
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Unaffiliated Individuals Mobilization Working Party call on Monday, the 8th of February, 2021 at 18:00 UTC. On the call today, on the English channel we have Roberto Gaetano, Alan Greenberg, Sebastien Bachollet, Bill Jouris, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, David Mackey, Eduardo Diaz, Esther Patricia Akello, Maureen Hilyard, Yrjo Lansipuro, and Joanna Kulesza. We have received apologies from Nadira Al-Araj, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, and Natalia Filina will be joining us late. Also, Sarah Kiden is joining us as we speak.

We have Spanish and French interpretation. Our Spanish interpreters for today are Veronica and Marina. And our French interpreters are Isabelle and Camila. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Melissa Peters Allgood, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

And before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their names before speaking for the transcription purposes and also so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels.

And also, Roberto, we actually now have Laura Margolis joining for LACRALO so we're complete. Thank you and I turn the call over to you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Claudia. Let's go to the view of the agenda. You have it on the screen. It's a short agenda. The bulk of the agenda will be continuing the review of the reports. But before that, we'll have a couple of short items. That is the review of the action items to make sure that we don't

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.

leave anything behind and this discussion that I think is going to be also very short, why ALSes have been rejected in the past. That's basically it. Any comments on the agenda? Anything to be added?

Okay. Hearing none, let's go to the first item on the agenda. That is the action items. So I will go through them in the oldest through the newest. The old one is from 11 January and is to review all issues through a privacy perspective. That's an action on me and as soon as we finish this review of the report, this will be ticked off. But until then, I would like to keep it open. Then, an action item, 25th of January, that is the link with the rejection of the ALSes. That will be the next topic on the agenda. And then, the third pending item is from last week. That is report to state that there are no restrictions for individuals in leadership position.

Let me use this opportunity to thank staff, who have done all the actions that were on them. So everything that is here is something that is for me to do. Any comments on the action items? I see no hands.

So let's go to the next point on the agenda. That is this discussion on why At-Large Structures have been rejected in the past. There was a comment in the wiki from Alan, who says, "Why are we bothering discussing this?" My recollection is that although I don't remember who raised this issue but an issue was raised, saying that we need to be consistent between reasons for rejecting At-Large structures. Those should be consistent with the reasons for rejecting individuals. Or in different words, we want to make sure that there are no situations in which, for similar cases, we do reject an ALS but we accept the individual or vice versa. So that was my recollection.

And I have gone through the excellent summary done by staff and I have seen two main reasons for rejecting ALSes. One was related to incorporation and the other one was because the ALS was not compliant in their objectives, or structure, or whatever with the objectives and the purpose of the At-Large. So I don't see an immediate equivalent in this. The equivalent, in terms of individual, for an ALS that is not incorporated is that the existence of the individual cannot be proved. We had this discussion and we'll see how to deal with that.

The other one is—I don't know—if an individual is in blatant violation of any conflict of interest. But we have already said that we will not reject people due to a conflict of interest. We will only ask for the conflict of interest to be declared. So according to my review of this point, there is not much that we can learn from the rejection of At-Large structures. So the floor is open for comment. I see already Alan. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Not commenting on why we're discussing this. I just want to point out because it's really important that three of the RALOs, or the rationales the staff gave for three of the RALOs, was that the ALS or prospective ALS was not incorporated or legitimately incorporated.

And I just want to make clear to the people on this call, and to staff for that matter, that incorporation is not a requirement. It has never been a requirement. It had been suggested by some people that it should be a requirement. But it's never been a requirement. And if, indeed, we have

rejected ALSes purely because they're not formally incorporated, then we have a larger problem than can be dealt with in this working party. I don't believe that's the case because I don't recall any such cases.

The mission not being compatible with At-Large. In general, we haven't used that as a rationale. We have lots of ALSes where the mission of the ALS, of the organization itself, is very much at odds with what ICANN does and At-Large does. But nevertheless, they have said they are interested in ICANN and they've done it.

The main reason for rejection of ALS applicants is they don't meet the criteria. So for instance, a prime criteria of an ALS is that it be controlled by individuals. If any organization is not controlled by individuals, then it doesn't meet the criteria and can't be an ALS.

