MICHELLE DESMYTER: Welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large leadership team monthly call on Wednesday, the 25th of March, 2020.

On today's call, we do have Maureen Hilyard, Daniel Nanghaka, Marita Moll, Yrjo Lansipuro, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Joanna Kulesza, Lianna Galstyan, Andrey Kolesnikov, Barrack Otieno, Eduardo Diaz, Dave Kissoondoyal, Sebastien Bachollet, Jonathan Zuck, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sergio Salinas Porto, Hadia Elminiawi … One moment.

Okay. And we do have apologies from Sylvia Herlein Leite and Satish Babu.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu, Silvia Vivanco, Yesim Nazlar, Claudia Ruiz, Gisella Gruber, and myself, Michelle DeSmyter, on call management.

I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please speak slowly and clearly for our interpreters. Please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise as well. We will also be using RTT during today's meeting. I will go ahead and put the link in the chat so you can follow along.

Thank you every so much. I'll turn the meeting now over to Maureen Hilyard. Maureen, please begin.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Michelle. Well, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone, wherever you may be. I truly hope that everyone is well. I'd just like to warn you that I've got a cold and I'm likely to sneeze or something during the meeting. So, please, I apologize in advance if that happens suddenly.

And just to let you know that I'm in isolation because I recently returned from overseas and therefore, for two weeks, I'm supposed to limit myself in case I infect somebody with something that I shouldn't. So I think that's pretty much like at—well, not everybody, but most people. I just contacted my family and they, as of last night, were in four weeks of lockdown, which police and others on the road to check the cars as to why they're on the road. So things have changed so much in such a short time. This is one of the reasons why I think we have to really look at and expect that the online and virtual meetings are going to be the norm over the next few months, possibly/probably. I have seen people still organizing events for May and June, and I think that's being very hopeful. We have to go follow the rules and regulations of our own countries and keep each other safe.

So, carrying on with our meeting and following on—I'm just going over the agenda, first of all—from action items and policy—we've moved to policy activities—I'm just noting that, at this particular point in time, too, our policy sessions at ICANN67 gained a lot of interest and [inaudible] not only from our own community but also from other ICANN groups, as well as the Board. I really think it justifies the effort that went into it, and I thank you all so much, everyone, who were involved who attended the sessions and participated. It made me very proud to be part of At-Large to be part of that experience.

Following on from policy, just carrying on with the other activities, if anybody has got any updates from the RALOs, that would be really good to hear. We've got post-ATLAS III activities. If any leads have got any updates that they're actually involved in at the moment, I know Cheryl, Hadia, and I would be very interested in hearing what those are.

Then we're looking at priorities during the COVID-19 environment—I have seen that people have been looking at, and that's really excellent—and having a little look at the communications strategy, which we've got out for comment at the moment, as well as the ARIWG update, again, to this—just a few items in there that we make sure we spend a bit of time working on because we want to get everything completed by the end of May and start writing the report.

Then we'll have a proper look at some feedback on the ICANN67 and what we can look at for ICANN68. Although we haven't had any official notification, I think we can possibly assume and prepare for a virtual conference there as well.

So that's the end of the items as such. Has anybody got anything that they would like to add? Is there anyone who's got anything that's basically additional that they want to add to the agenda?

Okay, great. Well, moving on then—thank you very much—the first item after this adoption of the agenda, which I'm assuming I haven't got any motions against … Looking at the action items, I see I've got new minutes for this, and it's because they're all the items that were for the February and March meetings that were all completed, related to ICANN67, anyway (most of them). So, all done. Great.

Moving on, our next item is of course policy activities with Evin, Olivier, and Jonathan. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Maureen. I'll just do a summary and turn it over to Olivier and Jonathan. This morning—or afternoon or evening, wherever you are—we had the Consolidated Policy Working Group call. There are a couple of updates from that call, but more or less the same if you were on that meeting. Recently ratified by the ALAC since the last ALT Plus meeting, there are quite a few that are listed on the agenda, including the At-Large Valentine—that was submitted in February to the ICANN Board regarding proposed Amendment 3 to the .com registry agreement—and also a New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group statement, as well as a statement on the FY '21-'25 financial plan, and operating plan and budget. Recently, there was ALAC feedback provided to a PIR public comment proceeding, which was not a part of the ICANN public comment process but was related to an issue of significance to ALAC and ICANN. We also received a letter from Maarten Botterman regarding ALAC advice to the Board on the ISOC PIR issue. That was received last Friday. That's also on the agenda for your reference. Finally, most recently ratified was the SSR2 Review Team draft report. They're missing executive summaries. They'll be confirmed soon. So those will be up as well.

There's currently two public comments for a decision, and those we also discussed on the CPWG just a short while ago. It was determined that the IDN Working Group would have a look at it, but likely the ALAC would not comment on those. Per statements that have activities, there's an ongoing ALAC vote regarding the EPDP 2 public comment, and an ALAC statement was submitted in the form of a survey response recently. There were three minor edits that were incorporated. A note was just sent to the ALAC members that already just voted, just flagging these minor but important revisions. There was also a discussion on the CPWG of the NextGen at ICANN Program and improvements related to this. A link to the agenda is the Google Doc of the draft ALAC statement for comment. As well, there is also an ALAC statement for comment regarding NCAP Study 1. Please feel free to comment on those. There's a Middle East and Adjoining Countries (MEAC) strategy for 2021 to 2025. That's getting some good collaboration between AFRALO and APRALO to have a joint RALO statement on that. Judith Hellerstein is working on a revised community travel support guidelines public comment. Finally, just discussed today as well on the CPWG is a new public comment regarding the Phase 1 initial report of the review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in gTLDs Policy Development Process. Greg and Marita have volunteered to provide feedback to this CPWG hopefully for the next call on that of potential points for ALAC consensus.

