
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Unaffiliated Individuals Mobilization Working Party call on Monday, the 1st of February 2021 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel, we have Roberto Gaetano, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gopal Tadepalli, Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez on audio-only, Joanna Kulesza, Jonathan Zuck, Sébastien Bachollet, Bill Jouris, David Mackey, Sarah Kiden, and Yrjo Lansipuro.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Melissa Peters Allgood, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

We have Spanish and French interpretation today. Our Spanish interpreters are Paula and Lilian. And our French interpreters are Aurélie and Isabelle.

We have received apologies from Maureen Hilyard.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name for the transcript record, and to please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Thank you all very much. With this, I turn the call over to you, Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Claudia. As usual, let's start with the review of the agenda. We have a quite short agenda this time. That doesn't mean we are going to have a short call. The points are basically a quick review of the action items, just to check the open ones, and then the bulk of the call

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.

will be the review of the draft report. And the version 3, we are going to go through all the comments and suggestions and modification and so on, and we'll see as far as we get. That will consolidate at least one part of the report. Any comments or questions? Hearing none, let's go to the first item that is Review of the Action Items.

I have sent an e-mail message. There were four open action items. Starting from the oldest one, one was carve out for RALOs that group the individuals into an ALS, state that this is possible. That was referring to the specific EURALO situation where we have an ALS for all RALO individual members. And, of course, the spokesperson, the official representative of that ALS is going to be an individual member but also representative of an ALS, and so we needed to make an exemption for this. The suggestion from Alan was to put a footnote. The footnote is there so I believe that the action is closed. Any comments?

Yeah. I see from Heidi in the chat that LACRALO is also considering the same approach. As far as I remember, the comment was not pointing out specifically just to one RALO but we'll make sure that it's a general approach. So that action item can be closed.

The other one on the same day was to review the issues through a privacy perspective. I think that in order to close this item, we need to go through the whole report. We are going to close this item only when there are no further questions or issues about privacy in the report. So that will remain open.

Going to the one on the following week, the only open one was to edit title 7, adding "Keep RALOs informed through an Annual Report." We

are going to see this when we go through the document that number 7 has become because of the numbering, the number 5 or number 4, I don't remember. Following the discussion last week, we came to an agreement about keeping the RALO flexible about Annual Report or however this report is going to be done. This point can be closed. It will be when we go through the report, when we reach that bullet point four and we approve that text. The last one is opened last week. It's open and I haven't done anything on this and, therefore, the point remains open. Any comments?

Okay. Hearing none, let me just add one thing. The open point from last week was referring to the reasons that have caused the At-Large Structures to be rejected in the past. I will need staff support for a list of those cases. Otherwise, I cannot work on this point. So this is just a reminder for staff that I need that list. Thank you, Heidi, for noting it.

So let's go to the main part of the agenda, and that is the report. So, let's start. The first page is a basically a table of contents. There's a comment about due diligence appearing there. The moment that we refresh the table of contents, that will disappear. So point taken but it's going to be done, automatically it's going to be taken care of. So there's no discussion on that.

Going to the Introduction: Working Party Formation and Process. The first paragraph under Working Party Formation and Process, there were no comments so I think I can clean up and remove the yellow highlight. The second paragraph, there are a few things. First of all, there are some data in red. Those, of course, would be filled in. The date and the number of times will be provided by staff the moment that we close our

work. And the URL for the attendance record, that will also be provided by staff. Any question and comments on this? Okay. Let's move on.

There were two comments in the same paragraph. One was the word "disagreement," the suggestion was to put "views". I agree. So can we say, "No decisions were taken at the single meeting and all working party members had an opportunity to express their views"?

The second comment was with summary of the attendance on Appendix 1. This is basically a question. Do we have a table attached to the report? Similarly, that would be exactly the same to what the ALS Mobilization Working Party has done. I would assume that we could do that also for similarity with that one. Any comments? Any comments also from staff? Is there any reason why we couldn't do it?

A comment from Cheryl says, "Might as well be the same thing as the other." Yeah. Unless there's an objection by staff that tells me that this is not possible, we will do it this way. And so I will ask staff to provide at least the design of the table, and we can provisionally put that in Appendix 2 even if then it will be updated only at the end of the working party. Okay. Let's move on.

