

YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the APRALO Rules of Procedures Review Working Group Call taking place on Tuesday, 22nd of October, 2019 at 1200 UTC. On our call today we have Satish Babu, Ali AlMeshal, Syuzan Marukhyan, Priyatosh Jana, Amrita Choudhury and Naveed Rais, as well as Nadira Al-Araj present on today's call.

We haven't received any apologies for today's call. From Staff side we have Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber and myself, Yesim Nazlar, and I'll also be doing call management for today's call. Before we start, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes please. Now, I would like to lead the floor back to you, Satish. Thank you very much.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you very much, Yesim. Welcome to this call and before we start, the agenda that we see in front of us was what we discussed last time. From this call onwards, we have to do a deep dive on the specific issues that we have listed out in the Wiki Page. I had sent out a mail earlier today with the first three items in the Wiki that we need to -- now we may not be finishing all the three today, but we can get started and discuss and try to arrive at some kind of a consensus. We're not directly going to edit the ROPs as of now.

The first round basically will be to gather consensus on these points. Some of them are inter related, so we might have to discuss all of them before we have a fully consensus on all of the related points. Also, we

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.

need to record the progress as we move forward. We need to note down somewhere, I'm not sure how we can manage that with Silvia or Yesim can suggest how the consensus can be recorded or the progress at least, not consensus.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello Satish, this is Silvia.

SATISH BABU: Go ahead, Silvia.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Perhaps we can do a Wiki, on the Wiki with action item, on that Wiki I can note the different points, the consensus points.

SATISH BABU: Okay, that's a good point. That gives -- that is a good thing because we need to have it in an accessible place so that every member of the voting group can refer back to it where required. Thanks, Silvia for that.

We are now -- this is a one-hour call and I realize that this is probably a busy time for many of us, including Staff so we will stick to one hour. The first item that we have is regarding the Criteria for the Unaffiliated Individual Member. Now, in what I send out earlier this morning, one of the continuous clauses was that the Individual Member Applicant should not be a member of an existing ALS. But before we jump into

details of this, let us look at the ROP, what they say, which is Section 27.7, page 29 of the ROP Document.

Now, I'm sure if we have access to these documents right now, otherwise I will read out from the copy that I have. If we can get it on screen then that would be good. Here we good. 27.5 says, these members are unaffiliated or they are not affiliated individuals, including any certified nomination committee appointed [inaudible] to the APRALO who met the following criteria.

The criteria is in 27.5.2, unaffiliated individuals must 2.1, be subscribed to the Asia Pacific Discus List. 2.2, be a permanent resident of one of the countries in the APRALO region as defined by ICANN. 2.3, not be a member of a certified ALS. 2.4, by way of certification of having met this criteria and therefore be able to contribute fully to APRALO -- there should be a comma there -- an unaffiliated individual member must submit affirmation of this criteria to Staff indicating how they meet the criteria.

And also note that ceasing to meet any of the criteria, the membership is terminated. 2.5, till there the criteria is there and then 2.6 onwards, it is not the criteria, it is how to chose representative. Until 2.5 we have information on the criteria for individual members. I will open the floor for your comments. If you any specific comments on any of the existing criteria or if you feel that you should bring in some new criteria or take out any of the existing criteria, please speak out. If you have general consensus we will -- Silvia will be noting it down in the Wiki. Are there any comments to start it off? I see Nadira, please go ahead, Nadira.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Thank you, Satish. You mentioned the criteria and the criteria itself, the applicant for unaffiliated, it's not clear, it's not included in this document. We need to have a, form a clear criteria because that's the option to be a not member of ALSes and all that. We need to work on the criteria itself, from my perspective. That's my point for now. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Nadira. I think the criteria is very clear, which is that they must be a resident of one of the countries or territories in the Asia Pacific Region, that is definitely a criteria. But there are not additional criteria, for instance, these must be people who are interest in internet governance or something like that. Now, I do not know whether we should be imposing any further criteria then an interest in ICANN's remit and APRALO At-Large's functioning or any other interest?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: I raise my hand again because today I have a respond from -- regarding the applicant for one of the ALSes and I recommended that -- the Chinese, they are running by two members. [Inaudible] says I was trying to encourage them to be part also of APRALO and he's not recommending that, so this is an issue. Maybe they are interested but - - so it's not only they are part of the region, we want to see their interested, that's kind of the conflicting, that's why I'm asking for a clear criteria about their interest because [inaudible] said they are not part, they are not interested in -- we didn't speak individually about those

