ICANN84 | AGM – At-Large Leadership Wrap Up
Thursday, October 30, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

MICHELLE DESMYTER: All right, this session will now begin. Please start the recording. Recording in progress. Hello, and welcome everyone to the At-Large Leadership Wrap-Up. My name's Michelle DeSmyter. I'm the remote participation manager for this session today. Please note that this session is being recorded and governed by the ICANN Expected Standards Of Behavior and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation will include English, French, and Spanish.

If you'd like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak, if speaking a language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace. And with this, I will now hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC Chair.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Day four, everybody. Congratulations. Maybe day seven is a better way to describe it. So, thanks, this is our wrap-up meeting, and the ever-evolving wrap-up meeting where we try to, I think our microphones are turned up now, where we are trying to figure out the best way to summarize what's happened, get reports from folks. But as always, speak up if you've been in a meeting and you think there's something that we should address, a letter we should write, a group we should be trying to meet with, et cetera.

Please take this opportunity to raise your hand and make that point. That's one of the issues behind the wrap-up session. So, starting with that, we'll look at the liaison reports, which I think will be limited because some of our liaisons are still liaising. But we do have Matthias here, so why don't you go ahead and go first.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK

Thanks. Matthias speaking, for the record. So, I will be also quite quick. So basically, the focus of this meeting, like in terms of SSAC was definitely the free and Open Source Software paper which was presented at most of the cross-community sessions. And then I would also invite you to check the Lightning Talks. So, there are some which are quite technical. They were focusing on DNS security, DNS automation, but also other topics related to, for example, digital identification systems. So, quite interesting.

And then, I think that was mainly the thing I want to report. I mean, I will then also distribute a bit more content on the mailing list. And then, yeah, I think also the joint meeting with the At-Large community was very good. There are a lot of interesting topics. And also here again, if somebody wants to, or if there is something you want to highlight at the SSAC community, just let me know. I'm happy to facilitate that. Yeah, I think that's basically it from my side. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Matthias. I think one of the outcomes from that meeting and also from the meeting with the NCSG is that we want to try to do some meetings intersessionally. Because clearly there were some very interesting papers coming in the near future that we want to try to work together on to disseminate out to the broader public and make use of our communications channels to do that. So, we're relying on you to help get us engaged with the SSAC as those papers evolve and as those opportunities present. Let's not wait until Mumbai to talk again.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK

No, so I mean, that's a very good point. Matthias Hudobnik is speaking again. So, I mean, I always try to let's say facilitate the things, also give the updates in the Working Group. And there are also these two upcoming new Working Groups related to AI and the DNS. And then also the DNS transparency one. But they are currently chartered. So, I mean, it's just like literally, it was like the kickoff meeting was at this meeting. So yeah, but I will definitely keep you posted as I always do. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW Oh, I had a question.

JONATHAN ZUCK Okay, say whatever you like.

JUSTINE CHEW This is Justine. A question for Matthias. Does SSAC plan to have any more discussion group type Working Groups where community participants outside of the SSAC can participate?

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK Matthias is speaking again. So, it's a very good question. As for now, I'm not aware of this, but it, I mean, we had at the workshop some, also some, let's say, ideas to have this kind of like smaller, whatever papers or guidances. But so far, I mean, the focus is, let's say, these two Working Groups we presented could be that there might be then some more-smaller discussion, alternative plus member, whatever groups. But for now, the focus is on these two ones to really bring them out quickly then and distribute it in the community. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW Okay, thanks. If it's small discussion groups, then I don't think they would open it up. The one that I do recall that they had outside community participating is the name collisions discussion group. So, that wasn't made up of just SSAC members. They actually had other people join. And I kept suggesting to Ram that, if you find an opportunity to have more participation from people outside of SSAC, that would be great. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Justine. And we'll go ahead and go. Satish, go ahead, please.

