

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Unaffiliated Individuals Mobilization Work Party call on Monday the 12th of October 2020 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Roberto Gaetano, Alan Greenberg, Bill Jouris, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, David Mackey, Gopal Tadepalli, Hanan Khatib, Jothan Frakes, Judith Hellerstein, Nadira Al Araj, Sarah Kiden, and Seun Ojedeji.

We have received apologies from Justine Chew. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Alperen Eken and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management. Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and to please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Thank you very much, and with this, I'll turn the call over to you, Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. Thank you all for joining although for some of you, this is a holiday. Going through the agenda, are there any proposed changes to the agenda?

Hearing none, I assume that the agenda is accepted as is. I would like first to explain a couple of things, how I would like to run the agenda. I have sent an e-mail message just a few minutes before the call, but I cannot assume that everybody has read it.

---

*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.*

---

The idea is to go through this bullet point list that we have built to check whether there are any other items that need to be added, and then go to the next phase, that is to come to closure on these points in the next couple of weeks. So the idea is that in the next call that is going to be in two weeks because we're not going to have a call next week, we will start having something where there is already a rough consensus and we can build on that.

The rest of the agenda, then we have discussion on productivity tools, on date and time of new conferences, and that, I would say, something where obviously we don't have closure inside, although I think that the sooner we make a decision on productivity tools, the more productive we are going to be.

So that said, are there any comments about this way of going forward? Hearing none, I would like to start with the bullet point number three, noting that, by the way, we don't have pending action items. So the question was, under which conditions can we allow an individual member of a RALO to also be a member of an accredited At-Large Structure in that RALO.

As I have pointed out in my e-mail before the call, I went through all the comments since the beginning, everything that is on the e-mail and on the chat, and I came to the conclusion that there is a rough consensus on the fact that individual users are a useful addition to the current structure and practice of the At-Large, but there are some conditions that we need to evaluate better.

---

So generally speaking, I hear, even if there are a couple of concerns, things that we need to clarify, but that's a general yes. And then we need to specify how unaffiliated individuals can be useful for At-Large and what are the risks that this can bring.

So before I start a detailed discussion of number three, I see Alan Greenberg asked for the floor. Alan, you have the floor, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm talking about number three, so if you want to do the intro first, then you can come back to me.

ROBERTO GAETANO: No, just go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Two points. The first is—and I'll put my hat on as the chair of the ALS mobilization working party. That group had extended discussions on whether the formal ALS representative—that is, whoever's named by the ALS to represent the organization to At-Large, and to the RALO, whether that person could also be participating in another part of ICANN, the NCSG perhaps or ccNSO, and whether that person could in fact be appointed by that group to be a spokesman for them.

and the conclusion we came to is that none of that is prohibited, but they had to make a declaration to make it public. So it couldn't be done in secret, but it was not prohibited for the person who's a

---

representative to hold a dual role even representing some other part of ICANN.

Now, I'm not trying to influence the outcome here, I just want to make sure that people are aware that's an extensive discussion that was had and that is the recommendation that will be going forward to the ALAC. So when you have this discussion, just be aware of that one.

The second part I have is a question, and I don't understand D under point three. That is, they must follow the rules of procedure of the RALO. Isn't that intuitively obvious, that everyone must follow the rules of procedure of whatever group they're a member of? So I'm a little bit confused by D. When you get to it, perhaps you can explain. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alan. Before giving the floor to Carlos, let me answer your comment and question. Starting with the second one, yes indeed, I agree with you that's something that should be self-obvious. However, the principle that I have used in gathering these comments is just plain brainstorming. So I have added points as they were suggested by anybody without getting into the merit of whether this made sense, didn't make sense, was obvious, was to be excluded and so on. The discussion was going to take place later.

So I have just accepted that we put on the list whatever came from the floor, leaving it for a second phase. That is what we will be doing from the end of this call onwards with the individual points.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Roberto, if I may comment, I think what is meant by D though is that we may not put any rules on but the RALO itself may have one of these as a rule. I think that's what that's implying.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yeah, absolutely. But in any case, whatever the rule the RALO puts, unless it's countering principles of the whole At-Large, it's something that the unaffiliated individual must follow. So your point is taken.

