
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Unaffiliated Individuals Mobilization Working Party call on Wednesday, the 23rd of September, 2020 at 17:00 UTC. On the call today, on the English channel, we have Roberto Gaetano, Abdulkarim Ayopo Oloyede, Bill Jouris, Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Natalia Filina, Dr. Gopal Tadepalli, Judith Hellerstein, Matthias Hudobnik, Nadira AlAraj, and Susan.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management. Justine Chew has just joined the call as well. We have Spanish and French interpretation on today's call. Our Spanish interpreters are Sabrina and Lilian. And our French interpreters are Isabelle and Camila.

A friendly reminder to please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise and to please state your name when taking the floor so that the interpreters can identify you on the other language channel. Thank you very much. And with this, I turn the call over to you, Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you. Are there any comments on the agenda or suggestions to change? My own comment, I have been prompted by staff that we should have a look at the action items. And so, I would like to quickly add this as part of the standing housekeeping at the beginning of the call. Any other changes?

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.

Okay. Having none, I think that we can start with the review of the action items. I don't think that Caleb is on the call. The first action item was on him. And it was about sending comments of waiting votes for UI and ALS to the mailing list. So, this will remain.

The second action item is from Yeşim. And since we are here, convened for the call, I assume that this has been done. And the third one is for the group to continue discussing possibilities for a set time, like rotating. And this is part of the agenda for this call. It's the last point on the agenda before the any other business. So, I think with that, we can close the point on the action items, unless anybody has comments. Any comments on the action items? Yeah. Hearing none and not seeing any hands. Yeah. Okay. No comments.

Okay. So, we can jump straight on the discussion on criteria. Let me just have a quick summary. The first point about the criteria was about an unaffiliated individual being incompatible with being a member of an ALS. We had this discussion on the mailing list. My sense is that the majority was in favor of loosening this requirement. However, not everybody has contributed to the discussion. So, I'm not really sure that we can have anywhere near a consensus call. So, I think that we have to figure out a way to have a sort of account of the opinions. And my idea was to ask staff, as I have anticipated on the mailing list, to launch a Doodle poll or to have some sort of a straw poll on this.

So, this is now on the table. Are there any other ideas about how to move forward on this? Otherwise ... So, the default is a straw poll by a Doodle poll. I see Cheryl has her hand up. And she will be next. And then

I will answer the question on the chat, asked by Jonathan. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Just without going into the substance, I just wanted to be very specific, based on what, at least, one region's rules say on this, in terms of unaffiliated individual members. Under the current rule, in the case of at least the Asia Pacific region, it's quite specific that even with this rule, that they are not a member of an accredited At-Large structure within the region.

And that's a pretty important point for members of the community who are, for example, active within the Internet Society world because it is certainly not impossible, under even this current rule, nor was it, at least in the Asia Pacific area, seen as a problem if, for example, somebody who's domiciled in Hong Kong, who has no affiliation within an accredited ALS within the Asia Pacific region, but happens to have ticked the box one day that has them as a member of San Francisco ISOC Chapter or London ISOC Chapter. But this rule isn't being triggered under those circumstances.

So, I just wanted to make sure that we were talking with that degree of specificity when we talk about the strict rule as it is today. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Cheryl. Yes. Your point is well-taken. I'm under the impression that this was raised sometimes on the mailing. This is exactly

one of the issues on the table, in the sense that we can set a general rule. But we have to be aware of what the exceptions might be.

Now, the problem ... Of course, the different RALOs will have some flexibility in adopting specific RALO rules. But we have to be quite careful when we discuss matters that are cross-RALO so that one rule in one RALO doesn't conflict with a rule in a different RALO, involving people that—for instance, in the case that you have brought up—that Cheryl has brought up. Then, somebody that is a member of an ALS in one region and individual member in a different region, we have to make sure that this doesn't bring a conflict if the two RALOs have two different rules. So, that's why we are discussing this.

To the question of Jonathan ... Jonathan, I think that your point is taken. But I would invite you to think about situations in which we have, for instance, quite large ALSs, where different members of those ALSs have different opinions and different ways to approach the—also, the policy making. They have different opinions on how to address the policy. And I think that it's only fair that we give them the possibility to state their own opinions.