SATISH BABU

Thanks very much, Jonathan. Satish, whether I could. So, this particular point that Justine brought up is important because of the two Working Groups commissioned, the ride is, I think, especially important for end users. So, I'm not sure how we can improve the communication between us here and this Working Group, which is close to us, except for you. So, some way to kind of improve the communication would be good. Thank you.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK

Can I just follow up quickly? Matthias Hudobnik speaking again. So, yeah, you're right. So, the ride is currently going on. And like from a structure in general, it's like that. So, the Working Groups are closed for just SSAC members. I mean, there are invited guests which are bringing in expertise. And then basically when a Working Group is done and the paper is finished, then we distribute it. But I also try to, let's say, give you some updates during the monthly meetings as good as I can.

Sometimes it's also, I mean, it's work in progress. So, I need to be careful also sometimes what I'm reporting because maybe it might be changed at some point then. And so, it's then also a bit like, yeah, can be problematic, let's say. But that's a very good point. And I think this paper is definitely of interest for end users. So, I will definitely try to focus and bring in as good as possible information and also where I think it's sustainable and not that I report something and then maybe two months later it's-- yeah, thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK All right, thank you. Justine, tell us about the GNSO.

JUSTINE CHEW Sure thing. This is Justine for the record. So, GNSO, we didn't get through a lot of things. We've had a change in the leadership because it's AGM. It's a general meeting. So, the incoming leadership comprises Susan Payne from IPC, who's now the GNSO Chair. And she's complemented by Jennifer Chung from the Registry Stakeholder Group as Vice Chair for the Contracted Party side. And Peter Taiwo Akinremi from the non-contracted party side house as the other vice chair.

They have chair and two vice chairs. Other than that, we had expected to vote on the motion to do with IGO, International Government Organization and International National Government Organization. Not non-government organization, sorry. IGO, INGO identifiers, which is one of the issues that I kind of discussed with CPWG some time back.

I think, well, and this issue was also sort of commented on by the Board, because it's an issue that came, arise out of The Subsequent Procedures Implementation Review Team, SubPro IRT as a point of disagreement in between what ICANN Org propose to be implemented and what the majority of the IRT actually thought. So, it sorts of got escalated to GNSO council. But I did report when I was discussing this issue with CPWG that there were two positions.

One was essentially, well, the question is essentially when a previous PDP, Policy Development Process actually made a recommendation for full name IGO identifier. So, for example, Olympic Committee of whatever. So, the full name should be protected in some way because these are organizations either established by multiple countries treaties or by some kind of international agreement of that sort.

So, they have a certain stature. So, the policy recommendation basically says that full name identifiers should be protected in the Next Round and so forth. But then there were subsequent developments in other areas to do with String Similarity. And essentially the position was that, if we chose one option, then we might have to extend String Similarity evaluations to prevent a non-IGO from getting a String that is then deemed visually similarly confusing to a IGO identifier. And in which case that could then prevent the IGO from getting their full name identifiers. So, that was the issue.

And the other option obviously was to keep to actual strict text of the recommendation and not have this extended protection for the IGO identifiers. We submitted our position, which is to make sure that the names are protected. But I think GNSO Council is looking towards the other option, which is to retain the strict interpretation of text in the recommendation. But they have conceded, it went through a long discussion.

And we still not prepared to vote because the concession they're trying to make, they still want to tweak some language. But essentially, I think they have come around, they have looked at the Board correspondence. And because in principle they want to make sure that whatever the GNSO PDP decides is should be that strict interpretation and not expand on it.

So, they're putting up a motion to basically say that we are not going to extend the protection, we're sticking to the actual text, but we're going to concede to some of the suggestions that the Board has made, which is in the event a non-IGO applies for a String that is deemed confusingly, and this is visual confusion. Confusingly similar to an IGO or NGO identifier, then ICANN Org would notify that relevant entity, the IGO or NGO to say that, hey, someone has applied for a string that is confusingly similar to your identifier.

So, potentially if they get it, then you might not get your name, please do something about it. So, either go put in a GAC early warning or go to the GAC and ask them to submit an advice to stop that process. So, GNSO council is saying, okay, fine, I guess that's fair.

There is some language in terms of the concessions that are being made that the registry stakeholder group is not happy with, so that's why we didn't vote on the motion. It's going to be amended a little bit and will be voted on in November. Other than that, I think I'll leave the GNSO DNS Abuse session to Steinar, he's going to report on that.

