

---

YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALS mobilization working party call taking place on Wednesday, 27th of May 2020 at 13:00 UTC.

On our call today we have Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Barrack Otieno, Eduardo Diaz, Yrjö Lansipuro, Judith Hellerstein, David Mackey, Amrita Choudhury, Justine Chew, Nadira Al-Araj.

We have received apologies from Raymond Mamattah, Maureen Hilyard, and from Dev Anand Teelucksingh. And my apologies that I forgot to record Sarah Kiden's name and she's present on our call.

From staff's side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğan, Herb Waye, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar present on today's call. I'll be doing call management also.

And just a kind reminder before we start to please record your names before speaking for the transcription purposes, please. And I see that Roberto Gaetano has now joined us as well, and now we leave the floor back to you, Alan. Thanks so much.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Thank you very much, and the agenda has been posted. I don't believe there's anything substantive change from previous ones. And I'll note I have asked staff to put on a two-minute timer for interventions, and it'll be used throughout the meeting.

---

*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.*

---

May we have the Google doc up, please, with the accreditation process? Just a note to staff, if we could scroll down a little bit below this, please. Keep going until we get a note to staff. That's it. And just noting that the ALS tracking page has a lot of applications on it which are very old, some of them including the full unredacted document.

Now, we don't have a formal policy for how to get rid of these that are still there. I'm not sure why some of them are still there. Some of them go back many years. But if I could ask staff to start working on them—and I'm sure I and Maureen can act as consultants on how to get rid of them, but we do need to clean this up.

And I will assume Heidi and/or Evin will take note of this. Hearing silence from both of them, I assume that means yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Thank you. Can we scroll on to item number two then? There were no other substantive changes in item number one, and I've not heard any comments recently, so I'm going to assume that is acceptable.

Number two is the due diligence issue, and there's a number of things here. The first one I have is there was a comment last time about the line "verifying general funding sources," that it's not clear that it's our responsibility to verify all of their funding sources. And I've replaced that with "If unclear in the application, confirm that no ICANN funding is

---

expected and any funding sources do not imply control by industry or government.”

Can we have a discussion on this? Is this a reasonable replacement? Does this transfer the intent of what the original one is without the wording that some consider offensive? Anyone have any comments?

The absence of comments, I'll assume this is acceptable. David, please go ahead.

DAVID MACKKEY:

Hi. A question, Alan. I'm not disagreeing. How is it possible for us to determine funding sources? It certainly is a very important question, I'm just wondering what abilities we have to determine funding sources.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

I don't know if we do at all. And the item has been there since the beginning. I don't know how staff has been acting on it. Perhaps we could hear from Heidi or Evin as to how either the current implementation is, or was it ignored? When I asked, are all of these being done, the answer was yes, all of these were being done. So I'm not quite sure to what extent they are. Evin has her hand up, so please proceed.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks, Alan. Actually, on both the application as well as the due diligence, there is a question about funding. The main, I think, concern from ICANN and At-Large perspective is that the potential ALS is not

---

dependent on ICANN for funding. So on the due diligence, they basically have to answer no to that question. And then I think we have to check that they're not overly reliant upon certain entities such as governments. But it wouldn't necessarily be a no if they were, but they just have to show, I guess, how they're influenced or where their funding comes from.

Most of them have funding coming from membership dues, kind of like grass roots volunteer support, but it is a question and if it's not answered on the application, then I do ask them for the due diligence to explain where the general funding comes from. And many of them are nonprofits, of course, so they don't have an income but they are reliant upon their volunteers.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

Thank you, Evin. Do you actually ask them, do you have funding from government, or are we using the word saying you're not controlled by government?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Yeah, I think it's the latter. It's on the application. I could look it up if you'd like.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

I'm aware that there is questions about reliance, who are you controlled by, but if we don't specifically say, "Are you funded by government or industry," but rather controlled, then we should remove this question. If we don't care that they get money from them, as long as they have a

---

convincing argument why those entities do not control them, then I think we need to leave it at that. Thoughts from anyone else?

Funding does not necessarily mean in control, although obviously in many cases, there is implicit control because their funding is contingent on something.

DAVID MACKEY:

Hi Alan. If I can just finish what I started then, thanks, Evin and Alan, that makes sense. It certainly makes sense to ask for a statement of where their funding is or whether or not they're controlled by industry or government.