So, in other words, to have people as individuals is not meant to be compounding the opinion of the ALS and give more value to the voice of the ALS but exactly to give the possibility to a minority in the ALS to express their own opinion. Or maybe we have ALSs that have one specific focus. And maybe, in the policy development, there are some issues that see things from a different point of view that is not of the interest of the ALS but is of the interest of some individual members

that are members of that ALS. I hope that this explains, a little bit, the question that is on the table.

But I see you have your hand raised. I would like to ... With respect to the order, I have Eduardo, Gopal, and then Jonathan. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a suggestion on the way we're doing this discussion. I think I see on the agenda that we have a point four on some discussion of the purpose of individuals. I think if we look at individuals on their purpose first and we have a consensus on what we need the individuals and what their purpose is, then it will be easier to know what requirement that we're going to put to this.

Because to me, for example ... Individuals, to me, being affiliated, or not affiliated, or coming from different regions, I see them as individuals volunteering to work on ICANN work, both in my region and in another region. So, to me, putting requirements that will make that not happen doesn't make sense. But that's because that's what I understand that individuals can bring into the floor. That's a suggestion. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Eduardo. Good point. And in a couple of minutes, we will start the discussion on point four. By the way, I will close the queue after Jonathan on this point. And we can, of course continue on the mailing list. Gopal, the floor is yours.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you very much. I have two observations. First, technical. They are [reforming] these rules. There cannot be anonymity on the net. When something is necessary or when I need to track down the individual, these rules and regulation must help me be disambiguate and locate the person correctly, in quick time. So, the perspective of rule for me, from technical standpoint, must factor this. There is no anonymity on the web. And I should be able to unambiguously track down an individual, whenever I wish to, from someplace.

Administratively, what is the concern with ALS? Whilst we are looking at what is the scope of an individual, at the same time, we should also understand what is the scope of an ALS, At-Large Structure. Presently, as my observation goes—I may be corrected—most ALSs tend to be looking at doing more and more of awareness programs. And therefore, there is something that they can do it on their own. If they can get a few individuals to go the next level, that will be wonderful. That's it. I wish to pause here and look for other opinions—one technical, one policy level. Thanks.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Gopal. Next is Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I appreciate it. Just to back up my question a little bit ... And this may just be a misunderstanding on my part. But I don't know what the value of being an individual member is. I know that I am one. And I decided to do it because I wasn't a member of an ALS. And so, it was a way to get engaged.

But I guess the issue is what is the ...? Besides just being a volunteer, what does being a member mean? Because from a voting standpoint, it's statistically insignificant to vote as an individual member. Is it about being able to run for office or something like that? Because I guess that's the question. And I think I would be equally inclined to believe that having every member of an ALS join as an individual member, too, also would have a statistically insignificant impact on an actual vote or anything like that. And in my mind, anything that results in more people doing the work is something that we ought to consider.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Jonathan. I think that this is a good input to the next point on the agenda. What is the purpose of having individuals? What I can quickly tell you is that, of course, a member of an ALS can, of course, also participate and do everything like any unaffiliated individual. I guess it just gets you some sort of more standing for it. But let's have this discussion on the point four. I see two hands up after I have closed the queue. Matthias and Judith, please go ahead. But just limit to a few seconds because I really want to go to the next point on the agenda. And we can continue the discussion on the mailing list. Matthias, quickly. Thank you.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK:

Thank you, Roberto. I will be very quick. Maybe I misunderstood something. But from a procedural point of view, I am very much in favor of the mode we are having in our EURALO. So, we have individual users, which are members of an ALS. And if it comes to a vote, all the

individual members can cast the vote. And then, the Board or the chair is collecting the vote. And then, the majority of the vote is accepted as the vote of the association.

I think that's a very good way. So, there's still individual members, the [inaudible] is very low, and the majority has the vote. I don't know if this is totally—relates to all discussion. But I think, from the procedural point of view, I think that's a very good structure. Thanks.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Matthias. Point taken. Judith, a few seconds please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. So, the ... One second. It's not the issue of voting and it's not the issue of being involved. It is that people do not want ... People want to not have their voice be muffled. If they don't want to have to ... If they otherwise ... If they're part of an ALS, they have subscribed to the policies and requirements of that ALS. But if they involve an individual, then they are the only ones in control. And so, they can actually contribute as little or as much as they want to. Yes, within an ALS, you can contribute. There's nothing stopping you from contributing. But you have to check what you are saying is the opinion of the primary and secondary reps. And if it isn't, then you can't really say it.