Finally, there are a few notes on additional policy activities. There was the post-ICANN67 policy report. That was released, so please do that to reference all the great At-Large sessions that took place during the virtual ICANN67. Also, please do take an At-Large geo-name survey, which has been circulated. That will continue to be circulated. The CPWG plans to have another single-issue call, or several calls, regarding geo-names. Also, there's finalization of ALAC responses to the ICANN Board understanding of the ALAC advice on DNS abuse, and the At-Large policy [inaudible] is in progress.

With that, I'll turn it over to you, Jonathan or Olivier. Thanks so much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I'm happy to speak up first here. I wonder if what makes sense is to take questions about any of this because there's such a high overlap between this group and the CPWG. I appreciate everyone's willingness to give me the informal permission to submit comments to the PIR call for comments because I was contacted by Paul Diaz on the last day of that period, and he said they really couldn't extend it, given the external deadlines that they face. So I'm glad I was able to get something to them, even though we weren't able to have a formal discussion about it in advance. It was all conducted from previous remarks that we've made, etc., so I had hoped it was non-controversial. I appreciate everyone mobilizing to let me do that.

Beyond that, I'm happy—I'm sure Olivier has his hand up, so maybe he has more to say—to answer questions about any of these things that Evin just raised.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Evin did an amazing job of taking us through all of the different work that has been undertaken. As you can see on the screen, there are a number of comments in the pipeline. The pipeline is never-ending. So I just wanted to mention that it's never too late to get involved.

I also wanted to point out—I've done so also on the Consolidated Policy Working Group call—that there is one statement in there which has two people who are not the usual suspects and who actually are from the RALOs. That's a cross-RALO collaboration on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries strategy. AFRALO and APRALO are working together on a statement since this is a topic that relates directly to them. It's great to see such good and positive inter-RALO collaboration. I hope that we can have a lot more of that in the future.

That's all I wanted to add on that. Well done.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I guess I'll just add one note about the geo-names survey. I brought this up again on the CPWG call. The rationale behind the survey sprung out of a face-to-face meeting we had on geo-names that really didn't go anywhere because there were so many unspoken underlying assumptions from everyone in the room that it was difficult to even identify the topic areas on which we needed to reach consensus and where there might be areas of consensus. So the attempt—I'm sure a [inaudible] attempt—with the survey is to take the same kind of tactic that the Myers-Brigg test takes—the one that we took during ATLAS—of asking enough questions that it susses out your positions as opposed to simply asking them upfront. That was the idea of having all those questions: to get you thinking in terms of scenarios as opposed to overarching issues because it turns out that the At-Large really runs the gamut of viewpoints, from what I might call an extreme reservation point of view that believes that all 11 million geo-names should be reserved to a completely libertarian, NCUC-type approach that says that it should all be open. All of those opinions exist within the At-Large, and all these different variations in between. It's also non-linear in that some folks that believe that there should be more geo-names reserved aren't necessarily in agreement about whether the ownership of those names should lie with governments or somehow with the public or communities or non-profits groups or patriot groups, etc. So there's an intersection of issues as well. I guess I've become fairly familiar with what those questions are, so we can try to hold a conversation and break it down like a matrix and have that conversation. That was the goal of the geo-names: really to put all of the variations of things as scenarios that would then, as a whole, give a sense of where people stood and where the organization stood with respect to what level of reservations we should do and what the mechanism might be to grant permission for those strings to be added. So that's the geo-names thing, and that's why we've been trying to encourage folks to get back into the survey if they can.

I'm happy to take questions or recommendations about that as well.

Olivier, is that your hand back up, or it's still up?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: My hand is back up, Jonathan. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Go for it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just to mention that, if you want to take the geo-names survey, it's on the agenda. You can click on it. It's actually under the table. It's not showing at the moment in the shared page, but, if you scroll down, you'll find out that it's just underneath that. Take then At-Large geo-names survey.

I also wanted t mention one thing that is not currently on the list but an activity we've had today, which is to first recognize the huge amount of work that Justine Chew has been making in policy. She's been focusing on the Subsequent Procedures being effectively the next round of applications for new gTLDs. She has been leading a small team of people that have been working with her now. They are still looking at every aspect of the Subsequent Procedures project. I would call it a project because we're now not talking one, two, three, or four topics but we're talking at least a dozen topics, if not more than that. Of course, at some point, this whole big thing is going to land on our table—or our doorstep, I should say, because the table will not be large enough—and we'll have to go through it and make decisions—very tough decisions, very important decisions—on what we're happy with and what we are not happy with in the work of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group policy development process. Therefore, because Justine and her crew are working on bite-sized parts of the huge, big topics on a per-topic basis … For example, today we had Christopher Wilkinson who spoke to us about community priority evaluation. So that's one specific topic. There was a lot of discussion on the call. We're going to have a number—we don't know how many yet—of single-issue calls that will be looking at specific points in the Subsequent Procedures for our community to be able to develop a full set of policies and positions that we can then compare to what's coming out of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group and afterwards we can then show as having tracked this and show this to the Board when we make our points to the Board as per the normal ALAC advice to the Board. But that's further down the road. So watch out and look out for an announcement on these single-issue topic calls because they're bound to be possibly interesting. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. It's a really good point because that small group has been tasked with just drafting potential positions for the At-Large that are not all the product of consensus-building within the At-Large. So it's going to be really, really important that we don't take a passive approach to the Subsequent Procedures' scorecards because, otherwise, you will later on find yourself surprised by what we're advocating. So make sure that you're looking at those scorecards, commenting on this, and participating in these single-purpose calls. Thanks.

