
MICHELLE DESMYTER: Welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the AFRALO single purpose call ALS Mobilization on Thursday the 11th of June 2020.

On today's call, we do have Vernatius Okwu Ezeama, Pastor Peters, Jacob Odame-Baiden, Bukola Oronti, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Alan Greenberg, Dave Kissoondoyal, Patricia Esther Akello, Hadia Elminiawi, Isaac Maposa, Sarah Kiden, Sarata Omane, Seun Ojedeji.

Apologies are noted from Joan Katambi.

From staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Yaovi Atohoun and myself, Michelle DeSmyter on call management. A friendly reminder to everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I will turn the meeting over to Seun. Please begin.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thanks a lot, Michelle, and hello everyone. Welcome. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to you all. Welcome to this single purpose call. I trust you're all doing fine and keeping safe during this period. We all hope that we'll get through this while we remain safe. Let's continue to keep the hope alive.

This call is a single purpose call, as you imagine, and the essence of it is to discuss the work of the current status of the work party that's the ALS Mobilization work party which was actually the aftermath of the last At-Large review that was done which was under one of the issues that was recognized and which the ALAC, the At-Large committed to actually improve ALS participation within ICANN. So that is the main purpose of this call, and this call itself was triggered by Pastor Peters—thanks to him—who actually suggested that it will be good to discuss based on some of the points or issues that may have been observed by him and perhaps may also be observed by other members of the work party as well which we are trying to ascertain.

I just want to make something clear in this call. The main purpose is this is not really a call of me versus you or you versus me, it's really a call of us trying to hear the—understand the status of this, hear the issues and then see if there's a way forward. But before I continue, there goes the agenda which has been presented to us on the screen. My apologies, I should have asked for the review of agenda before [inaudible] my welcome. Any suggestion for addition or removal from the agenda?

Okay, seeing no hand up and hearing no voice, I take it as the agenda is adopted. And just to conclude my welcome, once again, I'd like us to remain focused on the issues, on whatever is the main topic of discussion, and let's see how we can collectively provide clarity and also agree on way forward.

Let me also recognize the presence of the chair of the work party, Alan Greenberg who has been invited to also help provide clarity wherever required, and I also want to recognize [inaudible]

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: I can't hear Seun, please.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Seun, we think we've lost you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: You've lost me?

MICHELLE DESMYTER: There we go. You're back. Your audio was cutting out.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Sorry. My connection is actually not very good today. I'm in a different location. [Most gratitude] to Pastor Peters for actually getting this thing to our attention and having us do this single-purpose call. Without wasting time, and considering that we are busy, I would like that we just move on to the next item on the agenda, unless anyone has any remark to make. Any remark on what I've stated in terms of how we approach this particular session?

Okay, we'll move to the next item on the agenda, which is discussion on status of the ALS Mobilization work party. I would like to ask current members of the work party, any one of them to actually give us a brief. It mustn't be the entire gist of how far you've gone, but please just give us a brief on what you believe is the status of things within the work party. The floor is open. I would like to ask the staff to also paste the

Wiki link to the work party in the chatroom as well. Do we have any work party member who's on the call who wants to give something, a status briefly?

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Since I'll be making a presentation, [sorry to be, why not somebody else] give a report on that? Sarah is on the call. So I don't know any other member from AFRALO who is on the call who is on here. I know Sarah is in the work party and she's around, so she's another person who can do that.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thanks, Pastor Peters. So Sarah, if you're in a position to speak, can you kindly just give us a brief ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Hi everyone. I'll just give a brief about what I believe, and if anyone else has other comments, they can update or correct me. So the task of the ALS Mobilization work party is to make a recommendation to the At-Large Advisory Committee—that's the ALAC—on what needs to be done to allow full implementation of changes in support of At-Large structure participation in At-Large in accordance with the plan proposed under issue number two of the At-Large review that was approved by the ICANN board in 2018 and 2019.

So we started with the ALS mobilization plan, and the focus was not what we've been doing but how we've been interacting with ALSes and what we need to do in the future. Some of these issues were already

known before, like things people have already been identifying, but I think it was important to go through this process and see what was working and what was not and see how to improve the process.

And for the ALS mobilization plan, the issues were around active participation and how we use ALSes as a source of getting participants to be involved in ICANN policy development processes, things around ALS expectation, things around what we expect from staff, staff support and so on.

So right now, with we are looking at the current ALS application procedure and due diligence process. I think as many of you are aware, for an ALS to become member, they have to submit an application. They fill in a form and then staff will do due diligence and then it will be sent to the regional At-Large organization. In this case, that's AFRALO. Then for the case of AFRALO, we will bring it up with the members and then this is sent to members for voting.