So, I think that is, essentially, why we are doing this. And sorry for the other thing. I'm trying to do like [inaudible] and double-time.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Judith. Point taken. I think that we can continue this discussion on the mailing list. Some good points. And the question is why would we need to allow this? And then we have the counterquestion, why should prevent this from happening? What is the harm that this can do? So, let's continue this on the mailing list. And let's move to point four. And that is about the purpose on—of having, at all, unaffiliated individuals. And so Eduardo, I think, has pointed out, this can ... Discussions on this can clarify, also, whether—what we should allow, in terms of having unaffiliated individuals.

Before starting the discussion, I see a hand from Matthias. Is this the old hand?

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Sorry, Roberto. It was the old hand. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Good. So, let me ... No. I don't want to start this. I think that the discussion has already started in the last call. And I was wondering whether somebody wants to jump in and state their point of view about the purpose of individuals. We are still in the phase of brainstorming and collecting ideas. And if anybody wants to jump in ... I see Alan. And, Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. First of all, sorry for being late. Unfortunately, the meeting didn't show up in my agenda and I hadn't realized it was on. I think, ultimately, the purpose of having individual members is to make

sure that we give people opportunities to contribute and not restrict it to someone who is either a member of an ALS. Or, if you look back into our history, we did a lot of outreach into regions where there were no ALSs, for instance. And the situation we ended up having is, “Yes. I’m interested. Now I have to find 30 friends and form an ALS so I can start participating.” And what we’re trying to avoid is that.

Now, you don’t technically need to be part of anything to contribute. We have ALAC members who are appointed by the NomCom, who are not individual members, who are not part of an ALS and they contribute. And they could contribute just as much not being ALAC members. But people like the formality of being part of something and being formally recognized. And this is an opportunity to do that without the constraint of being a part of an ALS.

Now, the other half of the argument is, “What if you are a member of an ALS?” Without trying to have that argument—without focusing on that particular question—if being an individual member is the motivation that you need, and the acknowledgement and recognition you need to contribute, then I think it’s something that we want to do because ultimately, we’re not here to make arbitrary rules about membership. We’re here to find ways to get people to contribute and support the At-Large effort within ICANN. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alan. While waiting for other people to jump in, I will give you my own opinion. And that comes, also, with the experience of Europe—as a region, what happened in Europe. So, I think that although

there's no question about that the core, the cornerstone, of the At-Large are the ALSs, there's no attempt of changing or switching power to different types of constructions. So, the ALS will remain the core of the At-Large organization and of ALAC.

I think that we still have two different needs. First of all—and primarily, that was the driver for having individuals—is that not all individuals in the world are in ALSs that are likely to become—that are in organizations that are likely to become ALSs, certified ALSs. And still, there is a huge—how can I say? —a huge set of people that might have a lot to contribute to At-Large. And so, we need to have a way to involve those people. And that's the first point.

The second point is that even if you are a member of one or more ALSs, that doesn't mean, necessarily, that your point of view will reach, via the ALS, the At-Large community. So, maybe the ALS is doing something that is not related to a specific policy development issue that you are keen about. And so, the ALS will not take a position, whereas you can contribute to that and are willing to contribute on the personal level.

But there's a more general case. If we think about the open microphone at ICANN meetings, we see a lot of people who are coming on the mic and saying, "I belong to this and that organization but I'm talking on a personal level." And that's exactly the avenue that we want to open for people that can join At-Large as individuals and for providing their personal opinion as individuals and not as a member or a spokesperson for a specific organization that can be an ALS. This is just my personal opinion. And so, that's the reason why we want to open.

The role ... I can bring the witness of EURALO. Now, the individuals—the unaffiliated individuals of a RALO are, by-and-large, even more active. I'm saying just in average. If I look at the EURALO Board and the chairmanship of different committees and so-on, are really more active than in average of the representative of the ALS. So, we see a push, at least in Europe, for unaffiliated individuals, in order to open up a bit—in order to allow us to outreach to a different set of people that can be involved. So, that's my opinion.