As to the verification of it, maybe we don't have to worry about the verification at the time of the application, but if they said one thing on their application and it turns out later that that's not true, well, that could be a violation of the intent of the integrity of the application they put in.

And maybe we should have wording as such as opposed to the verification of it. Thanks, Alan. That's my input.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. We have a stream of people with their hands up. Amrita, please.

---

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Alan. I agree with what David mentioned because asking about funding, there could be a capture of any organization by private or by government. Simultaneously getting funding for an NGO or a civil society by government or private is a given thing, because else, they would not be able to do projects or work because membership money may be quite less for them. Or some may not be even taking membership.

Also, are we or ICANN staff in a position to actually vet whether there is a capture by any particular stakeholder on the ALS? I doubt it. So perhaps we need to look at rephrasing the question.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Sarah?

SARAH KIDEN: Hi. I agree with Amrita's comment about funding from the government. I've seen cases where the ministry of ICT for example will give an ALS funding for an event like a national IGF. So, does this count as funding from the government as well? Thank you.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Thank you. So, what is the consensus? We are already asking who are you controlled by. I don't think we're in a position to verify funding, and I don't think we can presume that because there is some funding from government, that they are controlled by them or industry. ICANN for instance, lots of organizations receive donations from industry but are not necessarily controlled by them.

---

I see there's a whole bunch of things in the chat, which I'm not reading at this point. Does anyone want to speak and add something? Eduardo, please summarize first and tell us where we are.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Well, I was just going to say, just leave there, confirm that no ICANN funding is expected and get rid of the rest of [inaudible] in there, because that's really what we want to say, right?

ALAN GEEENBERG:

Okay. Everyone agree? Cheryl says, "Asking is okay." Okay, so we'll get rid of the rest of the sentence. We'll ask about ICANN funding. But that's already on the application. So that's not a verify. So it sounds like it's not part of the actions of due diligence. It may be a question on the due diligence that we have to tick off. But it's not something that we actually have to go out and get more information on, unless of course they don't fill that out on the application. There's an implicit statement that anything which is blank on the application, staff have to follow up on.

next one, there is one that says require the applicant to demonstrate the identity of individual constituents. That is not a new statement. That's been there, and I don't know exactly what that means. And I'll note that during the first part of this work party's work, we decided that we would be asking applicants for a measure of the size of their organization in terms of number of people, and we would also optionally ask them to give us something about the demographics. That is, are they students, technologists? Who are they, what are they?

---

But in many cases, an organization may not even know what the people are in real life, and therefore it's an optional request. So given that background, what is the meaning and need for this last statement? It sounds like it is somewhat redundant, and I'm not sure to what extent we actually do this right now. And Evin may have some thoughts on that as well. Eduardo's hand is up. Please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I recommend to get rid of that bullet altogether. Thank you.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Thank you. Evin, any comments on, is this really done? And what does it mean?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Alan. Just verifying the identity of the leadership, or people noted on the application? Was that the question?

ALAN GEEENBERG: It says requiring the applicants to demonstrate the identity of their individual constituents.

EVIN ERDOGDU: I think that could mean both the membership and the leadership. From what I do, whoever they list on their application, I just check like on a public website let's say that they've also listed that corresponds, or maybe they're on LinkedIn. Just connecting organizations to the people



---

they listed. And I may contact them if they have an e-mail address and just get a response. So it's just more like a check that those people are actually affiliated. But I don't ask them to send a list of their membership or something like that.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay, so you use it in relation to the leadership or those who are making the application, not the full membership.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Correct, because there have been a couple cases where there have been applications that weren't necessarily official structures, or maybe their leadership, there was some confusion. So I think it is kind of a good practice to just confirm that the people are who they say they are, basically.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But that's not constituents.

ALAN GEEENBERG: What you're saying is what we are doing now in terms of this is not trying to identify their individual constituents but verifying that the people named in the application are who they say they are, and have cognizance, are aware of the application.



---

the various responses from either the applicants or GSE or external, like ISOC headquarters into that timeline.

And I think if we did that, then it could stay at 90 days. But it needs to somehow factor in the response time.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

Okay. Alp did put that into the chat last time. My comment to that however is my understanding is we have a 90-day, three-month period for the time from which the application is submitted until the time the ALAC decides they're admitted or not, or accredited or not.

