
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the AFRALO operating principles review working group call on Thursday the 23rd of April 2020 at 16:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel we have Isaac Maposa, Jules Nizeyimana, Seun Ojedeji, Hadia Eliminiawi, Emmanuel Mfitumukiza, and Ben Kyemba. On the French channel, we have Aziz Hilali and Michel Tchonang.

Our interpreters for today on the French channel are Isabelle and Jacques. We have received apologies from Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, Oreoluwa Lesi and Bukola Oronti.

From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management. Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and also so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels, and to please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise.

Thank you very much, and with this, I turn the call over to you, Isaac.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. I hope we are all okay through this time we are in globally. I hope you are all keeping safe.

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.

On our agenda, we are going to look at the recap on the action items from our last call, then we'll look at the working group methodology document. I would just give a brief update on that and get some feedback from the members. And the other item we're going to have is to look at the issues under review, the issues that we are going to review as a working group and issues that people think should be looked at from our membership section 5.6 to 5.12 on the operating principles document, and after that, we are going to look at what are the next items, the next steps after [we have planned the things] that we are going to look at today what'll be our next steps.

So basically, I give over the floor to staff to recap on the action items from our last call.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Hello. Thank you, Isaac. First action item, Isaac Maposa and Abdeldjalil to put the methodology on Google Docs so all members can edit it and make contributions. That is completed.

Isaac Maposa and Abdeldjalil to categorize the working group methodology in stages one, two and three with a timeline to keep track of the progress. That's complete.

And the third one is to send a calendar invite for the next call, which is also complete. Over to you, Isaac. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Okay. We are now looking on our next item, which is the draft of our methodology. I'm just going to give a brief update of our methodology. I

did share the link to the draft and also it's on our agenda. Also, I'm going to share it again on chat the link to our Google document on the draft methodology.

So we did an update on the draft methodology and did share with the working group members so that we can also get some feedback from working group members. We did get only two members did put their feedback. I'm not sure if everyone else is okay with what was put up or you didn't manage to go through it. Since we have shared the link to the document, if you still have something you think should be put on the document, you can go ahead and add it. it's open to edit to every group member.

So basically on the work document, we did highlight the goals of the working group which are we are going to review the rules regarding individual membership starting from section 5.6 to 5.12. We'll be looking at issues to do with criteria for individual member participation and [termination] of individual memberships, rights and duties of individual members, voting rights and participation in decision making, and then advising the leadership on relevant changes required.

We did put our methodology into some section as working group members requested that we do so that we have some timeline. We're at the first stage, second stage and third stage. [We had the first] stage which we've just put [inaudible] to do with reading the document so that working group members get to know what we are really working on through reading the document. Then stage two. That's where we are at now. That's what we are going to discuss, that will be our next item, so

basically [inaudible] collection of opinions and contributions from working group members.

I did share a document again on Google on the issues that we are going to look at. I will share the link as well later when we go to that next item. We also added [inaudible] the issue that was raised about decision making methodology where it was suggested that we use the consensus method. However, I do still want your input on that. If you feel that there's an input on that, you can also help me on that.

Seun, I'm not sure if the issue was well addressed on that document on the issue of decision-making methodology. I think that's all on the working group document. Is there any contribution on that or questions? Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. Thanks for this document. It's looking good. I just wanted to comment on the timelines. I see that for the stage two, which we are in now, that is where we're going to also carry out the survey and stuff like that. I think four months may be too ambitious considering the current challenge with COVID-19 that is happening globally. I would suggest that we put two months to that and then other timelines can also move accordingly.

In terms of decision making, I think what is written here is fine, so long as there's an understanding of what the majority vote is. I suggest that maybe we put [inaudible] 50+1 or something just to be sure what is majority. I don't know how many we have in membership right now. I think the draft of the decision-making section is fine, but if we want to

be more descriptive, then maybe we can add what we mean by majority, but I think it's okay from my own side. Otherwise, I suggest that this draft from my own side is fine barring any other suggestions [or modification.] Thanks.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you so much, Seun, for the contribution. Okay, we'll adjust the timeline on stage two as you highlighted. I'm sure most people are feeling the challenge due to COVID-19, and I think it would be more difficult for most people to work during this time and most people may not have reliable internet access. So I will be sure to put that into consideration and adjust the timeline there to two months, same for the contributions, and also the decision-making methodology. Thank you, we will adjust that accordingly.