So the working group right now is looking at the things that happen from the time an organization actually submits their application until the time when they are voted or approved as an ALS. And we've had a few meetings so far on this subject, and the work is still continuing. I think that's what I can say briefly. Thank you very much.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thanks a lot, Sarah, for that brief, and thanks to yourself and the rest of the representatives from APRALO that are participating. Can I ask staff to display the page of the membership of the work party? So from the membership—I'm not seeing the membership on the screen. From

the membership, I'm seeing that we have seven members from AFRALO participating in this. And this is—actually, we have several members and we have other participants who are also from AFRALO. So I think AFRALO ten in total in terms of names on the membership list. So the core membership, seven, and then the other people that are participating who have [inaudible] member status, three. Can anybody in the group clarify which ones are participants—is that the core membership? Let's get clarification on that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I can try. So there was a call. I can't remember when the call was made. And people were asked to join the work party as members. And I think everyone who submitted an expressions of interest was added to the group. So after the group started its work, there are people who said that they would love to join just to listen in, not as members but just to observe the work of the work party. And I think those are the people who are observers. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

They're the ones referred to as participants, right?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thanks for this. It's good to see that we have some of our members participating in this. That's very good. And I think that

summary is fine for me unless anybody has any other question to ask some of the members of the work party from AFRALO. I would suggest that we just move straight on to item four where we'll then discuss some of the concerns that have been observed by members of the work party.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Seun, if you're speaking, we're not able to hear you.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Could you dial out to him? Seun, we lost you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you hear me?

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Yes, we can hear you now. Let me know if you would like a dial out, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, the problem is that if I get a dial out, I would lose Internet connectivity because I'm using my mobile to connect.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Okay. Just let me know if you change your mind.

SEUN OJEDEJI: All right. I'm sorry for this network issue. What I was saying was that we'll move to the item four where we'd actually hear issues from the members of the work party, and indeed from any other members of this region who have observed any issues whatsoever that they want to raise. We have actually formally received concerns from Pastor Peters, and since that is already [on the ground,] it should be good that we start with that and then we can address that and then move to any other members who have other issues that have not already been raised by Pastor Peters. So on this note, I'll call on Pastor Peters to actually lead us through this one. You have the floor, Pastor Peters.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Thank you, Seun. Before I make my interventions, I want to echo what Seun said earlier: this call is not between Pastor Peters and anybody. This call is Pastor Peters as a member of the ICANN community whose ALS has been involved with ICANN for almost 11 years now and I've been participating with all the ICANN events believing in the fact that our involvement in ICANN is to further the goals of ICANN via our contributions and involvement. And as a result, it is my responsibility as much as others' that where there are issues that [could bother on] the core values of ICANN, it is appropriate that we speak out and see how we could amend issues. It has nothing to do with any personal issues, it's purely on defending what ICANN stands for.

I want to say that, yes, I'm happy to have been a member of different working group, including this work party. Yet since the inception of the work party, based on what Sarah just said as to the demand by the ICANN board to see how ALS can be actively involved in the activities of

ICANN, which was what may have led to the work party, in that sense, what should be the focus of the work party should be what are the things that can be done to encourage or to enlarge the involvement of the ALS in the activities of ICANN, because they represent primarily the core interests of ICANN which is the Internet end users.

But as we began to go along, [I know that] issues and topics that were coming up, to me, were not promoting that very purpose, but the issues and discussion were centered around [others stifling] or trying to curtail or try to restrict or try to kind of [exact] some powers over ALS involvement, so I began to be worried.

Two issues I want to raise. Some of us could recall, sometime ago there was an issue that bordered on how many groups within ICANN should an ALS member belong to. And that generated a lot of discussion. I actually had to raise this issue to the public forum. Up until that, the final word on that has not been decided.

Now, moving on to the ALS application process. When I looked at the goals of this work party and the [inaudible] been going on and the issues that are coming up, I could not in my good conscience just let it be. I had to take time to go study the ICANN bylaws, and I began to compare it with the terms of reference or the way the work party was going.

Number one, the working group was formed and then when proposals were made as to the application process, I know that I made a contribution on the floor of the work party and I [inaudible] these issues that are being discussed, by the time we finish this discussion, would the ALSes be given the opportunity to review whatever our positions as

a draft—whatever it is, a draft proposal, would it not be wise to allow ALSes to look at it, and if they have any input, [inaudible] and then it's collected and sent to ALAC. ALAC can then look at it.

But I was told, no, there is no way ALS will have the opportunity to do that. It will be sent to ALAC, ALAC can look at it. When ALAC is done, ALAC can send it to the ALSes, which contravenes section 1.2.(a)iv of ICANN bylaw, which made very clear that every ICANN activity shall employ open, transparent and bottom-up multi-stakeholder policy development processes and also ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process.

