
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALS mobilization work party call on Monday the 6th of July 2020 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard on audio only, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Ali AlMeshal, Barrack Otieno, Bastiaan Goslings, Eduardo Diaz, Herb Waye, Jacqueline Morris, Judith Hellerstein is joining us as well, Nadira AlAraj, Raymond Mamattah, Roberto Gaetano, Sarah Kiden, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, Yrjö Lansipuro, and David Mackey.

We have not received any apologies, and from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management. Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the transcription purposes and to also please keep your lines muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Remmy just joined the call as well. Thank you very much. With this, I turn the call over to you, Alan.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So did I. Judith. And Judith.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, Judith, I noted you in the attendance already. Thank you, Judith. And Natalia Filina is joining as well. Thank you.

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.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Excellent. We have really good attendance. And does anyone have any comments on the agenda? It's a very simple agenda today. We're going to do some work. And no comments. The agenda is accepted.

Before we go on to the actual work, just one quick comment. I discovered something that nobody seems to have mentioned anywhere. That is, those who are on audio only, who are on the phone, actually have the ability of muting and unmuting themselves and raising their hand. If you want to raise your hand, it's star nine. To mute or unmute yourself, it's star six. I haven't seen that mentioned anywhere, but it does seem to work. So for those who are on audio, you can now do those things, even though no one seems to have publicized it.

All right. Can we have the version four document up, please? Thank you. Now, at this point I believe we have finalized—subject to any editing, there were a number of people who made grammatical errors in the document and they've all been accepted at this point—so I believe—I don't think there are any current outstanding comments. There's a couple of small changes I made just to pass them by you. I don't think they're going to be controversial. And if we could scroll to page number three. And the bottom of it is a footnote. Thank you.

Judith had suggested some wording changes to the footnote. The footnote says the term “restricted access Wiki” and currently now says “shall not be restricted to the confluence Wiki,” it should be “currently in use by At-Large but could also include any other comparable tool.” And I've added, “As decided by At-Large staff in conjunction with At-Large leadership.”

So we're saying, yes other tools could be used, but it's not going to be used at a whim of one particular person. We'll have to decide that this is what we're using. So we're not restricting it going forward to the Wiki, but it'll be something that we'll be using consistently across the various RALOs.

And as we all know, there are no perfect tools. Whatever tool one person might not be able to use well, another tool someone else might not be able to. So we're going to have to look at this carefully. But we're not trying to specify the tool in this document. We're simply saying that we will use some tool like that.

And I see a thumbs up from Cheryl. Thank you. There are a couple of other small changes in number seven, if we could scroll down to that one next. And the word "applicant" was added, because we put things on hold when the applicant is responding. When we're waiting for things internal, that's our problem and it doesn't go on hold at that point. And there's a note to move last one somewhere else.

All right, so the document is now published. I only got it published late last night. I'm not sure when it was made open for working group. So please take a look at that. at this point, we have agreed to everything. Now, I would appreciate it, if you had a position which differed from the group and there was a strong consensus, that you not reopen the issue at this point. But if you believe there are things that are not reflecting what the consensus was, then please identify them. I think it's in pretty good shape right now.

And we're now on to the next section, which is suspension of an application. And that is on page six, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, we have a question from Justine in the chat. "Who is At-Large leadership?"

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's the leadership of the ALAC, which typically is the ALAC chair and the ALT, the five members selected, or the chair plus the other four members selected by the RALOs, plus the respective leaderships of the five RALOs. I'm not sure that's a term we defined anywhere, but that is how we've been using it for many years.

I'm going to leave it to the ALAC chair to comment if the ALT Plus, which includes a whole bunch of other people, is included in leadership. My understanding is the ALT plus, and certainly as defined in the—the ALT itself is defined in the ALAC rules of procedure. The ALT includes a number of advisors who may advise the ALT. And my understanding is the ALT Plus is the ALT plus the advisors. So they would not constitute leaders as such, as part of the leadership, but are advisors to the leadership.

That certainly is what the ALAC rules of procedure say with some clarity. And Maureen says she agrees with me, so I don't think we can argue with her. That's marvelous. Thank you. I always love it when people agree with me. Doesn't happen often. Sorry, just a little bit of humor here.

All right. If we may go on. “An application may be suspended where the suspension is requested by the applicant,” and we have a question from Nadira, “Can it be suspension or withdrawal?” No, we’re talking here purely about suspension. There is a question on withdrawal that we’ll come to later.