Is here any other hand raised? I don't see another, so I'm sure we can move on to our next item. So we are now looking at issues under review. What are we going to review as a working group?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Sorry chair.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Yes, I give you the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you, Isaac. I just wanted to be clear. Is the draft now finalized or is there going to be a review after this, or is that the final now? Is the draft now and the methodology now analyzed? I'd just like to before we move to the next item.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Thank you for that question. We will do the edits as you have highlighted. I think once we do those edits, I don't see another suggestion, but we'll give room for people to put in their comments. I'm sure most people have not gone through it because I've only seen your comments, two people had only commented. So it's free for everyone to edit.

Then after maybe a few days, we just make the final draft from the comments. Then we can continue working on it since we shared it online on Google Docs. But I think most of the major issues that needed to get raised, I'm sure they're in the work document. Is that okay?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. That's fine. Thank you, Isaac. Apologies.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Okay. So we move to our next item where we are going to look at issues that we are going to review, issues under review, and I did share the document and I see it's already shared on chat as well.

So basically, the issues that we are going to review, we are going to look at criteria for individual memberships, participation and termination of

individual memberships, rights and duties of individual members, voting rights, participation, decision-making. Then we are going to also look at when are we going to review this individual membership issue. are we going to review again after two years, or is it going to be reviewed again? Or what will be the next step after that?

So basically, I just extracted the section we are going to look at on our document. So I started from section 5.6 to section [5.1] where we are looking at 5.6, who can be an individual member? So now, we are soliciting for input from working group members on if there is an issue there that needs to be addressed. We can actually start working from the document and we put our comments and we can start putting our input on this document so that we can start gathering feedback from members on issues they think should be addressed.

Then we also look at criteria for individual membership and what is the criteria that we are going to use. Are we still maintaining work there? is there any issue on the criteria that we have been using before? Are there any issues that need to be addressed on the criteria for individual membership? Then we are also looking at participation and termination of individual memberships, what leads to termination of individual memberships. So basically, if there is anything that needs to be added there or something that needs to be retracted from that document on those issues. We also need some feedback on that and also on voting rights, so participation in decision making to ensure that what's currently there is okay. Is there anything that needs to be added on the voting rights of individual membership? What needs to be done?

Then we also look at, are we going to review this after a specific period of time or at a specific time period, or we are not going to review? Or what is the next step that's going to be done from there? Basically, that's what we're going to look at. So we are open to suggestions now, and I do encourage working group members to start putting their input on that document on issues they think need to be addressed, and adding to that ALS, as you have noticed on the working group working document, we had suggested also to take a survey with the current individual members. So just noticing that [inaudible] we share on the mailing list that we are going to draft a questionnaire or just a few questions that we'll ask our individual members so that we can get feedback from them on their experience with being individual members within AFRALO, what do they think should be addressed.

Okay, now I think I can give the floor to working group members. I see Seun has a hand raised. you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you, chair. I think I want to suggest that if it's possible, perhaps we can start with actually the questions based on the draft of the questions, the questions that we want to administer to the individual members, whether we can actually get those questions as a [inaudible] item so that some of this feedback that we get from that when we conduct the survey, it can then better inform our review of the particular issues documents under review better.

But of course, while we're getting the questions of the survey administered, I think they can run side by side, colleagues within the

working group and [inaudible] feedback on this, their personal [inaudible] on these issues. When we get the outcome of the survey, [inaudible] better inform the working group on this direction.

I also want to confirm, is the survey going to be administered to the individual membership alone or also to the entire membership of AFRALO? That includes the ALS members as well, or is there going to be a different set of questions [inaudible] to ALS in this context of individual membership? Thanks.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Seun. Quite a good suggestion. Yeah, I think we can get the questions from the working group members in this session so that when we make the final list of questions to use on the survey.

Also, the question you asked about are we going to ask to take a survey from individual members only or the ALSes or the AFRALO members, initially, I thought of only individual members, but I'm also thinking now, I don't know, we'll also hear from members what do they think. What I'm also thinking, probably ALSes and other AFRALO members have a suggestion on that so we may need to take a survey from all AFRALO members. I don't know what the working group members think, but I do think maybe some may have some suggestion due to their experience with individual members probably interaction with individual members, working with individual members.

