
YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the AFRALO operating principles review working group call taking place on Wednesday 26th of May 2021 at 17:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel, we have Barrack Otieno, Isaac Maposa, Sarah Kiden, Hadia Elminiwi, Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, Seun Ojedeji.

We currently don't have anyone on the French channel, and we don't have any apologies for today's call so far.

From staff's side, we have Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Yesim Nazlar, and I'll also be doing call management.

Our French interpreters are Camila and Jacques.

Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes in case someone joins the same channel. And with this, I would like to leave the floor over to Isaac. Thanks so much, Isaac.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you so much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. As shown on the screen, our agenda today, after we get a recap of action items by staff, we go into the issues under review where we left off on our last call so that we can finish up [posting] the document. On that same document, there's a question on voting rights. It's Seun and Hadia

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.

who lead on that section, and we have our next steps and Any Other Business. Any objection to the agenda?

I don't see any, or any suggestions, so I take that as the agenda is adopted. We can proceed. I give the floor to staff.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Thank you very much, Isaac. The action items of the last call, Sarah Kiden and Hadia Elminiawi to lead the review of the individual member application form. The second one, Isaac, Abdeldjalil, Sarah to share the document issues under review with the mailing list requesting comments by May 25, and Claudia Ruiz to schedule the next call—for this call. So those are complete. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Silvia. Now we move to our next item. Before we move, I'm sure the other item on the review of the application process by Sarah and Hadia, I'm sure we'll get an update on that, on where they are. Unfortunately, I've not put that on the agenda. I think on our next call, they can present on that item, so now I give the floor to Sarah to proceed from where we left on the issues under review document. Sarah, you have the floor. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Isaac, and thank you, Silvia and Yesim. So I note that Hadia is saying on the chat that we'll present on the next call. I agree, because there's quite a bit of stuff that we have to discuss today. So if anyone on

the call is interested, we've added the [inaudible] the end of this document. If you go on the very end, you'll see the [inaudible] there.

So I think we can carry on where we stopped last time. I did not see a lot of comments from anyone on the mailing list regarding the criteria for being a resident or citizen, so I think we can mark this as complete if it's okay with everyone.

YESIM NAZLAR: Sarah, sorry to interrupt. Which page should I be displaying?

SARAH KIDEN: Page one. It's right now showing 5.7, but we'll do the renumbering.

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: So the one I'm talking about is being a resident, the one I've highlighted. So we agreed on that. And I think last time, we quite didn't agree if we say more than one year or five years. I don't know if anyone has had a chance to think, or I saw a comment from Barrack but he didn't mention anything about the time. So, are we happy to just leave it open, or should we include the time limit?

I see there's a hand up from Hadia, so Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Sarah. I have been looking at the ICANN bylaws, and under Article 12, advisory committees, section D, AtLarge Advisory Committee, and then section IX, membership in the At-Large community, we have two clauses in this respect. The first, A, says the criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large ... [inaudible] individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the RALOs [inaudible]. And for that, I think [in fact] we include both citizens and residents, we should [inaudible]. So if we include both, it should be citizens and residents of countries and full stop.

However, there is another section which is Section C, and Section C says each RALO memorandum of understanding should also include provisions designed to allow to the greatest extent possible every individual Internet user who is a citizen of a country within the RALO's geographic region to participate in at least one of the RALO's At-Large Structures.

So what is necessary is that each citizen should have the opportunity to participate. Generally speaking, citizens and residents could be members. So I think the choice is between two things, either limiting it to citizens or opening it to both citizens and residents without actually putting a time limit.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Hadia, for the comment, and thank you for actually pointing us exactly to where that is in the bylaws. It helps us to decide. So, does anyone have comments or—

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I would prefer—my suggestion would be going with citizens and residents both, but then it's up to you. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Hadia. So I also agree that we should have both citizens and residents. I think we saw the explanation from Barrack on the chat, on the mailing list, but also last week, we discussed that either way, we should allow especially citizens who are maybe abroad, they should be able to apply as well. So I would personally also agree that we say both citizens and residents. But I see two hands up, from Seun and Silvia. So Seun first, and then Silvia.

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible]

YESIM NAZLAR: Seun, we cannot hear you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Can you hear me now?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, we do.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you. So I think I have two things here. Citizens or residents is different from citizens and residents. So, are we saying that if the

person is just a citizen, then the person can be a member, or must it be both citizen and resident? The current wording that we have on the screen allows for either of those options. But what I'm hearing from Hadia, using the word "and," if we're using the word "and" instead of "or" then it means that we are expecting that it should be both, the person, the individual must be a resident and must also have citizenship. So I think we need to clarify that. I would prefer that we use the "or" instead of the "and."