I think that might be it, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry. I forgot to unmute myself. Thank you very much. That all sounds quite exciting, really. There's a lot going on, I thank you all very much for your involvement in these. As I mentioned before, it's really, really good to see RALOs actually taking the lead in the strategy and having their names on our policy schedule. It looks really, really good. Hopefully we can get some more involvement from people from the RALOs as well, especially more into the CPWG, etc.

Moving on therefore, we first of all have the reports and RALO activities. Are there any RALO leaders who have any updates they'd like to give us about what's happening? I think AFRALO and APRALO might have something.

Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. Can you hear me?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Very, very faint, for me.

SEUN OJEDEJI: All right. Thanks –oh, very, very faint?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. Get closer to the mic.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Is it better now?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, sir. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Just a couple of updates. I think, the last time, I reported that we were in the process of reviewing a section of our AFRALO [approach in] principles. Just to update that, that process has kicked off. The working group had their first meeting. That process is in motion already. The idea/intention is to look at the individual membership section of the rules of the [approach in] principles for us to … We actually have it in our rules, but we would review it after two years to see how we can approve upon it. That is the main goal.

The other update is that, of course, during the last ICANN meeting, we had our usual meeting of the AFRALO and AfrICANN meeting [inaudible] the ALAC members and Chair and the other ALAC members who joined the calls but also Leon as well. We, as usual, produced a statement, and we're finalizing that to send to the respective recipients. We had to review our outreach and engagement strategy according the realities that we have on the ground now. So some changes have been done on the strategy. That has been led by Fatimata. That is in process as well.

The last, which I think is important to mention as well, is the fact that we have some [inaudible] applications. We have one [inaudible] application which has been on our table for quite a while. We hope to finalize it at during the next AFRALO monthly meeting.

I think I will stop there to give an opportunity for others to report. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Seun. That's excellent. Great to hear that there's lots of activity going on there.

I know that Satish is away. [Over to] Lianna. Lianna, can you—or [Ali]?

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Hi, everyone. I don't think that [Ali] is on this call. I will just give a brief update on APRALO. In regards to the participation in the last ICANN meeting, I'd like to say and highlight that the APAC region has very good participation despite that we have the worst time zone. That was really a challenge: that not everyone could be all the sessions over there. But, yes, we still have good participation.

Also, as [inaudible], we have started thinking about the next ICANN meeting. We're considering the scenario, if that will be virtual as well, what we're going to do. So [inaudible] region and the discussions of [inaudible].

Also, we are [inaudible] working on the APRALO outreach strategy plan [inaudible] and we've all discussed on the items. Heidi just mentioned that may be can have a separate call with all RALOs and the GSE to [inaudible]. But then the strategic plan will be submitted [inaudible].

So basically that is the update on APRALO. [inaudible]. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Lianna. Hope you can hear me now. My mute button seems to be working rather erratically.

EURALO?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. We had the leadership call on last Monday, open to all the Board members, and we will have a EURALO call next Monday. Some of the topics are the same that we were discussing during this call, and some specifics.

I guess a lot of European people are really concerned with what is happening. We think it's time to decrease the amount of work that we need to do because we are not able to do it. If there is no real way to say that at the global level, we will do at the European level because there we are concerned with doing things that were not supposed to do before in our life—having to take care of rest of the family, for example, or to take of the [inaudible] or elderly people. At the same time, there's— I guess it's in a few parts of Europe—the difficulty with the Internet. That's only one example. All afternoon, we were in a conference call with no Internet and it was quite complicated.

Therefore, I really think that it's one of the topics, and the one of the next topics, that we really have to think about: what is important to be done now and what could be [released] later. In generalizing, ICANN needs to take one a position that the current date to deliver something must be postponed for a few weeks.

But we will have a call on Monday. I guess we will discuss all those issues and the one you raised during this call. I hope to have feedback to give you later on on that. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Sebastien. You do raise an important issue with regards to the fact that our situations have changed, especially with the home situation becoming more important and with people having to be working from home. It means that their availability for a lot of work that we want to do be done just isn't going to be able to happen, as we have been doing in the past. So a change to a [consensus] means that we do have to prioritize.

The LACRALO. Sergio, are you available –[or Eduardo]— to give an update on what's happening there?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Eduardo actually dropped. Adigo is redialing him, so it'll be just a moment.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Well, we'll have Eduardo as he's available, please.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I am available.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, good. [inaudible], Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I hope everyone is safe and [inaudible]. In our case, because of the sequestration with COVID-19, all the [CROP pilots] that we were set up to go were cancelled. We have identified all the ones that are later on, but we don't know if it's going to happen or not.

We have created an ad hoc group—three people in our region. We're set to send out a survey to our membership to acquire information and to get to know the membership that we have. The main reason we're doing this—we did this about three years ago – is I think it's time to do it now—and many reasons—so we can have a feeling for what kind of expertise we have in our membership. That would make it more efficient for us to support or provide regional perspectives on the issues that are being discussed in the CPWG,]not at the end of April] but we stalk talking about the issues [inaudible]. So I think it's going to be [inaudible] month of April [or June]. It all depends on how thing move on other thing out of our control.