About the other point, as you might guess, I was aware of the fact that this discussion had taken place in the ALS mobilization. I think, though, that this is—okay, it raises a point. If somebody joins as an unaffiliated individual or individual user or whatever is going to be the official [inaudible], obviously, we expect from that person to declare a conflict of interest. And this is something that we will be discussing later on.

In my opinion, it wouldn't be bad if we ask people to compile a complete SOI, but anyway, we will discuss that later. The reason why it is not here is because it's not really—how can I say, not really something that is related to the concurrent status as an individual member and a member of an accredited At-Large Structure. This is why it was not added there.

But for sure, the similar point that has been raised in the ALS mobilization will be raised here for the individual user or unaffiliated individuals. Does this answer your question, Alan?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. It wasn't a question. I wasn't implying that the discussion in the mobilization work party was directly related, but it was a similar type of discussion and I wanted to make sure that the people who were not on that mobilization group like you were, were aware of that discussion and what it resulted in. I wasn't saying that it's the same discussion or should be something that should be paralleled here, it was just a related one and I thought it was important that they be aware of it. That's all.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay, Thank you, Alan. I don't see the hand of Carlos, but if you are still intending to speak, please [inaudible].

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much. Roberto, you correctly started the conversation about the main objective: why do we want more people, let's say, involved? And I think that the point that Alan raises is very important, because in terms of disclosure, in terms of the solution, we started a small working group in our RALO based on the request of our chair because we're in the process of reviewing all rules in LACRALO, and I think it's very important that we separate different layers in the discussion so that we can move forward.

I think one is the procedure of accepting individual members, which is closely related to the question that if individual members may apply for leadership decisions at the RALO level and at the ALAC level—and we have to be very specific what we are talking about—and the other issue is that from my perspective—and I might say my personal perspective—

---

is that the task that ALAC members have to do have increased tremendously.

We have people PDPs with seats for ALAC members, we have liaisons to all other groups, and we have a lot of work additional to what we used to have when those rules were defined. So we are very clear that the objective of individual members is, in our perspective, is to have very knowledgeable and specialized people.

And that puts our area in a very difficult position. We are a large part of the world but we also have a very high number of very small countries. And these small countries, they would like to participate but they don't have enough people to have a clear separation between the government, the NIC, the ccNSO member and the individual members. And our preliminary conclusion is that to give an opportunity to have people from smaller countries participating in our area is this combination of a clear process, agreeing if we want more people for leadership positions or we want more people for their specific knowledge, and we came immediately to this discussion that Alan mentioned, disclosure is very important because in the case of small countries, it's impossible to keep all these different hats separate. Thank you very much, Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Carlos. Yeah, this is absolutely true, but as I said, this issue of disclosure is going to be an important part of the discussion, and it's well understood. Any other general comments? Okay, so we have here, going to the merit of the different points, during the discussions and on

---

the mailing list in previous calls, we have identified a potential internal conflict of interest, so to speak. If somebody is an official representative of an ALS or leadership of an ALS, and at the same time, an unaffiliated individual, that seems to be a little bit strange. A lot of people have raised the issue, and I assume that there's a general concern that this can be an issue.

Now, we have to see—we will probably go to a poll, to a survey in order to verify how many people think that this is a concern or not, but I think that the point 3a and 3b, it is clear what they mean. Any observation? I see Alan. Just a second. I would like to invite anybody who has questions, clarification on what these points mean, and imply to queue up for taking the floor. Alan, the floor is yours.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just a question. I guess I'd like to understand what the difference is between A and B—that is, being either a representative or part of the leadership team of an ALS and an individual member, what's the difference between that and being in one of those capacities and being a member of another ALS? Because we have no prohibition about how many ALSes you can join.

So Roberto, you may be the leader of one ALS, but also a member of another ALS. How is that different from being an individual member? I'm not sure that they're the same, but I just want to raise that issue. Thank you.



---

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yes, absolutely. This is exactly the point. We have to figure out what are the possible concerns, what are the different conditions under which we can limit the affiliation as an individual member on top of the role that a person has in an ALS.