I thought that was the 90-day number. Here we are asking how much time is needed before you have the due diligence completed to send to the RALO. Is that 90 days right now? That means the overall process probably takes six months.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

I see. Okay, so that's less.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

Okay, come back, but note the time here is the time for us to do the due diligence from the start, from the time we receive the application, until the time due diligence is completed. It excludes any time waiting for the applicant to respond to new questions.

So an application is put on hold and the clock stops moving, while we're waiting for them to answer questions. It does not stop moving when

---

we're waiting for GSE or anyone else to do their work. So that's the time we're looking for. And I'm hoping it's something well under 90 days, otherwise we have a real problem.

But you should certainly have records of typically how long it takes from the time the application is submitted until the time you send it off to the RALOs. So you should have plenty of information on recent applications for what that timing is.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Okay, I'll put it in the Google doc.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Of course, your logs will not have stopped the clock, because real time is still passing. So what you have should be very much an upper limit. Okay, has there been anything in the chat that I need to look at?

ALI ALMESHAL: Yes, Alan, can I please comment?

ALAN GEEENBERG: Please go ahead.

ALI ALMESHAL: Sorry for coming late, but maybe I missed a part. I've noticed from your comment that you said the time required, it will stop once it goes to the applicant.

---

I think we need to put a time as well of the applicant to respond, because we cannot keep it open for them until they decide when they want to respond to the applications if there are some more info required as part of the due diligence.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Thank you, Ali. You're right, and I think we're covering that later on.

ALI ALMESHAL: Okay. Thanks.

ALAN GEEENBERG: All right. Then let's assume this is accepted. And we will fill that number in when it comes in. Number three, for final approval. Upon completion of the due diligence, the application revised if applicable, and the due diligence completed by staff, will be forwarded to the leadership of the RALO of the geographic region in which the applicant organization resides.

For purposes of this process, the RALO leadership is defined as the RALO chair, any vice chairs, and any secretariat.

The RALO leadership may share the application documents with the region's ALAC members, leadership council as appropriate—so that could include the EURALO board, it could include the LACRALO elders committee. It's not a defined term. As appropriate—ss well as others deemed to be part of the extended regional leadership. There had been an objection to referring to past leaders, regional leaders or ALAC

---

members, and we're making it a more general statement that if the regional leadership believes that they need the advice of specific other people, that is within their mandate to include it. The extended regional leadership composition must be documented, so they have to make it clear who they consult with. The documents may be sent via e-mail or made available on a restricted access Wiki. That's part number one.

Part two, at the regional leadership's option, the documents or redacted versions thereof—and we'll talk about that in a moment—may be posted on a restricted access Wiki available only to primary representatives of the RALOs, of the RALO ALSes. Whatever process is to be followed must be documented and used consistently.

So that says the existing ALSes may be consulted through their primary reps, but that's an option of the region. Some regions may do it, some regions may not.

In all cases, none of those provided with access to the documents may further distribute them in whole or in part. That has to do with privacy. Implementation note: the extent to which the documents need to be redacted before distribution to the ALS needs to be explored, and that's during implementation of this.

Note that often, the names of the prospective ALS leaders and proponents is often an important consideration. So I think the intent of this based on previous discussions is that we not redact the names, which are definitely personal information, because the names often tell something to the people in the region about this organization.

---

Therefore, it does contain personal information and access and distribution must be restricted.

And I see we have several hands up. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. All of the controls in B and as it goes on, “the must nots,” [inaudible] because it’s all about allowing certain degree of self-determination within the regional behaviors, but even when those regional behaviors exist, giving some guardrails so that they don’t risk themselves for issues of various types of liabilities, etc.

I have a problem with the “may share” in A. I don’t think it should be interpreted that this is an expectation, rather, that if the RALO leadership are already doing it or if it is their practice, or blah-blah. I just don’t want it read in my view that this is an expectation. I think it should be carefully written to say, if indeed this is the practice, then the following applies.

So the “may share” to me still is giving an encouragement or permission. Of course, as we know in some regions, this is not the practice and very much never will be. So that’s my only—[inaudible] from my perspective. Thank you.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

Sorry you're talking about A? I don't know any regions that don't—

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm only talking about A, as I said to begin with, I'm happy with all of the other [inaudible] stuff. It is the word "may" as in "permission and encouragement that I [inaudible] every time.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay. I don't think we can restrict it to what has been done in the past, because RALOs are allowed to change their procedures.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Not arguing that.] I'm saying don't make it an expectation that that is what should be happening.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Understand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's not "must and shall," I have a problem with that "may."