On the next paragraph, there were no questions, no points, so that's fine. On the one before the last, I had one correction by Sarah suggesting adding WP to Chair. Point taken. We'll do that. This paragraph is talking about the polls. The question was, should we provide a copy of the polls? I'm a bit hesitant. And from the comments that I have received, I have received two comments that also are more inclined to put to just a summary of the result of the polls and not the

individual votes at the polls. So that's a question of privacy that I don't want to get into also because they were just polls and not official records for voting. So in the Appendix I will put only the result of the polls unless there are opinions that differ. Any questions? Yeah, also Cheryl says, "Inclined about the summary."

Just a quick word to Alan. Welcome, Alan. Up to now, we are going through the report and I'm going through the comments one by one. And, up to now, there was no disagreement on the comments made.

So the last paragraph—actually, the last two paragraphs—there was nothing, no comments, and so I will just remove the yellow highlights. Can we go on, or are there any comments? Alan, do you have anything to add to the comments on page two of the report?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Nothing at the moment. There's nothing I've noticed so far I. Of course, once we finish this pass, do another pass. But no, I don't have anything right now.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Okay. Thank you, Alan. Yeah. There's still time, although the sooner the better we detect things that have to be changed, the better it is. So let's go to the chapter Working Party Mandate and Objectives. I don't see anything on the first paragraph. The first comments are on the glossary. The comment was from Patricia willing to remove the highlighted part, well, because it's not relevant. As a matter of fact, I agree that I have put it there just for us as a reference for the discussion. In the final

version, it can be dropped. Or if there are people who want to keep it, we can put it as a footnote. But probably the best option will be to delete it completely because it doesn't add anything. Any opinions on this? Another comment, "Drop it." Okay. For the time being, I will drop it and I still have the text if we have to put it back again on second thoughts.

The next point is one bullet point about termination that will be deleted completely. The suggestion to delete it came last week and I have seen that the term "termination" was not referenced anywhere else so we can easily remove it.

The other comments are basically editing uppercase or articles or these sort of things. I will accept them. I'm not fine tuning, wordsmithing these details.

Before we move to Expectations and Criteria that is on page four, any comments so far on the pages? I see one hand. Anybody else? Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. On the first point, there are two things. This is on RALO individual member. That says "...is a member that has been accepted as an individual member." I think we also need a clarification "and still continues to meet the criteria," because obviously if someone no longer meets the criteria, they would no longer be an individual member.

And the second thing is we need a footnote there just to make it really clear that in the case of EURALO, where individual members are grouped together in an ALS, that doesn't alter the situation. I'll put something in the chat for both if you'd like.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. You said still meeting criteria—that's just a note for myself, and then we'll figure out. What you said that the other point about the situation in EURALO, we have a footnote that is in a couple of pages. We have that. Let me check where exactly. I'm sure we put the footnote. Yes. We have a footnote on page 5. On point five of the bullet point list for criteria on page 5. So that's where we have the footnote. Are you suggesting that we have it also in the definitions? Because the definitions are just definitions.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's probably not really needed there. So we can skip that. The last footnote should be sufficient.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. But I will put that the member should be still meeting the criteria. Any other comments so far on that up to glossary included? Alan, that's an old hand, right? I assume, yeah. So let's go to the next page, page 4, Expectations and Criteria.

The comments here from Eduardo Diaz says that this paragraph is missing something, since it does not say anything about the individual members that are currently affiliated to an ALS, and we try to

understand they're going to be allowed to become individual members as well.

Okay. I will keep this open. I don't have right away an idea. Because the original idea was just to talk about this on top of the fact that they are also members of ALS. Let's keep it open and we'll figure that out during the week. Any other comments on this?

