YEŞIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALS Mobilization Working Party call on Monday, 10th of August 2020, at 18:00 UTC. On our call today, we have Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Pastor Peters Omoragbon, Barrack Otieno, Matthias Hudobnik, Roberto Gaetano, Amrita Choudhury, David Mackey, Sarah Kiden, Nadira Al-Araj, Justine Chew, Yrjö Länsipuro, Judith Hellerstein, and Daniel Nanghaka.

We have received apologies from Jacqueline Morris, Ali Almeshal, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Bastiaan Goslings, Maureen Hilyard, and from Remmy Nweke. From staff side, we have Silvia Vivanco, Evin Erdoğdu, Alperen Eken, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar, and I will also be doing call management for today's call.

Just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes. And now, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Alan. Thanks so much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Yeşim. Any comments or anything … My mouth is not engaged properly. Any comments on the agenda or any other business items? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, then we will start. If we could get the document on the screen, please? Just a reminder, we're working on the application process, and form, and things associated with that.

The first item we need to do a very final review on is at the bottom of page seven. This is just a confirmation that we are using the term

"accredit" and not "certify," and we will attempt to get the word "certify" removed from the bylaws, which is where it is used randomly in addition to "accredit."

And we will not be using the term "dis-accredit" or "de-accredit," but we'll use the expression "withdraw accreditation." And hopefully, no comments on that.

We are now [inaudible] to, hopefully, a final path over most of the accreditation form, and we'll start a little bit … Just scroll down a little bit. Since the last meeting, I have done … Essentially, juggled things around, moved things from one section to the other, added some other notes, and added the start of a certification section.

I think we're close to finished. There are two comments, I believe, from working party members that have suggested additions, and we'll talk about those as we get to them.

We said we would do an introduction, or some sort of a preamble to the application form which, among other things, will briefly discuss, and probably point to, exactly what ICANN's remit is, what the kind of things we are discussing …

A constant problem we've had over the decades is that we have groups joining as ALSes but without any apparent real connection to ICANN or to the things that we discuss. Going forward, we should do our best to try to make sure that, when someone applies, they have some idea of what it is they're applying to, not just something that's "Internet-related" and, therefore, "Let's join." So that, obviously, is going to have to be written, but it's not something we'll do here.

Going forward, if we can scroll … Oh, we're already on C, with "remove the concept of organizational Wiki," because we're asking for the organization's Internet presence, which might be a Wiki, it might be a website, it might be Facebook. We are asking for any social media accounts or identifiers, if they have them. I think that's about all in that section.

We're looking for a primary and secondary contact, and this is the primary and secondary contact for the application. If they become accredited, then they are required to have two contacts, and could have up to four, and we'll populate that as necessary once they're actually accredited.

A little bit scroll down, please, onto the contacts. And then, let's scroll so the "Structure and Governance" title is at the top of the visible page. There have been a fair number of changes, here.

The first one was asking, "Are members of your organization residents of your region?" That has now been changed to, "Are the majority of members of your organization citizens or residents," and that's from the bylaws, "of the region you seek to represent?" That's "yes" and "no," with an explanation if there is a "no."

Now, I note we are still considering multi-region ALSes. That's something we still need to get a legal opinion on. So, this question is not trying to ferret that out. It's a separate issue.

Next question: "Are one or more of your officers of your organization residents of another region? If yes, please explain the circumstances." This was a question that we weren't quite sure why it was there, but we

do note that we have had, and in more than once case, situations where, for instance, the president of an ALS, the head of an ALS, has not lived in that country for years.

And so, when we discussed this last time, we said it's not necessarily a make-or-break issue, but it's something we should try to understand. So, the question was shortened and it's more to the point. I'm looking for hands or comments. Questions?

Next one: "To what extent do members who are individuals not representing organizations involved in the … Are individuals involved in the governance of your organization and in making decisions within your organization?"

This is one of the key issues of the concept of an ALS within the ICANN bylaws, and that is the ALS must be controlled by individuals. We have had more than one case where it is questionable whether that is, in fact, what happens.

Now, "control" can come in a variety of ways. It can come through plebiscites and voting on everything within the ALS, or it can come from the members selecting who the president or the director is, or whatever. We're not going to try to govern how an organization runs, but the question is, are individuals involved? This is a crucial question and, in fact, it will be asked multiple ways within this application. We'll get onto the other ones later.