ALAN GEEENBERG: Can you suggest another word?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not at this unearthly hour of the night. If it was a normal meeting time, probably.



---

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay. It ends with saying "This must be documented." If we say the decision on who to share it with must be a formal decision of the RALO leadership and be documented as such, does that do it for you?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, because that's all at the end, and most people read the first bit and not the end anyway. So the upfront and the "may" part. It should be something along the lines of, in the case where the regional processes are that these things happen, then the following applies.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Yeah. I wasn't saying where the sentence would go, but does the sentence I gave you cover yourself? That is, it has to be a formal decision of the RALO leadership and documented as such?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] you'd have to shuffle it. But if shuffling it does the job, and we can't find something in the thesaurus that changes the intent from permission, sure.

ALAN GEEENBERG: We'll cover it next time if you don't like it. Judith, please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I don't understand, are we choosing A or B?

---

ALAN GEEENBERG: We are not choosing. A will always happen. B may happen.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So in the case if a RALO decides that we want to share the applications with the ALS representatives, that we could do that on either a Wiki or a Google doc—the Confluence Wiki is very difficult because it's not mobile friendly. So we prefer to have it on a restricted access Google doc.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Judith, we've had this discussion before. We are not going to micromanage it. There are benefits of the Wiki, there are downsides of Google Docs as well. I will remove the word "Wiki" and replace it with a more generic term, but this will not necessarily be something that is under the control of the region. It may well be decided that you use one or the other.

There are downsides on both wikis and google docs. And we're not going to decide here at that level which to use, and that may evolve over time as other tools become available.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. Yeah, that's fine with me. I just didn't want it to be just one mechanism.

---

ALAN GEEENBERG: Well, it will likely be one mechanism, but I will not specify in this document which mechanism it is. And my mistake for not removing that.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. So then we're going to have both of them here as an option, A and B.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay, the basic statement says RALO leadership, as defined here, the chair, the secretary, the vice chairs, get it. A says they may share it with a larger consultative group which may be their board, may be the ALAC members, some combination like that. It's at the decision of RALO leadership, should they make such a decision and document it. B says they may also share it with the lead reps with the ALSes. One does not preclude the other. Yrjö.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I guess it's fine. I just would have liked it—it seems from reading this that A is first and then B is second, whereas they're both at the same time.

ALAN GEEENBERG: I will make it clear that these are not in sequential order necessarily. Although they might be.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:           Okay. Thanks.

ALAN GEEENBERG:           Yrjö, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:           Thank you, Alan. Yeah, I very much agree with Cheryl that the word “may” is weak here, because it actually leaves the chair of the RALO in the absence of any vice chairman actually—and in the absence of the secretariat, actually leaves the whole thing in the hands of the chair alone.

So please replace the “may” with something else. Encourage, as appropriate, or ...

ALAN GEEENBERG:           Well, there is nothing else. We have no other people other than the RALO leadership who can speak on behalf of the RALO. So whether the RALO leadership decides it on their own in a little cocoon, in consultation with their other leaders, friends, or in consultation with the whole RALO at whatever level it wants, we can't control how they make decisions. All we're saying is the option is it's up to the RALO, and the RALO speaks through the chair, and whatever that RALO does must be documented and used consistently. I'm not sure how else we can put it.

---

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Well, actually, when we discussed this previous time, I suggested some subsidiarity here and that it should be how you define the RALO leadership should not actually be defined here, because each RALO defines that in different way. In EURALO, it means the EURALO board. So that the other way would be to just omit the sentence of how the RALO leadership is defined for this purpose.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay. I'm defining RALO Leadership, capitalized, as the people who are elected, selected to be in those roles. There is then an extended regional leadership, lowercase, which includes the other people who the RALO want to include in their decision process. And the latter is what A is talking about.

Now, you tell me that for EURALO, that includes the EURALO board. But the question is, how do we document this so the prospective applicants know exactly who's going to be reviewing their application. That's something we must do, factoring in privacy legislation. So we must document somewhere who it is that's going to be seeing the application.

