
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the unaffiliated individuals mobilization work party call taking place on Monday the 26th of October 2020 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Roberto Gaetano, Alan Greenberg, Bill Jouris,, Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, David Mackey, Dr. Gopal Tadepalli, Jonathan Zuck, Laura Margolis, Nadira Al-Araj, and Sarah Kiden.

We have received apologies from Maureen Hilyard and Justine Chew.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management. Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for transcription purposes, and thank you very much, with this, I turn the call over to you, Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you. Let's start [revising] the agenda. Basically, besides the housekeeping, I wanted to talk about the ongoing polls, have a discussion on the proposals about the productivity tools, and then have an endorsement and agreement on what will be the next steps.

If we have time, which I doubt, then we can start the discussion on the voting rights. That's basically the plan for today. Is there anything that you want to add to this agenda?

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, hearing none, I consider the agenda approved. So, action items. All action items are closed by now, so unless I'm mistaken, there's nothing pending. Any comments?

Okay, then let's go to the next point on the agenda, that is the ongoing polls. There is one poll that is about the alternate time that we should use in order not to have always the same people suffering from the uncomfortable time zone.

I've sent an e-mail last week extending the deadline, because I'm not happy about the results in the sense that the preferred time so far are more or less in the same time frame or similar, not far away from the current schedule, and therefore, we will be still having the same people having uncomfortable timing.

The plan was to have an alternate time so that we could share the pain, but if we have to toggle the time of the call only a couple hours, it would not make a lot of sense. It would just add confusion.

One other thing is that I have received comments asking not to change the time zone for next week because of a number of things, the incoming election in the US and the start of the IGF that will be in a short of European time zone. So we have still a little bit more time for deciding another possible time. If this is not possible, I think that we did what we could. If there's no possibility to get a different, an alternate time zone, we will stick with what we have. Are there any comments on this, questions?

ANDREA GLANDON: Roberto, Alan Greenberg has his hand up.

ROBERTO GAETANO: I have probably a bad connection. Let me stop the video. Can you please repeat?

ANDREA GLANDON: Alan Greenberg has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: She said Alan has his hand up.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. I saw the hand. Thank you. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just wanted to comment that I don't know how many people are members of this working group. It's 20 or 30 people, I think. And only nine people responded to the survey. So I really don't know why—if there are people who say they're members of this working group and are not even bothering to respond to the timing survey, I really have a problem with how we're going to move forward and how representative the Doodle currently is. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Alan. So we had nine people, it would be 10 with myself but I can live with any time. So it's indeed not a lot of people. For the other

poll that we'll be discussing in a minute, also we don't have a lot of people who have voted. But that's the situation. We have to live with that. I cannot force people to vote and cannot decide what they're going to vote for.

I think I saw Carlos Gutiérrez's hand. Carlos, you have the floor.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you very much. I didn't vote because this group is priority for me, so I will take it at any time. Alan, sorry I didn't fill the Doodle. I'll be there anytime. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. So my proposal is to [inaudible]. Still, I will relaunch a reminder. I will ask also staff to send a reminder maybe from staff will be more effective, I don't know. And then in any case, before the end of this week, I think that I will close it and draw whatever conclusion we can draw from the poll. But I tend to really have at least some calls in a drastically different time zone, so I will do whatever is possible for accommodating this.

So, next topic is the other poll that is about whether a so-called unaffiliated individual member can be also a member of an ALS at the same time or not.

So the situation so far is that there is no objection to the fact that a member of an ALS can also be an individual user in the same RALO. There are a couple of people that would suggest that we apply some limitations or restrictions to this, and all other people have no objection.

But still, also in this case, the number of votes is quite low, and so I will keep it open, and also, that was started only recently. I will keep it open. In the meantime, I will prepare some questions about the specific possibility, situations that we need to avoid and so on, but it looks so far that there is no serious objection to allow this double membership. Of course, we need to then see how we can manage the voting and all this.

So, any comment? Carlos, go ahead. You have the floor.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIÉRREZ:

Thank you very much, Roberto. As I mentioned in the last session, LACRALO has a small working group of four people who might be also present in these calls that we have in parallel as small working group on this very same issue. We have had only one meeting, and we will have the second meeting after the next call.

