

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Unaffiliated Individuals Mobilization Working Party call, taking place on Monday, 1st of March, 2021 at 18:00 UTC. On our call today, on the English channel, we have Roberto Gaetano, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gopal Tadepalli, Bill Jouris, Yrjo Lansipuro, David Mackey, Alan Greenberg, Christopher Wilkinson, Judith Hellerstein, Nadira Al-Araj, Sebastien Bachollet, Sarah Kiden, and Joanna Kulesza. Currently, we don't have on the Spanish channel and no one on the French channel either.

Our interpreters for the Spanish channel are Claudia and Veronica and for the French channel are Aurélie & Camila. We have received apologies from Justine Chew and Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez is expected to join a bit late. From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Yeşim Nazlar. And I'll also be doing call management on today's call.

And with this, just a kind reminder to please state your names, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes, in case someone joins the Spanish or French channel. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Roberto. Thanks so much.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Yeşim. Let's go to the review of the agenda. I have a slight modification on the agenda. And I'm sorry. This is something that I thought only after I have confirmed with staff the agenda. I would like to just start with the review of the agenda, but then skip the review of the action items. I will do this as a last step because some of the things

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.

that we are doing today will be closing, pending action items. So I thought it would make sense to do that at the end.

And I would like to start this call discussing what are the next steps. That, on the other hand, is normally done at the end but I would like to do that at the beginning because if there are objections to the next step, that might affect, also, our review—our process in general.

Then, we will go through the draft. And there are only very few points that are outstanding. Unless something comes up during this call, I think that there's nothing of substance that will remain open at the end of this call. And then, we will have the possibility for any other business. Any disagreement on this agenda, so modified?

Okay. Hearing none, I would like to talk about the next steps. In my opinion, unless we come to an unexpected problem today, this is going to be the last call because all questions of substance have been solved. There's still room for some editing. There's a couple of things. When we go through the document, we'll see where they are. But that doesn't change the substance of our work.

So my opinion—my proposal—is that after having done the editorials that we are going to agree on today, latest tomorrow morning European time ... So let's say within 24 hours, I would like to send this draft, as a draft, informally, to RALOs and ALAC. Actually, the best thing is to ask staff to do it so that they can start discussing—have the internal discussions for the approval of the document, noting that we are less than a month away from the ICANN 70. That's when we had the

commitment to produce the document in time for RALOs and ALAC to approve it. And the target was the meeting in Cancun.

So send this advance copy and then that will give us another week or so for some fine-tuning about some wording, editing—something that can be nicely put in page for the formal, final document. But that would not need a further call and a further discussion. So that's the plan.

I have a question from Heidi on the chat, who says, how long would I like to give the ALAC and RALOs to review the final draft report? I'm not in a position to tell RALOs and ALAC how long they are going to take. Maybe Alan or Cheryl would chime in. But my opinion is that we work for them. So, it's their decision how long it's going to ... They are going to take as much time as is needed for discussing and approving. It's not something that, in my opinion, we have to decide.

So that's the plan and that's the reason why I wanted to say this up front. Any comments on this and possibly opinions? I see Alan already in line. And I invite everybody to chime in on this because we are basically deciding whether today we are closing our work. So Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Two things. Number one, on who sets the timeline, I agree with you. It's not our job. I would think that we should send it to the ALAC and as a courtesy, send it to the RALOs. Tell the ALAC we've sent it to the RALOs and ask the ALAC chair to recommend how much time to give them. So that puts it, I think, in the right hand. And I don't think it's an ALAC thing. I think it's an ALAC chair thing and

that's reasonable. Of course, if she wants to go to the ALAC to make a decision, that's her business.

In terms of the overall timing, my suggestion is to add one more week to it. And the reason is the following. Following this meeting, I think we need a really clean version because the version we have still has a fair number of comments on it. And I know I, in any case, have been waiting for a really clean version to do a review on.