So the ALS accreditation may be suspended—I guess it’s the application process that’s suspended, not the accreditation itself. I’ll make sure that wording makes sense. So it’s also suspended when additional information is requested by At-Large staff during the due diligence process or the RALO secretariat of the region—okay, sorry, due diligence process. Number three, the RALO secretariat of the region that the applicant is based in determines if further information is required from the applicant which is essential to the evaluation of the application. That one now should be widened to if a question arises—it should really be worded that if a question arises during RALO review of the application and further information is required. So it’s not just the [secretariat] because the request can come from other places as well.

I don’t see any hands. Lastly, members of the ALAC believe that additional information is essential to the evaluation of the application. So, essentially, it can be suspended if the applicant asks for a suspension or any of the three phases of review, additional information is requested during due diligence, which is the staff process, RALO review, or ALAC review.

And I notice there's a comment from Peters which we'll go into in a moment, but does anyone have any comments on what we have so far?

All right, the comment from Peters is crossed out. I don't know if you want—is he on the call or not?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, he's on audio only.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Yeah, I'm on the call, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Peters, do you wish to comment on this? This is a comment you put and then crossed out, so I'm not quite sure. It starts reading, "Once due diligence has been performed and the RALOs are satisfied the applicant meets its standards ..." Okay, this is a reopening of the issue of whether the ALAC needs to vote or not, and at this point, that is not something that is within our scope to decide. It is part of the process that is required by the bylaws. It's something we've discussed extensively and there was a note earlier pointing out that some people have believed that this should be reopened, but that's nothing that we're going to reopen as part of our process. Would you like to make any comments before we go on?

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: If you say [the issue is closed,] so my comment would be of no effect. So if the issue [inaudible] any comment on it, [I wouldn't want to be seen as regularly arguing over issues that] [inaudible]. So you can move on. If I have any [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. As I said, this is an issue which can be discussed. It can't be discussed within our mandate, but if the ALAC would like to discuss that, that's certainly something the ALAC could discuss and try to raise with the board, whether that's something that should be done. Personally, I think that is changing the rules in such a way that would not be acceptable, but that certainly could be done. But it's not within our scope to do.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: No problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Whenever an application is suspended under part one of this section, that suspension shall be lifted upon the request of the applicant. So if the applicant requests the suspension, they have to lift it. When notifying the application of additional information, it shall be obligatory to also notify the applicant that the application is suspended until the information is received. An application that is suspended at the request of the applicant or waiting for information from the applicant for more than 90 days shall be considered withdrawn. At-Large staff should give appropriate reminders and warnings.

So, we have had problems in the past that we have asked for information and it was never forthcoming. This is a new clause which says after 90 days—and clearly, we can debate whether the 90 days is the right number, but after a certain period of time, the application is

deemed to have been withdrawn and we inform the applicant of that. And I'd now like to open the floor. At this point, this is relatively complete. There's a couple of questions we can ask, go to staff, but first I'd like to see if anyone has any comments on what we have so far. I see we have a hand from Jacqueline. Please go ahead.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Hello. It's a simple thing. When notifying the applicant of the additional information, it shall be obligatory. [You're not] notifying the applicant of a request for additional information or a requirement for additional information, not just additional information, because that could be additional information [regarding from anywhere] and we're just telling them, "Hey, we got information from somewhere else."

ALAN GREENBERG: Good point. We'll adjust that. Yes, the intent was when notifying the applicant of a request for additional information from them, we will notify them. The "shall be obligatory" sounds rather pompous, but the intent here is that when we're asking the applicant for more information, we'll tell them the application is on hold until they get us the information. And they have no more than 90 days or whatever to do that. Thank you for calling that out.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Just say something like, "When requesting additional information from the applicant ..." And go on like that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Point noted. Just a few words left out when I typed things late at night.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Please go ahead.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: I want to ask, if an application is withdrawn, can the application be resubmitted?

ALAN GREENBERG: We're going to be talking a little bit more about withdrawal later, but to preempt that, I can't see why not.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: [No problem.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Even if we were to reject an application, I don't think there would be any prohibition about resubmitting. Now, if someone may submit it 100 times and get rejected each time, we may want to have a statute of limitations on that, but I certainly wouldn't think that a withdrawn application would be something that we, for any reason, would not allow another one.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Okay. That's okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Seeing no other comments. There was a question that was written originally to staff and the work party and us. Are there cases where we may need to suspend an application other than the request for new information? For example, to get information from other than the applicant or due to the need for further evaluation. And the information from other people, I think we have said that's our problem and we have to do it within our allowed time. We have had cases before where the RALO has had significant difficulty making a decision and they didn't want to say no but they didn't want to say yes either, and some of those hung around for a very long time, long enough that if applicant had—under the applicant's rules, they could have filed a grievance against us for it.