And that rationale for rejection is exactly the same, I believe, as the one we would use for individuals. We set criteria. Either RALOs have done it to date or we're looking at doing it globally. And if someone doesn't meet the criteria, then they can't be accepted. And conversely, if they do meet the criteria, there's got to be a really strong reason to reject them. Otherwise, we're not using our rules consistently. Thank you very much.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alan. I will say a couple of words and then I have Evin and Sebastien. There is one thing that is not listed there because it has not been formally a rejection but just a move to a suggestion to apply in a different region. And this is probably relevant for us, in the sense that if somebody who contacts ... Since now we process things by RALO and

not globally, I think that one of the reasons for not really a rejection but passing that to a different RALO is if the person really belongs to a different region. Evin, you have the floor.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you, Roberto. And thank you, Alan, as well. I just wanted to address Alan's comments. And thank you for them as well. What he was saying is correct. And I just wanted to note that in terms of incorporation, I won't name the organizations but there have been examples where there has been a false representation. Maybe there are two applications with the same name but one of them is legitimate. This is mainly what this was in reference to.

Other times, there have been entities or people that have applied, saying they're an organization that doesn't exist. Other times, there have been spam entries on the website. So usually, the spam doesn't even make it to any sort of community discussion. It's just an IT issue. But I just wanted to note that what Alan was saying was correct. And I can maybe clarify the language on the wiki page as needed. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Evin. Alan, if this is a direct reply on what Evin says, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Yeah. Of course, misrepresentation and lying is a good cause for rejection. But that's not what the words that were put in the wiki said. And I just wanted to make it really clear to the people

here, that they don't away with a misunderstanding. As I said, I don't know of any ALS applicant that was rejected purely because it wasn't incorporated. But the words in the wiki imply that and I wanted to make that really clear. And of course, misrepresentation, lying, and various other things like that all should count against you. Thank you.

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

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Roberto. Two things. The first one is that the word "incorporation," it's frightening me. We try to—mainly not-for-profit. And the word in English, if you would translate it in French, it's not good at all. But I know that we are in a corporation with ICANN and it's a trouble. But for the ALS, I hope that we can find another word. It's maybe "declared" or another word than incorporation because we don't incorporate any not-for-profit association in France. We incorporate companies.

And the second point is, yes, we reject ALSes, once upon a time, when they were not dealing with one single country but for more than one country. They were not allowed to join us. Now, we allow even organizations who are across RALOs. Therefore ... Hello?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Sebastien?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. I thought it was me. It was everyone.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Sorry, Sebastien. We're not able to hear you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yeah. Until the problem is solved, I have Judith next. Just a word of warning. The scope of this working party is to discuss about RALO Individual Members. It's not to rediscuss the issues that are related to At-Large Structure. So if you can make your comments being brief, if possible. Judith, you have the floor.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Sure. I also am very confused about this because nowhere, as Alan pointed out, in any of the rules do we have anything about incorporation, or having them be nonprofits, or anything. They just have to be associations that have a website, that have subscribed to the principles of At-Large, and anything. And even with the same as individuals, they would have to be subscribed to our principles.

So I'm really at a loss to hear that we've been rejecting groups. I can understand we reject an ALS who says they have x number of people and then really doesn't. We had an issue with that in NARALO. But people viewed that that wasn't a reason to reject them because they pass information on to whoever their members are. But it doesn't matter how many they have, just that have members—at least three people. But I don't understand where this other thing came from. It

certainly wasn't in NARALO. And maybe other RALOs have different ones but I don't—

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Judith, thank you. But I really feel that this discussion about rejection of ALSes and incorporation of ALSes is really out of scope in this group. So what I may suggest is for staff to check this with RALO leaders, if there have been cases in the past that we need to reconsider. But Sebastien, I see you are back, if you need to finish your point. But please. The discussion is about individuals and not At-Large Structures. Sebastien, if you want to finish.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sorry. I don't know where I was because it was totally ... But I'll just say "incorporation" is a word I have trouble. And we, At-Large, we refused some ALSes where they were dealing with more than one country. It was historically the case. Now it's not anymore. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Okay. Thank you all. I think that this is a valid point. It's only out of scope here. And I think that if staff can make a note so that it's not forgotten and raise at the appropriate level to check this issue about incorporation of ALSes. Any other comments on this before we go to the next point in the agenda?