So I would say, out of this meeting, get a clean version of what we plan to send. Take one more round of comments from members of the team. Review them next week. If there's no comments, nothing to review, you can cancel the meeting. Because at this point, we haven't seen a clean draft of what you plan to send. And I think that's something that really is necessary to make sure we haven't left any loose ends. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Alan. I don't think that there's really much. If you look at what is missing, there's nothing that has an impact on the substance. And there are probably not much more than seven points that are highlighted. So I was just wondering whether, informally, we could license this document—at least pass it to Maureen so that ... My concern is just to speed up the work. But anyway, if we need another week, that's fine. It's just that besides some small detail, I don't think—nothing is going to happen next week. But I always value your opinion and your approach. Alan, if it's a new hand, go on. You have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. It is a new hand. Actually, I think you said you're going to send them ... I don't remember when your words were when you started. But if, indeed, you said something like you want to send them a draft, just to give them a heads up, then that's fine. But I think the group really needs to see a clean version, have an opportunity to comment on it, and then respond to the comments, if there are any, before we send the final version.

So if you want to send a heads-up version, that's fine right now. And that's not a problem. And tell them we plan to finalize within a week. If they have any comments, get them in quickly. And that's fine. That doesn't even have to ... We can set the timeline for that because we're just giving them an early version to comment on.

So if this is the final version which the ALAC is going to ultimately make a decision on, then I think we need the extra step. If this is a heads up prior to the final version going to them, then we could send any clean version you want. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yes, Alan. That was the idea. The idea was exactly to send a heads up. And the reason why I wanted to do that, at latest tomorrow, is because then next week is prep week and a lot of people will be involved in all the preliminary preparation for Cancun. And then, we only have another week before the meeting in Cancun, unless I have something wrong in my calendar. But it is only a heads up and a draft. And the clean version will follow. And we'll send it as soon as it's ready.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. My apologies, then. I still think we're going to need at least one more meeting to ratify the final version after we have a chance to comment on a clean version. But sorry about saying we shouldn't send it. As a draft, it's fine to send. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: No. It's fine. I was probably not clear enough. I have no problem in continuing the meetings, as long as in parallel, the work can continue on the other levels that will bring, then, to a final decision. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Roberto. Look, I fully support the parallel processing. I think that's fine. But you did ask the question of when did we think this feedback, if there is any, should be final or sent back—a no-later-than date, for example—from the RALOs, I'm assuming, and any particular input on the draft from any of the ALAC members who care to advance their opinion or editing privileges.

I would say that staff should note, because I'm aware the Maureen is traveling at the moment and isn't with us, I don't think, yet today, that this planning that you're putting forward is to allow for the ALAC to finalize this matter at the upcoming ICANN meeting. And that allows staff and Maureen to set a date in advance of the appropriate ALAC meeting that will be dealing with this at or immediately after—and by immediately after, I would think 72 hours by online vote type immediately after—the upcoming ICANN meeting because that was our

deadline at their suggestion. So, we're working to meet that deadline. Thanks.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Cheryl. Point taken. That's what we are going to do. We need to reserve a few minutes at the end of this call, just to make sure that the follow-up actions are clear to everybody. Okay. We are already 20 minutes into this call. Let's go to the document.

So the first point is a minor point on page two. I have been given, by staff, the number, the dates, the address, and so on—the total number of meetings, and the date of the first meeting, and the URL from where the attendance records are. There's nothing to discuss. Of course, this number 23 will go up to 24, 25 if we're going to have other meetings. But for now, we have a baseline. This is just factual so I don't think that we need to discuss unless there are objections.

The next point is on page four. And there's a sentence in numbered list number one, "caring about individual internet users." If I am not mistaken, Alan had suggested a sentence. And we can put it now or within the next hours. But I think that this is something that will not be controversial. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll apologize now on several accounts. I have a number of AIs that I haven't done. But I will do them before the end of today, probably sooner, after the meeting—or as soon after the meeting as I can. So my apologies but it will be done.