The next question was, "Is your organization formally incorporated or organized in a legal jurisdiction?" It doesn't have to be. "No" is a fine answer, but we're asking, is it such? And we have removed the term

"national" because we're not particularly worried about whether it's a national, a state, or whatever jurisdiction rules there are within your country.

"Describe your organization's structure." That, we have left alone. "Provide information on your organization's leadership, leadership names, positions, e-mails." That one, we may want to flesh out with some specific details of different items to fill in. I'll work with staff on that to see whether we really need that or it should be free-form.

This was already a question, but it was in the "communication" section for reasons no one could figure out. "In what language or languages does your organization conduct its business?" That was a singular. It has now become plural.

Questions on the section on governance. We're making good time. Next, "about your members." "Do you have individual members with the ability to vote or otherwise control the management of the organization?"

Again, this is the key issue. It is asked not only with respect to governance by members. Presumably, they will have consistent answers between the two. "If no, describe what role individuals have in the management and work of your organization."

Next question is asking, "Do you have organizations? Are they for-profit, not-for-profit?" Again, trying to ferret out to what extent this is not an organization of individual users but some other type of organization.

I see no questions. C, "Do you have governmental bodies or quasi-governmental bodies as members of your organization? If yes, please

describe the nature, and role in decision making, and the work of your organization, and the proportion of total membership made up by these types of organizations." This question hasn't changed from last time.

Again, the impact of government and organizational members on your governance is one of the key issues we're looking at. Is this really an end-user group, or not? Seeing no questions.

D, "Describe the general membership, and are they predominately …" Predominately and predominantly have the same meaning. If people have a strong feeling, we can change it to the other one. The other one may be a little bit more commonly understood than "predominately," but they are both correct.

"Of one or more professional backgrounds." This goes to the question of, "What are the demographics of your organization?" and it's something we said we would ask for optionally. This question is not worded so it's optional, so I think we need to change that slightly. We'll come back and do that.

E, "Describe how your organization keeps its constituents/members informed about, and enables them to participate in, decisions regarding issues of interest." So, essentially, how do you communicate with your members?

"Approximately how many members, or members of each type of membership class if you have more than one, do you have?" This, again, is something we decided we would be asking. The original question only asked, "How are they divided, if you have membership classes?" Now, we're asking in general.

"Explain eligibility requirements, if any, for your organization's constituents/members." "Are members or leaders of your organization, as individuals, involved in other, similar organizations, or involved in other aspects of ICANN or Internet governance? Yes/no. If yes, explain."

This is a question that I don't remember. I think we were previously saying, "Are your leaders involved?" and we decided at our last meeting to expand it to members or leaders, and make it somewhat more general.

And I see in the chat there was a recommendation to use "predominant" instead of "predominate," and I will make that change. Any questions more on the "about your members" section?

Next, we go onto funding. "What is the primary source or sources of your funding for your organization? If unfunded, simply write 'not applicable.'" The next section, we decided to omit altogether. It was asking, "Are you self-supporting, and are you not going to be dependent on ICANN?"

Since we have a certification issue—which I believe, actually, is missing from the certification; we need to fix that—we decided to omit that question altogether. Justine has a hand up. Please, Justine, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Alan. My comment was, actually, in relation to the earlier part where we were looking at the questions. So, if you could scroll back again? Thanks. These are the ones at the time.

I thought it might flow better if we asked the types of questions in relation to members and put them together. So, for example, question D,

"Describe your general membership," and so forth. And then, it would be F, "Approximately how many members," and so forth. Okay.

Sorry. There is another question D at the bottom, so I'm not quite sure how that numbering works. But basically, what I'm trying to say is, if we could keep all the questions regarding specifics about members together, I think it just makes it flow a little bit better. So, in that sense, question E is a little bit out of sync. So, maybe that should go at the bottom of all of the other membership questions. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Good point. Any other things on membership before we scroll down again? Okay. Back to funding. Now, the real question is, given that … What is the impact of A, and why do we ask it? That is, "What is your primary source or sources of funding of your organization?"