So, I was using that as my basic argument. What I did was to take time to put [a position] paper to the working group so that they could all look at it and then we can see how this paper can also enrich our discussion. But this was not done. My paper, whether it was read or not, [inaudible].

And so I fret I have to take it further and which was why I had to bring it up to my regional meeting, because I know the ALS constitutes the RALO. The RALOs are responsible for the election of two third members of ALAC, one third are appointed. So by extension, all the RALOs should have more influence over what goes on within ALAC, and not the other way around.

And permit me to ask, if you'll go to page two of my document, this is where the fundamental questions are asked, because—I ask, what informed this very review process in the first place? Sarah, if I [inaudible] the proposal was to see how we can engage ALS, a greater

involvement with ICANN activities. But so far so good. That doesn't seem to be going on. What was working well with the process in review? What is not working well with the process in review? If some areas within the process in review did not work well, does it warrant this elaborate and expansive review that has taken the shape of assizes?

Going further, I want to be specific because within the next two or three weeks or thereabouts, this work party would conclude its duty and then will refer whatever document that will come out of it to ALAC. Now, I want us—there's a copy. I don't know if the staff has a copy of the work party document that we're actually working on on the ALS application process. If they have a draft, they can share it. I want to draw attention of this group to the area that has to do with suspension, deaccreditation of ALS.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Pastor Peters, I just want to identify the first issue for what you just said now, which is the one about approval process. That is, the approval of the recommendation of the work party. So the approval process, now you're suggesting that it should actually get to the RALO first, RALO [as well as the RALO] should be part of the approval process and not just the ALAC alone. So I just want to identify the first issue. Is that correct?

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Not approval per se. Before the approval. ALAC is going to be the one to—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Once again I dropped.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: So what I said was that before the document is submitted to ALAC, the ALSes should be given the opportunity to review what the work party document that is coming out from this work party document, their review could be added to the collection of whatever's going to be submitted to ALAC.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: [inaudible] sending it back to AFRALO. That is following the bottom-up process of ICANN activities. Seun, are you there?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: We lost you there. I don't know if you heard me.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you hear me?

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: I hear you now.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Staff, can you do a dial out to me? I'm just probably going to do audio only, because I think my audio is more important than the Zoom.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Certainly. One moment, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thanks. Pastor Peters, continue.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: It is good you are online so that you can hear what I'm going to say so that we don't have to be going back and forth.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. No problem. Sorry, I do apologize for this. I understand that our time is already running, but we'll get through this fast enough. We won't have to spend much time. But —[inaudible]

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I don't hear anything. Is it only me?

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Seun will be on in just a moment.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Welcome, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thanks a lot. My apologies again. So yes, Pastor Peters, I heard you clearly. You were saying that ALSes should have the opportunity to review the outcome of the work party before it goes to ALAC for approval. So that's noted.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: [inaudible] in line with the appropriate sections of the ALAC bylaws, that every policy decision process should follow the bottom-up multi-stakeholder process, not top to bottom.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I understand. [inaudible] what I understand at moment is that the current work party that is working is actually—they're all drawn from various RALOs. So the development of this document itself has actually been done by the various members of that working group, which actually to some extent implied that there's a representation in those that are developing the document.

But the aspect we may also think [or that] we should also encourage is that when the final draft is ready for the final draft to be shared with all

the members of the RALOs just in case there's any other person that has comments.

I get that point, but I think let's just [make it as a point] then [inaudible] take the comments up. Perhaps to make it easier and so that we can actually feel that we are making progress, I should open the floor on this particular one. Let's thresh this out and then—before we move to the next comment or issues that have been raised. Is that okay? Because I think as you open the floor now, what do colleagues think, [inaudible] right now, the membership of the work party are actually from the RALOs, that's why I asked that we display membership of the work party. Do you think that RALO should also push for the outcome of the work party to be shared with the entire ALSes for review before the ALAC then make a decision on the draft? I would like to hear opinions on this matter. The floor is open.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Abdulkarim is raising his hand.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Abdulkarim, you have the floor.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much, Seun. I wanted to first of all raise one thing: are we going to pick the points one after the other, or we allow Pastor Peters to finish, then we now pick the points? I don't know whichever way you want to go. [inaudible]