ROBERTO GAETANO: No problem. The good thing is that on the other side of the Atlantic, the end of the day is farther away than it is here in Europe, where it's just about dinnertime. Okay. So when we'll have this sentence, maybe we can have comments, if necessary. But that should not be controversial.

The next point is on ... Okay. This is something that is pretty new. I'm seeing this for the first time. It probably came only a few minutes ago. And that's the privacy consideration. And there's a comment from Gopal. And it says, "Replace 'privacy' with 'data protection' on the title." Okay. I need guidance on this. And then, "Replace with the ..."

GOPAL TADEPALLI: No. It is the fact the "privacy considerations" will give way to ... It should read ... Just a second. The "data protection." That's all it should read, is what I thought. Yeah. It's here. I got the report. I logged in. I've got the report here. "Membership webpage in accordance with the applicable personal data protection procedures."

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. So, you don't like the "privacy considerations?"

GOPAL TADEPALLI: It's often being misinterpreted. And privacy, as a definition, has been changing. And for the government, there is a standard definition. So "data protection" will be more generally [inaudible].

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Thank you for this comment. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess I would tend to leave “privacy” because from the point of view of the applicant, of the individual user, it is a privacy issue, not a data protection issue. I’m fine with saying, in the rest of the sentence, “In accordance with applicable personal data protection procedures—” or actually, just “applicable data protection procedures.” So I would leave out “privacy considerations” and the word “personal” in the sentence. But I’d leave the title because it is a privacy issue from the perspective of the user, because we’re asking them, “Do you want us to publish your name or not?”

ROBERTO GAETANO: Understood. Any other comments?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: The point is, it’s already with us. They have already sent the data. It’s already with us. Once it is out-of-hand, it should be data protection. The user has already sent the data to us. So we are promising that data protection. It’s already out of the hand of the user. [inaudible].

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Sorry to jump in. I have heard the two different points of view from Alan and Gopal. I'm asking if there are other points of view. You can type it in the chat and I will read the chat at the end of the call anyway.

Okay. Then, we go to the notes on the same page. That was the sentence that was simply saying that in the attachment, we are going to have the reasons for and against our only controversial issue. That is whether ALS members can be also RALO Individual Members or not. As you remember, there were two sides to this argument. And those are summarized in the appendix. And we'll go through that. That's the last point on the document. So I think this sentence is not controversial.

So we can move to page seven, when we are talking about the withdrawal of the membership. The title is highlighted because that was waiting for a specification about the status of "suspended." If you move on to the next page, the sentence highlighted in yellow, a little bit—yes, exactly—is, "Besides permanent withdrawal, the RALO Individual Membership status can be put on hold, following circumstances of a temporary nature, like a member becoming an ALS representative or a member of an ALS leadership."

This, in my opinion, solves the issue of "suspension" because we had already agreed that that "suspension" was not the best term. But I'm still, obviously, accepting comments and improvement of this sentence. But the highlighting on the title, "Withdrawal of Membership," I will consider that solved because that sentence, possibly with some modification, will explain it. So yes. I see comments in the chat. I will take care of the comments in the chat after the call.

Next, on page nine, there's probably another action item on Alan. If I remember correctly, it was proposed to keep these proposed Bylaw changes and make reference to the Bylaws change that was suggested in the ALS Mobilization Working Party. So, I need the reference to be put here. And that's another thing that I assume I will get in the next hours by Alan.

So moving on, on the next page, page number 10, those are the next steps. There are three points that have been raised. I wrote the first one following a discussion that we had. Number two and number three were suggested, if I remember correctly, by David Mackey with confirmation by Bill that that was something that we needed to point out.

