

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Unaffiliated Individuals Mobilization Working Party call taking place on Wednesday, 26th of August, 2020, at 16:00 UTC.

On our call today, on the English channel, we have Roberto Gaetano, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gopal Tadepalli, Syuzan Marukhyan, David Mackey, Bill Jouris, Laura Margolis, Joanna Kulesza, Sarah Kiden, Judith Hellerstein, Hanan Khatib, and Alan Greenberg.

We don't have anyone on the Spanish channel, and no one on the French channel, for now, either. Natalia Filina has just joined us, as well. We have received apologies from Nadira Al-Araj and Carlos Raul Gutierrez.

From staff side, we have Gisella Gruber, Alperen Eken, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar, on call management. As you know, we have Spanish and French interpretation. Our Spanish interpreters are Lilian and Paula, and French interpreters are Isabelle and Claire.

Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And now, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Roberto. Thanks so much.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yeah. Thank you, Yeşim. Let me ask if there are any proposals for changing something in the agenda. I have one myself. Okay. So, hearing none, I go ahead. I have been advised that it's good to have a short

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.

explanation on how we have formed the group and why do we have ex officio members and participants.

So I will, first of all, give a short update on the situation. We have only a couple of situations pending. EURALO has not officially appointed their members; the unaffiliated individual member and the ALS member. And LACRALO has appointed people, but they are not all yet on the mailing list. I am confident that, in a couple of days, those small items still pending will be solved.

So, as it was explained, but I'm not sure if everybody participated to the previous call or to the discussion on the mailing list, we have three members per RALO that are officially appointed: one from the RALO leadership, one for the unaffiliated individuals, and one from the ALS members.

On top of that, we have participating to this working party the ALAC chair. And then, Alan Greenberg as, ex officio, as a chair of the parallel, I would say, working party, the ALS Mobilization Working Party that is about to finish their work.

And Cheryl Langdon-Orr is former chair, who has an excellent historical perspective and is aware of all the things that have happened up to now, and so, therefore, could be a good helper in minimizing the risk of doing mistakes. So, I would like to have these three people say, briefly, a few words: Maureen, Alan, and Cheryl. Can we start with Maureen? Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Roberto. Good morning from me. Thank you so much for joining this group. For me, this activity tops off our implementation activities from the At-Large review, which we began four years ago.

So, four years down the track, we're onto our last activity. So, it's important to At-Large from that perspective. But also, it follows on from, as Roberto mentioned, that important review that was done under Alan Greenberg, which helped to clarify our criteria and expectations for the ALSes, with regard to mobilizing our members into action to carry out the work that At-Large mandated to do.

I just want to say thank you very much to Roberto for leading this group, and I thank you all for being part of this working party. I'm really looking forward to being part of your sessions and just seeing the development of the work that we want to do with regard to just clarifying the status and issues for unaffiliated, individual members within the At-Large. So, thank you very much.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Maureen. Alan, would you like to say a couple of words from your perspective?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. Thank you, Roberto. I guess I bring a number of views into this meeting, and I hope some of them will be useful. I was involved in writing the last set of rules for At-Large in general, going back to 2007, as was Cheryl – probably to a larger extent than me.

I think the two of us did the final editing of all of those. I've just been almost finishing chairing the ALS Mobilization Group, and there is a fair amount of overlap between the two. It's important that we not introduce any conflicts as we go forward.

I was also the chair of the ALAC for four years during the largest expansion of unaffiliated members to the other RALOs because, originally, only North America had them. And I think I have the distinction of being the first and longest-standing individual unaffiliated member.

I started with At-Large just before RALOs existed and was part of the formation of the North American RALO as an unaffiliated member. I think I hold the distinction of being the longest-standing one, and I have a pretty good idea of why we think they're a good thing.

And of course, I was also heavily involved, as the chair of the ALAC at the time, in the At-Large review, where we were pushing individual unaffiliated members in addition to ALSes. Some of you may know there was a rather tumultuous At-Large review where the external reviewers recommended some rather radical changes that we managed to change to something we think is implementable. Thus, this group exists. So I think it will be an interesting group, and I hope I can add some perspective from a number of different views into it. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alan. Cheryl, would you like to say a couple of words? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It'll be my pleasure. Thank you very much, Roberto. I bring a couple of things in here as the additional ex officio member to Maureen and Alan. And of course, just so we're all clear, ex officio members serve as a resource for you all.

But of course, we have no ... Whilst we—subject, of course, to the chair's discretion—can be asked to speak and have whatever normal rights and privileges of interaction and consensus-building go on in this group, if anything ever came to any form of consensus call/polling, we wouldn't have a particular role in that. So, we have no influence on any counting that may or may not go on in your decision-making processes, just so we all know what ex officio means.