Okay. So let's go to the draft report. I'm not going over to the further comments that were done on the first part. I remember that we arrived at the point in which we started a long discussion that was related to

the statements of interest. We stopped at page four of the current draft, at chapter or paragraph or whatever—the numbered list—under what we will expect from a RALO Individual Member. And unless there are some very pressing issues about whatever was discussed up to that point, I will resume from here and go on and hopefully finish today.

I see no hands. So let's start at page four. The point that triggered the discussion was "submit a statement of interest and keep it up-to-date." Is that now clear, after the discussion we had? I was changed to "submit," according to suggestions.

Okay. I see no hands so I will go on. The next change was just, I would say, an editorial change. That is this "such as" instead of "like." So that should be no problem. I think that we can ...

And then, the next one was point five. That was "acknowledge the ICANN Expected ..." I can't read on that but I have my copy. "Acknowledge the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior," where there was a point from Patricia, saying it should be "agree" and not "acknowledge." On the other hand, I remember that in the past, we had "agree" and it was changed to "acknowledge." So I'm not an expert in wordsmithing and I'm not the best person to care about these details. But can we come to a common position on what is the verb to use here? I see Alan's hand. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I thought our previous discussion was on "follow RALO rules," to be honest. So I'm a little bit confused where we are here. But in both cases, they have to acknowledge the existence of and

agree to abide by. That's really all we're looking for. They don't have to agree that they're the correct ones. But given that they want to be here, they have to follow the rules.

The discussion on RALO rules, people pointed out that they should be able to, once they're part of the party of the group, to be able to try to change those through whatever processes. And that, of course, applies to ICANN Standards of Behavior as well, in both cases.

Now, I'll point out we have a little bit of an inconsistency here. You later on have criteria to become admitted. And we shouldn't duplicate those. So the criteria to become admitted, you have to agree to abide by the rules. Number two, you also have to have submitted a statement of interest. So in number two of expectations, we don't need to say, "Submit a statement of interest," but just keep it up-to-date. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you, Alan. So do we agree on the formulation that is "agree and abide by the ICANN blah, blah, blah?"

ALAN GREENBERG: I think by making that really clear, we're not taking implied meanings of words. If we want them to abide by them, say it. So they have to acknowledge the existence of these and agree to abide by them.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Let's do that. Let's raise this in the mailing list. And next week, we will come with a term. I see Cheryl has a slightly different formulation

that is, “Acknowledgement implies understood and the ‘agree’ is to abide by.” Okay. My proposal will be “agree and abide by.” Okay. And I will stay with this and we’ll check if there’s a disagreement next week.

So the next point was a question by Sarah on point six, that was related to working groups. “Do we need to say something about taking leadership positions, not only participation to working groups?” Yes. I can add taking up leadership positions. Honestly, I don’t see the need. But any opinions on this? Okay. So there’s no strong ... Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I don’t see any need to mention that. But the only potential problem, as we’ve already said, you cannot have a leadership position in other parts of ICANN or in an ALS if you’re an Individual Member. Therefore, calling it out here, saying it is allowed in working groups, may well be warranted. Otherwise, people may assume that our prohibition against leadership positions in other cases applies here too.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

So in short, you are in favor about explicitly mentioning leadership positions—in At-Large, obviously.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry. I’ve lost you there. We’re saying you can take up an At-Large leadership position. We’ve said you cannot take an ALS leadership position. So in working groups, if we’re allowing it, we should perhaps call it out. Otherwise, people may presume that the prohibition against

leadership positions, in some cases, may be carried out there. I personally think we shouldn't have any prohibition to leadership positions at all but that's not what we decided.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yeah. What I'm a bit puzzled is that this is not the part that is compulsory but is the part where we are encouraging people. So we are encouraging individual members to participate to working groups. In this sense, I'm not very much in agreement that we should encourage—open this can of worms for something that is not really a rule but some sort of suggestion or encouragement. Judith, you have the floor.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yeah. This is what I was saying, is that we should say ... I understand Alan's point and Sarah's point. And maybe we could say, "We are encouraging individual members to join working groups or to take a leadership position in these working groups."