So I'm not talking in the name of the region, but I want to tell you what our group is presently thinking, and I think it's important about this issue that you just mentioned. I think that the group should start discussing issues at the RALO level. I don't think that this group should spend a lot of time discussing issues at an ALS level. This is trying to put the issue at hand in different layers, and we would consider the layer ALS double members one that should be solved at the ALS level and we should focus here at the RALO level upwards and not try to get into issues to which we have no—we have influence, I know, but I think it's overextending our picket fence, just for the purpose of this discussion that you mentioned. I throw it on the floor. If you don't agree, I'm fine,

but this is, I think, a substantial procedural issue. We should start from the RALO level upwards. Thank you very much.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Carlos. Alan, please, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess I would like Carlos to elaborate a bit further, because I don't understand. What we're discussing here is, should there be At-Large-wide criteria for individual members, and is one of those criteria that they cannot be a member of an ALS? So this is wholly within our domain, and we're not quite sure what he means by we shouldn't be at the ALS level. We're not at the ALS level. the ALS criteria is something that's already gone through another work party. We're looking at individual users. So I'm not quite sure what he's saying. Thank you.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you, Alan. Yes, in the European Union, they call it the subsidiarity issue. The issue should be solved at the level at which they're relevant. I insist, if we look at this as a layered approach, that we have the national issues—for me, the ALS is a national issue, and then we have the RALO level, which is regional issue, then we have the global level which is the ALAC, and the purpose of this exercise is to have brainpower for policy, not for voting. I think the ALS level, under the subsidiarity principle, should be sold at the national level, and we at the global level shouldn't

be telling people at the national level what to do, is known as the subsidiary principle. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: I have Eduardo, then Alan, and then I would like to make a comment myself. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Roberto, and thank you, Carlos, for that comment. My understanding is that this work party was set up in a way that there are voting representatives from each RALO here in this group, and then there are observers. For example, I'm observing this group. And the reason there are representatives from each RALO is that if, Carlos, what you're saying is that you should bring into the conversation here what that group in the RALO suggests to bring into this conversation—and I believe you're already a representative—you bring it here as being representative of the RALO itself. But I don't think that we should go back to the RALOs and then go from—that's a way of going to RALO up to this point, and that's the way I see it. Thank you.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIÉRREZ: It is correct, Eduardo. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Eduardo. Alan next.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. This group is chartered by the ALAC to discuss individual members. One of our options for any criteria associated with individual members is to say this is what we believe the ALAC and At-Large should do, or we could say this is an issue which we want to leave to the RALOs. So the subsidiarity that Carlos is talking about is because in the European Union, it's already decided what is within the mandate of the European Union and what is within the country's mandate. And that's well delineated.

Here, one of the things we're discussing is whether this particular criteria should be one that we leave to the RALO or should be one that we choose to have universally. That's the subject of the discussion. So it's really important that we discuss it. We may say that this is something that we do not choose to rule on and it's up to the RALO, just like the ALS mobilization group said some things are up to the RALO. Other things that group recommended are done At-Large-wide. And that's one of the questions on the table here. It is not decided at this point whether we believe—this work party believes—this should be an At-Large-wide thing or a RALO-specific thing. Thank you.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIÉRREZ:

Now you managed to mix me up totally. Thank you very much, Alan. I don't think that the ALAC or the RALO should tell ALSes what to do. The RALO or the ALAC may not accept what an ALS decides. That's a totally different thing than taking decisions for the ALSes. Alan comes from a federative country—although they have a queen—and he knows perfectly what I mean. There are some provinces in Canada that don't abide by what the government says. They can be pushed into that, but

they're independent. Alberta produces oil and other provinces hate that. So my point was your question, Roberto, and my position, which I will convey and defend in a RALO, is that we should start discussions always at the RALO level and try not to tell ALSes if they're right or wrong. If they're wrong, we will accept independently the [regions.]That's it. We don't need to spend more time on that one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Roberto, may I reply?

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes, please. And then I would like to ... Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. There's been some misunderstanding. We are not telling ALSes what to do, period. We never tell ALSes what to do. The ALS mobilization work party has made some recommendations to the ALAC for criteria for being an ALS. If you satisfy the criteria, you can be an ALS. If you don't satisfy the criteria, you can't be an ALS. But we never ever tell an ALS what to do.