We're later going to ask, "Are you getting funding from government or for-profit entities?" So, what is the point of asking A? Is there a point in asking A? Do we need to ask it? No, but … David, please go ahead.

DAVID MACKEY: Hi. My thinking, Alan, is that it's really just transparency. It's a question of … I don't think it's a question of acceptance or rejection. I think it's a question of transparency. That's my answer.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And I note Nadira, in the chat, says, "No point and not our concern." Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH KIDEN: I think the two questions look different to me. So, one is how they get funding, or how they do their activities, and the second could be different for, maybe, if governments fund them for different things. It's not necessary, but I think they are certainly different questions, in my opinion, and we should maintain both. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. They are definitely different questions, and what is currently C is something we can't ignore. That one, definitely, we need. The question is, do we need A, though? Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Alan. I agree with Sarah that these two questions are a bit different. For example, you could always phrase the question of, "What is the primary source of funds for an organization?" We can say that we raise funds through projects, research, etc., which we get, and from it we run the organization.

And next, if you're asking, "Do they get funds from government or for-profit entities?" they may say, "Yes," and then justify, "These are why we've got government funds or funds from for-profit organizations." So, it could be C coming first, and then A coming.

But I think A explains how they generate funds for running the organization. So, I kind of find sense in it because, when the reviewer looks at the application, they would be understanding better, rather than sending queries through the ALS applicant again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. There is no question of C. We discussed C at some length last time, and C will remain in current form, or perhaps slightly modified form. My question is, why do we care about A? David said transparency.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Alan, just to answer, I can give you an example of when we were applying for the ALS application. Many times, when someone sees a government funding for some project, there are questions coming back saying, "You've got government funding. For what did you get government funding?" whereas the government funding could have been for outreach activities and other things. So, this particular question may help the reviewer of the application to understand, rather than ask the question once again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. When you say "this may," do you mean A might help that or C might help that?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: As in C is important and A helps in [clarifying] the C.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: A and C.

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

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I want them both.

ALAN GREENBERG: You want both. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You asked me, "Do you want both?" The answer is yes, and I want them both very much in support of what Amrita just said. It is a diffusing question because you can, then … If you just ask C, then there is going to be the, "Ah, how much is it? What proportion? What are the responsibilities? What are the requirements?" Where if you say A first, and then you drill down into the specifics about the funding agencies, it just makes sense to me in that way. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: As you explain it, it now makes sense to me, too. Sarah.

SARAH KIDEN: Hi. [When] we said we wanted A because we wanted the applicant to know that we wanted to know they have money so that they don't rely on ICANN for funding, or something like that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. And lastly, Yrjö.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah. Thank you, Alan. Yeah. The question A gives the opportunity for the ALS applicant to say that they are relying on membership fees, and that says a lot, actually, about the organization, whether they actually have membership fees and whether that is a big part, instead of just relying on handouts from some [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Should we explicitly mention that as one of the options?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: I think so, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Good idea. All right. I think we're done on … Natalia, please go ahead, and then we'll go onto the next section.

NATALIA FILINA: Thank you very much, [dear] Alan. I'd like to ask why we delete the option D? I think this is important, too. D.

ALAN GREENBERG: Because D will be a certification saying you will not be expecting ICANN funds.

NATALIA FILINA: Ah, okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Communication. We had several sections. Two of the questions moved to other places because we couldn't figure out why they were listed in communication. A is going into certifications, and we're left with B, "Does your organization post on the Internet publicly accessible, current information about your organization goals, etc.?"

Now, part of this is a certification that you will have to do that. But this is a general question: "Tell us about how you communicate." So, I think we said we would leave that. It may require a bit of wordsmithing but, basically, it's there. I see no hands or no comments.

"Objectives." I note there is a comment from Justine that we'll go to once we have finished the items that are already here. "Please describe your organization mission and purpose." We couldn't figure out why this question, among others, says, "Answer in the text box."

"What ICANN-related issues currently are of interest to your organization's constituent members?" We said we would, as part of the introduction, tell them what ICANN issues we're looking at. Not necessarily the detailed list of issues but, essentially, "What is it we are here for?"

I guess we'll go to Justine's right now because she flagged it right over here. Justine asked a new question: "How do you or your organization's constituents/membership see yourselves/themselves," needs a little bit of rewording, "being or getting involved in ICANN's mission?"