We have a new editor the newsletter. This is the fifth year that we have been doing this uninterruptedly—maybe a couple months here and there. So we're using that as a tool to inform the region on what's happening with the ALSes and also to keep a record of the work that we do month by month. So this record is there. We find the newsletter very important to do that.

We were also involved in the North American School of Internet Governance. It was to be coordinated some time before this year. I'm not sure if it's going to happen. We're going to make a decision on that sometime in April.

As elections go, we're going to start the process [sometime in April]. We start our elections before a new one falls because [inaudible] information out there for people to start thinking about this.

I have seen the mail that you sent, Maureen, asking for a priority list and to give comments on that. I sent that to the region, and I have gotten already a couple comments on it [inaudible]. I'm making sure that they put the comments in—if they don't do it, I do it—in the wiki page for everyone to see.

So that's my report. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great. Thank you, Eduardo. Is Sergio back with us, yet?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: He is not. But when we reconnect him, I will be sure to let you know right away so he can give a statement.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Awesome. Okay, then. Well, thank you very much for those updates. It seems like we can see there's some real engagement happening there and we're all on the same wavelength.

Now we move on to Item 6, which is looking at our post-ATLAS III and 2020 At-Large activities. This is of course the list of thing that we have proposed to do. Well, we've all got activities to do, and we'll be looking at the priorities. I guess we can probably, while we're going through this, look at, perhaps in each of the areas that we look at, what would be the priority area for that particular activity that we can focus on and perhaps not get the priorities in such a sequence that we do actually get to finish something and this time. But I don't want to put people under pressure, so let's have a look at what people are doing anyway and see how we can work on some sort of priority here.

So we're going to do 6 and 7 together, almost. The first one, of course, is the ATLAS III reporting activity. I had a look at the work that was being done in there, and I came across some really interesting information that has actually come out, which originally came from the feedback from our ATLAS III participants.

Eduardo, are you able to give us an overview of what is actually happening? I know that you've got a meeting soon, but it would be really good for others to hear what's happening with that particular report that's being developed. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Sure. The work has been slow moving. What we have now is a [strawman] document. I consolidated all the comments. We have a document in a [inaudible], and I consolidated the comments and changes that were supplied by the group. So now we have a meeting tomorrow to start going through the suggested recommendations. [inaudible] we have a look at every question that was asked in the survey, and we analyzed the data that we got. From that data, we have come up with suggested recommendations for each one of these groups, like the Capacity-Building, the Policy Outreach, and Communications. So there will be recommendations coming out of this report into these groups based on the data and feedback that we got from the people.

The idea of tomorrow's meeting and maybe another one is to go through each one of those questions and reach consensus on the different recommendations and [inaudible] are already provided in that strawman report.

So that's where we are. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Eduardo. I think that this is one of the important purposes of actually doing this analysis. I'm really pleased to see the way that that's coming about. All the response on a particular question have been analyzed. But it is the recommendations that are actually being to the three areas of At-Large from that analysis. I think one of the things that was really important was that, when the ATLAS III participants were presenting their responses for these questions, we took note of them. This is that whole bottom-up thing. It's really important that we listen to what was actually being said and how it could impact the work that we're actually doing. This is what Eduardo and his team have actually identified: that there are certain areas that seem to be considered to be important to the participants of the survey. We can actually action them because those recommendations are being made specifically for those areas. And to make sure that we incorporate the recommendations into the work that we do so that the work that we are doing within At-Large is actually based on the recommendations that are actually coming from our grassroots. We really do appreciate that.

I see that Sergio is on the phone bridge now, so we might just interrupt our current activity and see if Sergio can give us some feedback on what's happening in LACRALO. Sergio, the floor is yours.

INTERPRETER: I can't hear the dial-out message.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry. I missed that.

INTERPRETER: This is the interpreter. I am hearing the recording dial-out, not Sergio.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Thank you. Oh, well. We'll get back to Sergio when he's available.

We've heard a lot about the policy involvement. Jonathan, Olivier, and Evin have already given us a rundown on what is actually happening in policy. I think that Olivier has already explained that there is some prioritization and that there is going to be special sessions on particular issues.

Jonathan or Olivier, is there anything else that you see? Is that the priority? Is that how you prioritized what it is that we're going to do so we can actually list down what our priorities are going to be for policy?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I'll start. Olivier, please jump in. I haven't through this question through a lot, even though it's a really good question, because I think that the curse of the CPWG at this point is the fact that we are in largely reactive mode to the work that's going on around the ICANN community. So we're finding ourselves organizing around public comment periods which I believe to be an inherently flawed organizational principle for our group but one that's difficult to overcome, given the barrage of public comment periods. A far superior prioritization would be around the initiation of discussions within ICANN so that we start having conversations about them before we're under a deadline and comment on them before opportunities to participate in those discuss ions pass us by. So we need to find a way, as Cheryl says, to get the foundational work done on what our positions are earlier so that we're not trying to develop positions, read other people's positions, and respond to them all in a fairly short period of time.