My feeling at this point is that we shouldn't allow that, but there's already provision earlier that if we believe the process is being followed but it's going to take a little bit more time, that we may tell the applicant that we don't believe we'll complete within 90 days, we believe we'll complete within a certain other amount of time. And I would think it should never go past 120. But we will give ourselves some wiggle room. But I don't think we want to allow anything more than that. And even that, I would think, should be done only in very extenuating circumstances. Does that sound right? I'm going to try to write some words up to say that, but does that sound right in tone?

David says, sounds good to him. Cheryl, again, you have the history of times past where we were called out. Does that sound reasonable, to give ourselves some wiggle room but limit it to an absolute amount?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, Alan. Not only limited to an absolute amount, but it needs to underline it is exceptional circumstances. This is not to become a de facto extension of time. It is exceptional circumstances [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Heidi, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, Alan, thank you. [inaudible] question to the staff. Are there any cases where we may need to suspend an application other than the request for new information? The only one that comes to mind right now is that when we do have an application from an ISOC chapter and we will reach out to ISOC to see if that chapter is in good standing. And at times, we get a response back that there is some sort of transition going on, etc. And then we usually work with the chair and the RALO on that as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: That goes back to the question we had earlier, of, should we be able to say, "Let's wait a while?" And the decision we made at that point was, no, we don't want to do that because "wait a while" is too undefined a term. And we would at that point perhaps reject it and say, "Apply

later.” But there's another issue coming up now, that's that next thing on our list, about, should we be in a position to encourage someone to withdraw the application and presumably resubmit under some circumstances or not?

So I don't think we want to delay because they're reforming or something like that as an ISOC chapter, because that can take a good number of months, and so I don't think we really want to allow for that one, but let's bring that up again now in the next case. Cheryl has her hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Heidi, even in that circumstance, that would not be news to the applicant, an ISOC chapter in reformation would in fact be well aware that that's happening. So I would think that goes into a situation where the applicant would probably see the sense of suspending the application for a given period of time until they're likely to be sorted out. And I think we can take it up under withdrawal [inaudible]. I don't think it would be a very often or very needy exceptional case. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. it's interesting that we have had a number of cases where we have applications from organizations that are in reformation. And one questions, of course, what are they thinking? That if they don't have their act together as an ISOC chapter, then what's their business trying to take on a new role at the same time? Heidi, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just exactly what you said. I know that when you were chair, we had at least one case, if not two, where we worked with them carefully on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Now, certainly, if they are in reformation but this is going to end in a month or something like that, then they have the ability, under the current rules we're proposing, to suspend for no longer than 90 days.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, we have Jacqueline with a question in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. "Should the exceptional case have a process to trigger it, like the approval from the ALAC or the ExCom or someone?" I would think that you're talking about the more than 90-day issue, I presume. I would think that that's an ALAC chair issue. ALAC chair obviously in consultation with the appropriate RALO leadership. But I think you're right, I think we probably want to specify that in the rule. So I'll propose some wording for that. I don't think we should leave it unspoken. And the ExCom, for those who are not as old as Jacqueline and us, is the old name for the ALT. For those who don't know, by the way, Jacqueline was the ALAC chair prior to Cheryl.

All right. I see no hands. I see no applause for Jacqueline either. I think someone should applaud. Sorry, I'm feeling rather whimsical today. All right. The question is an applicant may withdraw voluntarily at any time. Should there be a process for encouraging withdrawal?

I was made aware a week or so ago that the concept of encouraging an applicant to withdraw an application, the encouragement coming from the RALO, is something that has happened some number of times in the past. I have no idea, I have never heard of it before, so I don't know who is doing this or when it's happening, or to what extent this has actually happened and someone has actually withdrawn because of it. If anyone from staff or the RALOs can fill me in a little bit on the background of this, I would really like to understand it more.

Anybody? Heidi? I know Evin isn't on the call.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

I don't have that much more information on that one.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Maureen, do you have anything? This was in messages that were forwarded to me for a discussion [you were holding.] And I think it was Evin, but it may have been someone else that made the comment that we sort of semi-regularly have RALOs encourage an application to withdraw. It sounds like it might be an interesting concept, but I'd never heard of it before. Anybody?