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Okay. Thank you, Judith. So if I can make a summary, I think that I would like to separate this, that is the encouragement to participate and also take leadership—take the participation, also, to a leadership level. But separate this from possible incompatibility of roles that should be addressed somewhere else. So I will try to reformulate this, this week, and submit it to your attention with some changes.

But I would like to ask one question to Alan. You were mentioning one other thing. That is inconsistency between something that appears in this chapter and something that appears later on, that I didn't get completely. Can you reformulate your point, Alan, please?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I was just pointing out that it may be more natural to have criteria for joining before expectations once you have become a member. If you scroll down a little bit, you have criteria for individual member acceptance. And one of the criteria, for instance, is "submit a statement of interest." So we don't need to replicate the "submit" in the expectations. You wouldn't have become an individual member unless you had submitted a statement of interest. So let's just keep it up-to-date.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Where is the unmute button? Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Similarly, for "agree" to follow the Standards of Expected Behavior, that's something that you have to do to get in. And you have to continue honoring it once you're there. So I'm just looking for consistency so we don't duplicate things in both expectations and criteria. That's all.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yeah. I absolutely agree. I was feeling a bit uncomfortable myself about this sort of duplication that was not a full duplication. But I think that your suggestion to move that higher—I mean, reverse the order—is ... So I would like to have a sense of the room on this. So we should say first, the criteria for RALO Individual Member acceptance, then applicability to existing RALO Individual Members, and then what we will expect?

Does this make sense to everybody? Are there different opinions? I see no objection. In the chat, I have a couple of approvals. Okay. Done. So I will deal with that during the week, changing the order. And I will continue but in the order in which they are.

So the next point where we have comments is there are comments from Eduardo. That is referencing the grace period. And he was asking who is going to do this, how we are going to solve it and so on. Now, this is obviously connected, as Nadira rightfully points out, to the process—the verification, the annual or biannual updates, and so on. On the other hand, RALOs have their own rules.

So I think that we should agree with the principles. And then, I will try to word it out in some way for your comments. But basically, we agree on the principle that there should be a grace period to be defined for giving the time to existing members to be compliant with some of the new rules, specifically the statement of interest.

And then, also, since we are going to use this reverse order, it will be easier to put under this heading the grace period and mention the annual or biannual update—keeping up-to-date with the stages of the

Individual Member, with their motivation and so on, and their skills and so on, under a different point that will be lower in the sequence, in reading the document. So there should be no problem.

So that's the proposal on the floor. I see Alan's hand. And I invite, also, others to comment. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Eduardo's original question was, "Who's going to do this? And when and how will it be done?" I think the answer to that, it has to be staff because RALOs don't have staff and we're not in a position to add extra tasks or enforcement onto the RALO leadership. So staff keeps track of who the Individual Members are. They should be the ones to make sure that they have a statement of interest for new applications. And they're going to have to go back and verify that old people have submitted them and provide some level of grace period.

So of course, whatever the rules we're enforcing are the sum total of what we're recommending to the ALAC, assuming they're approved, plus what any individual RALO may add separately. But it's got to be a staff function. There's no other way to handle it. So I think that's the simple answer.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yeah. Thank you, Alan. I had, as a matter of fact, misunderstood Eduardo's comment. Yes. You're right. So we should mention this, although ... Yeah. I will mention that explicitly, although the way we ... Okay. I'll do that and I wonder whether we should mention that rather

... No. Not in the application. Okay. Sorry for thinking out loud. Yes. It should be here. It should be here because this has nothing to do with the application procedure. Okay. Understood. I will formulate that in a better way, ready for discussion next week.

So the next point is about the criteria for acceptance. And there's a note from Alan, saying "caring about individual internet users." That's correct. I think that we should make a point there. And yeah. Alan, I would appreciate if you could, maybe in writing in an email or somewhere, write down the point to be added so that I can just paste it in.

The next point is affirming the interest in learning. And Nadira objects, saying that there's no merit in specifying this, also because this is something that we can not verify.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Excuse me, Roberto. I don't know where you're talking about it because what's on the screen doesn't seem to match what you're talking about. So maybe, we're not scrolled to the right place. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

No, because I'm looking at my copy and I am on number four of the list on page five. So in the criteria for a RALO Individual Member acceptance and the header was at the end of page four. And point one is on page four. And now, I am on point four that is on page five. That is, "affirm her or his interest in learning." I'm using my copy of the document because I can't read on the screen. It's too small.