Other than that, the GNSO council's going to have a strategic planning session in January and that's when they're going to look at things like priority topics, what do we want to see in the pipeline for PDPs or other work. Things like RPM phase two on UDRP that's been pending for a long time. DNS Abuse PDP is also on the radar. And a few other things, and council is always worried about whether they have enough volunteer resources and staff resources to support multiple PDs on at the same time.

We do know that, I'll just end by, we do know that the Latin Diacritics PDP is kind of working towards the end of their term and they're coming up with an initial report soon. And the council liaison to that PDP did report on the fact that there may be a request coming in from somewhere to make sure whether we can accommodate some of the intent or the recommendations for the Next Round.

Now, I've been quite clear to say that the Board is going to be voting on the draft AGP today, in fact, today's Thursday. So, there wouldn't be an opportunity to add language to the AGP to account for that. Because for that to happen, which is actually implementation. You actually need Board-adopted recommendations and then Board instructs, ICANN Org to implement.

So we're not even anywhere near adopted policy recommendations. We're still at the initial report and hasn't even gone to council. So, I don't know what's going to happen, honestly, but all I can say is if the Working Group, the Latin Diacritics Working Group can just expedite everything that they can do to get the recommendations out for public comment, so you're in that process.

And we would probably have to examine if we can, depending on the timing of it, through the standing predictability implementation review team, because that will kick in once the Board has approved the AGP. And that would possibly allow for something to change in the Next Round. But again, the best way to do it is if you have adopted policy recommendations. Because I can tell you for a fact that even the standing predictability implementation review team is not supposed to deal with policy questions.

So, they can only deal with non-minor operational changes. So, if they can say, point two, there is already Board-adopted recommendation, so it's just an implementation issue, becomes operational matter, then the SPIRT can take that on. If there's no Board-adopted recommendation, then it's not policy, which means that it cannot do anything about it. Okay, so I'll stop there. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Any questions for Justine? Oh, yeah, Christopher, I noticed you had your hand up. I tried to find out what you wanted to speak on. Are you still there? I was trying to IM with him. Oh, there you go.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON

Yes. Well, I find Justine's-- and Justine, this is an unusual critique to my part. I find Justine's position rather too formalistic and late in the day. We're dealing with an urgent situation politically. And I would rather support the email that you've all received from Olivier Crépin-Leblond about resolving the situation here and now.

A few days ago, I was asked to comment on the GNSO report on Board decision-making. Now, for the sake of argument, I don't know why that was assigned to GNSO. There are other people interested in Board decision-making. But my main point now is that, personally, I have lost complete confidence in GNSO as representing the outcome of a multi-stakeholder bottom-up process.

This has got to change in the near future, I hope. But meanwhile, as has been pointed out several times in the last few days, in the last few hours, I would say, the decision, if that's what it is, to exclude the Latin Diacritics from the New gTLD round is, frankly, unacceptable. It's absurd. And as Olivier characterizes it in his message, risking a train wreck. So, please think again and call in a special meeting today with the Board, with GNSO, our liaison with GNSO, and the members of the Latin Diacritics Working Groups that are present in Dublin. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW

This is Justine speaking. I understand where you're coming from, Christopher. You're not the only person who has that position. I know there's several people in the large community that feel the same way. I don't know whether, we can certainly try. I've raised this with GAC, so GAC is going to try and do something about it. So, I think our best ally is still GAC, because GNSO has already made it very clear when they even started the Latin Diacritics PDP that this is not a gating thing.

So, this is not going to stop the Next Round. That is clear position from GNSO. The Board, we can petition the Board or whatever. But same with all the other things that we've tried to get through, I suspect the Board is going to say we do not have policy recommendation for this. And I don't know how else to answer that. Because we have tried many other things to get it through the Board, but they keep giving us the same answer, there is no policy recommendation for this.