Okay, I do give the floor to Aziz. I see Aziz has his hand raised. You have the floor.

AZIZ HILALI:

Yes. Hello, everyone. And I think I said it the last time, I don't think we should spend so much time on those individual members. I don't think we need to spend more time on individual members than on ALSes. I have some experience at AFRALO and when we started in Johannesburg working on that, I remember our last general assembly we said that we should work on those individual members but we should first—and it's more urgent and it's the heart of ALAC and AFRALO—we should work more on our ALSes.

We have some issues with ALSes that are not active at all and we took some decisions on nonactive ALSes and we asked for the AFRALO leadership to work on that. We had some rules regarding the activity of ALSes. What is an active ALS? What is a nonactive ALS? And I believe that we shouldn't waste too much time on individual members.

I think that this group should work more on the evaluation of the ALSes. The ALSes are expecting from us to take care of them and we have to do a lot for them, a lot of interesting things and we have to really work on our ALSes.

And the last issue I would like to raise, we have ALSes—at least four that I counted that we never got any information from. Four of those ALSes since 2010 maybe. So they never participated, some of those ALSes, they never voted, they never did anything. So let's work first on those ALSes. And the individual members, I agree we can work on it as well, but this is something that enriches AFRALO that is good, that is important. The questions, can they vote, can they not vote exist, but

their participation of individual members can only enrich AFRALO and be positive.

So I think the questionnaire should be done for the ALSes. The ALSes are expecting us to be and to show leadership. We have to give more to our ALSes. They're expecting a lot from ICANN and AFRALO. And let's not spend too much time on those individual members. We have a few of them. That's what I wanted to say regarding those issues. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Aziz. Why we are looking at individual members is basically this group is mainly focusing on the section of individual membership. That is the main focus of this working group. So basically, we are focusing on the issues relating to individual membership. That's why our survey was aimed at individual members. So we are basically looking at section 5.6 to 5.12 which is section covering issues to do with individual membership.

We are not looking at ALSes per se in this working group. However, as Seun suggested, I think [inaudible] meeting, he did highlight that if you think we need to cover more issues as this working group or if anyone within AFRALO thinks that the mandate of this group needs to be extended, that can be raised within AFRALO on the mailing list as highlighted before. So basically, this working group is focusing on individual members.

Is there any hand raised at the moment? [inaudible] Aziz? Okay, I see Seun [has his hand raised.] You can —

SEUN OJEDEJI:

All right. Thank you. I think the chair has actually summarized it very well. I agree with Aziz that we should also look at ALSes, but just as the chair said, this was actually a special purpose working group and it was actually triggered based on what was in the current operating principles that we have.

[inaudible] the first meeting of this working group, we suggested that if folks made those—if we need to expand the scope of the working group, that we should hear that on the mailing list. nobody mentioned it, nobody raised it. And since this is also coming up again, perhaps maybe I will take it up on the AFRALO leadership and discuss with AFRALO leadership on the need to actually extend it. then we put it through to the membership. And if we don't see any other objection to that, then maybe we'll—good thing is that the methodology has not been finalized, so maybe we'll then follow up with the working group on the expansion of the scope.

But the thing is that we have not seen any comments on the mailing list on anybody that's saying it needs to be expanded. But it's just that when we come on the meeting, we hear this expansion coming up, so maybe we can just take this as that is interest to expand the proposals working group and I'll personally follow up with the membership on this since nobody [has said it on the] mailing list.

So [inaudible] action item. Maybe an action item for [inaudible] chair of AFRALO to follow up with the membership on expanding the scope of

the working group to cover some of the standing issues on the ALSes. I hope that helps. Thanks.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Seun. I think staff has noted the action item. And I see a suggestion on the chat room [that suggests] that the question is sent only to individual members. Okay, that's from Emmanuel. Then I also see a question from Michel, what would be the duration of the working group if we extend this work. I'm sure that would depend on how fast or how the working group will actually work on the work that will be there and that will be determined by what will come out from the suggestion that [inaudible] we need to include membership section that's including issues to do with ALS or other issues that are going also to be included on the new—that is if the AFRALO leadership assent to that.