So I would say that that's one of our biggest objectives: to try to switch our method of prioritization around such that we are empowering people with the equivalent of talking points in their work within the community, in the review teams and work groups and thing like that, and then checking in with those folks along the way so that more of them operate like the model that we've established with the EPDP, where we all got together and decided what our position was going to be and then sent Alan and Hadia into that working group to represent those positions and, whenever questions arise that we hadn't thought, they bring back to the group to discuss, as Alan and Hadia did today. I think that's the model we want to follow more if we can. That's my biggest priority: how we manage the development of our consensus positions and how we can get to it sooner so that more folks are empowered and given the resources to then participate in the conversations that happen in the broader community.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. The prioritization is a tough one. We're always coming around this same discussion, as in should we just focus on specific topics and then maybe we focus on one or two topics per quarter or per month and then leave the others aside and make a good job of those one or two topics we're working on and work proactively on it?

The difficulty is, what is a good topic? What is an important topic? What is a not so important topic? As I mentioned, the Subsequent Procedures Working Group and the whole process of Subsequent Procedures is likely to be another huge chunk of work. Certainly, for reviewing the next Applicant Guidebook, we're looking to use a very fine-tooth comb on something like, what, 200—300, 400?—pages maybe, where every page counts. It's not even fluff. Every page of it counts.

Then you've got ATRT3. Now, is that important? ATRT3? Well, I suppose so. And the Expedited PDP? Well, that's been important for a while. And the multi-stakeholder model and the DNS abuse, which we've spent so much time. As Jonathan typed in there, there's also the RPMs. And there's more. There are many other processes, like auction proceeds, for example. That's another one that's so important. They're all very long-term policy development processes that we've seen. Of course, a long PDP generates a lot of data and a lot of results, I guess, but also a lot of things to review when they come down to public comment. Then we're stick in this whole thing of having to run after the public comment.

I personally do not feel that we can just say, "Let's focus on one or two topics." I know, throughout the years, some people have said, "Well, let's just do what the GAC does. We'll just have on communique. We should stop running after … It's a bit like running after cars. Dogs run after all the cars and never manage to catch any of them. So we should stop playing and running after the car or running after the laser beam that the cats usually do and do it like the GAC does."

The problem that we've found with that is that the GAC has also changed in ways and it's doing a lot more than it used to do before. Of course, the GAC came into intense criticism when it was late in reviewing all the points of the last round of new gTLDs—the last Applicant Guidebook—because they raised a number of points that could have been raised earlier but it was very hard to capture.

So, if you have any magic want or some idea of how we could organize our work this way, I think it would be really welcome with all of us. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. You reminded me of another really important point, which is that I think we need to be even more disciplined than we are about the topics we take up. We are meant to represent the interests of end users. I think that one of the things that Justine and her small group are doing is trying to identify the portions of the Subsequent Procedures' output that are of specific interest to the At-Large and that we've already identified as being priorities for us. That's where she's focusing the efforts on those scorecards. So identifying the portions of things that are of key importance to us is also another part of this as opposed to trying to boil the ocean and tackle every topic just because we have smart people that are part of At-Large. We need to focus on the interests that we are meant to represent.

The other point that Sebastien and Tijani do a good job or reminding us of is that not everything is policy, too. So, because the CPWG has become a regular call and a well-attended call, etc., it has become the clearinghouse for topics. But, as we had originally talked about it, we were going to try to very quickly forward topics away from the clearinghouse to where they belong very quickly.

One of the things we've done is put Judith's discussion over travel guidelines of four times or something. I think that's actually reflective of it being the wrong venue for that discussion. What we ought to be doing is helping figure out where Judith should be making that presentation. It might be this group instead, rather than the CPWG. So the CPWG's focus is mostly on what Tijani refers to as DNS policy. But it's policy initiatives within ICANN. So that's, I think, another prioritization for us, too: becoming more efficient in offloading things that are either aren't policy or aren't the focus of individual end users.

Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Maureen, you don't want to give the floor to Sergio, as he's online, before I take the floor and let him share.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Ah, yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, sorry. I didn't-

MAUREEN HILYARD: If Sergio is available—no, it's okay, Jonathan—let's get him while we can.

Michelle, is he available.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: He's available. Please go ahead, Sergio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you so much, Maureen. The telephony is [rough] now and then, and there's a lot of transit here.

I just think that I was talking about the Board and what we were doing. Let me revisit what I said. We are developing a strategy for 15 days' time to start that meeting. We were going to have a face-to-face Cancun. We are putting together a SWOT matrix. We wanted to do that in Cancun, but, in light of what happened and the preparation of the virtual meeting for ICANN67, it was impossible to include all these on the agenda—all the efforts we were doing [at the Board.]

We tried to take a step forward after ICANN67. Now that we are focused on this, I guess, we will start getting together by mid-April without time limitation in these meetings because the goal is to achieve the goal that we are not in a hurry now because of a face-to-face meeting waiting for us. We'll make use of the time to reach safe haven. I hope that will have Cancun 2021. We're getting together training for the region, which has to do with leaders training to LACRALO's general assembly in Cancun so that they can undergo the training focused on issues mostly associated with policy development.

This is my report up the present time—uh oh. Wait, wait. Something I was missing. We have the first draft ready for the procedural rules. We are starting today. We have a governance meeting later on today, and we would be finishing this process in our region. I should not say this now, but you know what the process has been that we have been going through. Now the process is different. We are proactive with a lot of drive forward. Part of that going forward means having these rules of procedure in place. We expect that, in a short period of time, we will have the new rules of procedure operating in our region. A proactive, non-conflict region looking at the [inaudible] is a great way to start the year, leaving behind all the issues that we have gone through.