All right, let's ignore the fact that it may have happened. Is it something we want to write into the rules?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Actually, I do remember one time many years ago there was a situation, an organization in NARALO who, it was just felt that they were not going

to be certified. They just didn't have some of the key issues. So we did reach out to them and they did withdraw.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: That makes some sense. If a RALO is reaching the conclusion that they cannot recommend certification for some reason, it makes some level of sense to give the applicant a heads up and give them an opportunity to withdraw, perhaps with some advice for what is being waited for, or perhaps with a clear statement of why they will never become an ALS because they simply don't meet the core rules.

So it may well be a concept that we would want to document, or we can simply say it's something that might happen but we don't document it at all. And an applicant may withdraw voluntarily. Why they choose to do that may be on prompting.

What we don't want is we don't want an applicant to feel coerced by the RALO to withdraw if they don't indeed believe that this is something that should happen. So I'm a little bit worried about leaving it completely unwritten. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH KIDEN: Hi everyone. I really like this idea and I think we definitely should document it because this may happen, and in the case of AFRALO, I think this option is good because it covers the question I raised a few weeks ago about new applicants who, [like they're a] new organization and we don't want to say no but we can't say yes [inaudible]. So I think this option is good and it covers that case as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I would think if a RALO is going to do that, they have to do it in a very open way, open with the applicant, of stating exactly why they are doing that, and make it clear what the conditions are that they may encourage a reapplication.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Pastor Peters, please go ahead.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: While not totally in agreement for us to initiate in any way affirm the idea of asking a RALO to withdraw their application, I would rather prefer when they go through due diligence and they do not meet the criteria for registration, they should be evaluated on that basis and they are told application is not going to be approved or the application is missing this and that, than asking them to withdraw either because they are new or any other reason. But we have a set of criteria to evaluate an

application. So once an application is made, we should [inaudible] those criteria rather than suggesting to them to withdraw. So like you said, it would look like [inaudible] belong. So that is the way I would look at it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. There's a problem because due diligence is a staff process, and I don't think we ever want to put staff in a position of making the decision on behalf of the RALO or the ALAC. So simply saying staff does not believe they meet the criteria and therefore it should be rejected, I think I would have a significant problem with, because that puts a responsibility on staff which is not theirs.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: No, no, that is not what I'm saying. What I'm saying is that the due diligence [inaudible] RALO to the ALAC and then that is why you're having the process. So the staff [inaudible] due diligence [inaudible] RALO. If the RALO sees there are things [inaudible] the RALO do not meet from their own standpoint, there should be criteria that the RALO wants to look at before recommending. That's what I'm saying. I'm not asking the staff to really want to decide. The decision will [pass across] to the organization by the staff after the [the bodies concerned,] ALAC, RALO, and [the staff have done the due diligence] and find [inaudible] that the applicant needs to fulfill, not asking them to withdraw. That's what I'm saying.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Right now, we're doing exactly what you're describing. I'm saying the process we currently follow and the one we are documenting does just that. It goes through the full number of steps and they end up either being accredited or not accredited. And this suggestion is a new one saying, if it looks very strongly from the RALO's point of view that they are not going to be accredited, should we let them know that we give them an opportunity to withdraw? This comes back to the saving face, and is this a cultural issue which may make it more acceptable than actually being rejected? Jacqueline, and then Cheryl, please go ahead.

JACQUELINE MORRIS:

I agree that it is an option to have, to say, yes, you can go ahead and be rejected and that would be—or these are some issues and you can withdraw and fix them and come again, or these are some issues and we don't think you can fix them so maybe you should withdraw. The only issue that I have with it is that we should, especially if it's [at the RALO level,] we should have a process that goes across RALOs because there have been times when there are issues between certain people and other organizations and there might be the [collision factor.] So if it were a standardized process and open and transparent process, then yeah, I think that would work.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I'm not quite sure how you'd do that without actually having a RALO recommendation to the ALAC that we encourage them to withdraw.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yeah, that one would, but I'm just saying the idea is that sometimes, there are people or there might be people in RALO leadership who are from organizations that may have a beef of some sort with another organization that is applying, and I'm saying that has actually happened at times.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you're worried about specific individuals in a RALO leadership might encourage an applicant to withdraw just because they wouldn't want to see them as an ALS, not because they're not a valid ALS.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Right. So if it were a standard process—

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible] say it in a little bit less politically correct terms than you did. I could see that as a potential problem, and yes, that is an issue we have to cover. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was actually heading to follow Jacqueline very much, because indeed, that has been an issue in the past. So there's two ways of looking at this, and here is my preferred mechanism and certainly the one that I deployed when I certainly had a situation where it was far more kind and considerate to have a quiet word with the applicant to explain why

it was unlikely that the ALAC would be in a position to accredit them and suggest that if they were to withdraw and to resubmit once those things were not an issue, then it might be best. It's not coercion, it is staff and an ALAC chair stepping in to do that. It takes away from the regional risks of politically charged situations that can occur between countries and within RALOs. You would remember that in the past in APRALO, we've had some extremely politically and indeed more than politically charged issues between countries, so we have had to deal with [this in part] in different regions.