So, I'm happy to take instructions from the ALAC on what you want to do next. But as I said, we've already raised it with GAC, I still think GAC is the best ally, and I think they are putting something in their communiqué. Okay, so I'm happy to, again, as I said, take instructions from the ALAC. We can do a quick turnaround in terms of ALAC advice to support GAC's position. It's up to you guys, thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK All right, Sergio, and then Olivier.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO I'm going to speak in Spanish. This is Sergio speaking. Justine and dear colleagues, today in the morning, Bill and I just expressed our opinion on this. Can you hear me? Can you hear me, Justine? Yeah, okay. So, today in the morning, Bill and I introduced our position, personal position with respect to Diacritics and the New Round. I personally am not asking for a process to stop the round or anything like that. We are asking for a very simple thing. If the PDP goes out, it hasn't really already, we should include that within the things we actually need so that the New gTLDs can be presented. My concern is we are giving up in our position.

I think we need to make a proposal, and we maybe said no, but we need to have a more powerful position. And so, I have already asked for this in my region. I have asked the incoming chair to include this in Latin America and the Caribbean so that we can have a stronger, more solid position, and we can push this.

There has been an exchange of emails. Christopher sent one, and then Olivier closed it. And I think this is the right path that we can use right now. That's all. Thank you very much.

JONATAHN ZUCK Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND All right, Olivier. Yeah, thanks very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and thank you for touching on this. I was going to actually talk about it during my CPWG report, but that actually is more helpful because I don't need to take a hat off and so on.

So, speaking personally on this, I think what Bill mentioned this morning could be a potential way forward with the Board, which is to say that there is a placeholder, that there is, for the time being, a placeholder in the AG for this topic, which will be included when ready down the road.

The Board is able to do such things. When they vote, there is always a question as any amendments, and some Board members can ask for an amendment to be made. Of course, they usually discuss these before. Very rarely is there a Board member turning up with an amendment and says, I propose this, and then everybody else says no. But they could make a friendly amendment and just saying there is a placeholder for this topic, which would save ICANN an enormous amount of embarrassment and potential problems down the line if a heavy official way with the GAC, with countries writing to ICANN and complaining about this topic.

The way to do it, go for a quick sideline meeting before the Board meeting starts. Speak to the Board chair, speak to the various people. I would say GAC chair, Board chair, ALAC chair, and a few other people that I listed there. No need to bring 100,000 people in there. Just make sure that something gets done so that the door is not completely closed.

And we don't get told by one of the Board members who, of course, spoke on his own behalf, oh, sorry, it's too late. We can't do anything about it. The matter is out of our hands. Until they vote publicly, until it's on the record, it is firmly in their hands. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg. On a personal note, I strongly doubt the Board will change from their scripted resolution at this point, but sure, we should try. But the reason I put my hand up is, Justine, maybe you can enlighten me, but my recollection is the Applicant Guidebook does not have an exhaustive list of scripts and root zone rules which it will support, does it?

JUSTINE CHEW

The thing is we've dealt with variants, and this PDP is actually an exception that needs to be introduced with all the rules that are in place. So, we've had policy recommendations for variants, but the problem is this is not a variant issue, which is why we need to create an exception.

ALAN GREENBERG

I understand. But I don't think the Applicant Guidebook says what rules it follows. It says IDNs that are presumably, we have rules and have root zone rules. So, I'm not sure why, if this one goes into the books in time for someone to implement a TLD, that it should not be allowed. Now, if it isn't done by the time the TLD is implemented, that's obviously a problem.

JUSTINE CHEW

Yeah, so two things. One is, the thing is there's nothing stopping, say, for example, CORE, whoever is the registry for .Quebec without the Diacritics, right, which they already have, to apply for .Quebec with the Diacritics. There's nothing stopping them from doing it. The only problem that they foresee is the fact that the string similarity panel will likely, and this is not a foregone conclusion, right, they will likely say that .Quebec with the Diacritics is too confusingly similar to .Quebec without the Diacritics.

And there's an overarching policy that says that we cannot introduce confusingly similar strings into the root. Therefore, QBAC with the Diacritics will probably not be allowed to move forward. So, they can have, they can put in application, but it's not likely to move forward if it is found to be confusingly similar.

So, what the Latin Diacritics PDP is trying to do is create an exception to that rule to say essentially breaking it down, right, is if the entity that already holds .Quebec with the ASCII version without the Diacritics applies for the .Quebec with Diacritics, right, because it's the same entity, the risk of confusion or harm to the end user will be minimized because it's the same entity offering both strings.