I see Cheryl has her hand up. And Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Roberto. I'm very pleased with this discussion. Don't get me wrong. But I'm just wondering if we might, as we're in this area four of the agenda, just put a couple of almost virtual sticky notes up for our reckoning and reference. And that is to make sure we all understand what it is that we, in this work party, are trying to either solve or create as an outcome. And a number of the interventions have certainly mentioned aspects of, what I believe, at least, we're trying to do. We need to recognize that certain rules, including At-Large Structure rules and Bylaw rules exist. So, we are obviously here to propose any changes to any of those things if we believe they're worth it.

But the bottom line of both the ALS Mobilization work, which is just at completion, with its proposals being put together into a report now, and in, then, our work is, of course, to get the engagement in ICANN activity and the recognized engagement in ICANN activity clear and easy to understand and operate and to make more capable and more, even,

efficient within the world of At-Large. So, I think if we have that in our minds as the ultimate goal, that's going to help us, as well, in these conversations.

But we also need to recognize that across the different regions, there have been, at least in the past, very, very different views on how this engagement can and should occur. And that's where we find ourselves now—that it is only recently that all regions are doing even what was decided upon in the first ALAC review. And that was to ensure that if individuals didn't want to become part of an At-Large Structure or couldn't become part of an At-Large structure, that they could contribute.

And I guess if we keep those two things paramount in our mind, that will help us navigate, not so much from where we are now but where we want to be in the near future.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Cheryl. I have AK Oloyede as next. You have the floor.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I think one of the ... My own contribution is just that probably, based on what Jonathan said earlier, that my thinking is there should be just one requirement for you to be an individual member. And that is you should, first of all, participate and be active before you are allowed to join as an individual member so that the objective would be for you participate. So, I'm just thinking that should probably be the purpose and that's the way to set it up. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you. I think that there's a point that Alan wanted to bring, that is related to the Bylaws change in relation to the individual members. And I think that this is the right moment to introduce, also, this in the discussion. Alan, if you are ready to expose your point ...

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Alan, if you're speaking, you're on mute.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I am on mute. I was on mute. Claudia, could you put up the document that I sent you or pointed to? This is the ALS Mobilization Report. And there we are. Perfect. One of the things ... Hold on. Something ... There's someone at my door. I'll just be 30 seconds.

Okay. One of the things that came up during the ALS Mobilization Working Party work, in our review of the Bylaws, is we realized that something had slipped through the cracks in the last At-Large review. Specifically, as Cheryl mentioned, the last At-Large review recommended that all RALOs have the capacity to have individual members.

The Bylaws were currently written. And if you look at the highlighted phrase. Yeah. Just right in the middle of the screen right now—the one, "If so provided ..." The current Bylaws say, "If so provided in its memorandum of understanding with ICANN, a RALO may also include individual internet users who are citizens or residents of the countries within the RALO's geographic region." That made sense in 2003, when

the Bylaws were written, or slightly afterwards. And the only memorandum of understanding that allowed for individual members was the NARALO MOU.

We're now at a situation, as recommended by the first At-Large review, that all RALOs can have individual members. And we now have a discrepancy, in that we have four RALOs with MOUs that do not mention individual members, which technically, they should.

So, we can fix the problem in one of two ways. We can amend four of the MOUs or we can make a minor change to the Bylaws. And certainly, to the group that I was chairing, when we were discussing this, it made a lot more sense to make a very simple change to the Bylaws than to try to update the four MOUs that don't mention individual members because, among other things, the original MOUs were signed by all of the ALSs at that point.

It's not quite clear how we would amend the MOUs. Do we need all of the current ALSs to sign? If so, the logistics of that are just mindboggling. So, certainly, the ALS group, although it was not strictly within our mandate, said the simplest thing to do would be to simply amend the Bylaws to replace that sentence. Sorry. We're ... It's straddled. Claudia, can you scroll up a little bit so the second half of the last sentence shows up? It scrolls onto page 18 slightly. There. Okay. No. Just up a bit so we see the last two lines of the previous page. That's it. Okay.