applicants. We spoke about as ALSes but not about the individual. My recommendation was let those individuals apply as an affiliated member to be on APRALO, then [inaudible] he mentioned something against that motion. I didn't have time to respond to him yet but it is within the context. Thanks.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Nadira. Now, the piece that you're referring, CIDF, the China Internet Development Foundation, which is somewhat complex and Kaili's comment comes from inside information on the kind of structure that organization has but then, one of the issues here is that -- under 5.2, an unwritten criteria is that the applicant must be an individual. The applicant cannot be an organization and CIDF is an organization, it is not an individual. So, Nadira, when you say they should become an individual member applicant, they're organization and in this case that organization is appointed by the party in China.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ:

Sorry for the interruption, my comment about those two managing this organization, because if they are not the organization, the individual who applied for, that's what my comments were.

SATISH BABU:

We have a complicated case because they have applied on behave of the organization, not as individuals.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: I'm taking it further a little bit and say, these two maybe interested, let's recruit them, that was my perspective.

SATISH BABU: Right, take care of your concern, which I think is valid. If you look at the Wiki that we have started for this group, we had added on one more line that says, should we leave space for some kind of an associate membership status, which presently is not covered? An associated member is an organization, an ALS applicant who does not directly fulfill the criteria but we would like to get them to APRALO because they represent a country which is otherwise less, whatever the consideration be left to the leadership team and to ALAC.

The question whether we should be considering a different category of membership for such applicants, is something that we can revisit later. But what we are discussing currently that was only to individuals. Although not said in the criteria here that the applicant must be an individual, which I think is kind of -- its implicit assumption that we are making. Any other comments?

Now, we did have a little bit of difficulty about the criteria 17.5.2.3, that says that the individual should not be a member of a certified ALS. The difficulty is in two levels. The first level is whether this is a fair criteria. The second is, is it an enforceable criteria because we have had several complaints saying that some of the individual member applicants are currently members of the ALS but we are unable to confirm whether this is right or wrong and how do we do it because the regions, the Staff cannot possibly cover -- we have to go by the [inaudible] that they have

submitted. We have a little bit of difficulty there. What do we feel about this? Amrita, go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: We already know there are many individual members who are members of an ALS, so the only way is while Staff cannot actually valid it and we rely on self-validation, however, if the individual is from a respective country, the ALSes there could be asked to reconfirm. That helps and if we have that kind of a process like Naveed was raising in the chat, perhaps that can help.

SATISH BABU: I'm sorry, I didn't see the chat. Are we sure about the whole validation process? One situation where the ALS is inactive but they are still an ALS and an individual member wants to contribute but because of these criteria they cannot contribute because although the ALS is kind of dormant, they are put down by this criteria.

GISELLA GRUBER: Cheryl, I'm trying to mute you because we cannot hear you, it's just a static noise, nothing else. Cheryl, we cannot understand what you are saying, it's because of the static noise.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Are you able to hear me now?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Yes, we do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

How delightful. It's very difficult when I'm trying to unmute and you're constantly re-muting, regardless of the cause we couldn't problem solve until I could switch some things off and on again. First of all, I suppose one of the questions I would ask in these edge cases of whether an At-Large structure is in a phase of dormancy or whatever, is can they not be treated as exactly that, edge cases? Whilst that is being dealt with, that the individuals can be treated as members in waiting if that's where they're going to be heading for.

I'd also need to remind you exactly what is the reward, the benefit and the responsibility of an unaffiliated member? All the get to do, other than anybody who has just joined the list, whether they are an At-Large structure member or not, the only thing they get to do is occasionally take a vote. If we're not in a voting cycle, if they're not going to be running for a leadership position within the representation model that we have set up at least in current rules of procedure for the unaffiliated members, if they're not going to be exercising one of these enormous rights, at what harm is this refractory period where they may be benefiting from the huge amount of plus of being able to listen to public meetings and read public lists?