I see Aziz' hand is up. I give the floor to Aziz.

AZIZ HILALI:

Okay. Just to follow up after Seun, I'm not agreeing to broadening this question of ALS within this group. For me, it's better to think about this with old members like those who are very experienced with this members about this problem, and for me, [inaudible].

ISAAC MAPOSA:

I can't hear Aziz.

AZIZ HILALI:

Okay. I'll speak French. Sorry about that. What I wanted to say is in answer to Seun. I actually don't agree with expanding the work right now, and this has to do with my remark on the ALSes. I would prefer to have a group with people who have experience, who have been there for a while who can bring their contribution and who truly know the history of the ALSes so that we can really work on that issue of the ALSes, the ones that are not active, to again think through how we can motivate the ALSes to be more active. That's all.

What I meant, Seun, is that I want this group to work on what it has set out to do, and later, we can have another group that is larger with people with a lot of experience, and that second group will address the issue of the ALSes. That's actually what I meant. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Aziz. Seun, do you have a response to that?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. Thank you for clarifying what you meant. I just wanted to mention that the membership is actually diverse. There are various levels of experience on the current membership. So ultimately, if the individual aspect of the work finishes, this same group can still continue. Maybe you can still call for membership [inaudible] still interested to join the membership, the working group, and then they can continue the second [inaudible].

So maybe it would be good that this working group continue on the current scope while the leadership refine or produce [inaudible] scope

and will give it to the working group, and at that time, call for more membership for anybody that wants to join the working group, and the same working group continues this second scope.

So I think for now, the current work can continue. I think there's enough experience on the working group at the moment to do this current scope and to be able to do the subsequent one. But if we need to add more—the thing is it's a matter of who is available to actually want to do the work. So we can still open the working group call for more membership on those that are going to participate in the second phase of the job, so to the chair of the working group, I think for now, just focus on the current scope. There's already an action item for the chair of AFRALO. In due time I would [communicate] to the working group members on what we have decided in terms of the second scope that we may task this working group to carry out. I hope that helps.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Okay. Thank you, Seun, for responding to that. Then we'll wait on you to hear what will be the outcome from the AFRALO leadership on the issue. Thank you for the response.

Now I see Silvia's hand is up. You have the floor.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Thank you very much. I just wanted to point out and bring to your attention that what prompted the review of this issue of individual membership is the article 5.12 of section 2 membership of the rules, which I'm going to read out.

The individual membership issue will be reviewed by or before two years after the implementation to reconsider the rights and duties of unaffiliated members in light of the experience gained during this initial trial. So the rules mandate this review of individual membership after two years of implementation, which actually has passed. It's been nearly three years, actually. So this is what prompted this review. I just wanted to remind everyone of this. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Silvia, for reminding and for pointing that out. And I'm sure if working group member [inaudible] item 5.1 on the document for operating principles review document. Thank you for that.

Now we can move on with the issues that we're looking at. We wanted some feedback on what questions should we ask on the survey to the individual members so that we can get feedback on their experience through the individual membership journey for the [inaudible] individual members. So basically, we can now put up the questions for the survey, [do call] for suggestions, which questions do you think we should ask from our individual members? Seun, your hand is up.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you, chair. I think in terms of the survey questions, perhaps we can actually ask staff to see if perhaps staff have some experience in administering surveys and things like this, can ask them to suggest give us a list of possible questions and this working group can then look at those questions and then see whether we want to add anyone or remove and then have it published for administration. That's my

suggestion because if we want to start thinking about question on this call, we may not get as much. Thanks.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Seun, for the suggestion. So should that be put as an action item? So we give that to staff to put that as an action item, then we'll get feedback from staff.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Hello. Yes. I can send you some ideas about the survey. Actually, it's the first time that we're going to do such a review for individuals, so we can come up with some ideas and send it to the co-chairs and to the working group, actually, to start a conversation. It all depends on what we want to try to fix, what is not working well, what is working well. So we can come up with some ideas to start the conversation with u. and see how you want to do this diagnosis. So we'll take that action item. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Silvia. Yeah, basically what we need is to get all the feedback we can get from them on all issues on their experience. So basically, we need what did they experience during the individual membership journey, are there any issues that they think should be changed on the issues to do with individual membership? Thank you, Silvia.