That said, I certainly act as that hysterical ... No, sorry, you said "historical" resource, Roberto, for your ... And that's because, of course, I was chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee when the initial At-Large review went on. It was at that point that the whole concept of having harmonization across all of the regional At-Large organizations came to pass to allow unaffiliated individual members to join, because, at that stage, the only regional group that had that built into their system was, in fact, the North American RALO. So, I have that.

I additionally was once nicknamed—but I wore it with pride—"the queen of process." So, as Alan mentioned, we have a fairly deep understanding of all of the arcane arts of bylaws and rules of procedure, both those in past and those in present usage.

But most importantly, I assume that your group will be coming up with some things that may, indeed, be criteria and things that you may wish to measure or to establish that people do or do not need as their criteria.

And that, of course, puts things firmly into, then, once your work is over, the care and management of the Metrics Subcommittee of the At-Large Advisory Committee, and I am deeply engaged with that. So, there is that facilitation liaison of information across all of those working parts. Thank you, Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Cheryl. I would like just to say a couple of things related to the discussion that is going on on the chat. I understand it is probably not clear how the membership is selected/appointed/elected/whatever.

So we will have, for each RALO, one person that comes from the ALAC leadership, one person that is an unaffiliated individual, and another person that is an ALS member. So, we decided to have this in order to have representation from the individuals, representation from the ALS members, and representation from the leadership.

I would not worry too much at this point in time if not all the regions have these three people officially appointed because, in any case, we can start working. This working party is, in any case, open to everybody who wants to join, provided that they do their expression of interest, that they fill in the GDPR required form, and so on.

But once these formalities have been done, then they can join the group and participate to everything. The only difference is if, in one special case,

we need to go to a vote. Then, the vote will be restricted to only these members. The reason is that, if we leave the vote open, there is the possibility that one region is over-represented and other regions are less represented, and that will not ensure a balance.

However, I anticipate that there will be rare cases in which we will need to take aboard. If any, we will try to go on by consensus for every decision that we make. So, therefore, there shouldn't be a problem or a concern related to the vote. So, I see Alan has his hand up. So, Alan, you have the floor. And obviously, just raise your hand if you have comments on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Roberto. Roberto, you went to Maureen, me, and Cheryl for intro, but you didn't give an introduction of yourself, so I'll do that, since you're obviously to bashful to do it. Just for those who don't know, Roberto has been around At-Large since the very beginning in 2002/2003. He was an ALAC member. He was the ALAC liaison to the board. He was then an actual formal board member appointed by the NomCom. So, he has vast experience, both in At-Large and, from a board perspective, approving the rules associated with anything. So, I just think that that's important. Not everyone is as old as I am. Thank you, Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alan. So let's go, now, to the real work. The first thing that I would like to say is I would like to start with looking at the role that the individuals have and start the discussion on, what are the requirements that we want to have for those individuals?

One important bit of information is the table that staff has prepared. Maybe we can just, as work progresses, work on this table and see, in particular, if there are certain things that are applied in one region that, maybe, the other regions think, now, that it would be a good idea to apply for them, as well.

Why am I saying this? Because, as a matter of fact, for the individuals, each RALO has worked on its own. So, for the five regions, we have quite different approaches. This is not a problem. It really shows, also, cultural differences among regions. But maybe there are certain things that we could revise, maybe, if it's good to have certain things that are common to each RALO, so that we revise a bit the way the role for the individuals is designed.

I'm just quoting one exactly. One example is about how individuals apply. There are two differences, for instance, between North America and Europe where, in Europe, we have a process with a due diligence and so on, whereas that goes fairly—how can I say?—"in-depth."

Whereas, for instance, in NARALO, the process of accepting individuals is much easier and is ... Basically, once the conditions of residency or nationality are ensured, and the person is not a member of an accredited

At-Large Structure, that is sufficient, without going into any other procedural or bureaucratic burden.

So, this is something. It is just an example. It's fine if different RALOs have different procedures, but maybe we should ... If we want to really mobilize the unaffiliated individuals, the question is, are there any necessary conditions that we need to add, or any support that we decide we need to provide to the individuals, so that their participation is more effective for At-Large? I see, already, one hand up. David, you have the floor.

DAVID MACKEY:

Hi. Thanks, Roberto. As quite often, Roberto, I tend to have questions. So, I have a question that I'd like to just ask, to make sure that there is clarity and common understanding about the word that you used called "mobilization." Can you help me understand? And maybe help, possibly, a broader conversation, if there is any other clarification needed about when you use the word "mobilization." It's used in the context of unaffiliated individual members, but also within ALS. Can you just help me to understand the broad sense of what you're talking about with mobilization? Thanks.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yeah. Thank you for the question, David. That is, actually, a very good question because, too often, we use words, and then different people have a different understanding of what that means.