If we're talking about taking up leadership positions, if we're talking about exercising the rights to vote, then I see a slightly different concept here but I think we kind of need to keep this in perspective people. We're not giving gold watches and chains away because you're an

unaffiliated member. What we want is greater engagement in ICANN matters and in the policy development process. If somebody is in a At-Large structure, they didn't know they were in an At-Large structure because the entity that they are a member of is so underperforming and their membership is so unaware that they are an At-Large structure, if someone complains about it, well then okay, we investigate, we rectify and the person goes, good heavens, I didn't realize my organization was even a member and then we probably need to look at the At-Large structure.

But I think we need to keep the harm in perspective as well. If you are complained about, if someone says, but I know that person is the president of that association, surely, they should know that they are an At-Large structure, then that's the sort of thing that should be sorted out with due diligence or rectified as required. I just want to encourage us to not forget what we're trying to do is get greater engagement from a wider group of people and still not skew or bias the very few, the very minimal responsibilities with the membership status. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Cheryl. I think we need to keep in mind that point, that we are trying to encourage as much participation as possible from as many people as possible. Certainly, if the status of a member as opposed to someone who has just subscribed to the list, that status of a member makes a difference for them, then we have to see how best to do that. At the same, without blatantly violating this 5.2.3. I see more hands. I think Shreedeeep first and then Amrita.

SHREDEEP RAYAMAJHI: I agree with what Cheryl said, but I also think that we need to clearly define the definition of membership and presentation. As Cheryl said, a lot of the ALS, especially in the developing nations are not performing but they're not reaching out to their people. A lot of the time people don't feel represented. At such situation, there is a need. We need to that kind of situation with a due diligence process or whatsoever so there is not an unwanted situation. I would probably suggest that at least we have a definition about a membership and representation because that would help clarify as well as counter the issues. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Shreedeep. We will discuss a little bit further on with this consent membership and representation. Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Satish. I completely agree with Cheryl that we need to look at the objective, since our objective is engagement, we need to also look at why a member of an ALS is actually becoming an individual member, which can be one, the ALS is not performing or not engaging, however some ALSes do engage but have individual members. Perhaps we should encourage ALSes to have more of their members join the mailing lists and discussions, so that way the members also feel empowered just not the leadership joining the mailing list.

It can solve a lot of issue or them trying to become individual members because many times people do apply for individual membership, thinking that it is something greater apart from having a community vote there is nothing much more for an individual member. If the come into the mailing list, also solves the purpose. I think there is a need to create awareness or perhaps push it through the ALSes also, that their members also can subscribe to the mailing lists and others, that is one part of the picture.

Secondly, yes I agree with Shreedeeep, that memberships need to be defined, so that there are no issues. Also, if complaints come and it is take up on a case to case basis, then there might be queries coming from -- if there is a complaint coming from a particular ALS about an individual member, the member can always come back and say, why me, just because they complain and the others who are members of the ALS are there can communicate. We need to actually see how we will deal with those kinds of situations.

SATISH BABU:

Now, the point raised by Shreedeeep about defining membership. Now, the fact that the ALSes is a member, the member of and ALS is a member, individual member is a member, the only section that is not members is perhaps the people subscribed to the mailing list but they do not belong to any of these categories. I think we have a fairly flexible definition of membership but the only issues is, what do we do if I join a local organization because I know the local organization but I'm, as Cheryl said, not aware that they are actually and ALS and then I apply for individual membership and I declare that I'm not affiliated to any

ALS, that is an honest representation without -- it's not informed but honest. That is a point that we have to see how to address. 2.3 which says, not be a member of a certified ALS.

We also cannot make it something like, not be a member of a certified, inactive ALS because then we are to define what is active? That makes it even harder, really harder than the pull down criteria for inactive ALS. Now, if ALAC is going to pull down criteria, what is active? Then that does make our job easier but as of now, that definition is not something that at this point I think we want to take one because that is another possibly complex situation. How shall we conclude? What is our consensus on this?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ:

Also, I wanted to point -- to bring back what Cheryl has mentioned and what Amrita has mentioned, for example, I am now not representing not individual member and I'm part of an ALS. I'm kind of loose, I don't belong to anybody. The only issue we have as Cheryl has mentioned is the voting issue. If the voting issue is solved, then we don't have to have any definition, we don't have to have an affiliated member, anybody wants to joins to the list they are welcome, only we have to treat the voting issue.

If everybody wants to have one vote for individual -- I don't know how other RALO's are handling the individual members? That's the kind of the issue which creates the whole problem with the unaffiliated member because they have the vote, they have one vote, lump sum vote, only this compared to other ALSes which each ALS have one vote.