I would consider this just a simple, as-is condition. So if a person—let me just extend your example. if somebody is the official representative of an ALS and is also a member of another ALS, what counts here in terms of incompatibility or perceived incompatibility or conditions that we have to apply is the fact that the person is an official representative of the ALS regardless of whether he or she is at the same time also a member of a different ALS.

I think that this is something, if people belong to different ALSes, this is something that is outside the scope of this team, because that has been sufficiently discussed in the ALS mobilization work party. I see Gopal. Gopal, please go on.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

Yes. The idea of allowing people to move across these known structures is a hope that several others will automatically be with us. They can mobilize more people. That is the basis with which I have been looking at this idea of having people with multiple structures. In theory, it appears that we'll get more people, but we'll not be able to focus. We'll lose the focus in everything. An ALS per se is a structure that thrives when it is so independent, it doesn't seek any financial support from ICANN. It's an independent work which they have to show, and they can help out ICANN.

---

Therefore, I'm of the same opinion that, let's not have people having multiple hats at the same time. One of our colleagues, members of this group was mentioning. In practice, it's only going to create more chasms. Prima facie, it may appear that a lot of people may be shown as mobilized. In practice, it doesn't work that way. So I would think that A and B, an individual must not be an official representative of an ALS, an individual must not be in the leadership team of an ALS. [inaudible]. They're not with UIM. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Gopal. It's clear. So I would move to 3c, and the comment was they must not participate into the voting of the RALO leadership team elections. I need to have a clarification myself on this in the sense that, does this mean that the unaffiliated individuals should not participate to the vote of the leadership team? That's what it looks to me, but I wanted to make sure that this is the exact point that is on the table.

I saw Nadira's hand. Please go on.

NADIRA AL ARAJ:

Thank you, Roberto, for allowing me to ask a question. So item three, we are speaking about the unaffiliated or the ALS individual. I'm kind of confused here, because we started talking about unaffiliated individuals, and here, the different points, we are talking about the members of the ALSes, aren't we? Or I'm just confused. Thank you.

---

ROBERTO GAETANO: That was exactly my question. Are we talking about votes within the RALO for the leadership team? Alan is raising another point in the chat, votes for the ALAC seats and so on. So that was exactly my question: what are we talking about? Is it within an ALS or on the RALO or ALAC?

NADIRA AL ARAJ: According to what is frame here, I could understand that is the individual of an ALS. And also, I want to comment on Gopal's point about the focus. If we're talking about the structure within the ALSes, there is no problem of the structure, because the problem, when the effects of the RALO leadership team. So that's no issue.

If I want to represent myself as my ALS, then because I'm not voting, only one vote out of—usually, the way it's done by like the leadership team of that ALS decides on where the vote has to go. Usually, rarely ask the members of whom to vote for. That's from my experience, but I don't think it applies to other ALSes, the majority of the ALSes. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yeah. I understand. Before letting Alan speak, my personal opinion is that what I would like to point out is that we have a general issue about how to let unaffiliated individuals vote. How we count their vote if they have a vote at all? We have different situations, as I have described in one of the e-mails that I've sent last week.

I would try to leave this question of the voting out in this phase, because otherwise, we are making matters much more complicated.

---

Now we are discussing in principles. And then we will have the issue about voting, whether the unaffiliated individuals will have a vote or not, and this is part of a separate—I would like to keep it as part of a separate discussion, because otherwise, we risk not getting closure on anything.

One other thing is there's a remark from Alan in the chat. I'm reading these for those who don't read the chat. Indeed, unaffiliated individuals is not a correct term, especially if the individual is also at the same time member of an ALS, because it's not unaffiliated, it's affiliated.

This is another point that I would like to discuss in terms of terminology and how we define these people, but I would like to let this, for the moment, out of the discussion.

So that was for 3c, and about 3d, we have spoken. I would like also to move to point 4 and 5, but in the meantime, I have Alan and Judith on this point 3, and at this point, I will close the list on point three and then after Alan and Judith, we'll move to point 4. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I just wanted to make it clear, the term “unaffiliated,” I happen to be the one who coined it—was used by NARALO to differentiate from those people who are affiliated with ALSes and those who are not affiliated individuals. And that's why the term is in the title of our work party. Not every RALO uses the term “unaffiliated,” but it was used by at least one and maybe others.