What we're saying is the only way the ALAC can know is through the RALO leadership, the formal appointed RALO leadership, and the chair. How the RALO decides that is not something that we can mandate.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: The EURALO board is an elected entity, [plus ad hoc, plus in officio] members. And these are known names documented so that it by no

---

means happens that just a group of unknown people would be making decisions.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

Can you propose some words if you don't like these? Because I'm really lost at this point. We the ALAC have to document who is going to see the application for each region. And I don't know how the ALAC gets that except from the RALO chair who obviously should be speaking with authority and with the approval of the rest of the powers that be in their RALO.

Now, for EURALO, it's fine. It's the EURALO board. For LACRALO, it may or may not be the elder council. For APRALO, it may include the ALAC members. Each of them are likely to be somewhat different.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Okay, Alan. I'll try to formulate that, but I'll send it by e-mail and not now.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

Please, because I'm at a loss. Yes Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

In as much as I caused some of this consternation, I've put a proposal in chat. I know you don't read the chat so I'm drawing your attention to it. And then perhaps people can work on that. Not now, but it's something to start.

---

ALAN GEEENBERG: Thank you. Yrjö, please look at that. It's the second to last entry in the chat right now. Is that something that comes close to what you were happy with?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah. It comes. But if I may return to that just in a few minutes, perhaps in the chat. Thank you.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Thank you. Eduardo, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Alan. In terms of the last sentence there where it says the document be sent via e-mail or available in restricted access Wiki, I will eliminate maybe send by e-mail. E-mail is not restricted at all. I will leave it only on restricted access Wiki or whatever.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Access for the ALSes, I don't believe we have an option but to use the Wiki or something comparable, because that, we can access restrict. My personal feeling is e-mail is acceptable in the first case because these are all going to be people that we believe we have trust in and could even ask for a certification that they will not redistribute. So there's a higher level of trust in the people identified in section A that I felt comfortable in writing e-mail there, and it may well be the easiest way

---

to do this. If everyone wants to restrict it and say only the restricted access Wiki or comparable, then that's fine. I was just giving a little bit more flexibility there.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well, if I can follow up on that, be sent via e-mail the link to the restricted access. Do not send [inaudible]. That's one thing. Thank you.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay. Are you objecting to e-mail or just suggesting we might not need it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I agree with Ed.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm objecting send via e-mail if we're sending the document via e-mail. But if we send a link, I don't have a problem. [inaudible].

ALAN GEEENBERG: Is the general feeling of this group that we should not allow e-mail to send the documents to the RALO extended leadership? It's not to the ALSes but to the leadership.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, it's a weak link. Just put a link to where the document repository is. I agree with Ed absolutely.



---

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay. E-mail is gone, unless I hear other people—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] and then put it on a billboard.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay. I would have liked to think that if we're talking about the RALO leadership and the ALAC members or the board, we could trust them not to do that. But apparently, if we can't, if anyone feels e-mail should be an option for distributing the documents, please put up your hand and say so. Otherwise, it's gone. If you don't like it there, it's already gone, you don't have to say that.

Eduardo, are you finished?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes. Can you repeat the question? Thank you.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Thank you. Sarah.

SARAH KIDEN: I wanted to ask about documenting the composition of the people who go through the process. I had asked a question about where this documentation is kept. If I may give an example of the ICANN fellowship process, you sort of know who the selection committee members are

---

for a particular fellowship round. So not saying this is the best way to do it, but just asking if we will have something similar.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

It must be documented so that the potential applicant knows who is going to be looking at it, either by name or by their positions. Where it will be documented is to be decided. We don't do that right now. It's not part of our current rules. So we don't have a place right now. It must be documented somewhere and it will be documented on a region by region basis. Is that okay, Sarah?

SARAH KIDEN:

I'm trying to think about it, because, well, yeah, I think it's something to think about.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

It's part of the information that we provide to prospective applicants. We're going to be describing, as we do right now, what the application process is, what the steps in it are. As part of that, we will have to define with some clarity who is going to be reviewing the application. It may not be by name, because there's privacy issues there also in some cases. But it will generally be by name or by rank, what your positions are.

So APRALO may say that they include their ALAC members in the decision process. AFRALO may do it in a different way. EURALO may do it in a different way. But we will have to document that so the prospective applicant knows where the information will be going.