So let's be really clear about that. ALSes are independent organizations, and we can tell them they can't be an ALS because of something they do, but we never tell them what to do and who to allow in as members or whatever. So, just to be clear. So I'm not sure where Carlos thinks we're telling an ALS what to do, but that's very much not the case, and it's not within At-Large's ability to tell an ALS what to do.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Alan. Here's my point of view. I really don't understand where the problem is, in the sense that if we're talking about allowing somebody that is a member of an ALS to register also as an individual, to interact with ALAC as an individual, I honestly don't see how this will impact the ALS. If this is a problem for some ALS, they can simply have—if an ALS—let's make a straight example. If an ALS doesn't like the idea that one of their members is also an individual member in the same RALO, they are perfectly free to have this internal rule and forbid the member to join as an individual, or terminate their membership in the ALS. I really don't see this as forcing the ALS to do something. It's an opportunity, a possibility for that individual member. If the individual member, if the ALS of which the individual is a member doesn't like it, it's an internal problem of the ALS and we are not obliging them to take any decision. They can decide whether their members can use this opportunity of joining as individuals or not. But that is—we are not imposing that all members of an ALS will join as individuals. Is a possibility. And then if in certain circumstances this is not advisable, then in those particular circumstances, there will be actions taken.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIÉRREZ: Thank you very much for this clarification, Roberto. Note well taken.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you. I have in the queue Abdulkarim and Jonathan. Abdulkarim, you have the floor.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much, Roberto. I just want to—I think Carlos has made a point which I think we need to look into. I've been thinking about this, especially since I've been reading the ALS mobilization work party, the report, which I've not finished reading, I've just read probably about three or four pages, but I saw some comments on that which is why I decided to read the full report before I make any comment.

I think the issue of individual members to be accepted or not lies within the RALO. So even based on the points Carlos has made this evening is whatever happens at this level, it's up to the RALO to say I'm going to accept this person as an individual member or I'm not going to accept this person as an individual member.

So, I think the point we should look into, which I think Sarah also made the same point, is it should be a RALO thing, because no matter what happens, the way it's done at the moment is the way it's going to be done, which is a RALO has the right to accept an individual member or refuse an individual member. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Abdulkarim. Just a quick reply. Yes, of course, it's in the RALO's power to accept or not an individual as an individual member. We're not going to change that. Jonathan, you're next.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. It may just be that I'm being redundant at this point. I was going to ask Carlos what was said that inspired him to raise the point he did,

because that's the source of the issue. Clearly, we're not talking about ALSes, we're talking about RALO acceptance of individual members despite ALS membership. So it's never been about ALS policy, but something was said that made Carlos think it was. But maybe if he's got clarity now, it doesn't matter.

As for Abdulkarim's statement, I think it's well within the purview of the ALAC to standardize rules for RALOs, if we're really trying to encourage more individual membership. I don't know, this RALO sovereignty thing, I feel, is a red herring. I think if we're trying to encourage more individual membership and membership comes through RALOs, then creating a standardized system, a rule across RALOs is a reasonable thing for the ALAC to do. Just my opinion.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Jonathan. And I have Alan in the queue, and I see from the chat that we have a disagreement, Alan and myself. Alan, you have the floor if you can explain better what the disagreement is.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I think the disagreement is that positions have just been stated by Abdulkarim and by Jonathan which are opposite of each other, and one of the things that we're supposed to be doing in this group is deciding which of those we're recommending going forward with.

Right now, individual membership has been only the subject of discussion at the RALO level. this group was chartered to see whether

we can have any commonality and do things uniformly across the ALAC, across At-Large. As Jonathan pointed out, it's a lot simpler on our website to explain to individuals you can join a RALO as an individual if the rules are uniform. If we have to say, "Look up in this chart what country you're a citizen or resident of," and from there, you go to a pointer to a RALO and the RALO will then describe, probably using completely different language for each one, what the rules are, that can certainly be done. But it's a lot cleaner if we can simply say, "Here are the rules. If you want to join, you join." So our job is to decide whether to recommend to the ALAC that we have—and at any of the rules, some of them might be uniform, some might not be, but if any of the rules associated with individual membership be uniform. If we have not responsible for that, then let's just cancel this group because we don't have any mandate.

