rationale, but I have a little bit of concern that, because it's all focused on the same people, it may not get as well-funded as it may otherwise be. That's just a personal opinion of mine, and I have no say in the matter.

Any further questions on APRALO?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, just really briefly on the other ones, there were two for some outreach and leadership travel to events in the region. They were advised nicely by Maureen. There was also one for the Armenian Internet School. That has been detailed to a considerable degree. They're going to be requesting funds as well from ISOC. So I think that will increase its chances of getting approved.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. All of those changes were ones that, to a large extent, we requested as a result of the last meeting, noting that things needed to be fleshed out or clarified. I'm not going over the text of them. They were all done as requested. Heidi and I have looked at them, and anyone else could have looked to them, should they have chosen to go to the page. So I don't think there's any need to focus on the wording changes here. There have been changes that were done as

a result of the last discussion, and those have all been done, unless I'm noting them here in a way that I don't think will cause any problems and has addressed the concerns we expressed in the first go-around.

All right. EURALO. The only minor thing is that, again, the IGF request has the same proviso to be corrected. I don't think we need to post it.

We are now at LACRALO. How are we on attendance? Do we have anyone from LACRALO on the call yet?

YESIM NAZLAR:

Hi, Alan. Yes. Humberto has joined, but he's only on the phone bridge on the Spanish channel.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. In that case, we will go ahead with LACRALO. These are the only ones where – from my perspective, anyway – we still do have some concerns. If we could put the document up. Let me get my copy.

The first one – I have a comment that notes that the proposal is quite nice. I'm not quite sure what they're asking for, though. So either from Heidi who has been talking to people or Humberto, everything here looks like things that I would have thought we had within our disposal, unless there's really additional staff or some other aspect that's beyond our current availability. That's on page one of the document.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Humberto, would you like to speak to this? I'm happy to as well.

Okay. Alan, Humberto has his hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: The origin of this approach was in fact presented by Alberto. The idea was to have a training course for the leadership. I participated in a course. Leon Sanchez did as well. So all of us participated in this training course.

What we really want is to have training for new people to become new leaders. So we're talking about communication in general.

I see that Alan is not clearly understanding this. Would you like to add something else to make the proposal clearer, if you will?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Let me ask the question a different way. It looks like all of the training that is being talked about here is not face-to-face, such as the leadership training program that you and Leon participated, but is all electronic, based on ICANN Learn or webinars or other resources that we already have access to.

So the question is: what exactly are you asking that ICANN provide in this funding request? Or is one that Heidi can say she accepts and that there's no further work to be done?

Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

I think this is a good proposal. I do understand that it looks like a lot of it could be done by staff. However, it might be useful to still submit this so we can add a little bit; for example, from an external trainer, if we needed to have someone. For example, there's insight learning that we use for the leadership program to develop some documents that we could then translate into Spanish and French for use by LACRALO.

Or we could have him on a webinar about facilitation skills, etc. So that might be another reason to add it to this request. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Heidi. Then may I suggest that there be a sentence added to it somewhere that says that? Because it's not clear that the people reviewing this are going to understand that kind of thing any more than I will. So if we can add it under the resources needed or being asked for, then, as I said, I think it's a great request. I just think we need clarity to make sure that people understand what we're asking for. Otherwise, the answer is going to come back as "Yes, sure," but not provide any resources.

All right. I think that's done. So we need changes today from either Heidi's side or from LACRALO. Let's flesh that out. I don't think we need much more than a sentence or two and perhaps filling in something in toward the end when we're specifying what resources. Thank you.

The next one is the challenges for an At-Large community face-to-face meeting. That starts at page four. Two issues here. First of all, in the introduction it says that it's to address post-IANA issues that LACRALO

members need to be aware of to engage productively in policy development. Perhaps I am blindsided. I'm not sure what post-IANA issues we're talking about here. There are certainly issues with regard to getting LACRALO involved actively, but I'm not sure what the post-IANA issues are. So that's question number one.

Question number two is on the last page. The proposal seems to be talking about two meetings; one adjacent to adding a day to some meeting already going to be held in LACRALO, and the second a face-to-face meeting for 15 people. Under travel support, it only seems to be talking about one of those. So it seems that something is missing.

