
MICHELLE DESMYTER: Welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Operations, Finance, and Budget Working Group call on Thursday, the 25th of May, 2023. On today's call, on the English channel, we do have Holly Raiche, Alfredo Calderon, Cheryl LangdonOrr, Judith Hellerstein, Marita Moll, Sebastien Bachollet. We do not have anyone on the Spanish or French channel as of yet. We have received apologies from Ricardo Holmquist. From staff today, we do have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Michelle DeSmyter on call management. Our French interpreters are Aurelie and Dominique, and our Spanish interpreters are Paula and Marina. Friendly reminder, please state your name before speaking, and please speak slowly and clearly for our interpreters. With this, I'll turn the meeting back over to you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Michelle, and welcome everyone. This should not be a very long meeting at all. The first note to say is the leftover from last week, the NomCom2 review recommendations. One of them was about, and what we have voted for, and it is now finalized really, were the recommendations about things like the terms of the NomCom delegates voting, and the standing committee. And we last week discussed what is meant by unaffiliated. That has been decided, and is part of the definition that in fact everybody's voted for. So that item is really well and truly over.

The main item today, part of the whole NomCom2 review was the issue of rebalancing the NomCom. And if you remember, there was disagreement in GNSO on what to say. So that's not part of the public

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.

comment NomCom2 review. It's a separate issue. It's a letter that we've drafted to go to the board on ALAC's view of the rebalancing of NomCom delegates. That's what Judith is going to talk to in just a moment. And then there are two other minor items, and then we have a discussion about the next meeting. So Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Hi, thanks so much. Yes, and thanks so much. I'm glad that the NomCom2 review points were passed and all good. So I just have a few slides basically here that the basics of the NomCom were originally—you can go to the next slide. As Cheryl was saying, that years ago when the NomCom was created, there was no Noncommercial Stakeholder Group. It was just the NCUC, and NPOC wasn't created. When NPOC was created, then they created a Noncommercial Stakeholder Group.

And then also at that time, earlier, there was a very large difference between very large businesses and small businesses. And so that was one of the reasons, as I learned from a discussion later with Cheryl Langdon-Orr, of why in the GNSO, big business and small business had two slots and there were no slots for NPOC, because it wasn't created.

So the main idea which is here is that a balanced NomCom would be one where it's composed of members from each constituency so that in At-Large, we have representatives from all the RALOs. And then the GNSO has seven different constituencies within its area, its stakeholder groups. And the other ones all also don't. And they all can bring representatives to the NomCom.

Currently, there are 15 people on the NomCom. And so the idea right here is, what does it mean to have a balanced NomCom? And I was saying that it should be that all the constituencies can send their person to the NomCom. Of course, when you get to the NomCom, you're not representing your constituency. In a sense, you're not advocating your constituencies. Eduardo, I'll get to your question.

You're not advocating for your constituencies, but you are making sure that your constituency is understood when you're appointing leadership positions. So oftentimes, what we're doing in the NomCom, when we're looking for leadership for ALAC, they often ask the ALAC delegates, whether it's in the EURALO or other ones, they ask them, oh, how are things done in there? Could you explain that and give us the mindset? And so that's what it's really helpful for.

So the question here is, what does it mean? And what criteria would you apply to measure how the NomCom is balanced? And I really don't really know what criteria you have to measure, besides having each constituency be able to send someone. So I'm leaving it up to people to contribute and give them ideas of what they feel is a balanced NomCom.

And Eduardo, it's not just constituencies, stakeholders. Each of our RALOs, we also have MOUs with ICANN, and so we're all separate constituencies and we're geographically diverse. Unlike the other constituencies where they just appoint one person per constituency, ours are very separate and large. We're geographically diverse within the RALO. So that's the question on here, and we'll go to the next slide, and then we could discuss this later.

Do you support the need for a current composition of the NomCom to be rebalanced? And the question is, we've been a proponent of rebalancing efforts for a long time. And from what I learned from Cheryl, we've been trying to get that, but it just hasn't been as easy. And since ICANN board and the PTI board represent all constituencies within ICANN, all these different stakeholder groups or constituencies, they all should be involved in helping how we're going to select the independent delegates.