Okay. Thank you, Alan, in the meantime for your definition of RALO individual member. I will use that one. It's in the chat if somebody else wants to have a look. Sarah, I see your hand up. You have the floor.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Roberto. Thank you, everyone. I believe Eduardo's concern is answered under applicability to existing RALO individual members. So I don't know if we have to talk about it up there because I see something about that in the next section. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Sarah. I will start the discussion on the mailing list and let's see the opinion of everybody on this, and then and then we'll move on. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. At a simple level, Eduardo's problem can be fixed by adding at the end "in addition to those who are members of ALSes." However, if it has become a very long sentence then it probably needs to be broken up. But conceptually, we're simply saying there that we want to

take advantage of individuals who are not members of ALSes, in addition to those who are members of ALSes. That that complements the previous paragraph, where it says ALSes still have a role to play. But as I said, I think it's too long a sentence and probably needs to be broken down into two or more sentences to be really understandable. But at a simple level, all we need is to say it's in addition to ALS members.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Okay. I think we agree on the concept and the method of translating this into words. Okay. So let's move on. I have forgotten, there was still a comment from Nadira—at the end of the first sentence, I'm mentioning ALSes—and she asked if I mean At-Large. Actually, I mean At-Large Structures. I mean that the role of individual has to be harmonized with the role of the ALSes. Well, the role of ALS. There's no point in saying role of individuals within ALSes. So let's move to what we will expect from a RALO individual member.

Besides editorial comments that I will just import, upper cases, and instead of At-Large, the At-Large community and so on, that is fine, that is agreed. The first question other than that is about the word "compile". There was a little bit of discussion with several comments and the agreement, at least among the people who submitted comments, was to say "submit" because we use the word "submit" also later on in terms of the Statement of Interest. So for coherence, we are going to use submit. Any objection? Okay. We are going pretty fast, actually. Either you're all asleep or there's really agreement.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIÉRREZ: No. We're not asleep. We are listening.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you. That was Raúl, I assume, from the voice.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIÉRREZ: Correct.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Comment by Nadira is she wanted to add "or a member of an existing ALS." And the further comment is that "This is actually not a potential conflict of interest." So I need to figure out, maybe this sentence has to be split in two. I will keep it open for the time being and figure out during the week how to solve it, unless somebody comes with a brilliant solution right now. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the brilliant solution is not give another example if we don't have one.

ROBERTO GAETANO: I'm not sure I understand. What do you mean?

ALAN GREENBERG: Right now it says, “Declare any potential interest, like membership”—it should be such as, not like—“such as membership of another constituent part of ICANN.” And Nadira has added an “or” which we’re not sure is applicable. If there isn’t another example of a conflict of interest that we can think of, we just have to just give the one example. That’s all.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. I can agree with that. Yes, exactly. Also because the fact of being a member of an existing ALS is not something that will prevent people from being a RALO individual member, it’s only if they are the representative of an existing ALS that they cannot be a RALO individual member. So on second thought, I basically disagree with Nadira but I see her hand up. Nadira, you have the floor.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yes. I remember why I put this comment. It’s based on the fact that there is a possibility that they are in another RALO. Like if I’m from AFRALO and I moved to EURALO, then I have to declare that I was a member of AFRALO. That’s my point to explain what I thought of it. Thanks.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Before giving the floor to Alan and Sarah who are next, let me propose that we just keep it simple, as Alan said, and declare any potential conflict of interest such as membership and so on. And then all the cases of potential conflict of interest we’ll be developing the

criteria because, otherwise, we run the risk of having the potential conflict of interest defined in two places, and as such, we need to keep up to date two parts of the document. That's my project management background and not have the same thing defined in too many places because, otherwise, you will have to keep the changes consistent. So, Alan and Sarah.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The other conflict of interest that's the most common one and in fact exists all over the place is employment in the domain name industry. So you work for a registrar or registry. By the way, we should say potential or perceived because, in many cases, there is no real potential conflict of interest but it's perceived as one by others. So I would recommend potential or perceived. And if we wanted to give another example here or somewhere else, the most common one is employment in the domain name industry.

By the way, in respect to Nadira's comment about member in one way or another of multiple RALOs, we have no prohibition for that. Unless we are adding a prohibition, I don't think we should refer to it as a perceived conflict. For instance, you can be a resident of one region and a citizen of another, and according to the valid rules, you could be members—either individual members or ALS members—validly. Moreover, I can be an ALS member of a EURALO ALS. There's nothing prohibiting me from doing that. I can't be a controlling member. I can't be the majority of the members, being from Canada or North America, but I can be a member. So membership in multiple RALOs is very

common and I certainly wouldn't want to list that as a conflict. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Alan. Sarah?