It is important to, I think, have this as an option. It can be done and not spoken about. I believe it is better to have a high-level set of principles that would have this opportunity of staff working with the ALAC chair to communicate with the applicant and go over the current situation so that the applicant has the right to withdraw or not. And if they don't, that's their choice. But there should be no question of coercion. It's more a right and a communication exercise.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. So you are suggesting, if I can put it to different words to try to test the concept, that I think you're saying, at the request of RALO leadership—or would you see that this might be done—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

At any point. Staff goes, "This is not going to make the cut in due diligence," the RALO's saying, "Hang on, we don't think this is going to work, and this is why I think you take the opportunity." Look at it from the applicant's perspective, and that's what I try and do whenever I've

dealt with these things. The applicant could be new. They may have misunderstood. There might be all sorts of good reasons for an oversight or error to be easily fixed. You give them the ability, by a communication exercise with someone—and I'm saying that someone should be the ALAC chair—to see whether there's an opportunity to fix, was it an oversight, or should they take the opportunity to withdraw and reapply at a later date, or not. Their choice.

It's all about how the applicant feels, as far as I'm concerned. [inaudible] absolute courtesy and consideration from the applicant's perspective.

ALAN GREENBERG: So the communication comes from—and let me try to be flexible about it—the ALAC chair and/or staff?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, the ALAC chair in conjunction with staff. If staff finds a problem, staff should not be leading the discussion. Staff informs the ALAC chair and the ALAC chair says, "Dear XYZ, during due diligence, this has come to light. Is this an issue that you can remediate, or is this something that you don't plan on changing? If you do not change it, we do not believe it will fit our criteria. You have the following opportunity."

ALAN GREENBERG: Got it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Because it is the ALAC that does the accreditation on behalf of ICANN under the current rules. So it should be one of the lofty responsibilities, the fun bits, that the ALAC chair gets to do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So the communication comes from the ALAC chair, it can be initiated at any time in the process by either staff or the RALO.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Anyone else have a comment on this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to say, at least once in my time—Jacqueline might have had other experiences—it was a matter of having been given all the likelihoods and possibilities of what advice would be, the applicant decided to continue and risk being rejected. And that's okay. But they did it with full knowledge.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Jacqueline.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Yes. That's fine. My question though would be, if there were political issues that would have allowed the RALO chair, the RALO leadership, to

reach out to say, “Hey, we don’t want you in here, so please ...” You know, [request] them to withdraw, the only way I can see that coming to staff or the ALAC chair’s notice if the RALO does it quietly behind the scenes would be if the applicant contacts and says, “Hey, this is what I was told by the RALO.”

So I'm not sure how that basically political or bad faith actions by RALO leadership. I'm not saying that it happened—okay, it may have happened in the past, but I'm not saying that I expect RALO leadership to behave in a bad way, but we should have a document, a process that allows—

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Jacqueline, I think what you're asking is what happens if despite what we are talking about here, RALO leadership or the RALO chair goes to the applicant and says, “Withdraw.” Is that what you're talking about?

JACQUELINE MORRIS:

Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I think if we document that the only way that we can encourage withdrawal is through the ALAC chair, then they are in violation of our rules, and they pay whatever penalty goes along with that, assuming we find out.

JACQUELINE MORRIS: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jacqueline, I think the high-level yet documented process still [inaudible] fixing that, as Alan noted. But we've had wars running between countries where the leadership of at least APRALO—there's no way they can politically approve of this At-Large structure. Literally, they cannot do it without great risk to themselves. And that's one of the situations I was describing, and the ALS decided to not withdraw, knowing that was a risk, that the regional advice would be, right? And in fact, they ended up being accredited by the ALAC, which is great. So I was drawing on exactly that experience. It can fix it [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen, please go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I agree with all the discussions that we've been having, but I think just—Cheryl said it just before I came on board. But I think that there are going to be specific circumstances that are going to be different with different ALSes, and I think that what we've got to do is we should make some sort of statement, as you suggest, Alan, to sort of say that there'll be circumstances that are mainly to do with the fact

that what our criteria are and what may cause some difficulty accrediting some applications.