Now, if it's a different entity trying to apply for .Quebec with the Diacritics, then this is why we have this rule to not allow confusion. And it's all about end user confusion. So, the point is that there is no exception yet, which is what people are asking for.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I'll move on. Did you want to speak to the DNS group, DNS Abuse group? Oh, okay. We can't turn the closing session into a whole discussion about this, I think, so if you've got a new path forward or something, go ahead, but be quick.

SATISH BABU

Yeah, this is just to kind of say that we should take it up. I'm not sure what is the right way out. Is it a placeholder? Is it some kind of exception otherwise? Because we remember the kind of effort that is required to initiate this, because it is an exception. It took us a really long, a lot of hefts. We had really pushed hard.

Now we are going to ask for an exception, not an exception, which is going to be singularly kind of difficult. It is abnormal, and also multiple times the PDP itself has said that we don't think this will be ready by the time the AGB wants it. In the very first meeting, it's been minuted.

Secondly, the output of the PDP does not go straight to implementation. There is an impact analysis that has been called for. First, and that would take several months. So, let's anticipate all these issues. They'll be asking us all these things. So, let's think of some way out of all this and definitely try. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: For those that are interested, at the conclusion of this, don't leave. Let's have a meeting right here in this room at the end of the closing session. Steinar?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, hi. This is Steinar for the record. I'm going to take a few minutes about a session report for the GNSO DNS Abuse small team outcome. There was a session on Sunday. And for those who are not familiar, this is this session was due to the GNSO DNS Abuse small team discovered two gaps that they wanted to discuss how to proceed with. And the two gaps, there are unrestricted API access and also associated domain name checks.

At-Large has submitted comments to this. It's all in the Record. The thing here is how to present this to give advice, to my understanding, give advice to the GNSO how to proceed with this. And the positive thing here is, I think it's more than one positive thing, the one positive thing are the incoming comments to this are all in favor of going further on. Even the Contracted Party, the SOs, the ACs, et cetera, they're all in favor of it.

Another thing I would like to mention also, based on history, is that this proposal and the two gaps here are in a different area of the huge DNS Abuse question. This is more preventive, proactive. The previous recommendation in the RA and the previous conditions in the RA and the RAA is more in what should we do when the shit has happened. This is more in the language.

So, I don't know exactly how this will end up but I think that what sort of way they are going to do are they going to have two PDPs, are they going to have one PDP in two phases, are they going in SQL, are they going in parallel, et cetera.

Together with Kathleen and Justine, we wrote the summary report which is on the Wiki site so we can go more into details about that. I think it was very positive, very good feeling about this. So, any questions, I'm open for it or we can spend time on something else. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

All right, seeing no questions, I'm going to go right to Olivier to talk a little bit about CPWG.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Of course, we have plenty of policy work going on this week and the meeting of the well, immediately at the beginning of the meeting on the Saturday, I remind you of the At-Large briefing document which put forward most or many of the policy lines that the At-Large community had worked on and I hope that you've all read through it and that you have disseminated these points to other communities.

I should point you to the At-Large ICANN84 session reports and unfortunately very few have been received so far. We obviously have one on the Latin Diacritics PDP Working Group Part 1 and Part 2 from Bill Jouris. Thank you for this, Bill.

There was also one on the DNS Abuse work section which Steinar, Kathleen Scoggin and Justine Chew contributed to but unfortunately looking at the other days I'm not seeing reports and so I do hope that it's just an oversight and some have been to other meetings and will be able to fill those in and I do ask staff to please just send a note on the chat with the link to the wiki so people can add these or just email staff and they'll be adding them over.

As far as our work is concerned, we obviously had our CPWG meeting on the Sunday and spoke about specifically the Proposed

Next Round Base gTLD Registry Agreement. There's a public comment currently taking place.

The Public Comment finishes, the call for comments closes on the 17th of November so there's still plenty of time to comment on this but we definitely went through it and thank you very much Justine for taking us through that. And we also had Edmon Chung meeting with us, speaking to us about the Universal Acceptance Expert Working Group, the UAEWG and he shared some slides with us on that as well.