I can tell you what I mean by that. And then, maybe, if people have a different idea, especially if, for instance, Maureen as ALAC chair has a different idea, it would be very good if you, Maureen, correct me.

But the way I interpret this “mobilization” is in the way we can favor the participation of individuals. So that means, what are the conditions for the participation? But that means, also, how we are going to develop strategies for outreach. It means, also, how we can support their participation in terms of providing learning tools.

Also, how we keep updated information about the skills that the individuals have so that, when we have a certain working group that starts on a specific topic, we can reach out to the individuals that have skills that could be useful for that working group.

I mean, all these things are done. Joanna, who is on the call, for instance, is dealing a lot with webinars and training for people, and we need to figure out, specifically for individuals, how we are going to, maybe, develop certain specific training, and so on. Also, for outreach, there is a subcommittee for outreach.

Those are all things that we are doing. But the question is, since, up to now, the key concern was on ALS, we need to figure out whether, the moment that we have unaffiliated individuals, we have to take, also, a different point of view.

For instance, the skillset. This is very important. Unaffiliated individuals can come from very diverse situations and with very diverse experiences. Their skills could be extremely helpful in the work that we are doing here. But we need to have a more ... Not necessarily formal, but more

controlled approach, making sure that we are not forgetting things because we never formalized them or we never wrote them in a checklist.

So, that is how I understand the mission of this group/working party. I see Alan Greenberg with his hand up. Alan, you have the floor. Please, if you have questions or comments, feel free to voice them out, because this is, as a matter of fact, fundamental. I mean, we need to have agreement on what this working party will be doing before we start going in the wrong direction. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yep. Thank you very much. I guess this is one of the times I'll put my historical hat on, although some of the history is very recent. One of the reasons we use the term "mobilization" here is to show the parallelism between this group and the ALS Mobilization Group. They are the two prongs/the two parts of "how do we get more active workers?" that came out of the At-Large review.

So, there is the parallelism that they are two similar things that are going to have to be done in parallel for this to work properly. The term "mobilization" was used for the ALS group because we have had ALSes since the beginning of the current At-Large, which now goes ... It's almost 18 years at this point.

But in many cases, these ALSes were not doing what we originally envisioned ALSes would do – that is, give us their members so that we have a large pool of people on the ground in each country. So, that's why we use the term "mobilization" there. It was really to mobilize ALSes and

make sure they were capable of meeting the original objective of having ALSes.

And to some extent, the same has been true for individual members. We've had individual members in North American RALO for 14 years, now, and we've had individual members in other groups for a shorter amount of time.

But nevertheless, some of those people, although they were individual members in name, aren't active. They aren't doing things. And just having the glory of having the name is not enough. We really want to get people to be more active and more participatory. And so, again, the term "mobilization" is a reasonable one, in that case. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alan. I see Maureen asks for the floor. Maureen, please go.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Roberto. Yeah, I just wanted to add onto what you both said, which I totally agree with. For At-Large, I sort of see that the purpose of this whole direction of mobilizing all of our members, once we've clarified the objectives for both the ALS and individual members, it's really so that, once we have clarified it within At-Large, then the people who join up have a better understanding—we can actually give them a better understanding of what it is that we actually expect of them once they join up with us—and so that we can better do the work that we're mandated to do.

I think that I just have to agree with everything that both Roberto and Alan have said, especially about mentioning the skills and the experience that individuals bring, whether they're from ALSes or as individual members, and how that could help what we're doing within At-Large. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yeah. Thank you, Maureen. Are there any other questions or comments on this? Well, if not, I would go to the table and see how the different RALOs have so far interpreted the role of the individuals and what are the requirements. However, before doing this, I see the hand of Gopal. Gopal, you have the floor.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

Hello, everyone. This is Gopal Tadepalli, from India. I am in Chennai. It has been my pleasure to interact with so many good professionals from ICANN all over. I confirmed my membership, my ICANN At-Large membership way back in April 8th, 2000. It's very nice that ICANN was able to track all those formal documents [inaudible] from ICANN and everything.

We did some work on Internet governance for the government of [Tamilar]. We wanted to have the event APRICOT in APNIC. However, there are so many other constraints way back in 2000. Then I was with Internet Governance Forum. It is something which is very, very important, and individuals are the best to make localization happen in a manner where we practice jurisprudence. We also practice the way in

which Internet should be leveraged for the betterment of the community, with due regard to the global leadership. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you. Yes. So let's go, now, to the table. The first thing that I would like to note is that there are things that are common. My suggestion would be to ask staff to keep track while we review this table, to keep track of what we have in common already for the different regions, and what are the differences, and whether there are certain proposals to use certain processes for all RALOs, whether it would be a good idea.