SEUN OJEDEJI: [I've just said that] it should be one after the other so that we can at least be making progress as we're continuing [inaudible] any point that is raised.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I think on this point, Pastor Peters is making a wonderful point. From my little experience with the ALAC, the ALAC has always been [what I see as] top-down approach is always what has been used. And I'm not sure, especially with the At-Large, I do not think it's going to fly, basically because my own personal perspective is it's not in the place whereby things like that are going to fly. How is it going to be done? Is it that the statement is going to be submitted to the ALSes and after which it's going to come back to the ALAC? Which I think is one of the best approach for this. Thank you.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: My proposal is that the work party, yes, has representative from RALOs, but it is not all the RALO members. And the RALO members that are in the work party have not been reporting back to their various RALOs. Their involvement to a large extent is for themselves and for their ALSes. So my concern is that because of the power, because of the impact that this review will have on the ALS and the RALOs, I am of the opinion that yes, by the time this work party finishes its draft, the final draft, then it should be shared to the RALOs. Let them look at it and see where they have any input or disagreement. Whatever we are doing is

not a secret document. It is transparent and open. That is the ICANN bylaws.

So for you to carry the [weight that, yes, everybody has carried along,] the work party do not lose anything if it releases the document within a week or a few days asking the members to look at it and make their input before they submit it to ALAC. In that case, ALAC will be looking at one single document, not for us to take it to ALAC, ALAC look at it, and whatever the ALAC [inaudible] send it back to the RALOs, RALOs return it back to ALAC. That is wasting of time and responses. And then we are not following the rules as stipulated by ICANN's bylaw in section 1.2 which is multi-stakeholder, bottom-up approach.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thank you, Pastor Peters. I think that is noted. So what I have on [the ground] is recommend sharing the final document with ALSes before finalizing to ALAC. All right, can we move to the next issue, please, if there are no hands up?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Seun, there's a comment from Barrack on the chat. He's saying that ALAC work party reports to the ALAC as the chartering organization, and Barrack says the work party cannot report to RALOs since RALOs have representatives at ALAC. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thanks for this feedback. Of course, yes, the ALAC constituted the work party. So if this particular recommendation, if we agree that the

document should be shared, that still means that this recommendation of [us] as RALO would be going to ALAC, not to the work party. So ALAC can then decide on whether they would find our suggestion helpful or useful, and they would then [request] the work party to actually put that into implementation when they finished final draft. I hope that clarifies that. So let's move to the next item, please. Pastor Peters, if you would be kind to please go to this point of the next item so that we can move a little bit faster.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Seun. First of all, I would like to say that the work party is an ALAC work party, so it is something for ALAC, and ALAC constituted this work party. Fortunately, it is open to everyone so that bottom-up will be ensured. And the work party will report to the ALAC. That's clear.

I'm not saying that it is binding for the RALOs or the ALSes. I say that the work party will have its recommendation to the ALAC. I am not saying also that this report should be included as is into the final review report. I have another point of view on this point.

So as for the fact that the work party reports to ALAC, this is absolutely normal. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yes. Thank you, Tijani. I think that is very clear; the work party reports to ALAC because they're constituted by ALAC. I think the aspect of clarification is whether there is a need to [request that] ALAC have the final draft of the document shared with the RALOs before they finally make their decision [inaudible]. That is the main question.

I think the aspect of it not being bottom-up, I don't think we need to agree about that. The call was open to all ALSes. All those that expressed interest are the ones that are currently in the working group. And I'm very glad in the membership AFRALO is actually well represented. But the aspect of bottom-up in that sense is addressed. I personally believe that it's addressed.

The aspect of actually communicating the outcome of the work party to all the ALSes, I think it's fine. I don't think it's a huge request, actually. I think that we can, as a RALO, recommend to ALAC to consider actually communicating this to all the RALO when the draft is finalized by the work party so that that can also—just like a public comment kind of thing that ICANN does, the various constituencies do within ICANN. So I think that is fine, we can take that. And of course, the ALAC will be the one to decide because of course, this is just the RALO's opinion. ALAC will be the one to decide whether they want to go by that or not.

So I think let's just move on on the next point. You have the floor, Pastor Peters.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Okay. Thank you very much. Yes, I am not opposed to the idea that calls were made and members were free to join. Of course, those who want to join can join. And that also doesn't negate the fact that the group was formed by the ALAC and so report should go to ALAC. My position for the good of both the work party, ALAC and ICANN At-Large is that because of the far reaching decisions that will be contained in this document, so we do not lose anything if the RALOs are given the opportunity to look at the final document for input, because everybody cannot belong to one work party. So that is my position, which also enriches the position of ICANN on the bottom-up process.

Now, the area I want to rush through because of time has to do with suspension and decertification of ALS. Now, I'm going to just do an abridged summary of the discussion that is going on within the work party. Yes, the current process, the RALO can recommend in fact recommendations to register or suspend an ALS is made by the RALO to the ALAC and ALAC could accept or reject.