So the question is whether we should keep this or not. Regardless of whether this is enforceable or not, I would like to keep it here. Also, it's the same thing as the interest in internet user. It is something that we cannot do a test about whether the person cares about the internet users. We cannot do a test about whether the person has an interest in learning. But nevertheless, I don't think it would be of any harm to keep it here. And it will at least remain on the record to remind us about our principles. So I would like to keep it. Any other opinion? Is Nadira on the call? No.

Okay. Moving forward to number five—

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Roberto, apologies. We have a hand up from Alan.

ROBERTO GAETANO: I don't see it.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Never mind. He lowered it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I lowered it. It's not worth ...

ROBERTO GAETANO: Sorry. So now on number five. And it's the word "representative." "The RALO Individual Member must not be a representative or a leader of an

ALS to any RALO.” And I have a comment of Patricia, “Are there any cases where we have a representative who does not vote?” I think that the representative is defined as the person who has the right to vote. So I tend to say that the formulation of point five is correct. Any other opinions?

Okay. Moving forward to notes. I would like to put in this note—and I will do this next week. I will put a summary of if there are minority positions. So that will appear, if this is the case. In the meantime, I see in the chat that Patricia agrees with the formulation of number five.

So we can move forward. I’m now on the rights, still on page five. The question was about the approval. So the sentence, right now, is, “A RALO Individual Member may be listed in the RALO Individual Membership pages if they give their approval, in accordance with the GDPR.” So there was an old comment by Seun that I think was overridden by discussion. So any objection to this current formulation? Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you. “The GDPR” should be replaced by “privacy considerations.” GDPR applies specifically to Europe and not to other parts of the world.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Point taken. May I ask staff to correct it or comment immediately? Because otherwise, I will forget.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll do it right now.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Thank you. So we are now on voting. That is the last point before attacking the process. And the comment is by Sarah, that this is in conflict. That the RALO Individual Members will have the right to vote is in conflict with the current AFRALO rules. So now, the question is that this is a recommendation.

Now, we have two possibilities. If we have an agreement of keeping this recommendation, I will keep it here. And then, ALAC will decide. Or if there's substantial opposition, the fact that this is now conflicting with a current rule in AFRALO doesn't mean, necessarily, that AFRALO is unwilling to change this and to give the right to vote to individual members, although they will only vote in aggregate and this will not be greater than the vote of an ALS in aggregate or whatever formulation you would consider in AFRALO.

So this is the question on the floor right now. And I think that we really should express ourselves, either in this call or in the mailing list or wiki during the week because this is an important point that is key for the recommendation that we are going to make. Alan, you have the floor and I encourage others to give their opinion, at least in the chat, so that I have a feel of the room right now. Thank you. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This is a really important one, in that it is going directly against what, currently, two RALOs do, although we were told last time

that one of the RALOs is, in fact, discussing this at the moment. The other one is not likely discussing it. So I think we need to flesh this one out to some extent. I think we need to point out that it is different from what some other RALOs are doing and give a rationale for why we believe it's important and why believe, because of the aggregate vote, it's not a major issue.

So if we just put this one in like this, we'll likely get rejected by at least one, possibly two RALOs. And that may happen anyway. But I think we have to ... This is, perhaps, one of the very few major departures from where we are today. And I think we have to elaborate and not just give it one sentence and hope no one notices.

Yes. Thank you, Alan. So I will try to reformulate this, maybe saying, "The RALO Individual Members will have the right to vote if the RALO rules allow it," or, "depending on RALO decision," or, "It is left to the RALO to decide whether they have the right to vote," and so on.

But I sort of wanted to give a sign. The status quo is not necessarily something that we have to perpetuate forever. I personally don't think ... And of course, it's just my personal opinion. I don't think it's fair that we don't even—a possibility of having a percentage of one vote. Because I don't know. If we have 50 Individual Members, it is 0.002% of one vote that we give to each Individual Member. And to deny even this, I don't think it's fair, as an answer that we give to individual members, while at the same time we ask them to put effort, resources, enthusiasm, and so on.