These are not talking about the ones that are put in by constituencies. We're talking about the NomCom that appoints people to the PTI board, appoints a certain number to the PTI board, a certain number to the ICANN board, appoints members to different constituencies. So all the constituencies should be involved in helping these delegates. And I think it's wrong that some constituencies are left out.

The question is, how frequently does the balance need to be checked? And my guess is every five years. And that's sort of what Cheryl has been saying. And yes, RALOs are not constituencies per se, but we've always liked to be treated more than that when we were formed and we were chair. And we do have MOUs. So yes, MOUs can be changed or removed at any time, but we do have a very formed structure. And so that's why, I think. And that's basically this—sort of in a nutshell, I think the last thing is, I think there's a last slide that says what comments we have. So maybe last slide. Oh, this is the last slide.

So the question is, how would you suggest who should conduct the work and how should it be conducted? And how would your community group prioritize this work? And right now, our community priorities,

prioritization of priorities is a small working group headed by Cheryl Langdon-Orr within the Operations, Finance and Budget. And as the NomCom is an operations issue, so that's why it's in Operations, Policy and Budget. And we create these groups. And so this, in our group, it helps facilitate dialogue and focus our effort. And this is a common practice and something we've been doing for years. So that was my answer to that question, but I'm happy to take other people's things. And this is the end of my presentation.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Judith. We have, first of all, Cheryl, and then we need to discuss the particular question or two questions. What do we mean by rebalancing? Because you have used the term constituency, but the problem is that has many meanings within ICANN. And unless we're very careful about what we mean by representing all of the constituencies, what do we mean by that term? What do we mean by representation? Which is the really big question for this group. And then who conducts the work and how should it be conducted is a secondary question. But should we start the discussion with Cheryl? Thank you, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Holly. Two things. First of all, I know a number of us have also been working on responses to these letters from the regional large organization perspective as well. So I know APRALO, Amrita has put together with a lot of input from the community, a lot of thinking and discussion on a shared document. We only had a couple of meetings on this as well.

So there may be some wording that when those come in, which I assume will be also copied to, I don't know, who is it will be copied to? I have no idea whether they're going directly back to Tripti or we would get a look at them. But for example, I think there is some language in at least the document I am familiar with that could help us put words together for some of these questions. So that might be a useful tool. So I want to share that.

How our community group prioritizes work. One of the things we made a point of in the APRALO documentation was to remind [inaudible] that there is a high and considerable prioritization of the ALAC and all of the regional At-Large organizations in the appointment of the seats, the five ALAC seats, which are the geographic seats which align with the regional At-Large organizations, every single year, and that we would continue that high degree of interest and care and diligence when the terms change in the future. So that sort of language I think also would help frame how our group would, in this case the ALAC, prioritize the work. It's held in extremely high priority and it's given a huge amount of effort and that wouldn't change regardless of that. So I think there's some language we can steal or plagiarize shamelessly to have that out.

So who should conduct the work and how should it be conducted? In the region we took a twofold approach. We reminded the reader, whomever the reader will be, that of course there is a commitment, including in the Nominating Committee, going forward as a result of not only Work Stream 2 requirements but also ATRT3 recommendations that are to be implemented—so it's not like there's a choice, they need to be implemented—for a continuous improvement program, which needs to

become a demonstrable continuous improvement for all of the ACs and SOs, their component parts and the Nominating Committee.

So there could be an opportunity for a quite regular internal looking at are we still structured as a NomCom in the best way to meet our purpose. So that could be built into their continuous improvement program requirements. But that we thought periodically there should be—and that's where the five years comes in—a slightly more holistic view. So not just the NomCom looking at its own navel and making its improvements, but also for community to do that and to get wider community input and support. And that really should be some form of cross-community or community representational model and also have all the associated public commentary, etc. And that covers the who do you suggest and how do you suggest question there.

But I wanted you to pop back to slide two, if you could, please. Because on this one, I have a problem not only with the use of the word constituency within our document, because unless we're referring to the constituencies which are component parts of the GNSO stakeholder groups, there is no actual meaning of the word constituency beyond that for this purpose. So I would be very careful not to use constituencies.