Two things. Now, there is a position that yes, a RALO can make a recommendation to ALAC to suspend or to deregister an ALS. But the way the decision is going is that ALAC can still go ahead to refuse the RALO's recommendation and insist that the RALO remain, which brings [to call] as to who is better in a position to assess or evaluate the performance of an ALS within the RALO. Is it the RALO or the ALAC?

Going further on the discussion is also the discussion that now, even without a RALO recommendation, an ALAC member could move within

ALAC to request that an ALS be suspended or delisted or deregistered. So now the issue was the question I raised is, what criteria must the ALAC member fulfill before taking on such enormous request which is very far reaching? So that I feel is giving the ALAC so much powers in such a way as to now begin to gag the activities of the ALAC and the RALO, denying the RALO and the ALAC the freedom of opportunity.

[inaudible] was this debate that as far as ICANN is concerned, the RALO and the ALSes, they are not official organ of ICANN. So it is ALAC that is official organ of ICANN or the formal body within ICANN that can work with ICANN, not RALO or ALS, which kind of worries me in a sense that before an ALS becomes member, they are written by the At-Large, that's the staff, they go through processes and are officially welcome. So that is an issue.

So now in concluding, because I do not have the opportunity to have my express myself, [that is what I said in the work party,] because we were timebound, and so now I want us, by the time we leave here, to take cognizance of section 12(d) of ICANN bylaws. Maybe we can ask the staff to put it up, Section 12(d), IX, F to G.

Now, F says very clearly that decisions to certify or decertify an At-Large structure shall be made as decided by the ALAC in its rules of procedure, save always that any changes made to the rules or procedure with respect to an At-Large structure application shall be subject to review by the RALOs and by the board. So the power does not really on just ALAC.

G says decisions as to whether to accredit, not to accredit or disaccredit an ALS shall be subject to review according to procedures established by the board.

Lastly, H, on an ongoing basis, ALAC may also give advice as to whether a [inaudible] ALS meets applicable criteria and standard. Now, the underlying section F above supports our position that the ALSes have greater role in any review that attempt to promote their activities. The powers of ALAC in section H is not absolute but a possibility. These are subject to G above.

So now what I want us to be concerned about is that, yes, should ALAC be given that far reaching powers to decide to deregister, with or without a RALO recommendation? Two, whether if a RALO recommends, they can overrule and override the RALO recommendation and say go ahead [inaudible]. So these are some of my concerns that I want us to look at.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you, Pastor Peters. I have some reactions to that, but I'd like to hear from the floor first before I actually make some comments. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Seun. I don't know from where it was said that the only official body in ICANN is ALAC. For your information, the RALOs have only an MoU with ICANN, signed with the CEO with ICANN. So

ICANN recognized the RALOs, and the RALOs are made of ALSes, and the ALSes are very well mentioned in the bylaw.

So, why we say that the only official body is the ALAC? It is not at all. ALAC doesn't have an oversight on the RALOs. ALAC is constituted from members of the RALOs and from the NomCom. So I don't know from where this idea came.

Second, perhaps you have a point when you said that one member of ALAC couldn't ask to decertify an ALS, because who can know the ALSes? It's only the RALO normally, the region. So any request for decertification should come from the RALO in my point of view. Or, if there is a catastrophe, there is a big problem, yes, even the ALAC could do that alone.

For the record, the only body who has the right to certify and decertify the ALSes is ALAC. But it goes through the RALOs. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, Tijani. Any other hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Seun, sorry, can I ask Sarah to buttress or otherwise my claim that the work party, the discussions centered around the fact that, yes, ALAC is [is the only] official or formal body within ICANN? I don't want to be

misquoting anybody, because she was on that call. Twice last week and the week before. So Sarah, please, [more light] on that.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I think we have Alan on the call as well. This is not putting anybody on the spot. I think Tijani gave a good summary of it, especially on the bylaw. The ALAC—in terms of At-Large entirely, the ALAC is actually the main policy path of the At-Large. And when it comes to approval of things, final approval, etc., it goes through ALAC. It doesn't mean that the RALOs are not also an organized structure. But the point is that the RALO works with the ALAC. So I would say that in terms of structure, the ALAC being on the top or the side of the RALOs, that is [what one can actually relate it to.] [inaudible] or approvals or finalization of approval actually goes through the ALAC and then once it's finalized—in the bylaw, that is the organization that is actually mentioned. Nevertheless, each of the RALOs, as Tijani said, have an MoU. But when it comes to processes, approval, especially the ones that have to do with the At-Large organization in terms of policy-wise, it's actually this approval of the ALAC, which also is indeed the representation of the entire RALO in one way or the other in terms of composition. But I'd like Alan to actually clarify the point about ALAC being the only organization that is recognized. [Does it mean that the RALOs aren't recognized? Even though we heard a] response, I think it's good to hear from Alan. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Seun. I'm glad to. The ALAC is the only body in the ICANN bylaws that is empowered to take actions on behalf of ALAC. The ALSes are defined in the bylaws and as are the RALOs. The relationship with the RALO is rather unique. It is not a part of ICANN as such, but as noted, each RALO does have a memorandum of understanding with ICANN.