Now, if the ALAC is to agree and the ALAC has to agree with representatives from the RALO agreeing, because two thirds of the ALAC is made up of RALO appointees, then we have agreement. If the RALOs disagree with this and the ALAC will not agree, it won't pass things. But our whole mandate is to decide whether there is some commonality, and if so, what is it, among individual members across RALOs. Otherwise, we have no purpose to exist. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Alan, I agree on the fact that that's the target, but we are moving from a situation as of today where the individuals join a RALO, and it is a RALO decision. The proof of that is that different RALOs have different rules. Now, what we want to do is we want to get to a situation in which there

are some similarities that we can use as a common denominator so that we can do this ALAC-, At-Large-wide. But this is not the situation today. The purpose of this working group is to check whether this is possible. It's not to impose a transition to a different scheme of things. I interpret that in this way. So I will be very happy if we can reach a situation in which we can have the situation for individual users is the same for the whole At-Large. But this is not—it's not necessarily something that we're going to achieve. I'm sure that for instance, there might be some differences in terms of, I don't know, the way we do the due diligence, the way we interpret certain things. I don't know. We have to verify. We have to make sure that we get to a common ground.

But the purpose of the working group is exactly to discuss whether this is a possible solution or not. So in this sense, I'm saying that we are not imposing it. We will see. At the end of the process, if we have a consensus, then it's fine. If we don't have consensus, then we'll continue in the situation in which we are right now.

I have Eduardo and Gopal. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, Roberto. I'm confused now, because ALAC really cannot impose rules in the RALOs. RALOs aren't really a thing that has any recognition other than being part of At-Large within ICANN. In fact, all the rules for the RALOs are made by the RALOs. So even if this group and ALAC approve that across the board, individuals will be accepted, that's the consensus, each RALO can do whatever they want in their rules and nothing will happen. So this is similar to a ccTLD. You have

policies and some of them follow them, some of them, they don't participate in ICANN. Thank you. So I'm confused.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Eduardo. Again, I probably am not clear. I'm not saying that ALAC will impose rules on the RALO. the RALOs, as of today, the situation is completely in the hands of the RALO, and each RALO has their own rules. The question is, is there something—do we have some common things so that we can make some ALAC-, At-Large-wide rules that hold for each and every RALO and that is subject to the fact that we have consensus among the RALOs if each five RALOs agree that one certain thing, they're going to do one specific thing in the same way, then that thing can become an At-Large-wide rule. And that is not prevaricating the power of the RALOs. They decide to join together. There was an example made by Carlos about the European commission. It's basically the same thing. The individual countries remain sovereign, but if they decide that one thing will be managed based on the basis of a common rule, then the common rule is the same for all countries. I don't know if I managed to be clear.

Anyway, I have Gopal and then Carlos.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

Thank you very much. A few things that I wish to observe. One, our goal is a brand called ICANN. RALO is on MoU with ICANN. it is not exactly ICANN in terms of definitions. The goal is to contribute towards ICANN. RALO is an [envoy.] ALS is completely independent. I work with an organization and therefore, I'm neither affiliated to RALO, nor affiliated

to any ALS. I'm an individual, and therefore, this term, unaffiliated, is very nice. I'm affiliated to neither RALO nor ALS in practice.

So from within my organization, how do I contribute to ICANN overall Internet governance while respecting the organizational structure that has evolved to manage the overall governments at a global level? So if we say we will come up with some—as Roberto was mentioning—common ground across all RALOs, across the various other structures which ICANN has evolved into, what is it that we can contribute to ICANN? That's the goal. Therefore, there's a need for individual unaffiliated. These two terms are necessary. That's all I can tell.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Gopal. I have Carlos in the queue, and then I would like to close the queue on this topic, and maybe if there are some other clarifications, questions, comments, we can move over the mailing list, because we have other topics that we need to address during this call.

Carlos, you have the floor, and yours is going to be the last intervention on this topic.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIÉRREZ:

My apologies for taking so much time. Thank you very much, Roberto. Your comments have been very clarifying. Thank you very much. I think you are heading the group in the right direction. I want to make a point with a practical example.

In the case of EURALO, they allowed for—and based on the rules, just on the procedural rules to accept individual members, which staff made a beautiful comparison, and that was the source of my comments.

In the case of Europe, individual members can join ICANN or the RALO, and the European group was very smart, they created an unaffiliated members ALS. And I think it makes a lot of sense, because in other areas, the approval of a new member grants them rights to be in the mailing list of the RALO. So I can imagine that if an individual member wants to be unaffiliated but the ALS doesn't want him to, they can block the access to some of the mailing list, the ALS mailing list or the RALO mailing list. So my worry is, in practical terms, who is going to approve the unaffiliated member? And who is going to make sure that unaffiliated member gets access to the list? Because if you look at the rules, the access to the mailing list is like the golden key that finishes the application process.