---

Peters. I can't hear your if you're speaking. Peters, if you can hear us, put something in the chat to say you can hear us. Okay, I'm assuming he's not able to speak.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, he has said yes in the chat.

ALAN GEEENBERG: But we can't hear him speak. I don't know.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yesim, could you look into why he's not able to ...

ALAN GEEENBERG: May we hear from the EURALO secretary, please?

NATALIA FILINA: Thank you very much, Alan. So I understand and fully agree your concerns about privacy, but I think that the understanding about new potential ALSes on [inaudible] is very important for us. And I think we can get benefits for us if we have opinions of ALSes in the same country for example who has knowledge about this new applicant. And after all, I think we do the same with new individuals who are going to join us, and even if informally, we can ask other people's opinions. And I think, of course, if we have the help from GSE team now and care about privacy, of course, we cannot share the data about new ALSes who wanted to join us. But I think sometimes, we may have some additional

---

information and I think we cannot restrict ourselves with this opportunity or ability to know more about ALSes. Because in our region, we can see—I don't know how can I say it, [not so really want] ALSes on the ground and big difference in official information and the reality, if you can understand me now. Thank you.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay. Let me try to be clear. Are you saying that B is not sufficient, that you want to be able to send it to other people other than the RALO leaders?

NATALIA FILINA: Yes, Alan. As I said in the chat, I think we may share this information between RALOs leadership, its extended team and we may ask about ALAC RALO leaders too and share information between these people.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay. Maybe I'm not understanding something. We're already saying you can share it with ALAC and other people such as your EURALO board. We are saying in B, you can share it with your RALO—with your ALS representatives. All of them. Are you saying there are others that you want to be able to share it with also?

NATALIA FILINA: Maybe we can discuss this opportunity because I suggest to understand that official information from the application form and reality may have

---

some differences. And the opinions other reps of our ALSes is maybe more important for us, because now we have—

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay. Who is it that you would want to share it with that we have not included already?

NATALIA FILINA: Now this information can be just RALO board—

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters.

NATALIA FILINA: It's not enough to have a decision. And as I understand now, GSE team now involved in this work and can say us a positive or negative view to new applicants. But I think maybe it's enough, maybe it's not enough for us.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Okay. After it's reformulated, if it's still not enough, we'll ask you to speak again. Peters, please go ahead.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. First, I want to observe that I sent an e-mail, comprehensive write-up to this group, and I'm sure you got it. I'm surprised no mention was made of the document since we started

---

this meeting, because I recall the other time when I was trying to elaborate my points, you said if I could please put it in writing. [So I'd appreciate] if this could be tabled or mentioned [of members advice, please read through] because some of the positions I have were documented in my document. And if wanted to take my time to get into it and separate them, that would take a lot of time from our one hour. So I, please, want that to be on record.

On this issue we're discussing, I have very serious concern about the definition of extended regional leadership. And the need for the RALO leadership to also communicate with the ALAC members during the process of due diligence.

ALAN GEEENBERG:

Are you saying they should be able to communicate, or should not be able to communicate?

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: I'm not comfortable [inaudible]. Can I just finish? You'll understand when I'm through. Now, the ALAC would be the final body that would recommend the decisions of the RALO to the board for any ALS to be admitted into ICANN. So I do not see the need for the RALO leadership to be communicating with the ALAC members from their region when they will have the opportunity to do their bit at the ALAC meeting once the RALO has recommended any ALS to them. That is number one.

Number two, I also do not understand the need for what is being called the extended regional leadership here, because if I get the definition of

---

extended leadership, you're trying to say past RALO leaders. And I do not see why they should be given a role—

ALAN GEEENBERG: Past RALO leaders is no longer there.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Okay. Now, when you're talking about extended regional leadership, [what does that] constitute, the extended regional leadership?

ALAN GEEENBERG: That is up to the formally appointed regional leadership. In AFRALO, that would be up to the chair, the vice chairs, the secretariat to decide and document. And they may well be consulting with their ALSes in making that decision. It's a regional decision.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Okay. Fine. [The reason why would you want this body to create cohesion] within the different RALO is to begin to put in place rules that can make the leadership of the various RALOs perform their duties.