So, what we were suggesting and what is going into our report—but clearly, this group has to agree as well—is to replace the line that says

the MOU says if you can have members to simply say, “Each RALO may also include individual members who are citizens or residents of the country.” And then, there’s a mention later on in the Bylaws about what rights individual—what rights ALS members have. And the next line simply confirms that individual members have similar rights.

So, I’m going to be sending out an email documenting this and point—giving you all the pointers. But it’s something that I would like this group to reaffirm in time for the report going out to the ALAC to the other ones because it’s important to start the Bylaw revision going soon because it’s going to take a fair amount of time to do that. So, we want to go out for legal approval and things like that on Bylaw changes as soon as possible.

So, I’ll follow this up with an email, detailing it to the whole working party’s membership. But I just wanted to give you an opportunity for a head’s up and if anyone had any questions. And I see there’s a hand from Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. Just a quick thing. I will replace ... If we’re going to go by the Bylaw way, I suggest we replace the “may—” the word “may—” because that opens a door for a RALO to “not may” include individual internet users, if you leave that “may” there. I may. I may not. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's a good suggestion. Too bad you didn't make it in the other group. But thank you. Yes. That's good.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Any other ... Yeah. Any other comments on this? Okay there were a lot—

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Sure. There was a lot of discussion in the chat. As usual, I will ask staff to save the chat. And I will read it before the next session. And right now, I would like to go to the next point on the agenda. That is some administrative matters.

And the first thing is the time of next call. I have sent an email a couple of days ago, stating that unless there were objections, we would inhabit Alan's slot. So, Alan, can you please confirm that you don't need the Monday, I think it was 18:00 UTC slot, for the ALS mobilization?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Yes.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. So—

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry. Just to be clear, at this point, I do not foresee any more meetings. It is conceivable that when the report draft goes out to the working party, something horrible will come up and we'll have to address it. But I think that's a highly unlikely situation. It is also possible, in a few months, the ALAC could send the report back to us for revision. But in either case, I think that's both unlikely. And if so, we'll deal with it at the time. So, take the slot, with my blessing, at this point.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yeah. Thank you, Alan. If something like this happened, I think that another proposal that is on the table and that we will evaluate on the mailing list was to toggle the time on the Monday to use another time of day, still on Monday, that is not so unfortunate for—in particular, for Asia Pacific attendants.

So, I would like to have this rotation. For the time being, I would like to set up the next meeting for Monday. I think it was 18:00 UTC. That is the slot that Alan had. And in the meantime, discuss what will be the alternative time, on Mondays, for the call. Do a bit like the Consolidated Policy Working Group is doing. That seems to work. Any comments on this?

Yes. Before I give the floor to Cheryl, can I ask staff to put an action item for what I have just said. Thank you. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Roberto. I am an absolute supporter of the time rotation. So, let's make that clear, and for, obviously, rather selfish reasons of not

always having to join you at 3:00 AM in my morning but for everybody to equally share the issue of time and the fact that it keeps changing in a round globe.

But I'm wondering, can we not ... Now we've set the next meeting for that Monday slot, can we not just agree at this meeting that we will be going to move into a time rotation? And then, we can start getting permanent slots in our calendars, particularly as so many ICANN and non-ICANN meetings are crowding our personal calendars, for the next few months, with many virtual events—or many events going virtual, I should say. It would be really useful to get these, even, rotating times well-established as standing times in our calendars.

So, I would move that we at least agree on time rotation between this current time and Monday time and then just get on with the job. Thanks.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Cheryl. So, okay. I think that this is settled, with the action item. And we'll continue discussing on the mailing list. But I see, from the chat, that there's some support to toggling time. So, the problem will be only to figure out what—what will be the appropriate time. I would like to remind everybody that some Asia Pacific folks are having this call in the middle of the night. So, I think that it's only fair that we share the pain.

So, next, there's ... I have a request from staff and from Alp to talk about some tools to use in addition to the mailing list, in order to have—to be

a bit more efficient and effective in the work that we do. So, Alp, are you ready to present your ideas right now?

ALPEREN EKEN: Yes, Roberto. Thank you so much.