One group and maybe we just cancel the voting for unaffiliated member and everybody will be just a member, that's an issue. Thanks.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Nadira. Before I go down the list, just to clarify quickly about how other RALO's handle this. There seems to be two models for handling this, one is that the unaffiliated individual members choose one representative as APRALO has done and that individual representative gets to vote as a single vote in the election. The other model, what EURALO follows is that all the unaffiliated individual members, they create a virtual ALS, the net effect is the same but they process is slightly different. Everybody in that virtual ALS are actually individual members and that behaves just like any other ALS. Those are the two current models. Amrita, go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Satish. One option could be that the individual members do not have a voting right or something. The other option could be when they are applying, perhaps they are asked that if for example, the ones who are applying, whether they tried to join the mailing list earlier or why they want to join as individual members. The ones who joined earlier inadvertently not knowing that the ALS was a member, that charter was a member of an ALS or something but going forward, perhaps a question can be asked whether -- have they ever tried to join the mailing the list initially.

Another thing, while speaking to some of the members, the individual members actually joined the list so that they have their individual entity

rather than a group entity. I don't know whether the model of EURALO sounds good but would it actually work or what the motivation is of individual members? Perhaps we could ask some of the individual members and find out?

SATISH BABU:

Right, thanks Amrita. My comment at this point is that we really do have to step back a little and examine why we had this provision for individual members and why after the At-Large review the need for individual members became much stronger? There could be a bunch of reasons but the one that I see in a positive sense is that we really, the At-Large represents the global public interest and the mechanism to do that is to have people from across section of the communities.

Sometimes it's difficult for organizations to be set up and become members of APRALO in this case, therefore we should then encourage if there are any individuals without any mode of sources to create an organization, as merely as individuals. We should provide them spaces to join, learn and participate and reflect the views of their community in At-Large. That is in some way the broader perspective there. We perhaps should not be unwilling to [inaudible] cases of conflict of interest surfacing, especially in the case of elections. We of course have to build in safe guards to ensure that doesn't happen but without losing the big picture.

I think most of us have expressed the view that this 2.3, the section that should not be a member of an ALS should continue, that is the impression I'm getting from our conversation. At the same time, we do

not want to emphasize it too much but from the last intervention Amrita, she said that we would like to make it more rigorous and maybe ask more deeper questions as to why do you want to become individual member? Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Just to challenge our thinking and make sure that we don't just continue you along the way things have been because the way they are. Just because our current rule of procedure and I do have invested interest in them after all, state that you cannot be a member of an At-Large structure, exactly as it is written, doesn't mean that that's the way it has to be. We could have particular clarifications, you cannot be, for example, in a leadership position and exercise the voting rights for an At-Large structure might be another way of managing this horrendously rewarding thing that apparently people get so excited about and that's ability to exercise a vote.

Especially in a region which, if we don't change that aspect of our rules of procedure, seeks above all other regions, to reach results by consensus not by voting. It just seems to me a little bit amusing that of all the regions out there, ours is the one that aims to reach results by consensus over voting, so voting is the last line of where we would be going on just about everything and yet, we're not recognizing that of course we could simply control this enormous fear I believe of double dipping, by stating that if you are in a position where you are exercising the vote for an At-Large structure or in a leadership role in an At-Large structure, then you cannot do the same as part of the individual or

unaffiliated member structure. Think outside the box as well, that's all I'm suggesting. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Cheryl. I agree with that. We have to take a slightly broader view this thing at the same time, I understand the spirit in which -- in the last instance, it pertains to the whole thing, the election to the individual membership representative position, there was a strong feeling expressed by some people that we should not have let it happen, and the reason why this has happened was because our ROPswere not covering edge case but I don't think it's possible every edge case, every contingency in any kind of ROPsand we do depend on to some extent on individuals to be sensitive to this. We can of course make it slightly more difficult for this sort of thing to happen in future but to make a water tight kind of legal thing, may be somewhat difficult for us. This is my personal feeling. I think we have some emerging controls of consensus and I hope that Silvia has captured these things.

Now, as we said earlier, we are doing it in two phases. First, we are looking at some of the pin points and then noting down our general consensus that we arrive at through these discussions. The next phase after running through the list, we will go back to the actual ROPsand see where we need to tweak them.