SARAH KIDEN: I don't know. Maybe my comment is relevant only to AFRALO but I know I've seen stuff sending out—when someone applies, they send out an e-mail and ask them to confirm for things, and one of the things usually is that they are not currently a member of an ALS. So our rules currently say that if you're a member of an ALS, you should not do that. So I'm not sure how we can handle that. One way would be to start to, say, declare if you are a member of an ALS or any potential conflict of interest like membership, etc. So we put the ALS thing before or we break it down and make it a totally different point. But if it doesn't apply to all RALOs then we can. I don't know how to handle it. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. Thank you, Sarah. Alan, I think it's a new hand. You have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is a new hand. My understanding is currently all five RALOs have a rule saying you can't be an individual member if you're a member of an ALS. We are recommending to the RALOs and to the ALAC that this be changed. So let's not confuse what the status is today with what we're recommending. Now, what we're recommending may not be accepted,

and so be it then we'll make adjustments. But we're recommending that there not be any conflict or any rule against being an individual member and a member of ALS. We'll see how it unfolds.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alan. I just have a question now about being a member of the industry. I have been, for instance, in the Board of Public Interest Registry and I actually even chaired the Board of Public Interest Registry, while at the same time, being an individual member of EURALO. If I go through the list of EURALO individual members, I can easily find other people that are even working for the industry, most probably also people who are involved in governments.

So I'm a bit hesitant. Do you think that this should be a must? Because, to a certain extent, there's a sort of difference between somebody who is speaking on behalf of an organization and somebody who is speaking at his or her personal level as an individual. So I'm not really sure that we should avoid to have such situation. And, in any case, if we do—this is a bigger issue than just here in the report—I think it's something that we should discuss thoroughly. I have Gopal, and then Alan again. Gopal, you have the floor.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

Thank you very much. What I didn't understand is when in doubt, how do we cross check and who do we cross check? At any point in time, we may have a doubt. Say, for example, as mentioned earlier, ALS doesn't give the members list of members. So if somebody has a doubt, is this person a member of ALS, how do we cross check what is the reality? I'm

sorry. I didn't understand who will cross check, how will it be cross checked.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Well, actually, we don't know, actually, who are the members of an ALS. They are not obliged to give us the list of members. So you're right. We don't know. We only know about the official representatives of an At-Large Structure and the leadership, if they communicate that to us. But currently the obligation is only about the official representatives. But that's the way it is. This is why also it is not advisable to put a constraint that somebody that is a member of an ALS—just a normal member but not a representative—cannot be a RALO individual member because we have no way to check.

I have two people, Alan and Judith, but I see also Gopal. If you want to reply to this point, to my answer, you have the floor.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

Yeah. Also, we need to understand that ALS representative notified [at] the time of application of the ALS. The same story prevails. We don't have a follow-up on what is happening, the dynamics in the ALS, so when we say ALS members which we know at the time of the ALS application.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yeah. That's correct. We need to make sure then, you know, periodically checking. I have Alan and Judith. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. In regard to who the ALS leaders and representatives are, we will have follow-up because the recommendations that the ALAC has approved from the ALS Mobilization Group is there will be every two years a request of who the leaders are and ALSes are required to keep the representative contact information up to date, so we do know that. In terms of who their members are, we have no idea, we don't care. That's not our business.

But back on the potential or perceived conflict, Roberto, we're not saying that it is a problem. We know there are many, many At-Large people who are employed in the domain name industry. All we're saying is you must declare it so that there's no one's going to come back afterwards and say, "Hey, I just found out that Roberto is chair of PIR. Something is going on here." You have to declare it. And your position is in fact an interesting one, your former position. You were chair of the Board, someone who is empowered to speak on behalf of the registry. Now, PIR are generally perceived as being good guys and I don't think anyone ever raised an eyebrow saying there's a problem with that. If you would be chair of Donuts or Verisign, I bet your people would have complained like anything. So it's all a matter of perception. And all we're saying is you have to declare it. We're not saying it's a problem or a conflict. We're saying it's a perceived or potential conflict, which means it should be out in the open and not a secret. That's all. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Alan. Judith, you have the floor.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Before, when individual members could not be members of ALSes, what we did is when we got individual members, we verified. So what we would do is if we knew what state they were living in or something like that, we would query a couple of the Internet Society Chapters and ask them, “Is such-and-such a member of your organization?” and they would tell us whether they were, yes or no. And if they were yes, then we would tell that person, “Oh, the current rule is if you are a member of an ALS, you cannot be an individual member, and you would have to choose which you prefer to be a member of.” And they would make that choice and they would join. Or often is the case would be the Internet Society person said, “No, this person is not a member.” That’s how we did our verification.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Judith. So I think we have solved this point. The next one was I think an editorial comment from Nadira, adding discussions of At-Large positions on policy development process. Yes, I will add that one.