Are there any other things that we need to put in here? I'm not really sure whether we need to put in things like the practical next steps—that is sending the document to ALAC and so on—because this is really meant to be something that is outside the scope of this working group. But it should not be forgotten and should be done by a new working group or a version 2.0 of this working group. So that's basically it. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Just a thought. Some of these are next steps. Clearly, among other things, we have to end up creating forms for applications and web pages describing things. So those are next steps. Others, such as your number one there, or maybe even number three, are not really next steps but are really suggestions for the things the ALAC should consider doing. So

you may want to separate them into things that are truly next steps in implementing what we are talking about and other good ideas that we don't want lost. Just a thought.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Point taken. I will see what I can do. I thought it was just simpler to have everything together. But if we need to make the distinction, that's not a big job.

ALAN GREENBERG: Roberto, I can live with this. I'm just giving a thought that you may want to separate them. It's not a real big issue.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yeah. I understand. The problem when ... I have been, professionally, a programmer. And when you code a program, it's always 99% done. And this 1% that keeps adding is what brings the total time, then, at the end, up to 50% of the whole project. So I tend to avoid the last-minute changes because that triggers new changes and so on. Just a statement of principle but I will see what I can do. Any other comments on this? What would be, also, very important is if somebody thinks that there is something that we have forgotten in these next steps, that is also quite important.

So, moving on then, the appendixes. There's the first appendix. Appendix one is the attendance log. We only need to update it because this is probably a couple of weeks old. And I still think that it's good to have the attendance log here, even if we give in the document the URL

where we are going to have the actual figures, simply because if somebody's reading this document on a plane, supposing that we start again traveling, whenever you are not connected, it's irritating that you have to make reference to a URL that you cannot reach. So that's the reason why I wanted this table here. And I think that the ALS Mobilization Working Party has the same.

Then, appendix two also is just factual. Those are the results of the poll. Those are the figures taken at the closure of the voting period.

And then, the last appendix, appendix three, is the bullet point list of the reasons of the arguments for and the nice text, provided by Yrjo, that explains the position against the ALS member being a RALO Individual Member as well. So I'm not touching this text because I don't want to—in the sense that I think that this text belongs to the part of the working party who wants to raise this argument. And I only want to execute the changes that are agreed by the people who are supporting the position against. So I'm not touching this text unless I'm given clear indication. Yrjo, you have the floor.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Roberto, very much. As I think Justine said in the email to you, and I concurred, we would like to redraft out text, after seeing, now, these arguments in favor. The substance is the same but it's just a structurally better match to it. And you'll get it in the beginning of the week. Thanks.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Yes. I remember this exchange of emails. I don't think that there's going to be any changes in the arguments in the bullet point list. So I will consider that pretty final. So as soon as you have it ... Then, when we submit the draft ... Okay. When do you think you are going to have this text ready Yrjo?

YRJO LANSIPURO: As I said Roberto, in the beginning of the week. Today is Monday so what I'm talking about is tomorrow or, at the latest, Wednesday.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. Excellent. Because I think that this is an important think to have worded correctly, even before we send this informal draft. So I will wait for your text before sending the advance copy to ALAC and the RALOs. Okay. That is basically it. Yrjo, I believe it's an old hand, right? Thank you. Any comment of any kind on the document? Okay. Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Roberto. I'm so sorry I came late. So I did miss a lot of the earlier discussion that you had about what happens to the document following this meeting. We have such a busy agenda in the next—as far as ALT-PLUS and ALAC meetings. And of course, the ICANN 70 schedule is already pretty full as well. But it is important that the completed document goes to the ALAC for their consideration and discussion.

So what I'm saying is that it must be the completed document, and it must go to the ALAC, and then we will decide as to whether we ... As it

depends on the urgency, we may have to decide on electronic vote or some other way, if we can't actually get time to meet to do that. I think with all the other things that are coming upon us at the moment—and we're soon up to ICANN 70—we really do need to have something that's pretty complete before we make any further decisions on it. So please, if you can do that, that'd be really great. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you, Maureen. Actually, this comment comes as the right time because we are now trying to put together the action items—all the things that we need to do. And that includes, also, the next steps. I'm sorry that we didn't finish earlier to be able to do this on time for ICANN 70.