So my learning from this discussion is if we're going to have unaffiliated members, we have to make sure that they're not blocked by the ALS, that they can leave the ALS, but we have to make sure that they have access to the mailing list of the RALO. So with those three conditions, the RALO can guarantee that an unaffiliated member gets similar rights. If we choose the European model of regional ALS or not, it's not the issue.

The issue is to make sure that the application process and the access to the information is guaranteed. Thank you very much.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Carlos. Yes, I agree. The point is going to be what kind of rules we have for joining as an individual. And hopefully, we can reach a point in which the rules are similar for—the basic rules are similar in the RALOs.

Okay, I invite you to continue providing comments on this topic via the mailing list so that we can advance on the mailing list. I will now move to the discussion about—to the next point in the agenda, that is productivity tools, and I was wondering whether Alp—I don't see Alp in the participants list. Heidi, do you know whether Alp has joined?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Roberto. No. We've been trying to contact him, and we're also trying to locate the Wiki page that he's created. So, apologies until we find that. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: No problem. I had an exchange of e-mails with Alp, so I know what he's planning to do. So basically, as I have proposed also via e-mail, we are going to use the Wiki, Confluence specifically, so that we can move all the comments in one place.

For instance, there's a lot of valuable material that appears in the chat, and of course, we can read the chat afterwards and so on, but it would be good if we could take sort of bullet points, extracting from the chat and put that in a common place like the Wiki so that we have a common reference.

We have also to think that at some point in time, we might have new people joining, and it will be useful if they could get a quick summary of what the situation so far has been, without having to look at 20 different places and go through all the exchange of e-mails that we have done in these weeks.

So that's the first thing. And then we could use Google Docs in order to prepare the draft for the recommendation as soon as we get consensus points, add them to this Google doc and make comments on that. That's basically what has been done with the ALS mobilization work party.

So, that is the plan. The problem is there were other suggestions for other tools in a previous call. I think it was two calls ago. The problem by using a tool that is not currently supported by staff is that it will be more a problem than it solves. So I would prefer, honestly, to stay with what is currently mastered by staff so that we can get started with those two tools. Any comments on this?

Okay, I assume that's approved. So, I would ask staff to proceed in this direction, and I know that Alp is already working on the Wiki. Good. And yes, please, maybe we can have an action point on this, and it will be good during this week to have a quick e-mail by staff telling us what's the status of the thing and what's the plan for implementation.

So, next point on the agenda is a quick discussion on what comes next. We have less than 15 minutes. I have sent an e-mail just before the call. I cannot assume that everybody has read it. So I quickly summarize. The plan is to close during this week, by the end of this week, the two polls so that we can move to the next step. I think that we need to add to this

also commitment to further discuss on the mailing list what we have discussed today in terms of the second poll, and so that we can clarify exactly where we are and where we are heading, what is the power of the RALO and what is going to be done if we get an agreement ALAC-, At-Large-wide.

Then following that, the closure of the first poll, I will try to make a proposal for an alternate time for the teleconference. This has been also discussed in the chat. There were a couple of comments saying that even if it's a minority option for an alternate time, it's still fair to toggle the call because obviously, also the minority has the right of not being on top of the fact that they're a minority but also uncomfortable time for the calls.

So, but we will see what the result is, and then we will discuss in detail. We also need to check whether there are some timing that we cannot use because they're already allocated for different calls or other things. I will need to check with staff. Actually, if staff can check whether there's any other regular commitment that clashes with the proposed—that falls within the proposed range for the [new call.]

Then it will be time to get into the discussion on what is needed for becoming an unaffiliated member, an individual member. For instance, Carlos has mentioned the fact the subscription to the mailing list, and all these things were what we consider necessarily or important for an individual to join as an individual.

Then I think that we can skip this part that is related to the productivity tools because I think that we got already an agreement during the call,

and then at a certain point in time, we need to figure out the issue about voting by individuals.

In different RALOs, we have different situations, and I think that we can discuss the different approaches and figure out whether we can reach a common approach or whether we will remain in the same situation that means rules—that maybe there are different rules for different RALOs.

Any comment on this? Comment, suggestion, other things that you want to add to the to-do list in the near future? So, hearing none, I will consider that bullet point list a plan, we still have the possibility of modifying that, enhancing that via e-mail.