Are there any more comments on the criteria? Current situation seems to be that we will continue with this but we need to see how we can tweak these wordings so that the concern on leadership positions and

what Cheryl calls double dipping, if we could take care of that, then the existing wording maybe -- with minor tweaks it should be enough.

The next one was regarding enforcing the same, this criteria. Currently we do have a limitation in which the ability for Staff to do due diligence is almost entirely based on the applicants affidavit. Now, in the conversation earlier we have had suggestions that we should go beyond that. Some suggestions have been for instance, can we ask other ALSes or members in that region or country to cross check? But then we will be forced to depend on this opinion. It's the applicant word versus the other ALSes word. If there is an ambiguity then we will have to sort it out which becomes a very difficult task for our Staff. What is our general feeling regarding enforcing this vote at entry point as well as [inaudible] and in that sense, there is also the issue of how long should the membership be for, what period? Should there be automatic timeout, after which they reapply?

Now, NCUC sends out a mail every year before the voting and you respond in a certain deadline, you are kicked off the list and you are not allowed to vote but you still continue on the membership list, so it's a bit peculiar. What is our thoughts on some of these issues? Basically, we are looking at two aspects, one is the mechanism of enforcing the criteria, both at entry time and in subsequent periods? The second is should there be a time limit for membership, after which it automatically times out and you have to renew manually? I'm not seeing any hands. Unfortunately, I'm not able to see the chat. Amrita, please go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: When we want more participation, perhaps some tweaking in the application form would help us as Silvia as proposed. But, then if you look at a long term thing, perhaps revision of the entire membership process as Cheryl is saying makes sense also but I don't know whether you want to go on phase wise manner of changing or tweaking the application and waiting and seeing how it works and then going for a change in the rule, that's something which perhaps the group may want to discuss.

SATISH BABU: Right. So, what you're saying, how do we make it easier? Can we simplify the application form?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Yes. What I'm trying to say or think aloud is, do we want to go in a phased manner, see that if we tweak the application form and work on it, does it solve our purpose of the concerns which suddenly come up or do we actually need change the entire process of ALS members not being allowed to an individual member? As in do we want to go remove that issue itself because it's confusing or what do we want to do?

SATISH BABU: Simplifying the application form so that it makes it less difficult for people to come in.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Yes, as in two things. One is either we simplify the forms to make it more easier for people, a transparent process, currently it's a bit not transparent. Or, do we actually want to go remove the clause of ALS members not becoming individual members, as in we need to actually -- I think the second option we need to see that whether we want to do away with the clause, if we do away with the clause the process changes. If we want to retain the clause, then the only option is making a change in the application process or tweaking the application form.

SATISH BABU: Right. I don't think we have reached a consensus that we want to take out the clause but we want to make it as unawkward as possible. If we had that in our ROPs then we have to have it in the application form, we cannot simply take it out because that is a requirement as far as the ROPs are concerned. We can prefer to go by the affidavit or the self declaration, in which case we don't make much of an issue regarding that but, on the flip side, we have to then put in some safe guards, not necessarily in the ROP's.

We do have another document called Code of Conduct, which our working group is supposed to come out with. That is a document which is not as rigid as the ROPs and we can make stipulations on how people should not be -- this conflict or leadership positions. Those can actually find a place in the Code of Conduct. In short, we have three different places where we can put in rules regarding this. One is the ROP's, which is the hardest to change because we are to go ICANN and all that to get

it changed. The second is the Code of Conduct that we are actually going to create under this working group.

The third is the Application Form, which is actually the manifestation of these regulations but there's also an element of, we can actually make it simpler. We do have these options in front of us. Even without touching the ROP's, I think we can still manage but I'm not so sure about the time of the membership. If you're going to impose a time limit. If we feel that we have to have a two year time period for membership, then I'm not sure if we can do it without the ROP change. Maybe Cheryl can tell us whether that's possible?

But, in the first instance, do we actually want a time limit? What is the general feeling about this? I've seen in other context the gradual process of gathering deadwood in the membership ranks. The membership keeps on increasing and the participation that's not necessarily increased after a while, many people who applied and got in years back are no longer interested but we still carry them on and that can become an inconvenience but that is the worst-case scenario. Of course, we do not even know whether some of them are alive are not, that begins somewhat embarrassing, you're carrying their names on. Apart from that, I'm sure if there is a real issue with timing? Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Satish. I must say I'm no more concerned about us having dead people on our list then I am that Facebook still tells me people I've gone to their funerals are having their birthdays or their anniversaries as

friendships with me, this is just the things that happen sometimes. If dead people start exercising their vote, then yeah, I guess I'd be a little more concerned.