So, the first thing that we can note is that, in all the RALOs, the criteria for accreditation are fairly ... There are some identical things. I believe that those are, in any case, requirements by our bylaws, but I'm not 100% sure. But in every region, the unaffiliated individual must be a permanent resident of the region, or having a nationality of one of the countries of the region.

"Cannot be a member of an ALS." That means you cannot be at the same time a member of an ALS and an unaffiliated individual. And you have to be subscribed to the regional mailing list. So, those are common to all the regions. And then, I believe that this is something that is mandated, anyway.

In Europe, we accept observers that fail to meet the requirements about the nationality or the residency. I can explain why this has been a historical case. In the South Caucasus, Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan are countries that are very close—in particular, Romania—to Europe, and people are very much interested as to what happens in Europe.

And so, they are eager to participate to the discussions that are happening in Europe. As a matter of fact, I believe that Narine is one of those persons who is an observer as an unaffiliated individual but with “observer-ship” in EURALO. That was the reason why we have opened this possibility.

Now, there are other situations, potentially, in the world. I’m sure you know that, for instance, territories in other geographical regions that are historically part of a European country ... I mean, France has overseas territories and overseas departments in, for instance, the Americas and in Africa.

Those territories are, according to the ICANN recognition of countries, allocated in Europe. So, people from one island that is in the Americas that is a French territory should belong to EURALO, even if, as a matter of fact, that person is much more connected with the other islands that are surrounding it and that are located, for instance, in the LAC region. So, this is something that we could discuss, whether this is a good idea that we propose to have this option for individuals in every region. So, two points I would like to make.

First, do we all agree that this nationality/residency/not being also a member of an ALS and subscribing to the regional mailing list, those are mandated, and we can start saying that this is a common basis, and that will hold for all the regions?

The second thing is the discussion about whether we could use a form of “observership”: we allow people to participate in discussion and

contribute, and being unaffiliated individuals with a special status of “observer” in a different region.

So, the floor is open for discussion. I have, in this order, Gopal, Alan, and Judith asking for the floor. Gopal, please go.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

Yes, it is agreeable to me, and it is very nice that we will get professionals as observers from various other regions. Per se, there is no reason to be wary about any At-Large Structure outside of an individual requirement, as they [voted in the chat] that we would rather be identified with the institution, and institutions [inaudible] world-renowned education institutions. [We’re one of] those world-renowned institutions.

So, it’s all over [Tamilar] and it keeps me busy enough to manage the governance aspects of Internet within the institution. I’ll be happy to participate, keep making voluntary contribution to ICANN At-Large. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Gopal. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Alfredo asked a question in the chat, which I think is worthy of discussing. That is, why do we need individual unaffiliated members? Why can’t someone just join an ALS? It’s a good question. The answer is, number one, the ALS in your region may be ... Most ALSes have some root existence before they became an ALS.

So, for instance, the ALS in your region may be heavily involved in other aspects of Internet governance, and you have no interest in it. It may be an ALS which helps teach school children how to use computers, and that's not something of interest to you. And of course, an ALS might have a fee to join, and you have no interest in paying that fee. So, there may be all sorts of reasons why the local ALSes are really not suited for you.

The related question, however, is, why do all RALOs have a rule saying you can only be an individual unaffiliated member? If you're unaffiliated, you cannot also be an ALS member. And the real answer to that is somewhat arbitrary. Originally, the thought was, "Well, if you have a vote within an ALS, then you shouldn't have a vote as an individual member." That was true in NARALO, which was the only one with members.

On the other hand, there is no prohibition about you being a member of 12 different ALSes in the same region. So, the multiple voting may not really be a valid one and, some regions, the individual members don't have a vote, anyway.

So, that's one of the things we could discuss here: Is being an unaffiliated with an ALS something that is really important? Is it an arbitrary rule? Is it simply a way of distinguishing people? That's something which could be on the discussion if we chose to do it but, at this point, it's a rule within all the RALOs. But the history is interesting. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alan. I have a comment on this, but let's go to Judith, first. Judith, please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

So, in also talking to Alfredo's question, another thing that Alan had left off is that the politics of that ALS may not be something that you're interested in. I know particular occurrences where a particular ALS that you may have been affiliated with was ... You feel like you could not get your ideas across, or they were not listening to you, or that you felt that the only way you can get ideas across would be to come out as an individual. That was also a thing.