Now, you never can tell the [interest] of any RALO leadership. If you talk of RALO leadership, you're talking of just three individuals out of so many members within that RALO. Now, they are at liberty to decide what they want to do for the interest of a majority of thousands of members.

---

So if they can restrict their functions to what is prescribed within the ICANN rules, fine. We try to give them extended powers. They may decide if they like. Where rules are set, loopholes should not be created for people to play around with. So we may have good intentions in putting it in place, but we do not know the intentions of those who'll be in the leadership position at any point in time.

So I do not see the possible need for us to see the RALO may decide to extend their leadership. You are giving them powers that they do not merit even from the structure of the ICANN rules. So I for one do not support that extension or that condition that [they may choose or they may not, they may not want it.]

ALAN GEEENBERG:

Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who supports the position that RALOs should not have the discretion for making the decision as they wish, and it should only be limited to the RALO leadership proper?

From my perspective—and I'm giving you my personal position—is a RALO elects its leadres and has to put some trust in them, just like we do in virtually every other political organization in the world. But if a particular RALO chooses not the trust their own leaders and demands that everything be put to a plebiscite, that is the business of that RALO. I don't think it's quite operational, but that is their business.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: I wouldn't want—



---

ALAN GEEENBERG: Peters, you've had your word. Let other people speak, please.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Hold on. I need to make myself clear because there are terms you are using that could influence the decision of other members in this group. Don't use the word "trust." Nobody is talking about trust here. We are talking about rules. So it has nothing to do with trust. [inaudible].

ALAN GEEENBERG: Please, you're into your third two minutes. I'd like to give other people a chance—

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Now, you didn't address my first [inaudible], Alan. Why was my document not mentioned to this group since the beginning of this meeting?

ALAN GEEENBERG: People read e-mail. I don't have to mention the document.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: [inaudible].

ALAN GEEENBERG: Everyone received it and read it.

---

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: No, Alan, this is an official document—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Those of us who did read it, can we assume we don't need to have it read out?

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: [inaudible].

ALAN GEEENBERG: Peters.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: No, sorry, please. I've not—

ALAN GEEENBERG: You've sent a many-page document. We're not going to read it in this group.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: The question is, when I was going to speak last week, you said I should put it in writing. And I've done that bit. So it's expected of you as the leader of this group to have mentioned that, yes, this has been communicated to you [inaudible].

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

ALAN GEEENBERG: It is now mentioned.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Peters. I think you're being a little sensitive here. I certainly—and I believe everyone—most assuredly, unless they are not reading any of their e-mails and they are not contributing to the work of this group, have read your missive. I think it is this business of this meeting to finish its work on this document. I don't see that it is mutually exclusive, nor compulsory, for us to have gone through the minutiae of your very extensive text. Thank you for your text, that's fine.

Now, in answer to Alan's question relating to what you have just gone into detail on, I see this text as an effort to put controls and refine and define specific guard rails or subsidiary rules to those very rules you and your document are referring to as being paramount.

So in the case where a RALO has a practice of sharing this material, these words should be acting as control points and guard rails for how and why and to who that material does in fact get distributed and who has or has not got access to it in the short-, the medium-, and the long-term.

All of this work we're doing is complementary, not critical, to what I believe—and I did read your document, including the highly inflammatory text within it—is asking for. There's the answer to your question, Alan.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for your intervention. We are past the end of the hour. I will allow the people whose hands are up to speak, and then we will adjourn, and hopefully next week, we'll have a more productive meeting. Natalia, please go ahead.

NATALIA FILINA: Sorry, old hand.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Thank you. Amrita, please go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Alan. I agree with what Cheryl has said, and RALO leadership has to have some discretionary power to take a decision. However, if someone has some issues with that decision, they can ask for clarification. But that doesn't mean we should not give them the authority to take a particular decision. Thank you.

ALAN GEEENBERG: Thank you. I don't think we can overrule the leadership in how they make their decisions. It's up to their own RALO. If a RALO elects leaders and they find the leadership is not doing what they think is reasonable, most RALOs have a way of removing their leaders, should they choose, or certainly not reelecting them.

---

All right. There have been a number of things in the chat which we have not read out. Some of them are substantive. I suggest when the chat is published, you go back and read it. It may be worth your while. We didn't get very far today. I hope we will get farther next week. I will try to reword this document, this section to be clearer, and the intent.

I thank you all for your time, and I'll see you next week. Thank you.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**