Now, AFRALO, if I recall correctly, has a memorandum of understanding with AFRINIC. That doesn't make you part of them or them part of you, but it means you recognize each other and have a working relationship with them. And that's the relationship that's defined in the bylaws for RALOs.

ALSes on the other hand are a formal part of ICANN as approved by the ALAC. Now, in terms of who should do the approval, right now the bylaws call for the ALAC to be the organization to accredit or deaccredit, and it's not within the scope of this work party to change that. If that's something that there's a strong demand for across all five RALOs, and indeed it's supported by the ICANN board and things like that, that could change. But that's way outside of the mandate of this working group that's just looking at how to empower ALSes and make sure that our accreditation, our approval process matches what we are now saying ALSes must do and how we recognize an ALS. And that part of the work is already all complete. It's not formally reported, but the work party has essentially agreed on all of those. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alan. Seun, staff is asking me to confirm because we can't reach you online, the call is supposed to end in one minute so they're asking if we should extend the call.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. if they could please extend by 30 minutes if possible, but if not, 15 minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Silvia, may you please confirm how much time we can have?

SEUN OJEDEJI: How much time can we get?

MICHELLE DESMYTER: That is perfectly fine, as long as you need. 30 minutes—

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thanks a lot. 30 minutes, we should round up. And my apologies for pushing this to a 90-minute call. Sorry for that. I think it's good that we finalize this on this call.

Thanks, Alan, for that. Thanks, Tijani, as well. Do withe have any other hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we have hands from Tijani, Pastor Peters and Abdulkarim.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I think I've heard from Tijani and Pastor Peters. Abdulkarim, is it on this matter? Please go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I don't know if it's a new hand from them, so if you want to take them first.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Please go ahead, Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay. Thank you very much. I think my comment is that I just wanted to seek clarification because the ICANN bylaw says the decision to certify or decertify has to be done in line with the board. So I think staff should probably—I don't know who would give us clarification on what is the role of the board in terms of certification and decertification, because I think we also need to take that into consideration.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thanks. I don't know whether it was Pastor Peters or Tijani's hand that was up first, but Pastor Peters, you have the floor.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Okay. Two quick ones. The bylaw is very clear; certification or decertification is between ALAC and the RALOs and the board. So ALAC do not have the final say as to. So before any ALS will be decertified in any form, it has to be in conjunction with the RALO and the board. That is section 12.(d)(x)(f).

Now, quickly on the explanation given by Alan, I just want to also say, if the purpose is for us to see how can engage ALS and the fact that the rule has been made as it is right now ALAC can certify [or not certify,] now this decision or this rule is contained in the current rules that we are reviewing. So now, is it out of place for us [not to be able to] propose that, yes, the idea that ALAC has the sole responsibility to deregister or to suspend should be reviewed and take into cognizance the rule of the RALOs? That has to be [inaudible] because this issue is contained in the proposal we are also reviewing. And so that is—

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun—

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'm going to also—please let's [inaudible] I'm going to ask staff to please kindly put a one-minute timer on this session so that we can actually maximize the time. I'm not looking at the timer here, so please staff, once any of us exceed the one minute, please just stop us. Even if it is me as well.

Who's hand is up? Tijani next. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, Tijani, and then Alan would like to respond to some of the questions.

SEUN OJEDEJI: To Pastor Peters. Yeah, that's fine. Tijani, you have the floor. We can't hear you, Tijani, if you're speaking—

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Actually—

SEUN OJEDEJI: If Tijani—

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Yeah, I don't see—

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can we have Alan responding?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I said I was willing to respond, I wasn't asking to respond. But I can try to clarify. The section F of the bylaws that was being mentioned says any changes made to the rules of procedure in respect

to the At-Large structure applications shall be subject to review by the RALOs and the board. And that in fact will have to happen. Part of the responsibility of the ALAC is to make sure that the RALOs are informed and have an opportunity to discuss. Now, how a RALO does that, whether it goes to its own ALSes or chooses to do that in a different way, that's up to the RALO, as usual. So we're not going to go directly to ALSes in the working committee because we report to the ALAC. But I'm presuming that the ALAC members, when it goes to the ALAC, will consult the RALOs. The board has approval after the ALAC approves it. If the ALAC approves it, it then has to go to the board for its approval. So that's where those things come in.