I strongly disagree with not giving even a small additional recognition of their participation. Although I agree that the bulk of the decisions have to be taken by the ALSes, that even if all Individual Members get together and vote against, it's the opinion of the ALSes that rules the work of the RALO, I don't think it's fair to exclude the Individual Members from voting.

But that's my opinion and we should put the opinion of the majority and not the opinion of the chair. The floor is open. I have Alan, if it's a new hand, and then Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you, Roberto. I wasn't saying to change this recommendation. I support it strongly. I was simply saying that we can't just have one sentence here. We need to point out clearly to the ALAC and the RALOs that this is a departure from current rules and we should give the rationale for why we are recommending it.

Now ultimately, we may lose, and the ALAC will not ratify this, and it will be discretionary on the RALO as it is now. But I thought our recommendation was solid, that we believe there should be a vote, just like you said your personal position is. And I was simply saying add some words around this to make it really clear that this is a departure and this is the reason why. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

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

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Roberto. Hopefully you can hear me. I'm using my mobile phone. Let me declare, I am all for allowing and, in fact, encouraging and preferably, having it a very, very equitable vote exercised for all members of RALOs. Having said that, I'm not sure we necessarily need too many more words, Alan. I think what we need here is very cleverly and carefully selected words.

So if I was doing this ... And remember, I'm trying to be more an observer here. If I was doing this, I would put the sentence in the positive light, in keeping with the recommendation we're making, which is the ability to have the right to vote because of the responsibility of the work you're doing, regardless of how that's proportioned. So I would say something like that, "The Individual RALO Member exercises their right to vote," or, "exercises their vote, when required, in keeping with," or, "consistent with the RALO rules."

Notice, I'm not saying their RALO rules. I'm saying the RALO roles. And I'm also saying it in a positive, "You've got the right to vote," but modifying it with "consistent with RALO rules." Now, why is that important? Because it allows the flexibility, while one or more of the regions review or perhaps end up being the only one not, allowing some form of direct voting mechanism.

And if there is a RALO or even two RALOs that don't allow it, for whatever reason, eventually the benefits, and advantages, and general pressures will come to bear. Or maybe it'll go the other way. But I think we can be clever with the wordsmithing. Thanks.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Cheryl. Before giving the floor to Alan, it's four minutes to the end of this call. So this is going to conclude the call. I wanted just to mention the fact that we had a straw poll. We had, maybe, two straw polls about the voting. And we had a large majority that was providing support to this decision of giving a vote to the individuals. So to make this recommendation will be in accordance to what the working party has expressed as a majority.

So I think that we can use a more careful wording. But just by thinking over, I'm confirmed that this is the way to go. Alan, you have the floor and you will have the last word because after that, I will close the call.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. The other area where we are departing from current process is somewhere—and I don't remember where it is—we're saying that individual members have the right to hold office, that is, to be selected as an ALAC member or a RALO leader. And we're not being flexible there.

And I think we should do the same thing here. We are making a recommendation. It may ultimately not stand. That's fine. But I think our recommendation is that all individual members should vote, should be able to have the vote according to the detailed rules of the RALO, just like they should be able to hold office. If that isn't how the world unfolds, then so be it. But I don't believe our recommendation should be any softer.

And I'll point out, we have representation on this group from all five RALOs and I haven't heard any negative comments yet. So thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. Thank you, Alan. So that closes the call. Let me just say a couple of words about the next few days. We are really late. We should have a report ready by now. And we still have at least two calls before we come to a complete, approved report.

So I'm taking full responsibility for being late. But I would like to encourage you to thoroughly look at this whole document, not only the part that we are going to be discussing next week. I will be making the changes and I would like to have something, so at the end of next call to be able to be completely through the process. That's the aim, at least, so that in the call two weeks from now, we will just trim the details.

So it's really a couple of weeks of hard work in front of us. But that's necessary in order to be able to provide a document that ALAC can act before or at the ICANN meeting in a little bit more than a month. Having said that, may I ask the host to close the call? And wishing you a rest of the day, the evening, or the night, or whatever to everybody. Thank you all for having joined us.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thanks, all.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And see several of you in another hour at the NARALO call.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Thank you all for joining. This meeting is adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]