However, the question really is about constituencies within the GNSO. Nobody's suggesting that we're going to have a different structure for the geographic diversity that the appointments, the ALAC make to its five seats which are linked to each of the regions. That's not on the table, at this stage anyway. However, we don't want it to get on the table in the future either.

But what bothers me about the very fair and very equitable approach and the one Judith certainly does support where every constituency within the GNSO, the problem with the NPOC, etc., to get a seat is that the GNSO is, I remind you, the only thing, the only AC or SO that can expand. And it expands by adding new constituencies. So you theoretically could have 10, 12, 15 constituencies at a future point in time, and that is every single one of the seats currently being used or a NomCom of 30. That doesn't sit well with me. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Vanda, do you want to say anything because to talk to what you say in the chat? And then we can have Eduardo as well.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah, no, it's just what I said, is ALAC is, in my opinion, balanced inside the NomCom because we have representation from each geographic region. And mostly, and at least in those years I have been in the NomCom, ALAC always send, besides the geographic, they send mostly also gender, different people. So I believe that we work in some way balancing better the NomCom.

Other constituencies are more difficult to deal with because, or they are a lot of people, but sometimes a large majority is from the same region or other issues related to diversity. But in a way, the most important issue is capacity. To be inside the NomCom, we need to have people that deeply knowledge of ICANN because to select the people, you need to discuss what is important and read their profiles and focus on what is

important. Reading the profile, even if people are not connected to ICANN, needs from the member deeply understand what ICANN means.

So it's, besides the balance in that way, I'm also always worried about the qualification of the people. I look this time that we have a very good and balanced NomCom. Even in gender, we have even less women than normally. We also have geographic diversity quite interesting. So it's just that I would like to state here.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. And I think what we're working toward is what are some of the criteria that we'd be looking for. Now, Eduardo, do you want to talk next? And then we'll go through with Seb and Michael.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Sure. Well, like I said we have to be careful with the language because the RALOs are not constituencies. I understand the balance about the region. That's very important, which is something peculiar to the ALAC because you don't see that anywhere else. However, I also put it in the chat that we should consider the idea of having one representative from each AC and SO, independent of the size. And I think that way it will be balanced. Everybody will be represented there, but not. And then you will have this balancing now that you have many people from—like that example that Cheryl said, you can have 12. [inaudible]

So I think we should consider that idea. I haven't heard it. Maybe I haven't heard it somewhere else, but to me, that makes more sense. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Sebastien, go ahead, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. First of all, I feel when we talk about the representation within the NomCom, is At-Large representation and that's good to have the five seat. But we have to decide first if we want to give up those five seats. If we want to give up, we can go to one representative by SO and AC. If we don't want to give up, we have to be very careful on what we ask for GNSO because as at the end of her talk, Cheryl said, we may end up with 10, 15 people from the GNSO. And therefore, we will lose everything.

Personally, I will not open this box and changing the one of the BC by the NPOC. It's, from my point of view, too dangerous. If we want to rebalance, maybe, and it will be difficult to be accepted by the GNSO, it's to go by stakeholder group. And therefore, we will end up with four representatives from the GNSO. I don't think they will buy that. But it's the only way I think, for us, it could be a feasible rebalancing. Because if we keep at the level of the constituency, and as soon as one gets, I am sure that we will have different new constituency at the registry and registrar level, because they will see what they can get in doing so. Therefore, I really think that we need to be really careful on what we ask for. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Michael, go ahead.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So what I'd like to do is perhaps just give a little bit of a history lesson. I think this imbalance is something that has been talked about since the original formation of the NomCom. And this was after the ICANN evolution and reform back in 2002, 2002, 2003. And basically, what happened is, one of the criticisms since that original formation of the NomCom was the fact that the Business Constituency had a small business and a large business representative.

Now, the irony of that was, that was almost kind of a concession to Marilyn Cade. Marilyn was very opposed. And I'm sure there are some people that are remembering this very well, as I do. What happened is, Marilyn was very opposed to the bicameral approach, which basically gave the contracting parties basically a half of a voting block within the GNSO council. So this was kind of the bone that was thrown to her. So I think it's important to look at it from that historical perspective, why there was that large business, small business.