So, essentially, we're asking them, "Okay, fine. You're now going to become an ALS. How are you going to contribute?" I think this may require a little bit of some wordsmithing, but I think it's a fine idea. Comments, anyone? Again, this comes down to the core of making sure there is a nexus, a connection, between the ALS and ICANN. Yes, please go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think the principle is good, and I think if we just agree in principle and get [it tidy at the end] to fit in, in whatever version of English you want, it will be a good addition.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I see no negative comments, and I see another "it's a good idea." Thank you, Justine. "Has your organization set up any event, meeting, or real-life activity," I'm not sure we want "real-life," but I'll take input on that, "pertaining to Internet governance issues and other issues related to the interests of Internet users? If so, explain."

I guess I have a question. Do we want to generalize it, "interest of Internet users," which is a much wider thing than ICANN's remit? I'm happy to put it there just because it gives you a sense of the organization, although it may not be an ICANN-related thing. So, I'm happy to keep this pretty well as it is. I think we may have had that discussion last time, as well. Nadira, please go ahead.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ:	Yeah. Thank you, Alan. In fact, in these questions, we have to rely on the objective of what we discussed earlier. Why, now, we [have concerting] about what they are doing? It wasn't in our concern in the process which we discussed earlier in the document, according to what I remember. So, we have to do some matching, here: what they do and what we expect them to do. I remember we eliminated the Internet governance activities. Again, it's not what we have written. Yes. Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I'm not quite sure I understand what you're saying, but let me go to Cheryl next.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I hope I understand what you're saying, Nadira. And if I do understand, I'm not sure I agree with you. I think what this question is giving us is useful information about how already engaged or prepared the entity is within the world of "Internet."

Now, if they have already been strongly engaged in Internet governance activities or whatever, then they're going to come in with a certain degree of basic understanding and, very likely, contribution, which will be different to, "We're a Telco user group and we felt we needed to get more involved in Internet."

They're going to need slightly different expectations for the problem and, perhaps, some more capacity-building to bring them up to a certain speed. So, I just see this as a useful thing and not something that needs to be matched with criteria, as such. |

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I also see this as one of the cross-check questions. If the answer to this is, "What we do is we teach school children how to use computers," the answer may well draw additional questions from the people reviewing it of, "Okay, and how does this relate to ICANN?" or, "why is ICANN going to be an asset to this?"

So, I think knowing what they do and what they claim to do, again, gives you a better picture of the organization and can make judgment calls as to whether this will be a reasonable ALS or not. Nadira, your hand is still up. Is that a new hand?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: No. Yes, it is a new hand, because I think I agree with you what we are supposed to ask them in these questions. But when we discussed earlier about why the ALSes and what we have … In the earlier document, we kind of drifted from this objective. That's my concern. And then I think, the one we approved earlier, we have to revisit. That's my point. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: When you say "the one we approved," are you talking about the expectations and criteria?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yes. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or are you talking about earlier in this process?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Not about the application. I'm talking about the expectation of the ALSes and what we want them to do. So, in this application, we are drifting. That's why. We have to, first, [back] both of them to be complementary.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I guess I don't really see that. What we're looking for … Remember, in expectations, what of the prime expectations is you will forward to you members interesting things about ICANN. That's almost the core of the expectation that we have. That is, you have members and we want access to them.

This question is giving us some insight as to, is there likely to be a nexus point, a connection, between what we're sending to your members and what you members have an interest in?

Again, we're trying to predict the future, but we're trying to figure out, is this going to be a profitable relationship for both of us? That is, we will give you things that are useful and you will make contributions back. It's looking to see, is there insight? So, I think they do complement each other. I don't agree with you that they don't.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Excuse me. I will look into the other document and I will come back to you with my point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yrjö, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. My recollection is that we didn't … When we discussed this, actually, at length, at an earlier phase, to be involved in Internet governance activities was not established as an expectation. But I recall that we had to have some language about that, which is positive and in no way negative. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The reference to Internet governance in the previous one is … That was a discussion we had of, should we recommend to ALSes that they should be involved in local Internet governance? And we decided the answer was no, but we are suggesting they might consider it because, for some organizations, it may make some sense, and for others it would make no sense whatsoever. So, that is a discussion we had, and there is

a reference to it, not in an absolute criteria but a suggestion of something we might say to ALSes.