---

If this group ends up deciding that it is okay to have an individual member also be a member of an ALS, then clearly, we're going to have to use a different term because unaffiliated would no longer be a correct term. So let's not worry, as Roberto said, let's not worry about the term, let's worry about the concept and then we'll come up with a good name afterwards which matches whatever we decide on. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Alan. Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Hi. I agree with Alan on that point. We would need a new term. But I just wanted to quickly, even though we're not talking about voting, someone raised the point. In NARALO—and just like in other area—I don't know other ones, but in NARALO, we suggested the ALSes poll their members and then vote for whoever they want, and this is why we have elections discussions and “meet the candidate” nights. But also, I don't know if others do that, but with all unaffiliated, they have an election the day before the election closes for officers so that their choice is known and then their representative can vote in the main elections.

So I just thought I would raise that point. I don't know what other RALOs are doing on that, but that's what we do in NARALO.

---

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Judith. Yes, we also have the issue—it's not really an issue, but we have to take into account that different RALOs have different rules. Wherever it's going to be possible to have a uniform rule of sort of best practices, we're going to recommend that, but if there are differences in the way regional organizations treat a topic, that's perfectly acceptable.

So with the note to staff, can you please make an action point for me to start a discussion about terminology? Let's go on point four. Point four is important because it points out potential serious problems, so the harm in allowing individual member of a RALO to be also a member of an accredited At-Large Structure.

We have three points that were raised by the discussion. Again, in this case, I just added them without starting the discussion, and those are, one is the issue about voting so that not allowing an individual to have double vote. One is individual and one is a member of an ALS. And this is a clear concern and is a point taken, and I think we should address this complete issue of voting separately, but the point is taken we need to be careful on this.

The second point that has been raised is that having individuals and having At-Large Structures will add complexity, and the third point is if a lot of people apply as individuals, do we still need the ALSes?

One point of clarification on 4c, 4c is related to something that is dictated by our institutional papers, by the bylaws. this is something that we cannot—I guess we could recommend to change, but it will be

---

very bad if we come out with questioning the structure of At-Large and go towards getting rid of the ALSes.

What I would like to make sure is that we all understand that the purpose for adding individuals is to enhance the possibility of At-Large to get the benefit of people that can individually participate, individual volunteers, experts on certain topics that can be a resource for At-Large. This is something we're going to discuss under point five. But it's not to go and propose radical changes to the structure of At-Large as it has appeared from the reform.

So I would like to make clear what are the limits within we are acting in this work party. The idea is how to favor additional resources for At-Large and is not to put under question the structure of At-Large. So the floor is open. David has his hand up. You have the floor. Please go ahead.

DAVIC MACKEY:

Thank you, Roberto. And I'm going to come in from a slightly different perspective from most of the e-mail conversation and most of the conversation that we had for the first 40 minutes of this meeting. And I'm going to take us up a level and relate to what you were saying, Roberto, with respect to the structure that we have been given as formatted by the bylaws.

We are working within the bylaws, and specifically within the ICANN bylaws and then within the At-Large section of the ICANN bylaws. The specific clauses related to the At-Large bylaws, there's 11 of them, and the first one talks about the role that we're trying to represent the end

---

users, and the tenth clause talks about the activity that's expected within the At-Large community.

And most of the other clauses talks about the structure of how we're going to organize ourselves in order to achieve the first clause with the activities in the tenth clause.

The discussion that I've seen over the last week, and pretty much all of this call, has been totally focused on the structure. And occasionally, we glance over and say yes, we want to do some work. And I'm thinking, from my perspective, that's sort of opposite of what I would hope, which is that we focus on what is our overall goal to support the end users? What are the activities that we need to do to support the end users? And then the third thing would be, how do we structure ourselves to do it?

So coming from that perspective, I don't want to get too caught up into the structure. Structure is important, how we relate to each other, how we organize ourselves in order to do the work. But certainly, I'm a little disappointed that we have put a lot of energy into trying to categorize what is or is not a certain type or class of member.