I do want to make sure that if we're going to look at some form of time limit a recertification, renewal, re-whatever, that we're not putting up barriers of entry to individual unaffiliates who wish to make a contribution and we don't have anything in parity with the At-Large structures, which to be totally honest, from my personal perspective is a lot more problematic a pile of deadwood if indeed they are deadwood and I think we do need to recognize as well, that both entities and individuals will come and be involved and engaged with ICANN when there are things that interest them and their issues are relevant with what's happening with ICANN and it's perfectly possible for people to wax on way and to more or less active over time.

Now, if everyone of them suddenly wish to seek travel support, then that becomes a difference but then again, maybe it doesn't because if you have criteria which requires active participation to be shown, set some standards, expressions of interest, some form or meritocracy involved with the selection as opposed to some right that is associated with being a member whatever class, again, it's not a big problem to manage. In many parts of, not just this organization, the only time you hear from anybody is if there is a forced or the requirement for a vote and that's not what we want, we want people who are actively and continuously engaged, when and where they can make contributions that benefit what we are supposed to be doing within ICANN.

So, if you're going to go down a pathway, some of these pathways will definitely require higher level approval from our friends in the legal area of ICANN because it can't make a change for example to our rule of procedure without that as you've rightfully pointed out. Standard Operational Procedures and those things are more flexible as you've rightfully pointed out but do try and make sure that we're not just building bureaucracy for the sheer sake of looking like we're being terribly, terribly, terribly diligent and remember, every time you a re-accreditation or recertification or a re-issue of a status, that is Staff time and regional leadership time that is being taking up and being taken away from their contributions to what we're supposed to be doing with ICANN as well. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Cheryl. I think that pretty much sums it up. In conclusion, we can put in some more rigor into some of these issues, not into the ROPs perhaps but into the Code of Conduct or whatever it's called, where we have a bit more flexibility. Although, we don't want to make it too heavy weight and as long as we have this distinguish between right space and merit based, I suppose the next ATLAS 4 said there is a preference for members, whatever shape or size, then we have an issue there but as long does not happen and it's on basis of some merit based approach, ICANN Learn and whatever else, we are not seriously threatened in anyway by continuing with a little more rigor the current way. In essence, the individual members do not have too many rights that would tend to distort the functioning of APRALO.

One other thing that I would like Silvia to check is on the issue of the duration of membership for unaffiliated individual members, what do the other RALO's do? Do they have any such -- Silvia, if you can check and get back to us, it will be good?

SILVIA VIVANCO: I can check but I can already tell you from what I recall, that they don't have any time limits. Once they become a member, individual member, as any other ALS or member of the RALO, they don't have an expiration date. They become members and as long as they participate, they can continue to exercise their rights.

SATISH BABU: Okay.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Sorry, I cannot find the button of raising a hand on my new computer. Regarding the time limit, if we decide what is appropriate to use or not, I think that should go both for individual members and ALSes as well, since we do not have active ALSes too and we do have a lot of dormant ones. I think we can exercise some -- sending some notes to all our members, both ALSes and individual members, whether they want, they have a continued interest to be a member of that?

It doesn't necessarily mean that they need to be inactive because the description or the determination of what is active is quite different because some people could be participating on monthly calls or just following up in this way as Cheryl mentioned, depending on the subject

of their interests, the activity can be different. It doesn't mean that they are not an active member if they are following the discussions and if they find something interesting for them, for their community, they would contribute to that.

But just merely keeping in the loop or discussion that having the interests and the conformation that yes, still want to be a member, that would somehow give a conformation. Its not a term limit but somehow a conformation, that would be good I think and we will be for sure know that those members that we do have, the individuals including, they really want to continue the membership. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Lianna. We will note it down for weaving into our consensus later on. But, it maynot be so easy to create a term limit for ALSes. We do have a de-certification process for ALSes but as of now, the term limit, I don't think exists anywhere as Silvia is pointing out. By default, that would mean we can't have a term limit for the individual members as well. Shreedeeep and Amrita.