And in relation to this one, I don't think we are considering that, if they say, "No, we're not involved in Internet governance," it's necessarily a negative. We're just trying to get an idea of what the organization does. David, please go ahead.

DAVID MACKEY: Hi. Thanks, Alan. I have an observation. I don't know if there is anything actionable out of this. I'm just connecting some of the words you were saying, Alan, that make sense to me, which is you used the words, "We're looking for a nexus between the organization that's applying with us as the At-Large or ICANN organization."

And yet, we don't have that. We have the process. We've been going through the process, and we're in the final discussion about the form of how to feed into that process, but we don't talk about the criteria of what is a successful nexus.

I think that might be okay in the sense that the process we're describing funnels organizations into a process for the people in our organization to make decisions and to have some sort of conversation about what that criteria is. I just wanted … The observation is we're talking about … We touch on criteria but we don't actually describe it within the process, and that might be a good thing. That's my observation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think I know what you're saying. Let's defer the thought until we have fleshed out a little bit more about the preamble and the discussions of "what is the connection between ICANN?" because I think by the time we finish we will have that. I may be wrong.

In the chat I see, from Justine, "I understand Nadira's point. Wondering if we should be up-front with the connection with DNS and Internet governance [or] ask any supplemental questions?"

The whole issue of Internet governance and DNS is an interesting one. Clearly, we are part of Internet governance. We set some of the rules for parts of the Internet, and there is certainly a significant overlap between people who are interested and involved in ICANN and who have an interest in other aspects of Internet governance.

So, there is an overlap, a union of the two. And from an ICANN internal point of view, there are a number of other organizations involved in Internet governance that have, from time to time, said they wanted to take over ICANN. So, from a political point of view, they are obviously connected.

I'm not sure that is as relevant on an ALS side but, certainly, there is some connection. All right. We're running out of time. I'd like to try to continue this section right now. And certainly, if you have further thoughts on it, please put them in the e-mail list. E-mail is something we don't use very well within this group.

And the next question, again, is related to Internet governance. "If your organization is accredited." We had some trouble understanding what that meant during the last call. It says, "If we accredit your organization,

will you commit to participating?" I think that's going to go into the certification.

"If your organization is accredited, does it and will it agree to adhere to the provisions of the memorandum of understanding?" That, also, is moving. That, essentially, is complimenting E and F, or close to saying the same thing, because one of the things in the MOU is ALSes contribute to the RALO. But both of those will move into the certification.

"Does your organization have written bylaws?" We say, "Show them to us, preferably a pointer." Now, the certification was my first cut. There are things missing from it right now. But essentially, what I did was take, as bullet points, here, the expectations that we set during the first several months of this group.

There are a few things that I realize, as I've been talking here, are missing, and those are the things that we're saying you had to commit to. For instance, no funding from ICANN, and a number of other … And adopting the memorandum of understanding. So, this list is not yet complete, but it's the start.

There will also have to be a section on privacy. That is what we do with your information, and you're agreeing to allow us to process and publish selected parts of it. And then, a certification that your organization understands and accepts the expectations and understands and agrees to the privacy disclaimer, or whatever the appropriate language is going to be there. And then, signed by someone who is authorized to act on behalf of your organization. Judith, please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Yes. Is the bylaws question new? I don't recall that we're requiring ALSes to have bylaws.
ALAN GREENBERG:	It is not a new question. This says, "Does your organization have written bylaws or other constitutional instruments? Yes/no. If yes, provide them." That's not a new question.
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	But if no, we haven't refused them?
ALAN GREENBERG:	No. I don't think there is an implication there that—
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Okay.
ALAN GREENBERG:	We're refusing them. Now, why is that, by the way, under objectives?
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	I don't know.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Shouldn't that be under governance?

EN

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I would think so, but …

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I'm just noticing that here, and it's like, maybe that was an optional question? If you don't have bylaws then you just say no, and it's like, "Okay, move on," you know? That's fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: We could ask Evin. Does anyone ever express shock that we're asking it and they've said no? I think this is just one of the yes/noes, "Tell us about your organization."