So with respect to, on the agenda, item four where certainly, [I respect] a different perspective where some believe that the structure is very important and the classification of individual member versus an ALS, and I respect that not everyone might come in from the same perspective I'm coming from, but I'm not sure that those three points are that important as it relates to how do we motivate ALS people and



---

individual people to do the work we need to do that is defined within the bylaws.

So that's my comment. I thought this was the appropriate point to bring it in, and I'll give the floor back to you, Roberto. Thanks.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you. Yes, the point is well understood. Any other comments on point four? That not being the case, I would like to quickly go through point five that I assume is an easy one. The reason why we have point five is to have also some sentences on the record that support the fact of the benefit of having individual members on top of having members in the RALOs.

And specifically, this is a summary of things that have been coming up in the discussions. There's issues related to the fact that somebody might be disagreeing with the position of the RALO and we want to hear also this voice. It's also a matter of direct communication so that we don't have to only rely on the way that an At-Large Structure diffuses the information about At-Large activities which we do not have control on, and so on.

So you can read the three points yourselves. This is basically the moment that we come up with a final document, then we need also to explain why to allow to have individual members also participating in At-Large Structure.

So, any comments on this? I see a hand. You can speak out your comment. I was going to read it on the chat.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

So what I posted in the chat is I guess what I'm failing to understand. If all these points are true that the individual who's a member of the ALS is not getting a communication, why don't they just subscribe to the e-mails? In fact, many of the ALSes that we have in NARALO, the leaders are so inundated by e-mails that they sometimes feel it's too many to give out to the members.

So that is the hold up we more have, is that there's too much e-mail as opposed to too few e-mails. But everyone can join the individual RALO list and staff send the email out. Not only do you get that when you join the list, you also get ALAC Announce and other stuff, so you get multiple copies of the same e-mail. So I guess I fail to understand how people are not getting communications. Are they not subscribed to the list? That was my main question.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Judith. Before giving the floor to Greg, I would like to try to answer this question. First of all, the regions are also culturally different. There are parts of the world where there's more individual participation and parts where the organization is important. And so people prefer to participate as a member of an organization, and that organization is going to be the cornerstone of At-Large.

It's true that we ask the organization, the At-Large Structures to diffuse the material, to engage their members in At-Large policy development and other activities. But the problem is that we don't know if that happens. So I presume that giving the possibility to individuals to,

---

independently from the fact that they belong to an At-Large Structure, to join as an individual, is a far easier solution than having to police what the At-Large Structures do and to check whether they diffuse the communication to all their members and so on.

We say in our recommendation that the At-Large Structures must propagate the information to their members and get the feedback from their members and send it to us. But the reality is that we cannot police this. We cannot enforce this. We can just say that it's necessary, but then we are not going to have a monthly check on whether each At-Large Structure has sent all the communications to their members or not. So that's my concern in terms of what we were discussing. And I shut up here and give the floor to Greg.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Sorry, I missed the beginning of the call. On this point, first more broadly, I think point five covers, to some extent, two opposite situations. One is where you have a member of an ALS deciding, in addition to that, to become a direct member in the RALO, and the second situation is where you have an existing individual member who then joins an ALS as well. I think both create some issues regarding representation and double dipping and the like.

And I think that in terms of the points that are here, the points that are dealing with communication or lack of communication really should be dealt with just on the level of communication and not on a level of membership. Membership, I think, should not be used as just a default solution for direct communication. I think it would make more sense for

---

the RALOs simply to open up or have a mailing list where things go out to individual members or I should say to individuals who are members of ALSes, at least should they so choose, or they could opt out, whatever.

But the point is we don't have to create a membership category in order to make sure that communication is taking place. So there's really no need to monitor what the individual RALOs or ALSes are doing, although it's good to know whether they're doing anything or not. But I think it's an over solution. I think the members should become members, not simply as a way of getting communications—and we need to make sure that we understand full well what we intend individual members to do and how they either complement or supplement or show alternative views to the ALSes that they might otherwise be members of.

A related concern is that an ALS can hopefully grow, but an individual member, unless they decide to found an ALS, will not. So in terms of finding structures and methods of getting out to the maximum number of people overall, we need to consider how the individual members fit into that. We could have hundreds of thousands of individual members, perhaps, but that could be structured within ALSes by and large.