But anyway, I don't think that it would have been really possible to, unless we were going to cut the corners and shorten the discussion. It was impossible to come to something sooner, also considering that we had at least one large contentious point where we needed, really, to let the discussion go and to give the opportunity to everybody to speak, to make their point and to make sure that their point is well understood. Otherwise, it would have fired back. So anyway, we do, as usual, not what we like but what we can. So this is the situation. I understand your point and we are going to try to have the full final document as soon as possible.

So let's go to the action items. From the action items ... And that's the last point on the agenda before the AOB. So actions from the 8th of February and starting from the oldest one, there's an "all members to

review all sections of the draft final report in the next two weeks.” And I would consider that done.

Then, there’s an action item on “Evin and Yeşim to add the responsibility of annual follow up with Individual Members re meeting the criteria.” I’m not sure I understand this. Yeşim, you know what we are talking about and that is clear? Do you want to add something to that?

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Hi, Roberto. Actually, it doesn’t seem very much clear for me, either. I think I need to reach out to Evin to check if she’s already working on it or she has an idea so I can support her.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Okay. So, staff will see when this can be closed. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you. Just to let you know that my understanding of that action item is that Evin and Yeşim were just to add that it is going to be the staff responsibility to follow up with individuals, that they meet the criteria and their SOIs, along with their other annual work, reaching out to the ALSes. That was my understanding. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. That's not something that we need to add to the document or not?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. So maybe we can mark it. Anyway, you'll see it. The following week, 15th of February, "Find language for the case of suspension." I would consider that done. The text is the one that we just saw a few minutes ago. And that has been on the document already for at least one week. And then, also, the last one for that day, "Members to review the final document the week of 22nd of February." That is also done.

So going to the action items on the 22nd, "Alan Greenburg to post sentence in next steps, similar to the ALS Mobilization Working Party final report." This is something that we have just discussed, and in a few hours will be done, and then we can tick it off.

And then, we have the action item from today. So following what Yrjo has said, the first point is not to send it in the current format within 24 hours but it is as soon as we have the minority report in place in attachment three. Then, "ALAC and RALO to submit any comments." Okay. "Alan Greenburg to post text ... " Fine. "Yrjo to send a revised minority ..." Okay. I'm fine with the action items from today. Anything to add about the action items? Any things that ...?

So let's pencil in a next call, next Monday. If then, it will not be necessary, then we are going to skip it. Okay. For my part, that's

basically it. So, “Will you prepare a clean version before I send the draft final report to the ...?” Yes. I will prepare a clean version. As soon as I have the formulation from Alan and the text from Yrjo, I will prepare the clean version. So you can put it as an action item on me and say, “to produce the clean version and authorize staff to send it.”

Okay. I think that it’s time to thank everybody—since we might not have a call next week, even if you are going to schedule it—everybody for the participation and for great contributions.

The only thing that I’m a little bit upset is that we have not fully taken advantage, as much as we could have done, about the huge effort from the interpreters. I understand that it’s good to hear what has happened in your native language, or at least in a language that you are more familiar. But I think that we could, now also that we have, I understand it, in Zoom—we have improved, also, the way that the interpretation interacts within Zoom. I think that we could do more, going more towards multilingualism and that we’ll get used to use the tools that cost money and effort. And it’s good to use them.

So that’s basically it. I have finished. Thank you, everybody, for participating, and if necessary, next week. Otherwise, it will happen at other meetings that we meet. Okay. Bye, everybody. And may I ask the host to close the call?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thanks.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: We also want to thank Roberto for a great job he's done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to say ... Yeah. We all want to say thanks to Roberto. Many others have in chat but special thanks to you, Roberto.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Sure. Okay. Thank you all. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye, everyone.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Thank you all for joining today's meeting. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]