ALAN GREENBERG: But you're happy, though, if we have a rule saying an applicant can be encouraged to withdraw but that encouragement must come from the ALAC chair, not from some other level? You're comfortable with that?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I guess I am, but I just remembered that one of our situations where it was the RALO leadership that was actually arguing with the ALAC about whether we should accredit the particular ALS. And that was probably against chair as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I guess the only potential problem of saying it must be the ALAC chair naming it is there's a political issue with where the ALAC chair comes from and the country—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But then that's okay—sorry, Alan—because the ALAC chair can declare that. In fact, they would need to. And it would go to one of the ALT, so they would delegate. The ALAC chair has to be responsible because they can be voted out.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. What we're saying is it's not necessarily the ALAC chair as the person and the ALAC chair as the role, and that may be delegated. That's fine. That's all I was trying to clarify.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It should be the opportunity to withdraw. Encouragement is not the right term. It should be the opportunity to withdraw.

ALAN GREENBERG: Understood. I think I have this down pat. Is there anyone else who has any further words? All right, I think I understand that. I'm going to have to listen to this call carefully to—go ahead. We still have a few more minutes, so let's start on a section labeled deaccreditation.

Just a comment on what is the concept we're debating. We have been talking about accreditation of an ALS. The bylaws randomly talk about accreditation of the ALS and certification of the ALS. I don't believe the bylaws are using them in different terms. They are using different words in different clauses. It's caused some confusion in the past, and I think accreditation is a better term because accreditation says you are allowed to do things, you're allowed to say you're an ALS, whereas

certification really says you have certain credentials. You're certified as a doctor or as a lawyer.

So I think accreditation is probably the right term. Cheryl says the ALAC has only ever used the term accredit. I believe that's correct. So I would suggest that when we look at the bylaws, we may suggest to the board to change that word just to make it clear. And that is not something I disagree with.

The next term is, what is the removal of accreditation called? Now, ICANN in the bylaws uses the term "disaccredit," which we have never used, to my knowledge. We have used the term "deaccredit." When I look further into what does ICANN call removal of the registrar accreditation—and they don't use either term. They say you are no longer eligible to be accredited, or words like that. But they don't actually use the term "deaccredit" or "disaccredit." The bylaws do use the term "disaccredit."

I would suggest, for simplicity in the bylaws—and if we tell the ICANN lawyers they should use deaccredit instead of disaccredit, that's a battle that I'm not sure is worth winning. And Judith said she found somewhere that the official opposite of accredit is disaccredit. So I would suggest that we change the term to disaccredit and go with that. Maureen says ALSes are usually deregistered. I've never heard that term in my life.

Yeah, we've used "deaccreditation." The bylaws say "disaccredit." I'm happy to change our words and use "disaccredit" so we're consistent with the bylaws. I look for anyone having comments.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, please.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Yes. There's a term known as deregistration. You can register and deregister. It's just a matter of semantics. So recently, some political parties that were registered in Nigeria were deregistered. So terms like that do exist. But if we are looking for words, what I'd want to use is "deaccredited," not "disaccredited," or "deregistered," [then we have to decide] which we want to use. But I think it's a matter of semantics, like I said.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. "Registered" is not a term we use at all, so the fact that "deregistered" is the opposite is not relevant. The question is for accreditation, which is the word we have always used, and [as I said,] the bylaws use "disaccredit," we have used "deaccredit," I'm suggesting—we don't do it very often, but I'm suggesting we use "disaccredit" so it's consistent with the bylaws. And Roberto says, "they're no longer accredited." But what's the action called of doing it? I would suggest—

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: [Not “disaccredit,”) it’s deaccredit.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And several people have pointed out that isn't a word in the dictionary and isn't a term. So I suggest since we're just about five minutes out of time, people think about it and we'll take up the discussion at the beginning of next week and I will do a bit of research on the terms in the interim.

Abdeldjalil is saying we should use certification and decertification. And we could, but we have used accreditation up until now, and it actually is a better term than “certify” for what we're doing. Okay, let's think about it. We'll take it up next week and I'll do a little bit of research on the terms.

All right. Thank you for a very productive meeting. We're getting very well along. See you all next week.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

The meeting is now adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]