So, that's the CPWG work this week. Obviously, as we've just heard earlier, there could be some more that we might need to do but in the interest of time, I'll stop here and happy to answer any questions and I think Avri is co-chairing something else somewhere else so she's unable to add more but I'm sure she will listen to this and if she's not happy with it, she will add more in writing. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

That's right. She's in the former Board members' meeting. Any questions for Olivier? Okay. Excellent. Bukola, would you like to talk a little bit about the OFB?

BUKOLA ORONTI

Yeah, thank you very much, Jonathan. This is Bukola Oronti for the record, and since Claire is not here, I'll be the only one that will be giving the report today. So, during the OFB meeting earlier this week, that was on Sunday, we had a couple of important parts of the session.

The first one, the ICANN planning thing were with us and then they presented to us some key parts of the strategic goals that aligned with that of the ALAC strategic priorities. So, this was looked at and the good thing at the end of the day was that apart from seeing the alignment in both strategic goals, also during the Board meeting, the Board was actually pleased with how far ALAC has been able to work in identifying their strategic priorities in line with that of ICANN. So, that's a good one.

Also, there was a brief touch-up on what is to expect for the fiscal year 27 operating plan and budget. So, though the documents will be out during Christmas period for Public Comment. So just give us a heads up and also those who would love to volunteer for that should not forget to start getting ready so that doesn't infringe on the holidays.

We had a brief presentation with the ALAC CIP team on what has been done so far on the implementation process and the action item in this area is also that the ALAC team, the ALAC team itself should have a meeting with the ALAC CIP reps so that we can decide and actually put names to some of these actions that is to be done under the CIP as the mapping has looked at how the CIP initiatives, activities, aligns with that of the ALAC strategic activities and also with the ICANN.

So, the mapping is being done but then some of this given to identify with individuals that will actually take it up from there going forward. I think that is all.

Under the strategic goals for the ALAC, also there's a request that the RALOs, probably the chairs and the ALAC reps should actually forward their own activities plans so that everything can be looked in together and see how resourcing and the likes that is necessary can be requested from the Org. I think that's all from the OFB and the action items. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks a lot, Bukola. Any questions for anyone? All right, we're missing Sébastien for the same reason as Avri. Natalia, can I put you on the spot to see if you want to talk about some of the EURALO activities? Yeah, Natalia, is that what I said? I thought I said Natalia.

NATALIA FILINA

Thank you very much. Natalia Filina speaking but I prefer to give the floor to Sébastien, but I don't see Sébastien here. Ah, okay, thank you very much. What I can say about EURALO current activities, we are now coming to the new stage of our work because we went through the election now, we have a new EURALO Chair, Frédéric Taes is here and maybe we can give them the floor.

We established our outreach and engagement plan recently and approved it and it seems to be for us about a new refresh agenda for EURALO, more activities on our field, more local connection with our ILSs, engagement next gen to the role of our discussions, putting forward hot topics important for end users in large European region and I think we might invite all other RALOs to this work and go forward together. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Talk about the NextGen thing that you did.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thank you, Jonathan, Amrita, for the record. So, we wanted to engage the NextGen. We had a workshop which was done by APRALO and EURALO but primarily led by APRALO because most of the next gen were from our region because of the changing of the region.

So, what we did is we had a few of our fellows who are actively engaged in APRALO, sharing their experience, then we had three blocks where they went and spoke about getting to know what APRALO's history, et cetera, has been, how they can engage, sharing their views and what could be the future way ahead.

And then it was summarized and the objective of this entire exercise was to at least get them curious about what APRALO is and perhaps join the WhatsApp group. So, yes, this was the activity we did. I think it was interactive. They did speak a lot because we wanted them to speak and share their own thoughts. I'll stop at this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Great. Thanks for the update.

NATALIA FILINA

Thank you very much. Sorry for the mistake with my reports. If I may put forward on the table highlights from the cross-RALO meeting which we had. So, I may say that it was a very fruitful meeting and meeting with GSE team. We presented very shortly our outreach plans for each RALO. We talked about how we will move forward with our initiatives. We talked about CIP Working Group and results and it used to be a future work maybe for aligned ALAC CIP level and working stream with all RALO's CIP result of this intermediate work. So, that's all from me. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you. I can report there was a successful RALO round table on ICANN accountability that I got a chance to be on and was well attended and I think went very well. Discussing a number of issues including the reviews that were coming up. So, that was a successful session as well as well as one on RIRs that was very popular. This room was full at that time as well.