And there’s a comment from Sarah in the same point six about working groups. The question is, “Do we need to say anything about taking up leadership positions?” If I understand your point, we should say that—well, rather than me guessing, Sarah, since you are in the call, do you want to elaborate more on your comment? In the meantime, I have a hand up from Sebastien. Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I am sorry, but I wanted not to come back but to have a comment of the previous discussion. One of the questions raised after the discussion is how to prevent At-Large not to be—I don't know if it's the right word—but take over by registry or registrar and how we can prevent RALOs, ALSes, and At-Large to be in that situation. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Thank you. Sarah, are you—yeah. You said in the chat that you were going to clarify.

SARAH KIDEN: Yes. Thank you, Alan, for reminding me that we're talking about recommendations and not current practices. So one of the things currently is I think it's not very clear about if individual members can take up leadership positions, and I think it's important to mention that it's okay or if there any restrictions—and we mentioned that they are there—because I know we've had this discussion in AFRALO when individual members want to take up leadership positions. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: I'm not sure I got the point but maybe we can have a discussion on the mailing list. Cheryl, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Roberto. I just wanted to mention in response to what Sarah was just saying, we are making recommendations. We're not necessarily codifying what's happening in any one RALO and forcing it down the throats of any other, but I thought we did have a conversation about the fact that there should not be limitations on what individual members could do in terms of leadership, at least not at this level of documentation. If individual RALOs want to have, dare I say, quirky little ways of doing things, well then, so be it. People might have the good sense not to join their RALOs if that's a problem for them. But I thought we had it in fact established without us having to go back to the mailing list, Roberto, that we were not limiting leadership or any other opportunity.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes, that's correct. As a matter of fact, we have several EURALO individual members that are in the Board of EURALO, for instance. So we have several cases, but also in other RALOs. So I don't really understand exactly if we want to put any limitations and why. But if this is an issue, I think that we cannot solve it during the call and we need to start a discussion on this and maybe even open an issue. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The only limitation that we have discussed that I'm aware of, that I recall anyway, is the limitation that you can't be an individual user at the same time as you're an ALS leader or representative. I disagreed with those but that is what we decided, I believe. We have never had

any discussion about whether individual users can hold roles in the RALO or be appointed to something by the RALO. Different RALOs currently have different rules about this. I was an ALAC member for a bunch of years. And some of those years, I was appointed by NARALO. I have also been appointed as other things by NARALO. So NARALO has no such rule about individual members not being able to do things. Other RALOs do have such rules right now and I don't believe we have discussed that at all. And I believe that's something we must discuss that either we be silent on it or we recommend a change from what the current flexibility is that's allowed to the RALOs. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alan. However, in the meantime, looking at the chat, I had misunderstood what Sarah meant. In fact, what you wanted to say is that currently there are no restrictions or clarifying that, to state in the document that we don't recommend that we have limitation. This said, of course, if then individual RALOs will have internal rules that are more restrictive, I think that they should be allowed to do that. As a matter of fact, we don't say that everybody has to behave the same. But for the document, we are going to recommend that there will be no restriction to take leadership position and other—like, for instance, being NomCom representative and so on. Alan, I assume it's a new hand. You have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry, I'm confused. I'm hearing two different things. Are we going to be silent on whether an individual member can hold positions within the

RALO or selected by the RALO? Or are we going to recommend they can? Because right now, we have a situation where we have no At-Large rules, and some RALOs have strict rules, others have no such rules. And I'm not quite sure what you're saying. I'd be happy if we say there should be no restriction against individuals holding those roles. But I haven't actually heard that discussion in this group yet. Can you clarify what it is you're proposing we say?