ROBERTO GAETANO: You have the floor.

ALPEREN EKEN: Thank you so much. Claudia, can you scroll down a little bit, please, for us to see the comment section? Yes. Actually, since the start of the working part, we have been having the discussions on the email group, with the initiation of Roberto. But sometimes, emails are hard to reply and follow. And especially if there are multiple topics in an email, people generally follow up in one or another or reply to the wrong person. This is what we all experience with emails, I believe.

So, we're told everyone has wiki accounts—I mean this community.icann.org account. So, like Dr. Gopal did, we can comment on the topics. So, we can create child pages, children pages, on the Unaffiliated Individual Members Working Party page. And we can create a table with them. So, every time you go in a topic, you can have the space to comment on. And then, it will be more permanent and easy to follow, compared to email discussions. This was my suggestion for this group. Thank you, Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alp. So, I think that—and I’m just keeping an eye on the chat—there are also other proposals on how to use efficiency tools. And so, I wonder whether somebody wants to present another idea on this—suggest any tool.

I think that on one thing, Alp is right. We cannot just stay with emails. I’m, unfortunately, not so up-to-date with efficiency tools. So, I will rely on suggestions, keeping in mind that this—that we can discuss this while waiting for a new—for a different tool. We can still discuss that on the email.

And I would like to just make a point. I think that other tools are good, in terms of increasing efficiency. But we have also to keep in mind that we need to keep a sort of minimum common denominator for—something that everybody can use, even the people that are not too familiar with new technology and other things.

So, I think that we need to keep a balance. We still need to keep the good old email part open and maybe to have something in parallel for having a higher speed and higher efficiency. So, this is the opinion, at least from an old elephant like myself. Judith, you have the floor.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. We would love to have the ability to use tools that Jonathan is mentioning—either Loomio or something else. But currently, because of rules that ICANN IT staff have put on, we’ve been trying to get permission from ... We’ve been trying to get permission from the staff to use a different tool. But right now, we have not been able to get that permission.

But my suggestion is maybe, if we can come to get—come think about how we could do a tool that would work with the staff ... Staff have their own Google Docs. And maybe we could figure out—brainstorm some idea of Google's, whether it's a form or something else, where we could contribute, and see everyone, and see these running comments. And maybe we could get a form that—we can go to a wiki and see it all.

The problem with the wiki is that it is not mobile-friendly and it is often very difficult to get information when you're on the mobile because you keep having to render it—render text. So, there's a lot of different things that if you ... The Technology Taskforce has looked at these issues. And we've had IT staff on. And we've been arguing for it. But each time we argue, they say, "Oh. Well, we'll discuss it, we'll discuss it, we'll discuss it." And it never ... And we just can't get a resolution on that. And so, I'm happy to bring it to the TTF again. But right now, it seems like they're not going to let staff participate in these and we can't use it.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Judith. And I think I will give Alp the floor for the last word. We are two minutes away from the close of the call. So, Alp is having the last word.

ALPEREN EKEN:

Thank you. Thank you, Roberto. This is Alp for the record. Thank you, Judith, for your comments. I know that commenters tried to use Loomio, with Jonathan's initiation. I really love these tools. I used them before. But unfortunately, as Judith indicated, we cannot use them in

the ICANN context because staff ... We cannot support you on these because of IT restrictions.

Both Slack and Loomio are great for collaboration but I think they are good for communication. They're not great for editing documents because then, it is about editing a document. It is never great on the mobile. You can never have a great editing experience on the mobile. That's why I think, as Cheryl commented, we need different tools. And currently, we have Google Documents, and wiki, and email. So, I believe we would be really good using wiki and Google Documents as tools. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Okay. Thank you, Alp. I would like to just summarize a couple of important points. Next call is going to be Monday. I believe it's 18:00 UTC. But it's, in any case, the slot that was formerly used by ALS Mobilization Working Party. And I would kindly ask staff to make sure that all what can be translated in an action item, in this call, will be done so that I can keep control on what is happening.

Thank you, Claudia, for the confirmation. And with a few seconds' delay, I will ask the host to close the recording and the call. Thank you very much, everybody for having participated.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you, Roberto.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks everyone.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: This meeting—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Roberto.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]