Now, what I find interesting, and I'm going to sound like Jonathan here, I think we should always, whenever we take a position, we should go in it from a very factual based decision. So one of the things that I think is, we should look at the people that have served on NomCom over the last 20 years and look at who they were nominated, and where did they come from?

Because let's just take for an example, this year, what is it? Jordyn Buchanan, who is serving as the big business representative, is in fact from Google. And for the first 15 years, or first 10, 15 years of Jordan's

participation, he participated in the registry constituency. So there's so many people that wear so many different hats, that instead of looking at, quote unquote, who is nominating somebody, let's look at who actually composed the entire NomCom as a whole. Because at least my experience, when I served on it a number of years ago, I would agree with Vanda. It was pretty balanced, gender-wise, geographically, diversity-wise. So before we just start willy-nilly saying, add one here, take away here, I think looking at that—and I don't know, maybe this was done as part of the review. And if so, I apologize. I'll go back and look at those numbers. But I don't know if there is an imbalance, to Vanda's point. And maybe we should just get those back. So that would just be my comment. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Michael. And I think we all remember going back. And lovely rest in peace, we can say. And it was a good look back. Thank you. Thank you. Judith, go ahead, please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

So I hear all your points. And I agree with many of them. But I'm also troubled by reducing it to a small number. I do think we need more than one person per stakeholder group, more than four. I do think having 15, then it would be much better decision-wise, we get more opinion, diversity of views. And I think that generally helps everyone who's in the NomCom. And so I'm averse to reducing it to that smaller size.

I am always about fairness, and what is morally right, morally wrong, what should be done. And that's also why I was saying, it's only right.

But I agree we don't want to open the gate here. So maybe we want to leave it to the constituencies to manage their numbers, but just like it was in the report, not assign each seat to each person. And maybe GNSO will have seven, and they can assign the seven how they want. And that, I think, is probably the best we could ask for, because then we won't be opening up our own can of worms. But I do not like the idea of only having four people on the NomCom.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Judith. Sebastien, go ahead, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you. I take the history about Marilyn Cade, but I just want to remind you that the step before was direct election from At-Large users. That was withdrawn. And to organize the things, we're creating two bodies. One was, ALAC to have the voice of individual end users, and the NomCom to have people on the board to replace the election. And therefore, the fact that there were two seats from the Business Constituency is not just because of Marilyn Cade, it's also because it was users. And therefore, it was to try to keep some momentum of what was supposed to be done in direct election.

Therefore, I really feel today that the power, the [inaudible] of GNSO within the whole ICANN is starting to be too much. And if in five years, we discuss that, I think we need to suggest to go to the SG level and not the constituency level. And please, don't open the possibility to have more seats for the GNSO, because we will be in big trouble at the ICANN level, not just At-Large or end user. At the ICANN level. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Cheryl, go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, just to follow on from Seb's point, that'll be the quickest way to be called a trade association that I could possibly think of. And should I be wishing to destroy ICANN instead of actually see if we can make this little love of work, I would do exactly that. But no one's paying me to do that. Therefore, I work on the other side of the fence. Not that I'm not capable of working on the dark side, trust me, I might keep doing it for some time.

That being said, we need to remember that the proposal that everybody saw in the early public comments regarding the implementation of recommendation is exactly what many of you are saying should happen, that the seats stay the same and that the removal in the bylaw language of having the GNSO seats specified down to the constituency level should simply be removed, leaving it up to the GNSO to work out how it works out its seven seats. Hell, you could have any sort of swap, doesn't matter, but it's the GNSO's seats.

That didn't fly, and the implementation working group was faced with the following situation. Hold all of the recommendations up for this one thorn in a few sides or decouple it, and that's what's happened, run the rest of them through, therefore we have no change in the full number of the Nominating Committee because one of the recommendations leaves the number the same.

These other hypotheticals actually can't be implemented now and could not even be discussed until a future balancing review point comes on. This exercise is to try and help us, help the board at least, come to terms with what this whole thing means, because right now the board members are coming from their sending organizations' points of view.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Before we go any further, I've noted down some things. I'm taking up Vanda's point. Instead of talking about just numbers, somewhere in there, people should be talking about diversity, both geographic and gender diversity. We need to address the numbers, and what I'm hearing is people would have the same number from each SO/AC as are currently.