In terms of section G where it says decisions as to whether to accredit, not accredit or disaccredit an At-Large structure are subject to review according to procedures established by the board, that gives an ALS an opportunity to appeal to the board if they don't like the ALAC decision. So it's not that the board is involved in the decision, but there's an appeal mechanism, should they decide. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yeah. Thanks a lot, Alan, for the clarification. I hope that addresses the concern. And to some extent, I think that could also address the initial concern about sharing the final document with the ALSes before finalizing by ALAC. However, we would probably still [inaudible] that to the ALAC and which is one of the things that we've actually taken out from this. I hope the aspect of the decertification of RALO is clarified.

I also understand—let's just look at it. If, Pastor Peters, you recall, we are currently actually reviewing our operating principles and we're focusing on a section of the operating principles. So it's because the entire rules is there does not mean that the entire rule needs to be reviewed by the work party. I think their scope of work is clear and the aspect of the powers of the ALAC to certify or to decertify in terms of approving new ALSes is already existing. So like has been said, we can also look at whether these rules can be changed, but I think that will be a different process not within this current work party which is not in scope anyway.

I think from what the three points that have been made by—is there any other hand up, before I actually—

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Yes, my hand is up.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Pastor Peters, you have the floor.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Thank you. Yes. Seun, the rules are there. The work party, part of the rules that is being reviewed, this issue of decertify or certify is part of the work we are doing. So it is not an external work we are bringing in. This aspect is contained in the current application process that has been reviewed. So I want to clarify that. So I'm not bringing up anything from outside [inaudible] work party. So now that it's being reviewed, it's an

opportunity for us to also look at it and to see how [it can be straightened.] That is my position on that.

Also, [for the request, we should also key into] as to, yes, when the work party finishes their final document, because of the far reaching nature of [the decision that it's going to contain in it,] the RALOs will lose nothing by requesting the ALAC to have request for input from the RALOs before the final decision is taken by the ALAC to the board. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yeah. Thank you. I think we have already agreed on that, that the AFRALO leadership is going to send an advice to the ALAC to actually share, engage with the ALS, with the RALO when the final document is sent to them by the work party before they finalize. [inaudible] even though it's already there and they may actually do that, but it's good to also reiterate it as well.

I think in terms of deaccreditation, unless there is interest on the floor for us to make this [request] in view of these powers that ALAC already has—because this is not a new power that has been introduced. Unless there is an interest on this floor for us to request that this be done, I would suggest that I've not seen any—apart from the concern from Pastor Peters—anyone raise the concern to do this within the working party. I would like to hear from our members if there is anybody in the party that actually wants to do this, and if that is the case, then maybe we can look at it.

I'm looking at the draft of the ALS accreditation [inaudible] and I don't see—the only thing I see in terms of what is added on that deaccreditation is in terms of documenting the process that is followed for deaccreditation, and that is actually an additional empowerment which I think is the scope of the work of this working group to actually empower to improve ALS participation. So [inaudible] documentation is better done, that means that [inaudible] there is more clarity on why XYZ ALS was disaccredited, accredited, and there's more transparency in this process.

But in terms of existing rules, modifying the existing rules, I don't think that is within the scope of this work party. But if you want to do that, I would like to hear from the work party members, [especially from] AFRALO members. Maybe we can actually initiate a different process for that. But on this note, I think it may not be necessary for us to actually raise that with ALAC if they have not had any support for that, [but the fourth points which were raised] in terms of the final report comments to AFRALO, [just to be specific,] I would present that to ALAC accordingly.

If there are no other issues that Pastor Peters has observed, I would like to mention that I noted some of the issues myself. One of them which I think Pastor Peters did not mention was about AFRALO itself having a larger [—in terms of 3(e)]. Pastor Peters [seems to think that] AFRALO has a larger regional [—3(e)] suggesting that a larger regional leadership body. I don't think that is the case. So I hope that is clear [about 3(e).]

I think [3(e)] is about suggesting that in terms of the due diligence, which is what we currently do at the moment. Where we have the due

diligence of an ALS, we actually call all the members of the RALO leadership. So we call ALAC members, we call liaisons, and all the officers of AFRALO to a meeting to discuss it. And while we do that, the outcome of that discussion, we would then also take it to the ALSes or members during or monthly meeting call. That is where we do that.

So it is something that we currently do. But even in the [3(e)] that you currently drafted, it's only saying that [inaudible]. But [us] in AFRALO, that is what we currently do. So if we think that we shouldn't be doing that, I think that is an internal thing within AFRALO which we need to address and it's not something that we can then tie to the global process which is [inaudible] right now.