Beyond that, what's next in the agenda? Yeah. So, the next thing is the farewell to departing leaders and how do you want to handle that? Do you want to go here or there maybe? If it's okay for you guys. Yes, exactly, okay. Nobody is looking that way. All right. No problem. Me? Oh, from me? Okay. So, we have some departing leaders here. Starting with the ALAC. We have Bukola Oronti. Come on down. Shah Zahidur Rahman. Lillian.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK So, maybe it should be somebody else reading these names. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH Next in the room, we have Sergio Salinas Porto, LACRALO Secretary, departing. Sorry. Oh, sorry, they're there. I'm sorry. Sorry. Okay. Sergio Salinas Porto, LACRALO Secretariat. And next in line, we have Adrian Schmidt, departing LACRALO Secretariat. Sorry about that. I had a moment. Going on to the-- We have Adrian Schmidt coming up. Welcome. Thank you very much. Yes, and for the people that we've just recognized here, there is the formal recognition at the Board meeting, which starts at 16:30.

And because I'm also got part of that, please do come if you see me. We're going to seat the formal recognition people at the bottom left-hand side. So just look for me. Ah, Sébastien Bachollet, departing EURALO Chair. Thank you. That is an EURALO color. We do it with the scarf. So that completes the departing leaders here again. Sébastien, just to remind you that there's the formal recognition at the board meeting 16:30, so do look for me because there's a seating order. Thank you.

The NomCom delegates, I'll read the names, not that they are here, but we will just be recognizing them. Would you like to? We have Kissoondoyal, African Region, Humberto Carrasco from LACRALO, and Eduardo Diaz from NARALO.

JONATHAN ZUCK

We have some incoming leaders as well. We are not asking them to come up and be embarrassed. Maybe stand up in place so we can give you some applause. First in the ALAC, we have Adebunmi Akinbo. Please stand up. Thank you. Aftab Siddiqui.

HEIDI ULLRICH

He is gone.

JONATHAN ZUCK

He is gone? Priyatosh Jana is the APRALO Vice Chair. Frédéric Taes, your EURALO Chair. Lance Hinds as the new LACRALO Chair. Sandra Rodriguez is the LACRALO Secretariat. Vanda Scartezini is the LACRALO Chair Elect. Lilian Ivette De Luque Bruges is the LACRALO Secretariat Elect. She's just piling on the awards. And Bibi Rookayya Gulmahamed is the NARALO Secretariat.

And then the new NomCom delegates, Bram Fudzulani from the African region. Christelle Vaval from the Latin American-Caribbean region. And our very own Alan Greenberg from the North American region. All right. That's everybody. Thanks so much for all that you do. Big round of applause for all of you. And we did good. That's the end of our agenda.

I have no next steps. We have a lot of prep for 85. We will start right away. That is coming up quickly. In case you were planning to take a vacation to the moon or something like that. Good to know. Alan, go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG I would like to offer my congratulations to Jonathan. We have never, ever finished a wrap-up meeting on time.

JONATHAN ZUCK I only accomplished it by being mean. So to that end, when we adjourn here and we let the interpreters go, let's convene and talk about Latin Diacritics and see if there's anything we're trying to do there. But with that, I would like to thank the interpreters for all their work across the week. So, thank you.

None of this works without them. And for some of us, it wouldn't be heard without all of the tech and the microphones. So, let's thank them as well. And with that, my friends, ICANN84 is formally adjourned for the ALAC. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH If I may, just for those who know, we also had Yesim Salam supporting us for this whole week online from Turkey, Istanbul.

She wasn't able to be with us. Thank you very much for all your support this week. And of course, Michelle here doing the RPM, Michelle DeSmyter, for those who have not yet met her. She's always on all our calls here.

So again, just come and say hello. And thank you, everyone. And of course, well, I think all of the staff as well. So, well done. And we have Ozan joining us now as well. Ozan, Hadia, Silvia, Gisella. Support, Andrew, as well.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]