A concern that was brought up is that if we talk about constituency without defining it, we, as Cheryl pointed out, run a real risk of the GNSO keep producing more constituencies and therefore giving themselves more seats. That's something that our answer has to actually address and not support.

So what I'm hearing is a call for the same number, that one aim be balancing both geography and gender, and that we leave it up to the set numbers within each SO/AC as to how they fill each number slot. Now, am I correct in summarizing that?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes, seems to be.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay. My suggestion, we have to answer the two questions that were left. The first one, I think we have come to some agreement, but I think that this needs to go to a much larger group for a thought. The second is how do we—well, is the process of getting there our job? I don't think so. I think the process of getting there is within each SO/AC and I think we need to say that as well.

But can we go back to the slides, please, and let's go to the two unanswered questions because those are where we need ALAC support and experience. Back to Judith's slides with those two unanswered questions. Can we go back to Judith? Sorry about that. One moment, of course. Thank you. Now, the next page on this one has, and the next one is the final one that does not have answers.

O So, the answers that need to be filled in, how do we talk about rebalancing? And that is where what we have been discussing would go. Who should conduct this work? And I think the point that we would make there is within each SO and AC, it should be left to them to decide how to do that. But I think that's where we put in the criteria of geographic balance, gender balance, the need for experience, and whatever.

O So, my suggestion to address this is that Michelle or Claudia circulate among both the ALAC and the RALOs to have probably a wiki page.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I mean, the RALOs are well advanced in their work. Most of them have completed, or are completing it in the next days.

HOLLY RAICHE: Should we be saying these are the things that are coming out of this discussion? Because we're going to have five RALOs. We may not have the five. Heidi, go ahead, please, on what you're doing. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Holly. This is Heidi. Thank you. On today's cross-community call with the RALO leadership, it was agreed that staff will set up a table on a workspace that has all five RALO individual Google Docs documents that are being prepared, as well as one cross-RALO one. So, I guess we could set up the one for an ALAC one as well. So, there'd be a total of seven. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Right. Where would the outcome of this discussion—because the people who are interested in this issue have come up with a suggestion, and I'm just wondering where that can fit. Because I think there's general agreement on an outcome from this group, and that should form part of the discussion. Obviously, it's going to be ALAC that responds to the board letter, because it was addressed to Jonathan. So, it's ultimately Jonathan and ALAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Letters went to extensive leadership lists, including all the RALO chairs.

HOLLY RAICHE:

But it also went to Jonathan, and we're responding to Jonathan. So, I think Jonathan has to respond, and this subgroup would be saying to Jonathan, this is what we've come up with as a response. So, Heidi, I think that's perhaps the time to deal with this, because this is an answer coming from this group as a recommendation. And then we need to obviously allow people to have a place to discuss the sorts of things that have been discussed in this meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

In terms of what is written, Holly, if even the language in these slides were put into a collaborative document, and all of us who've had the benefit of our interactions over the last two weeks, let alone some of us like Vanda, who have been working on this for many years, and [inaudible] and some of us who just go back going, oh, my God, forgive them, for they know not what they do.

But we could all put our comments in, and that may then allow us to agree, disagree, or otherwise, and narrow down at least a high-level document that might be quite appropriate for the ALAC one to be, because I would not want to see a situation where the ALAC wasn't at least cognizant of what their regional input would be. It doesn't mean it has to be hand-in-glove, but perhaps if there is lack of complementarity, it would be nice to know about it. It could be that this thing becomes an overarching response, and if there's great complementarity, especially with a cross-regional letter being formed as well, it could be that reference is made to all of those. But this is also a numbers game, so I fully support responses from all of the addressees of Tripti's letter, because it will be a numbers game further down the track. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. What I'm therefore suggesting is that this group has come to some nice outcomes, and that that should be reflected so that the two questions that have not been answered by Judith, we have actually suggested answers for that. Judith, are you comfortable with the answers that have come out of this group, filling in those? Because, quite honestly, what we've come up with in the question where there is no text is a set of words that would fill that in, and then who should conduct this work?