So I would suggest that maybe I would take that as an action item for myself to, during our next monthly meeting call, I would [explain] the process by which we actually make decision on the ALSes' accreditation or deaccreditation so that if our RALO, our ALS members, want to suggest—believe that that is not appropriate, then we can discuss that internally within AFRALO. I hope that addresses your concern in terms of section 3(e), Pastor Peters. And if there r any other comments with regards to that, the floor is open.

ALAN GREENBERG:

There are two hands, from Abdulkarim and Pastor Peters. And—

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yes, Abdulkarim, you have the floor.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay. Thank you very much, Seun. I just want to—probably these are my last comments—say that I've gone through the document that the working group is working on, and I think there are some fantastic suggestions and improvements that the working group is suggesting, which I think they are quite well thought of and would actually help going forward.

One of my main concerns in the document is issue of the global ALSes. I think that is one area I want us to look at critically to see if it's something that is actually required or if it's something—I have my own opinion about the global ALSes and I think it's going to create some problems with the RALOs. And that's where I think we need to also concentrate our energy on to look at it critically on what the work party is doing on that.

Given that [inaudible] some of the issues Pastor Peters has raised, I think just like what Seun said, we should give a comment on some of those things, and I think some of these issues should have been resolved at the work party level if the work party—I think we need to try to learn to accommodate each other more and also we need try as much as possible to—because I see some of these issues should have just been say, "Okay, this is the problem with what you're saying, this is where you lack some understanding" and we would gain a lot of things from this. Thank you very much.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you, Abdulkarim. From my understanding, I think there was engagement within the work party as well, but of course, there are

some of these issues, it's also good that we are discussing it as a RALO so that at least we are also converging on the issues because that is the most important. The work party itself is more diverse than this RALO that we have. So I think that is also important to note.

Before I summarize the comments [inaudible] in terms of the way forward, I would give the floor to Pastor Peters to make a final statement.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Number one, one of the take home from this meeting is a proposal to the leadership of the AFRALO that any work party or working group that is not set up by AFRALO should be of interest to AFRALO as long as our members are in it. In essence, in every call, members should be called upon to report back to AFRALO what is happening, how does it impact or affect the AFRALO, is very key so that the membership are carried along. All of us cannot be in the working group. That is number one.

Number two, on the issue of the global ALS, I've also raised that issue. It [has even formed] part of my paper and the idea was there could be some RALOs that may not want to—though [inaudible] taken on that by the work party, it's still a view, but ordinarily, I do not see the need why such an idea will crop up, because [inaudible] a member of ICANN as an individual or as an ALS. So those structures are in place to accommodate everybody because there is currently nobody on Earth today that is stateless. So that is on that.

Number three, in closing, it's also the fact that I also still want members to take more than a passing interest on the rules and the bylaws of ICANN. So our involvement in ICANN does not exist merely on participating in working groups or attending conferences, but we need to [inaudible] what the rules say so that whenever we are in a particular working group, we should make our voice heard. It's not enough for us to belong to a working group just to add our names to it as part of our CV that, yes, we were in this working group and that working group. No, our interest should be the larger interest of AFRALO.

I will say that I want to thank the leadership of AFRALO and also the staff of ICANN for creating this opportunity for this meeting, and also appreciate Alan for taking part in the discussion. So in the interest, it's for ICANN, it's about ICANN, not about me or [inaudible] individual. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thanks a lot, Pastor Peters, and thanks for your dedication and contribution to this. And thanks also to all the members who have participated in the discussion.

In terms of way forward, the leadership of AFRALO will be recommending to the chair of ALAC to consider to actually share the final document with the RALOs when a final draft is done with. That is the way forward. And in terms of sharing the updates on our monthly call, we recognized this in our last monthly call that we will be doing that going forward. That was actually an [oversight on the side] of the leadership, and I take responsibility for that, especially for this particular

working group, and we would start doing that in the next monthly meeting [I actually noted that the] secretariat has noted that for future monthly calls.

Having said that, I think this has been a productive discussion. I'm happy that we are able to have this session. At least some clarification has been provided and we also have one issue which we are going to be engaging the ALAC about.

So on this note, I'd like to thank staff. And do we have interpreters? And the interpreters if they are there, for actually allowing us to extend this call by another 30 minutes. Actually, we tried to note exhaust the 30 minutes. I hope that's helped. Thanks to you all for participating. Thanks to Alan, the chair of the work party, for actually attending this call. And from me, I say bye for now.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thanks so much, Seun. Thank you, everyone, for joining today's call. Meeting adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]