That is all. Thank you so much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Sergio. Yes, that was really disappointing: having gone through all that process of producing a schedule and trying to get the Board members to Cancun for their first opportunity to be tougher and to work together, which would have been so ideal. But that has just been postponed a bit until next year. There's lots of work that can be done in between those times. So that's really excellent. Thank you, Sergio, and thank you, Sebastien, for enabling that intervention. It's your turn.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Maureen. I wanted to, I will say, balance some of the inputs from Jonathan. First of all, I [can] say everything is policy, but not all needs to go through the Consolidated Policy Working Group.

Second, on every item of ICANN, we can find a reason for end users to be involved. That's the difficulty of where we are. It's why we have to consider were are just …And it's important [inaudible] community. It's not from us that policy is starting. We may start sometime. I know, [for good reason, Alan] is very proud of launching one issue. But it's maybe not the best place to start policy in this organization. We have to be able to both discuss gTLDs, ccTLDs, IP addresses, and other topics. It's why we are sometimes seen as running after what is happening, but it's way the ICANN is built today, and it's the way we have to be included and participate included in the work.

At the same time, if we take the document about policy prioritization, I would like very much that somewhere it stated that there's work going on where At-Large people are involved. Olivier talked about ATRT as one. SSR2 is almost finished. It's also one place where we have people involved. I think it's important to have that in mind because we need to follow this work, too.

That's some input. I don't want us to just try to do what is considered by some the more important. Yes, [you don't] see the discussion about what we do for the Middle East. There was work done by one of the members of the CPWG. Then the decision as, "Maybe it's not an ALAC topic, but it's taken care of by the RALOs." If take the example of the travel, maybe it's better for the CPWG to say, "No, it's not in my remit." If there is no idea where to take it, it may be given back to the RALOs. And it may be as a coordination of the RALOs that it could be discussed: this issue. I want us to consider the word "subsidiarity." When it could be done in another level, let it be done at this level. [inaudible] important point to help things to be handled completely and at the right level. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Sebastien. I think that's what Jonathan was saying—Jonathan and Olivier. I think it's something that needs to be decided on by the [inaudible] develop some kind of policy related to … And I think you've been through that before. What do we talk about? What don't we talk about? And not just discarding it but actually putting it in an appropriate place. Perhaps we should have a specific section. This forum was suggested. Perhaps that is appropriate because the ALT Plus meeting is supposed the one where matters are discussed so that, when we go to the ALAC meeting, we don't have to go through that process: a decision has already been made.

One of the things that comes out of it, too, with regards to the length of time that we're given for the comment period, it's something that we can definitely talk to. I know that the SO/AC chairs have got a meeting with Theo tomorrow. So I can certainly raise that because it has actually been raised by SO/AC chairs in the past. It's one of the reasons why they actually recommended some prioritization by ICANN with regards to these policy issues for the same reason that we're discussing now and that they felt under pressure when the comment period was one after the other and we were always in catch-up mode. So I will take that to the meeting tomorrow to say that it was raised and discussed at some length: the whole policy prioritization issue. So I can follow that up for you.

If there are no—we have Alan's hand up. Alan, last comment on this one?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'd like to both disagree and agree with Sebastien. Let me tell you why. I believe I'm the one who coined the term "Consolidated Policy Working Group." The intent at that time, which has changed since then—but that's fine—is that we had a number of different policy working groups that, in theory, we were working on policies in areas that those people found interesting. But it was important to have a wider forum when things get to the point where we wanted to talk about a public comment or advice to the Board or at the times when we wanted to air something wider than just the people who really were interested in that area. That's what the Consolidated Policy Working Group was designed to do.

Since then, things have changed. The individual groups seem to have disappeared completely, and the CPWG has been left as the one group standing that will discuss policy issues. And it's working really, really well—so well that we run out of time every meeting and so that we are now having single-purpose calls, which goes back to the original policy-type discussions on specific issues. It's working well enough that is now the group where we discuss thing and where we get a large enough mass of people to have really good discussions and raise issues.

So it has become, despite people saying, "But this is not policy," the Consolidated Stuff Working Group. And I'm not sure that's bad. I think we're running out of time, and there are too many things to discuss than can easily be handled in a single hour-and-a-half or two-hour meeting a week. But that's marvelous. That means we're having discussions which, in the past, never happened, or at least rarely happened in such large groups.

So I think we should not get really uptight about the fact that something is policy or not. If that's the group where we have a vibrant discussion on things, then let's have it happen. If there are enough things that are not policy that we want Consolidated Non-Policy Working Group that meets every Tuesday and talks about the other things because we've just run out, fine, we can divide it. But I think we shouldn't throw away something that's really working well and we're having really good discussions on just because it's not exactly as we pictured it to begin with. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Well, we're—Tijani, I'll let you have the last word on this one. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hi, Maureen. Thank you very much for this discussion. I was the one who asked from the beginning, if you remember from the beginning of then first term of Maureen, that the CPWG to dedicated to the DNS policy issues. I heard very well what Alan said, but this is to say that we transfer all the work of the ALAC to the CPWG. Why are we having these meetings? Why are we meeting today? Why will we meet for the ALAC monthly call? We have to [remove] all that and stay in the CPWG. I don't think this is the right way to do it. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Tijani. It has been noted. Again, I take on board everything that has been said with regard to what Alan calls "stuff" of ALAC. We've offloaded the financial side of things. And things like travel, which actually involve lots of people, I see as an issue that could very well come to this group where we can have the discussion and make a decision to make a recommendation to take to the ALAC.