SHREDEEEP RAYAMAJHI:

I completely agree with the ALS part. The] ALSes need to be active and go through the process and look at what the ALSes have been doing, the community pages are not updated, so the process has to be done with a proper evaluation process and that would also help the ALSes be more aware. Apart from that, the members also should have the right to address whether they want to be a member of the ALS of if they want to individually be a member.

I think when we talk about individual member, then it's something like when I want to be an individual member, it's something that I want to contribute, so for that, if there is a time limitation, at least it would trigger the point that -- it would keep hitting, at least I need to be engage, I need to -- there would be a set of certain reminder. I think there needs to be a timeframe as well. Thank you.

SATISH BABUE:

Thanks, Shreedeeep. You feel that we should have a term limit because it will motive them to perform better and that there should be a renewal process after the expired time limit. That's noted down now.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Satish. When the objective of having ALSes and individual members is contribution and this is a voluntary way in which they contribute, setting term limits or trying to review them, I think it's being a bit unfair because many times even in ALSes the leadership changes, so it takes time for the new leader also to get aligned to it. When we have not been practicing this for ALS members, why would we want it even for individual members?

I think until an issue comes us, the membership should be allowed to continue because the objective is not to restrict, as in we need to see what the objective of trying to review or not review them is. The objective should be to encourage or let ALSes or individual members participate, engage, would reviewing help in engagement? I have my doubts but it's up to the community to actually look at it. Personally, I would not want to review every year because A, it is massive task, even

for staff, they already have a lot of things to do, do we want to engage in these kinds of activities or resources?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Amrita. I'll have a comment on what is said but Shreedeeep, is that a new hand?

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Sorry, it is an old hand.

SATISH BABU: Yeah, what Amrita is saying is that we should remove this factor that is friction for members and not tax them overly, considering the fact that they are all volunteers and the ability to contribute will vary from -- multiple variables like time and how much spare time they have. They might have interest but they might not have time to contribute. I take the point and think that it's reasonable and that we should not impose any additional constraints that add friction to this whole thing and let them be as free as possible to contribute.

I note that we have another three or four minutes to go, two minutes. Are there any other comments for these topics? Otherwise, we have -- Silvia has noted down these points. We have discovered the initial one point which is about the criteria. The next call we will be discussing the role of the representative of individual members, which is yet another slightly complex areas because we are electing somebody, the individual member is electing somebody and they are given a position but there is nothing currently in the ROP that says what their right and obligations

and duties and so on. That we will discuss the next time. In the meantime, for today, are there any other comments?

LIANNA GALSTYAN:

We do have some comments in the chat. Naveed put that and I agree with his comment, that this renewal, it's not a renewal process, that's a checking processing. It shouldn't discourage anyone for participation. I absolutely agree with what Amrita has said, that we should encourage participation and that it's not the contribution would ideal but our objective is to encourage everyone to raise awareness within the region, I absolutely agree with this. We shouldn't discourage our members to participate and know what ICANN is doing.

In any case, I think this kind of check in, I agree that this a burden for the Staff, we agree that this can be done not an annual basis, probably we can do this for our general assemblies, by that time because when we are preparing for the general assembly in Abu Dhabi, that is really hard to find a contact person for the leadership change of the primary contact, we found we couldn't even establish connections to some of our ALSes. If we have this process as continual process, with the check ins, just confirming that yes, we continue our membership, I think that would help the process and motivate them to be involved, to be a participant. I do not save a contribution or an active participation but just participation and knowing what we're doing is okay. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Lianna. Another aspect of this whole thing because the At-Large review is working out a set of metrics and there will be

presumably metrics for ALSes as well as for individual members. We also have to consider that and the output of that process because we may already have some indications of activeness of these members from the metrics.

Of course, Lianna is correct that during the Abu Dhabi, we had such a lot of difficulty, even though we had funding, we could not even contact many of the ALS representatives. We have a problem in that but I see that there is some amount of discussion, we don't have a consensus yet completely on the matter of this check in verses renewal on a periodic basis or annual or bi-annual or whatever it is.

Silvia, I suggest that we keep this alive and the next meeting we'll start with this once again. Now it's time and it's a busy time for people, I don't want to keep you any longer. Thanks everybody for joining and for the very active discussions. We will continue this and see you -- most of you will be there in Montreal and we will meet there. Safe travels to everybody. Over to you, Yesim, to close the call.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you, Satish. Thank you all for joining today's call. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of today. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]