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Yeah. If I may? Thanks, Alan. No. Yeah, generally, this question is answered. They either copy-paste it—it can be quite a few pages in the document—or they share a URL to their website that displays it. Most applicants share this readily, so it doesn't seem like an issue to them.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Evin, does everyone have bylaws? Because some places that … Even groups or an organization, they may have rules but, if they're not incorporated, they don't have bylaws.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thanks, Judith. I can look into that question further, but my overall impression is that they do, because most of them are incorporated. But I can look into that. There could be some exceptions, but generally they are.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we need to look into it. We know that we do not require incorporation, and I have no doubt that some of our organizations are informal enough to not have bylaws and rules. But unless we believe that, if the answer is no, we will reject them, or consider rejecting them because the answer is no, I don't think we need to worry about it further. Again, this is another "let's collect information about the organization," but we're not passing judgment that it's necessary or not.

All right. So, we need some additional stuff within the certification that is not there. Lastly, there was a suggestion from Sarah that … And it's on the next page, if you can scroll down a little bit. There we go.

Not sure where to add this: "For outreach and engagement purposes, it could perhaps be useful to find out how and where they learned about ALAC and ICANN, if through an outreach event, ICANN local meeting, local event, whatever."

I don't have any clue why we never thought to ask this before, "Where did you hear about us?" but it's a question that everyone asks when someone is joining – or when you shop at their store, for that matter.

I can't imagine why we never thought of it before, but I think it's a great question to ask. Thank you, Sarah. Any further comments about where

we're going on this? I think, with some cleanup, we're just about done on this section, and Cheryl agrees. All right. I will do another cleanup pass.

To come, at this point, we need … I believe there is a document somewhere, either Heidi or Silvia, of the summary of the five memorandums of understanding, showing common points. They are each worded slightly differently, but the points within them are generally relatively uniform.

At this point, I don't think we are contemplating signing a new memorandum of understanding, but I do know that, in some cases, we do need an amendment to it, particularly for individual end-users. That's not quite our domain but, I think, as one of the governance documents, something we have to look at.

So, I think we want to quickly review the MOUs and see, is there anything that's wrong in it? Which will be troublesome, but I think we need to understand. And lastly, is there anything that needs to be added to it?

Following that, we also want to do a quick review of the bylaws to see, is there anything we've missed? Is there anything wrong? Is there anything we need to fix? We are coming close to the final part of our work.

I'm going to start trying to pull the original criteria and expectations into a form of a report for the ALAC. It's not going to be very different than what we already have, but a little bit of editing. I think we're getting close to the end.

Our hope was we would get this to the ALAC, preferably, in time for a decision at the Annual General Meeting, which, if we're going to make

that target, we clearly have to get it for the ALAC in enough time for the ALAC and ALAC members to distribute it to the RALOs. You'll recall, according to the bylaws, making changes on the relationship between ALSes and the rules does have to be done in concordance with the RALOs. So, there is a step there.

So, at this point, I think we should either be ready for a decision, or at least know when the decision will be made, following the Annual General Meeting, if we don't make that timing. But hopefully, we'll be close. Silvia says she has included it in a chart in the part. Silvia, if you could send me a copy?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would appreciate that.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Sure, yes. I will search for it. I think, in the past, I did a table comparing [them were used], if I recall correctly, a while ago. So, I will search my files. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep. Thank you. Yep. Cheryl, the target is getting it to the ALAC agenda for the Annual General Meeting. The only question is, because of timing with regard to consultation with the RALOs, will there be an issue with

that? But hopefully, not caused by us. When is the AGM? Does anyone have the dates? Clearly, we can look it up.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. It is going to be two weeks. It is the 13th to the 15th, and then it's the next week after that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you tell us which month?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: October!

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sorry. It's not always in …

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay, yeah. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, it ranges from as early as September to as late as … The Annual General Meeting moves all over.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. Yeah. It's October. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And then the preview meetings, the pre-meetings, are the week before.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Okie-doke. Any further comments before we adjourn for the day? It has been a very productive meeting. Assuming the light at the end of the tunnel is not a train coming at us, I think we're progressing well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thanks, Alan. Thanks, everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, all. Bye-bye.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]