Alan, is it … Okay. One more comment, please. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Very briefly, a number of years ago the GNSO was at a point where it had a lot of work today. It started holding meetings every three weeks instead of a monthly meeting. If indeed Tijani is right and the CPWG has morphed into this Super ALAC—the ALAC and a lot of other friends who want to discuss policy issues—maybe there's a message that we should be having more frequent meetings and not have them as organized as we are right now, where we do routine things and only end up with 30 minutes at the end to talk about real stuff. Maybe we need more ALAC meeting, and ALAC meetings plus other people who want to talk to these substantive things.

All I was saying is we have a group that's actually doing work—and doing good work. We may want to take that inertia and move it somewhere else and transform it into a wider ALAC group instead of the CPWG. Maybe the CPWG is renamed the ALAC Policy Discussion Group and it's held weekly—or an ALAC Stuff Discussion Group. We've got something that's really working that has never worked in ICANN's/At-Large's history before, where we have that much discussion about substantive issues. Don't lose it. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I think the CPWG is almost like … ALAC goes to it. It's an everybody meeting. The fact that they're actually holding it weekly … If we hold ALAC meetings weekly as well—I don't think so … So the ALAC meeting is a consolidation of all the activities that are happening within At-Large, and it's a reporting-back to the community. That's how I see that. If there is any feedback that we need from the community, then that may arise as the discussion. It shouldn't be the same people are discussing things here who are raising thing that should be coming from the different other people that attend the ALAC meetings who discuss things that are raised by us as part of our recommendations from this particular meeting or the CPWG or the Outreach and Engagement Working Group—that kind of thing.

Again, the prioritization has to come from within the CPWG. If they prioritize that there is an issue that needs to be discussed as a single-issue meeting and it's held the following week, it's up to them how they do it. But, really, I think that, given that extension of time, if we get them to change their minds about … They have asked us, "How can we do things more efficiently?" If that's what we need in order to be more efficient and just lessen the pain and the stress of having to do everything so quickly, I think this is where we need to be focusing our suggestions to ICANN.

We're running low on time here. Moving on to—that was an important discussion—capacity-building, I know Joanna gave a summary at the last meeting, but there are people here who weren't at that meeting, Joanna. So if you can lead us on what's happening in the capacity-building area, please.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Maureen. In terms of capacity-building, I reported on the items, as you can see in the agenda. Indeed, there are three subgroups I the Capacity-Building Working Group that focus on the ICANN Learn course that focus on a series of webinars that Hadia has been leading successfully, wonderfully, and very efficiently, [inaudible] since onboarding materials/policy platform. That course is led by Dave. We have [inaudible] with Jonathan trying to make sure that all those efforts that cover policy reporting and capacity-building go hand-on-hand. So those would be the three items you can see on the agenda that I've reported on before.

The latest development those of you who participated in the CPWG call this morning have also had the opportunity to follow already, but just let me briefly summary the NextGen comments that were presented by Laurin earlier today, which resulted in consensus, I understand, of us [exempting] an academic engagement plan that fits also into the Capacity-Building Working Group agenda. So we'll be taking hopefully coordinated steps to get more academic engagement as one of the groups that we will be targeting with capacity building, but it's not to put emphasis on academic engagement but rather to make sure that all the groups we are reaching out to are on equal footing.

In sense, there's a series of initiatives that [inaudible]. This was something that was also discussed in the Outreach and Engagement call earlier today. So are trying to ensure that those activities that we would be targeting at potential end users who might have a direct interest in participating in At-Large will be provided in a coordinated matter.

The first step is the NextGen comments. That focuses on At-Large providing a welcoming environment and supported guidance for those who come into the ICANN environment. We will help them to build their capacity but also get them relatively quickly and efficiently involved in policy development.

Upon that background, we will be building further initiatives around the IGF, around the webinars, and around the ICANN Learn course to make sure we can target specific groups of end users with the overall ICANN agenda focus on academic engagement, working together with the GSE and working together with the ICANN Learn team. So that is on our short-term agenda to provide more engagement on.

One last item that's a takeaway ICANN67. The successful theme—the policy theme—of DNS abuse resulted in a takeaway that deals with following up the current ICANN Learn course on policy development within At-Large … Following that one up with a DNS abuse ICANN Learn course. But that is, at this point, somewhat of a remote target for us. We want to get three to four ICANNs done first. The academic engagement plan, as I already said, will have several bullet points to it that we will try to address.

I'm going to stop here. I'm apologize. I'm on the audio bridge. I cannot see the chat. If there are any hands raised or questions in the chat, I would appreciate those [inaudible]. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Joanna. While I see the academic engagement as being a real brilliant initiative, in this era of prioritization, and, as Joanna explained, there are things that are being put in place like the more pressing needs. This is something that we have to look at.

There aren't any hands up, Joanna, so you're off the hook now.

Is that—Daniel, just an update, please, on your outreach and engagement meeting, which you've just finished. What prioritizations came out of that for you?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Maureen, for giving me the floor. Regarding outreach and engagement, I'm happy to share that the discussion is going on regarding the [inaudible] events. And a page has been created for the various [inaudible] events that can be attended. One of them is RIPE 80. That will be taking place, I think, in May.

Also, I'm happy to share that the Co-Chairs are still working on their respective strategies. Also, as an outcome of ATLAS III, post-ATLAS III, so far NARALO, led by Glenn, has its strategy completed. But the others are still working on them. I'm also happy to share that an action point that came out of the meeting is for the GSE, the RALO leaders, and the Co-Chairs of Outreach Engagement to have calls to discuss how they can be able to harmonize their respective strategies. There'll be able to report during the next Outreach meeting that will be held in April. That is a brief.