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Well, the problem is, from my point of view is that if we make the recommendation that RALO individual members do not take leadership position, we are going to miss half of the EURALO Board, we are going to have severe consequences. Personally, I don't think that is going to be a good idea because if we accept individual members, we would like to have them to participate, incentivate, foster their participation. And if at some point in time, they can be good leaders, I don't see why we should prevent them from taking a leadership position. But that's my personal opinion. Maybe we should open an issue on this and have a discussion during next week and come to a conclusion. Alan, it's a new hand, I assume.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, it is. Roberto, the situation you just described, I don't think anybody has proposed that is forbidding individual members from taking on roles. Within RALOs right now, there are two situations, there are RALOs which allow individuals to be treated just as ALS members and assume roles. They can be appointed to the ALAC, they can be on the board of

EURALO, they can—whatever. EURALO and NARALO do that right now. I believe APRALO also does it. The other two RALOs, I believe, currently have restrictive rules saying you cannot hold those positions.

So the question is not do we forbid anyone to hold those positions. I don't think that is on the table. The options we have are being silent or saying the RALOs can make their own rules. Or we make a recommendation saying, which supports what you say you personally support in what EURALO and NARALO do and APRALO, that is individuals have all the regular rights associated with ALS members and being able to run for office or run for positions. So our options are be silent—and that implies the RALOs have flexibility—or we can explicitly say the RALOs have flexibility, or we can say the RALOs should not have flexibility and people should be able to assume office if they have the right skills and interest. So to do either of the latter two, we actually have to have the discussion on it and see if we all agree. We can be silent without having a discussion about it.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Okay. Alan, your point is taken. What I would suggest is to ask staff to open an issue on this point and also to put an action item. We are going to discuss this during the week, also because we are two minutes away from the top of the hour, and I don't want to have a discussion here without having recorded that in the wiki or via e-mail. Judith, you have your hand up. You have the floor. Then I will close the discussion and also ask the host to close the meeting.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I don't understand why we are differentiated, as Heidi was saying, between RALO and ALAC. If we say an individual member can take a leadership role then it should be taking a leadership role for any positions. What they did like—and I wish we had thought about it in NARALO—was that there are certain rules that individual people cannot have to be leaders, like they can't be working for government or they can't be something else or advocating on someone else's behalf. You can declare that and you could also declare why this will not be a problem. And I think that declaration solves everything. That if you can explain why this will not be a problem and everyone agrees with that, then I see no reason. I just didn't understand why we are differentiating between RALO and ALAC.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Judith. I see Silvia. You have the floor.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you very much, Roberto. But just very quickly to add to what Alan mentioned. I put the rules there, the LACRALO rules, which as you know were recently approved last year. So they have a number of limitations for individual members to be able to apply to leadership positions. So you have the rules. Also, AFRALO is at the moment in the process of reviewing the rules, which at the moment do not allow the individuals to be leaders, but they are discussing this issue. So at least for those two RALOs, you have limitations. They are in the process of reviewing it but they have been very conservative about allowing individuals to become leaders, as you may be aware. Those rules also are posted on that table

that I prepared as part of the working group reference materials. So you can explore them.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Silvia. Alan, very quick last comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Very, very quickly. Judith, I think in our last intervention was confusing the characteristics of an individual that is who you're employed by with what you can do. And I think the discussion we're having here was just individual members, regardless of who they were. So let's not confuse the potential conflict with the rules against membership. Silvia is right, but I'll give you an extra nuance. AFRALO, the words currently—and I know AFRALO is discussing it, so the current rules may not matter—but the current rule is saying, "An individual member cannot assume leadership role in the RALO," but they also interpret that as meaning you can't be appointed to the ALAC and a number of other things. So they have one set of words and interpreted very widely. LACRALO has it more explicitly as you can't do either. The question is, do we want to leave that status quo or do we want to make recommendations? And I think it's a valid discussion to have. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Alan, I think that this is something that we're going to discuss during the week on the wiki and on mailing list and figure out then next week if we have a solution or not.

Okay. This said, may I ask the host to close the call? See you all in one week from now.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Okay. Thank you all for joining the call. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]