And there are also a lot of situations where the person ... Just like in any other organization, one person has very different views than another group and is an outlier in that group. As we're trying to gain consensus, it's a lot easier for it to be clear who is talking in the name of what.

So, whether it's one ALS talking in the name or whether it's an individual within that ALS. And so that's also why, in NARALO, we have suggested to people that either they form their own ALS with a different viewpoint that they wanted to get across, or that they become an individual member, and then they can express their viewpoint which is what they want to get across, and that's what matters to them, and that's what concerns them.

Originally, why I raised my hand was that I think one of the criteria that you brought up on the observer status, I think, should be voted secondly, because I think it's very different. I don't necessarily agree that, as the case with the island nations, if you happen to be owned by ...

We have, in NARALO, many territories in the Pacific. We are never going to get them to be NARALO members, nor do we want them to be

NARALO, nor will they fit in well. Their cultural ... A lot of their characteristics, a lot of what they are trying to do, and a lot of the issues are all related to the region where they are located.

So, they really should belong to the region where they are located. And there was a whole, long, non-geographic-names issue brought up many years ago, and yes, they are territories. I can understand the point they should belong, but we should be able ... But if they want to, they should be able to be a full individual member of another region and not be restricted.

So, I don't necessarily agree with your observer status by saying French territories that are based in the Caribbean cannot be joined in the Caribbean. I think they should be able to. That's where the relationships are. I know we're not going to change. But then, why bring it up? So, I think bringing it up just sullies the issue and gets into controversy, where we don't really want to bring it up. So, that's sort of why I commented on the observer status rule that you have.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yes, Judith. Thank you. Your point is taken. However, just a couple of things. In the very beginning, this was not the situation. In the early days of ICANN, regardless of whether they were territories that belonged to different countries, the location was geographical. The location in the RALO was geographical.

And then, at a certain point in time, very early, it changed. It was mainly ... And that was an issue that was related to ccTLD because certain of those territories have their own ccTLD. I'm thinking about Guadeloupe

and Martinique that are French territories, and they have their own TLDs, and they were, obviously, not related to Europe for all their processes.

Anyway, we are not going to change that. But the reason why I am bringing this up is because this is a case that we already have with an ALS. We have an ALS that is located in one of those territories that belong to France and, therefore, they should be part of EURALO. But in fact, they are not interested to be part of EURALO.

Anyway, this is something that we can probably discuss on the mailing list where I can, maybe, point to the example and to the documents so that we have a background.

So, also because we are six minutes away from the end of this call, and I know that there is a subcommittee on outreach that is starting on the top of the hour, we cannot really overrun. So, maybe we can discuss this on the mailing list. I will provide a little bit of information about those situations.

And to the point of Alan, if I recall correctly, there was a similar discussion in the ALS Mobilization Working Group, where we sort of made a distinction in certain cases between a plain member and somebody that is part of the leadership of the ALS.

So, by extension to this, maybe we can soften this requirement. We can discuss about softening this requirement of not being a member of an ALS for an unaffiliated individual, saying you cannot be in the leadership of an ALS.

The problem is very simple. Somebody might belong to an ALS but, on a specific topic, that person might have a completely different point of view from what ... Let's put it politely: has a minority position within the ALS. And that person might well participate in a working group, expressing his own opinion as an individual, even if they differ from the opinion of his or her ALS, or at least of the leadership of the ALS.

So, that could be a reason why we could think about softening this requirement. Anyway, we are three minutes to close of this call, and there is one imp thing that I would like to say. My intention is to work a lot on the mailing list.

So, this is not a working party that I would like to run only by meeting once a week, but most of the work should be done in the mailing list, also because, when a problem pops up, we can be quick in providing references and URLs to other documents, and so on.

So, please be prepared to dedicate some time in between calls to read the e-mail and to voice out your opinion. This, to a minimum extent, has happened. I would like to increase the participation on the mailing list as we go on/as we proceed with the work.

So, are there any things, any other points that somebody wants to make? Okay. For the time being, I think that we will go on for the next call, again with a Doodle poll. Then, I was wondering whether, once the ALS Mobilization Working Party is finished, which will happen sometime in September, we can inherit that slot, because most of the people that are in this working party were participating in that other working party.

And so, that should not be a big disruption. Maybe giving two options, doing like the Consolidated Policy Working Group that changes time zone in the same day so that it's not always the same geographical region that has calls in the middle of the night. Any other comments? Hearing none, maybe it's time for us to close the call. Can the host, Yeşim, please close the recording and close the call?

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Sure, Roberto. Thank you. Thank you all for joining today's call. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]