So I think all these things kind of fit together, but I think membership and direct democracy and representative democracy mixed into the same batch creates complexities even before you have the idea that the direct representative of himself or herself could also be influencing the positions of an ALS. Thanks.

---

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. Thank you, Greg. I think your point is taken and you had several agreements with what you're saying in the chat. So we will definitely take this into account for further development. I see Cheryl with her hand up, and then I close the queue and move on quickly on the other points on the agenda as we are seven minutes away from the end of this call. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Roberto. Just while we're contemplating all of this and hopefully to just bring in another point for you all to consider, remember also that very few, if any, At-Large Structures are created solely for the purpose of engaging in ICANN. Most of these membership organizations have many other purposes, value propositions, things that attract perhaps even the vast majority of their membership. The vast majority of some of their member activities may have utterly and absolutely nothing to do with ICANN's mission and core purpose.

So let's not confuse the size of reaching out through an At-Large Structure, the size of a member listing of an At-Large Structure, without, of course, downgrading or not recognizing the importance of the abilities of an At-Large Structure-to have outreach and to get the message of ICANN there. But quite often, it'll be the individual who is passionate about an aspect of something that ICANN does that will find that [one to] ICANN relationship very rewarding in whatever way, shape or form, and that is where we get a great deal of productivity and response from.

---

But if you've got a member organization of 10 or 10,000 people, it is unlikely that the 10,000 people are all going to be interested. So individual memberships do allow people who are interested without having to join into an entity that may not have core interests and activities that they're quite so passionate about. There's that flipside as well to consider. Thanks, Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Cheryl. Very clear. So, just for closure of this point, I think the point five was not about the usefulness for an individual to join as an unaffiliated individual but was the reason for somebody who is already a member of an At-Large Structure to, on top of that, join as an individual. Just to clarify the point. This said, the points that Greg and Cheryl have raised are well taken and we'll make sure that in the future, we keep this distinction clear.

I will move quickly to the other points in the agenda. For productivity tools, as we are three minutes away, I think we must address this on the mailing list. Only one comment I wanted to make is that we don't have an unlimited choice of productivity tools. We have to stick to what staff can support. We cannot ask staff to go and support to her tools on top of what they are supporting now, even if we believe that they would be more productive. So I plan to have this discussion on the mailing list and then come to a conclusion before the next call that is going to happen in two weeks.

Point seven, voting rights. We didn't have the time to get into this and maybe also in the near future, the next couple of weeks, it will be better

---

to come to closure to the things that are close to closure, and then attack the voting rights chapter separately.

The last point before AOB was the next call, and as I said, we are going to be skipping next week's call because of the ICANN 69 and everybody is so busy that we cannot have another call. We will resume the calls in two weeks, and I would in the meantime launch a poll for finding an alternate time so that we can toggle between the two times in order not to make it always for the same people to suffer. We have been talking about this. There shouldn't be any problem in doing that. But I would like to be able to set the time already for the call of the 26th.

I have Heidi with her hand up, Alan with his hand up, and I understand that Alejandro would also like to make a comment. So I don't remember the order, but I would like to start with Alejandro. Please go ahead on.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Thank you. hello, everybody. Very briefly. Let's make sure that we create something that doesn't fall into a very usual ICANN trap. Let's create a system where the rules are pretty simple so that people who want to do something and are honest and have their conflicts of interest clear and participate easily, make it hard for cheating and capture instead of creating a system whose loopholes are so protected against that it's very hard to participate and only professionals will want to spend the time going through the loopholes. Thank you.

---

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Alejandro. Alan, you have the last word, and then after Alan, I will ask the host to close the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a quick comment. In the foreseeable future, the number of people who are affected by the decisions we've been talking about ad infinitum here, that is the overlap between individual members and ALS members, is going to be very small. It's not likely to have a major impact on what we're doing, we just need to go ahead and make a decision and move on to the other issues we were talking about. We're going to spend forever doing this and I don't really think it's one of the more important things that we have to do. Just a thought. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Alan. And this brings us, with two minutes delay, to the close of this call. Thanks, everybody, for having joined. The host can close the recording and the call. See you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all very much. This meeting is now adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**