Well, if our response is from the ALAC that there be a representative from each of the five regions, then it would be up to the regions, and we could use the criteria for all five groups, which is geographic, obviously, for all five groups, which is geographic, obviously, would be geography, the five groups. But then the other test would be gender diversity and experience, and leave it up to the RALOs. I just think we need to have a document that somewhere summarizes what this group has said in this meeting.

So, Heidi, I think my suggestion is to have a document where the outcome of this meeting, which is suggestions, I mean, we haven't canvassed each other even, but what I was hearing was what was being talked about, and to have this group, the OFB working group, make suggestions as to the two blank spaces that are here, and then that becomes part of the discussion. Does that make sense for you, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. So, what I'm hearing, or I'm thinking, is that on the policy advice development wiki page, we'll create a space with a Google Doc. I'm assuming, Judith, that you have a Google Doc, you're working on that. We can put that in there.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, I don't have—No, we don't.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We'll get that set up ASAP and have it open to everyone on this group. And Judith, are you the pen holder then for this?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, I can be a pen holder. Yeah, happy to do so.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, we'll do that ASAP on that one. Okay, thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, that's good. Well, that really wraps up this particular issue, and thank you very much for that. The other two issues for today, and they're both, I don't think very, well, they're important, but not critical. The first one was the PTI governance issue about their base contracts between the RAs and the RAA contracts. I've had a look at that document, and the changes that they are proposing are simply the language change from WHOIS to the new terminology, the registration data. I don't see any substantive change.

Now, others are most welcome to read the document if they spot anything that looks like significant change. Please bring it to my attention, but my recommendation on that issue is that we've got nothing to say, because it's simply a language change to update the language from who is to registration data.

The other one is the ISPCP. Those comments are due 26th of June, and if people want to, I think we can put that up on the wiki page for comment. I read it, and what it looks to be like is simply an establishment of some set procedures for governance for the ISPCP, and I'm not sure that we have any comments to make. It's simply a way to better organize themselves to conduct business.

So, my suggestion, and I think at the next meeting we can simply sign off on we have nothing to say, or maybe at the ALAC meeting, upcoming ALAC meeting, to officially note that we have nothing to say, either on the PTI governance issue about their base contracts, or about the ISPCP. That's due the 26th of June, and I welcome others to read that, but what I see in that is simply a way to formalize an organizational structure. So, I'm not sure that we need to spend any time on either of those two. Okay, let me just have a look.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I agree, yeah. We don't need to spend much time on that.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm just seeing this to be a waste of time, frankly, because do we want to butt in and say, thank you for organizing yourselves, but we think you

should organize yourselves differently? I'm not sure that that's something that we particularly want to do. I welcome people to read, particularly the ISPCP, because it is an organizational arrangement that they've decided to put in place. I'm just not sure that it's ALAC business that we tell them how to do their business, frankly.

So, my suggestion on that, Heidi, may be simply that people are welcome to look at those two documents, but that we formally recommend to ALAC specifically that we have no comment to make on either of those documents. Any thoughts?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, noted, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Well, you've got the rest of the morning or evening, and the next meetings that we will probably be holding are all going to be about the ICANN and IANA budgets. Does anybody have any other business?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I suppose I should just mention to you that this cycle of prioritization work is kicking off. They've had the onboarding meeting earlier this week, myself and Hadia, the At-Large Advisory Committee appointments on that. There's only three meetings involved in it, and we may have finished our work by our next one, in which case I'll be able to report to you what the work was. But that does fit under this organization, this committee's gambit. So, the prioritization work, which is for the 2025 financial year, of course, is kicking off.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Well, that'll be our next meeting. And Claire, we're happy to have you aboard and listening. Welcome everybody's input. But I think today's business, we've pretty well come to an outcome, which will be comments on the wiki, and then there will be an ALAC response to that. The rest of it, I just don't think we need to spend time on because we're looking at the beginning of the cycle, again, about budgets and commenting on budgets, which will take pretty much all of our time for the next several months, actually.

So, are there any other business? In which case you all have eight minutes back. And thank you, everyone, for your attention. And this meeting is adjourned. Thank you,

MICHELLE DESMYTER:

Thank you, everyone, for joining. Meeting adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]