If, again, either Heidi, if she knows, or Humberto could address that. Humberto, go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

It seems there are two different things and two different meetings. One we talk about is the post-IANA transition problems or issues. We refer to those issues that have already been mentioned: jurisdiction, issues related to human rights. Our idea is to be able to encourage more policy discussion within LACRALO because this is one of the issues that we have always claimed, and it necessary that the members in the region start addressing that.

Secondly, these are two different meetings, precisely. There is one meeting that was targeted to be – for example, in LAC IGF, which could be held in Chile or somewhere else in Latin America, would be attended by five members, who would be members from the region who would discuss all these issues. Maybe they could create some kind of paper.

These could be published and it could be materials to be distributed among the LACRALO members and probably within the rest of the community with the aim of increasing our knowledge.

Now, at the same time, there is another meeting that is related to those members who attended the Los Angeles meeting. The aim is to finish all the pending issues that we conducted very recently in January. The idea here is to create the LACRALO roadmap. This is what we are asking for. That's why we want these issues to be discussed.

Maybe Heidi would like to add something else?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. Thank you, Humberto. The second meeting is more of a follow-up from the recent LACRALO assembly, which went very well. I think that there's still a little bit more to be done. This is seen as a way, as a means, for that to happen for them to get together and address some issues that they're working on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I see Cheryl's hand up, but if I may intercede first, on the first question of the post-IANA issues, if Heidi or Humberto can just add a parenthetical after that so other people understand that we're talking about issues such as privacy and human rights or whatever the items are, just so there's clarity. Otherwise, it's not going to be clear what it is we're asking for.

In terms of the second of the two meetings, I understood that there are two meetings. My concern is that, under Travel Support, the wording is

“Travel support for between 5 and 15 LACRALO members. A meeting will be identified for which many requested participants are already supported to minimized ICANN travel support.” That seems to be talking about the first meeting adjacent to another event already to be scheduled. It is not talking about the follow-on to the Los Angeles meeting that both Humberto and Heidi referred to. My only concern is that, under Travel Support, if we are asking for travel and support to this second meeting, it should be specified there because the travel support only refers to the first one.

Cheryl, do you still want to speak?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I can, Alan, just very briefly, and assuming you can hear me; just specifically that the term “post-IANA issues” I balk at. I think that what it is you’re trying to do is in fact look at Work Stream 2 topics because that’s what you’ve outlined in the explanation – human rights and all of those sorts of things. I would just not use “post-IANA” but rather switch out the terminology there for something which goes with your parenthetical, Alan – I don’t know what alarm is going off in someone’s background, but it’s extremely loud in my ear [bit] – something along the lines of “some ongoing matters of discussion, such as going in the Work Stream 2 for accountability and other matters,” just to make sure because, reading that, to me, sounds like there is problems regarding “post-IANA” – not even “transition.”

In fact, any of those topics have very little to do with PTI being in play. It has a lot to do with our ongoing and continuing working in policy and accountability [there].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I note we're ten minutes away from Heidi having to leave.

The reason I suggested a parenthetical, even though I share your concern with the expression, is that the expression is peppered throughout the document and we have very little time. So I was happy to define it, essentially, in the first parenthetical so it then has context for the rest of them.

But I don't really care how it's changed. We just need a bit of clarity because otherwise I don't think it'll be understood.

In terms of the travel support, Heidi, can I leave it with you? If LACRALO wants to submit it without asking for the travel support for the second meeting, I'm happy, but it's not going to help that meeting happen.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I'll follow up with Humberto. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The next one – again, we're still in LACRALO – is the third proposal, starting on page seven: Empowerment of Capacity Building. If we can just go to the next page of the document, please.

We basically said that we did not see how we could a proposal like this through without some changes. I understand changes were made to it but not in the budget section. It is still asking for a total of about \$250,000. That's about half of the overall SO/AC proposal. It includes a

\$100,000 for 54 units, and it's not clear what they're units of. The description is "digital library support material." They seem to have an \$81,000 charge, which seems to be PCs for all of the attendees at the meeting and all of the ALSes. That's almost \$2,000 apiece, which these days buys a pretty good tablet or PC.

I just don't see how we can put a request like this through with any credibility and no further description of what these items are. It will virtually certainly be rejected, and I think our credibility will be hurt by putting it forward.