Also, another outcome of the meeting was to come up with a way how videos can be shared because we had Jonathan have a presentation on creating videos from At-Large. One of the action points that came out of the meeting was that a small group was to be formed to discuss various topics and the creation of the videos. Probably, at one point later, Jonathan will be able to take the various members interested creating videos through probably a webinar or a session on how to create these prospective videos.

That's all that I can think off of my head at the moment. Let me give then floor back to you, Maureen. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Daniel. [inaudible] the priority for Outreach and Engagement is the strategic plans that are being done by the RALO in collaboration with the RALO co-chairs but that the strategic plan does involve everyone in the region. It involves GSE. There's a lot of people who are required to be part of that strategic development for outreach and engagement from within the RALOs. So I think that this is important because it does mean that, once they're all in, Outreach and Engagement can prioritize their activities based on the needs of the regions and how they can best assist the regions to carry out their work that they're working on with the GSE.

So that leads onto my work, which is mainly the work that I do as the Chair. The priority for me is going to be the At-Large review of the implementation plan activities. That has to be the priority because we've got a timeframe to meet with regards to meeting Board expectations.

For those who have a task in the implementation—the ARIWG—could you please make sure that you … We'll be targeting people, actually. We're going to have a meeting—Cheryl, Hadia and I—to prioritize people that we're going to be focusing on--I know that one of them will be me—so we can make sure that everybody can get things done by the end of May, at least. So, for me, that's a major priority.

Another priority is the communications strategy, which is the next item, which I would hope that you've all had a look at. It's something that I've been bringing up, I think, for the last two or three comments. We've been asking for comments. We've had a few. And we've incorporated those comment.

One of the things that's really important is that, for that communication strategy, we're using a template that's come from the ICANN communications unit. I really feel that it's a nice, clear, simple strategy document that details what is important for people to know about how we're going to communicate, who we're communicating with, and what priority of communication-targeted groups are. I think this is a model where we're doing communication strategies throughout At-Large. If we can stick to that model, I would really appreciate it. I'm sure ICANN would, too. It was something that we trialed in Montreal. I think it really worked with regards to getting the right messages out. So, if we can do that with that communication plan, that would be really awesome.

Here we are, back on … We were on the At-Large review—oh, here we are. This is the strategy. It'll be all dollied up, of course, once we've got everybody's okay. I'd really like any comments to be made before the next ALAC meeting, which is when I'd like to present this to the ALAC for endorsement. So, please, if you've got anything to add to it, please do. We can get this through. It does cover policy, outreach and engagement, and, of course, the organizational stuff.

We've got five minutes left. What do we got left on the agenda? This is a 90-minute call, isn't it? Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Maureen. It is. What we have is the feedback on 67. I think you wanted to just quickly highlight some of the feedback from the SO/AC chairs. Looking forward to 68, I did pick up the action items on the communications plan for Item 11, so we could skip that one if you'd like. Then I think we're okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Cool. Yes, I did want to actually mention the feedback from the SO/AC chairs. I was … Why was I surprised? They were really blown away by the quality and the topics and the engagement. On so many levels, the chairs were really complimentary about what had actually been done by At-Large. I think it was also because we were one of [those] who actually did a … I don't think that we did things too differently, I must admit that the [inaudible] … Jonathan, Holly, and Joanna did an amazing job in the presentations that they gave, the engagement they has with the presenters, plus the way that the participants were engaging with it as well. You could tell that was happening even through what was happening in the chat.

What actually came about in the SO/AC chairs' feedback was that there were several mention in there about the way that At-Large handled their sessions. I think that, for example, just going through that list, #11, of course, is based on Joanna's session. It's actually based on a comment that I had actually made to them about the fact that we took advantage of the fact that the HIT topics … It was really interesting that ICANN dropped their session. It made our session, which was originally dropped off the list, more of a standout. I think that it really, for a lot of them, actually said that they also needed to change the way that they were actually doing things based on the model that we had set.

So I just wanted to pass that onto you because I think that this list is available and you can check through it. This is the list that we're actually going to go through with Goran tomorrow as we discuss ICANN68 and other issues that are of importance to him. I was pretty chuffed to hear the compliments. It's all thanks to you: the presenters plus everyone who came along and supported. It was brilliant.

On that final note, seeing that there's no questions or queries, I think that we're nearly at the top of the half-hour.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry. Did you want to talk a little bit about the priorities for 68? You had talked a bit with Joanna about [inaudible]. Or are you going to skip that?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think we will because I'd like to get some feedback. Before we start looking at ICANN68, I'd really like to have this discussion that we're going to have tomorrow with Goran to actually find out how they're planning to do ICANN68: whether it's going to be the same model (the same scheduling and that kind of thing) because they're scheduling did interfere with what we actually wanted to do. So I want to find out first what their plans are before we actually look at what we're going to do and how we prioritize that.

Is that okay?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Absolutely.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. We've got the ALAC meeting coming up very shortly, where we'll have more details. We will probably have had a meeting of the ICANN68 group by then anyway.

So that's next steps.

We definitely are at the top of the hour, so we do need to move on to other things. Thank you, everyone. It was a really good group here today. Thank you very much for your participation. I'm looking forward to your engagement and participation in other activities that are in place. Be prepared. More online meetings coming up. Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]