We have just a few minutes left. We are right on schedule. And is there anybody, who wants to say something about, has a serious concern about voting rights? Just jump in the topic and start raising the issue. There's no plan to come to any conclusion today, it's just a sort of brainstorming. We only have five minutes for this. I have Carlos as the first speaker. Carlos, you have the floor, and then Alan.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIÉRREZ:

Yes. Thank you very much, Roberto. I don't know what I had for breakfast. But I beg you to clarify voting rights again in terms of voting rights in the organization, in the process, in the RALO, or voting rights when they're working in PDPs as representatives of the ALAC. I think it's a very important difference, and I wonder if you want to tackle them together or separately. Thank you very much.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Okay. I'll let Alan speak and then I will reply. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'll give you my reply to Carlos's question. You can tell me if you agree. I think we're talking about voting within the RALO on things the RALO votes on. We have no ability to stop someone from voting in a GNSO PDP or in a working group, or if we appoint person X who happens to be an individual member to some ICANN CCWG. We have no way of stopping them from participating if they're appointed. So I think we're talking about voting within the RALO.

What is not on this list, however, which I think is more important than voting, we may never get closure on voting, it's something people feel very emotional of within the RALO. But one thing that is very important that I think we must be discussing is if you are an individual member, does that stop you from becoming, for instance, being appointed as an ALAC member? Currently, some RALOs say that if you're an individual member, you cannot be appointed as a RALO ALAC member. And that disenfranchises a worker to a very great extent. So whether they can vote on that decision is one thing, but whether they can be eligible to be nominated is something else that I think is a far more important issue than the actual voting rights. And I'll note that in the past, as in individual of NARALO who may or may not have had a vote, I've been appointed as an ALAC member. So the two are not dependent on each other, they're separate issues. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alan, for raising this point, and I agree, this, we have to open the discussion on that as well. Just to clarify, I think that Alan has replied already to Carlos, but just in addition to this, I would like to recap the current situation. The current situation is that if I understand correctly, there are three different approaches. One approach is that all individuals—and that's the EURALO approach—have one aggregate vote. So the complete set of individuals counts as much as one ALS in EURALO. That's one way to solve it.

I have heard that there are other situations. One is that they don't vote at all, so the individual members don't have any vote, not even one as an aggregate, and then if I'm not mistaken, there's a third way to look at that, and that proposal is that the number of votes that the individuals have together is a function of the relative number of individual versus the number of ALS.

I think that this is the situation in Latin America and the Caribbean, if I'm not mistaken. But anyway, Heidi has shown the pointer to the documents that explains all the different rules. So we need to go over this document and then start the discussion and figure out whether we can come to a common rule or not. I have Cheryl in the queue. Cheryl, you have the floor, and then I will close the queue because we are two minutes from the top of the hour. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Roberto. Just as you're all contemplating this—and I've heard a couple of times in today's call, RALOs decide this and RALOs do that. And that's not what I'm suggesting we need to question.

I want to remind you, however, that in the absence of demonstrable fairness and equity in the treatment, rejection or acceptance, and in the rights and responsibilities of this membership class existing between RALOs, wherever possible, you will open yourselves up for justifiable complaints and therefore imposed modifications, should ombuds fairness investigations come into play. If, for example, a RALO has rules that can be shown as demonstrably unfair to individual members' rights and responsibilities compared to other regions, that is an issue that you may find crop up in the future. Just make sure you consider those unintended consequences as you're going through your work. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Cheryl. So last thing is the next call. I would suggest that we keep the time of the next call at 18:00 UTC so we can set it right now, and then in the meantime, we figure out whether we reach a consensus on an alternate time to start from the following week. So yes, Heidi, in one week from now, next call, at 18:00 UTC.

Okay, that concludes the call. We're exactly at the top of the hour. I have Alan for the last quick word and then we can close the call.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just to note, in North America anyway—I'm not sure about Europe—daylight saving changes on November 1st, so even though the call is at the same time UTC, it'll be at a different time for some of the participants. Just to note.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Alan. In Europe, it has changed this past weekend, so we are already with the new time that is one hour earlier. I don't know in South America when it changes. But anyway, that's the beauty of saying UTC, is that then everybody knows where they are, how they relate to UTC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Roberto, I understand that, but some people said that because of the election or other things, they wanted to be at the same time next week. I'm just noting it will not be at the same time next week. I'm not saying it's good or bad, just noting. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Understood. Please, can the host close the call? We are one minute late. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you all for joining. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]