I see that Tijani has his hand up. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. It's advice or perhaps information that I gave to my colleagues in LACRALO. This request with this amount will not be accepted. I know very well how the finance department works because I am on the finance community – I don't know what the name of this group is – and we've worked together for several years. I know that we have an envelope for the whole community, as Alan said, and you are asking for half of it. So it will not be accepted as it is.

I advise you to modify and to make it something which is acceptable. Don't forget that you are an element of the whole At-Large, and that At-Large is an element of the whole community. So you have to have this on your mind when you decide on the cost you want to put in your request. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Tijani. Tijani and others have said that the Finance and Budget Subcommittee should not act as a gatekeeper. But we are here to make decisions on behalf of ALAC, and these requests are due tomorrow. We have very little time, and no time for this committee to meet again. So unless there can be some radical changes and the committee delegates to me or me and one other person to pass judgment on, I don't see how we can submit this request as it is. And I question whether it can be modified sufficiently to do that. But –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Hold on, Tijani. If Cheryl [inaudible] or me. I point out that Heidi does have to leave in five minutes and we still have several requests to look at.

Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that, since Humberto is with [inaudible] now, they can decide quickly. Otherwise, the request will not be accepted. This is the problem. We don't want to prevent them from sending it. We want them to be aware that it will not be accepted as it is. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I think it hurts the credibility of At-Large and ALAC if we submit a request like this.

Cheryl, go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I'm coming in on exactly what your last words were. I do disagree with Tijani's aspect of us not being a gatekeeper in this. I think there are times, particularly with the current timing of other things happening with the reputation of ALAC and At-Large, when indeed to watch the reputation on behalf of everybody. This is going to fail as is. All of these things get published, and I think this group should seriously consider not putting it forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Humberto, do you have any quick statements to make? Otherwise, we will at this point not forward it and go onto the next one.

No comments. I think a decision has been made. Heidi, please note.

Next item is the Internet and social development of the workshop in Venezuela. That is starting on page ten.

Just a brief comment. It says "translation services." This is under Services Requested. Are you asking for translation services or interpretation services? They are quite different in terms of price and likelihood of being provided. I think we need clarify.

In other words, are you asking for simultaneous interpretation meetings, or are you asking for translation of documents? If we can get an answer. I know this came from Harold, and he's not at the meeting. If we can get an answer on that and correct it if necessary or clarify it as translation of documents or simultaneous interpretation. I know we

tend to use the word “translation” generally, but we have to be specific here because the costs are very, very different.

Humberto says he believes it’s simultaneous interpretation, in which case, can I ask Heidi to change the words? I think, unfortunately, that makes it less likely to be funded, but that’s not our call.

All right. Seeing no other comments, the last one is on page 13. This is a new one that this group has not seen before. Essentially, it is an offer from a university on Columbia that if we provide one ALS member and one university member a trip to an ICANN meeting, in exchange the university will issue what I believe is a certificate to LACRALO members who complete a certain number of online webinars or other courses.

It is not clear to me – and maybe Humberto can fill this in – that they’re asking for a single trip for two people at one ICANN meeting, presumably in the next year or so. It’s not clear how long they are committing to provide this service or providing certificates. Is it only over that same year? Is it a longer-term commitment or what? So if Humberto could speak to that, I would appreciate it.

Humberto, go ahead – no, Dev, this is a new proposal. It was just submitted. It did not meet the cut-off, and Humberto asked and I said we would allow it to be distributed and shown to this group. So, yes, it did come in very, very late.

Humberto, go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: First of all, this was a proposal that we received, if I'm not mistaken, on the 28th or 29th of January. I discussed this personally with Alan and also with Rodrigo De La Parra.

In sum, the idea was that this proposal is in agreement with what we want in LACRALO which is we want people to get more involved in the training webinars. This is an ALS called [Embrado], and they also are related to the Autonomous University of Columbia. What they say is that, if the members of LACRALO – and they refer to all the members in Latin America and the Caribbean – attend 80% of the webinars organized by LACRALO and LACRALO staff, then the university will be able to issue a certificate proving that participation because many of the LACRALO members may consider this certificate a increment in their resume, in their curriculum vitae.

So they say that they can issues a certificate for this, whether on a semester basis or annually, depending on what we agree on with them. They only thing they require in exchange for this certificate is funding for two trips to an ICANN meeting. This is something we would need to agree on with them. It would be only one meeting where they would have no hotel. They would only get funds for air tickets. This is what it is in general terms. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Humberto. We are getting very close to the point where I have to leave and Heidi will have to leave.