Is there any contribution? Okay, I don't see any hand or anything on the chat. So I think we can move on to our next issue. Wanted to work on

the question, so now we are leaving that to staff, then we'll wait for the feedback from staff.

So basically, we can move to our next item on our agenda, we can move on to what will be the next steps. Our next steps are we'll be working with staff to send us the questions which we'll administer for the survey to individual members. Then also, working group members should start inputting their feedback on the document. We had said [inaudible] titled issues under review. We can start inputting our contributions on that document so that we can actually start working on the core issues which this group is meant for. So we need your contributions on that document.

Then I think that's all. Is there anything else? Probably I may have left out anything else. Is there anything else? Okay. If there is no any other contribution or any other hand raised, is there Any Other Business? We can move to the next item, Any Other Business.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Chair.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Yes, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: [I don't know if it is] Any Other Business issue, but I just wanted to check because during this period, we also have to be sensitive of the fact that some people are quite—even though they are locked down does not

mean that—they are probably busier during lockdown than on normal day. So just wanted to check perhaps maybe due to the attendance today, I don't think it's very significant, at least compared to what we had last time. So it would be good to know whether once in two weeks is too much or whether it [should] be once a month or whether it's—I'm just wondering what could be [inaudible] how do we improve attendance [inaudible] comfortable, [inaudible]? Even though I remember that this timing was based on Doodle if I recall correctly. But I just want to raise that it may not be something of major concern, but just to raise it. Thanks.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Okay. Thank you, Seun. I think we can get the feedback from working group members. What do you think, working group members, on this? Is once in two weeks too much, or do we need to review our meetings to once in a month? I see Sarah's hand is up. I give the floor to Sarah.

SARAH KIDEN:

I apologize for being extremely late. For some reason, this was not on my calendar so I need to check my settings. That said, I just wanted to ask if we are determining if we need to meet once a month or once in two weeks, do we have a timeline for when we need to actually complete the activities? I think that will help us determine how frequently we need to meet. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Thank you, Sarah. There was no specific timeline that we were given. I'm not sure, Seun, do we have a specific timeline on this?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. Actually, chair, you just finished the timeline presentation in your methodology when we started. That is the timeline. It is what is in that methodology that is the timeline. And I think there are some dates that were indicated in that methodology document. That's what the timeline is. Timeline is within the working group to decide, actually. [inaudible] finish.

I hear Aziz saying we should not spend too much time on this. So [inaudible] finish next month or even or in two months' time. It depends. But the timeline is actually flexible and it's according to the working group's decision. Thanks.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Okay. Since after the suggestion about meeting once in a month, probably the timeline on the working document can actually be adjusted and also it's not [inaudible] highlighted that we can't work on stage one in two weeks, so we are actually adjusting on that timeline. So I think that can be adjusted.

Okay, back to the members, should we have it once in a month or in two weeks? I don't see anything on chat.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Chair, may I?

ISAAC MAPOSA: Yes, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'm sorry for raising this. Perhaps it's not an issue as such so maybe we maintain the once in two weeks and then see how it goes. Thanks.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Okay. I see contributions on the chat, someone saying a month is long, we are flooded with calls, we might lose momentum. Perhaps every two weeks is a good sequence. Okay, we can continue with the meeting after every two weeks. I think it's okay if people are okay with that. So I think that's all for now.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello. Sorry for interrupting. Yes, about this sequence, I just wanted to contribute that based on the experience in similar working groups, two weeks is a good sequence because everybody still remembers what they have discussed. And perhaps as a good practice for the co-chairs, few days before, like four, five days before to share already the agenda, any documents and start the conversation online with emphasis and enthusiastic conversation online so when people come online in the Zoom room, they already started the conversation online a few days before through the mailing list.

So staff can send a reminder like a week before and start prompting the conversation online as well. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA: It's okay. Thank you, Silvia. So stick to our current arrangement of meeting after every two weeks. I think that's all for now. Thank you, everyone, for attending this meeting. Thanks for your time. Please do stay safe wherever you are. See you all in our next meeting in two weeks. Bye, everyone.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Bye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining the call. This meeting is now adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]