There are two decisions we need to make on this one. The first decision: is this group willing to submit this request, given the late timing of it?

That's number one. Number two: I am asking Humberto for clarity on how long the university is committed to do this if ICANN agrees to provide this travel funding.

Humberto, is that a new hand?

Okay. Oh –

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: It's not a new hand, but I can still answer your question. Right now, Alfredo Lopez – he's the one who is submitting the project – is chatting with me right now, and he's participating also in this meeting. He says this is valid for the time that is required. Alfredo is the one who submitted the proposal. It is my understanding that, if this is more permanent, then we can discuss it with them. Alfredo is present at this meeting, and he is saying that the university is willing to have an agreement. So I think Alfredo is the right person to answer right now in this meeting. Maybe, Alan, you'd like to give him the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would, but let me make very clear what I'm asking. All I want is a statement in this proposal, for: if ICANN provides them with these two trips – that's a one-time-only two trips – how long is the university willing to commit to carry out this certificate program? I don't care what the answer is, but I think we need it in writing in the document. If Alfredo has a quick answer, then I'm willing to have him speak up.

The other question is a show of green tick marks or Xs from members of the Budget and Finance Subcommittee: are we willing to submit this

despite the late timing, given that Humberto has indicated that this could be a useful tool for getting involvement from LACRALO?

I see one X and I see one tick mark at this point. That is not definitive.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, I'm against it because of the timing. They should have gotten this in in time before the deadline.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I see many tick marks. I'm not sure all of these are from members of the committee, but at least several of them are. I see two tick marks and four Xs.

Would anyone else like to weigh in on this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's Cheryl, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If the committee prevails on their hard and soft deadline rules, so be it. But if we do do that, I would like to make sure that this committee makes very clear to the applicants for this that they should really reapply, either through this same process in the next financial year, or that we find an opportunity – certainly, I'd be happy to help them – to explore other options for support for this sort of thing to occur via other

types of ICANN support – perhaps through one of the other funded departments.

I know very well from other experiences in other volunteer realms that third-party certification and accreditation can be a valuable asset to the users' encouragement of participation. So that's why it's getting my support now. I'm not going to have enough people on the green [path] to do that. However, I wouldn't want to see this baby go out with the bathwater. I think we should do our best to support the initiative.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I notice that a few members have not voted. Clearly, I think, Harold, had be had been on the call, would. We have Ali, who's a member, who has not spoken up.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, this is Judith Hellerstein. Did you get my vote?

ALAN GREENBERG: I did get your vote.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. Thanks. Sorry. I'm in a busy [inaudible]. So that's why.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. We have not been particularly rigid in other cases, and we have allowed things to come in this admittedly late. I'm willing to let it go through at this point. We have slightly more nos than yeses. I did not

vote, and we've had some strong requests that it go ahead. So I'm willing to let it go ahead at this point. But we do need the correction. If we cannot get a clear statement of how long the program will be good for, then I will not recommend that it go forward. So if we can get clarity on that, I would appreciate it.

That being said, there are two NARALO recommendations. There have been no substantive changes to requests. There have been no substantive changes to them from the last time. One is for a North American School of Internet Governance. The other is The Global Indigenous Persons Mentorship Program.

I think we've done our business at our point. I thank everyone for their participation. Are there any further final comments before we adjourn?

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR:

Alan, Cheryl again, if you don't mind. I was about to type but you won't leave me enough time to type before we close the call. In response to Maureen's point in chat that other applications had as little in their support material as this one does – they've been told they're a little bit thin – if this one as it is now is able to have a little more depth and color put in within the next 24 hours, that would be good.

What I was going to say is that the depth and color part is part of what should be happening when it goes through the regional review. Depth and color shouldn't be something we should be continuously asking for. So the RALOs need to up their game, in my view, in the future and do a little bit more supporting and nurturing before we get to it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I think, number one, the timing was bad this year with the holiday season coming in the middle. But I think we need to be a bit more proactive telling RALOs what we expect of them. But I agree completely.

So, yes, I support what Cheryl said. If we flesh this one out a little bit, fine. Otherwise, it lives or dies on what is there.

I thank you all very much. I appreciate your participation, and I think we will make the albeit-extended deadline at this point.

Thank you all.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

All right. Bye.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]