What is not clear to me is whether putting a year requirement to that is against the bylaw. That is what is not clear to me from what Hadia has read in the bylaw. Will adding the year—whether one year is sufficient or whatever year that we agree, will adding that be out of the bylaw? Will it be against the bylaw? I think we have not heard that yet, and I personally would prefer that we put a year or at least [inaudible], but I'm also fine if we end it at the current text without the year. My initial preference would have been to put at least one year. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Seun, for the comment and the question. So I think let's first hear from Silvia and then Abdeldjalil, and then Hadia, maybe you'll respond to some of the questions. So Silvia, you have the floor.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Thank you very much. I want to mention that the AFRALO MoU signed with ICANN in 2007 says under membership, "We declare that every interested citizen or resident in our region is welcome to join at least one of our ALSes." So the MoU is broad enough and is consistent with

the wording of the bylaws, which says “or.” So in that sense, I would strongly encourage to keep that wording, interested citizen or resident. And I am going to type out the membership section of the MoU for your reference. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Silvia, and I like that you brought the MoU because it means that we don’t have to change so many places if we go with what’s in the MoU. So we’ll go to Abdeldjalil and then Hadia. Abdeldjalil, you have the floor.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: Thank you so much, Sarah. I think that I have my answer for what Silvia states. Before I agree what Seun said about to put one year, and now Silvia says that we have the agreement and the agreement says it’s not timing to put it but in my proposition, if it’s not against, it will be that being a resident for at least one year or citizen of one of African countries. But now we have the clarification with Silvia that the agreement that we signed with ICANN is clear that there's no time to put or ... [inaudible] so I agree on that. Thanks so much.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Abdeldjalil. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I would only agree with what has been said. Since Silvia put the membership MoU article and since it says citizens or residents in the

region without putting a time to it, I'm not sure that —maybe if we put a time, that could be a contradiction to what's in the MoU. I'm not sure, but it could be, because the MoU did not limit the timing of the residents. But again, the MoU was talking about the ALSes and we are talking about individuals.

So I'm not sure. We could go without a time limit. If Seun thinks we need to put like a year, I think this makes sense as well. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Hadia, and thank you for reminding us that the MoU was talking about ALSes. So I think it's up to this group, but I get the feeling that we should remove the time limit from what I get from the room. So if people agree, just say that, we will keep it as being a resident or citizen of one of the African countries or territories.

So I see there's a comment from Jules, and he's saying that we should consider applications from members from inactive ALSes. Oh, wait, there are two hands, from Hadia and Abdeldjalil. My apologies. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Mine is an old one, Sarah. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN:

Okay. Thank you. Abdeldjalil.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: Thank you, Sarah, for giving me the floor. So I think that it's good to delete this. So now, and being a resident, if you'll allow me, why not add being a resident, permanent resident? So the permanent resident shows that you're a resident in Africa. So if you can [inaudible] like this, some people who come only for one or two weeks can be a resident also. I don't know if we can put [inaudible] permanent resident. So I think it helps us to solve the problem of time. What do you think about that? It's just a suggestion. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Abdeldjalil. I'll throw it to the members of the group. What do you think about adding permanent resident? Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. That's a good suggestion. Whether it [is in line with the] bylaws is a different thing. Especially if we agree that adding the one-year limit is not in line with the bylaw, then adding permanent I'm not also sure whether it will be in line with the bylaw. But either of those, I see what Abdeldjalil is also trying to do, to address, which is actually [really] why we were also thinking of adding the one year initially. So if we can have permanent, if it's in line with the bylaw, we're fine with it.

The other thing that I see, the slight issue I see with using the word "permanent" is that some countries actually issue temporary residency which could actually be for a couple of years. So using the word "permanent residency" could also be misinterpreted as those who have

temporary residency when it's actually for a long time would not be qualified. It's neither here nor there. I think for the sake of moving on, we should probably just leave it the way it is right now, and maybe in future, we probably would add it, modify it in future as we see how things go. Maybe we should just leave it the way it is without permanent, without one year, and whatever the case is, evaluate the matter on a case by case basis. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Seun. I see Hadia raised her hand, maybe to respond to you. Hadia—

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yeah, so I think actually Seun's suggestion is a very good one. So first, I don't think that adding a one-year actually contradicts the bylaw, because again, those were talking about ALSes and we are talking about individual members. And it is clear of course that all citizens must have the ability to join.

However, I think that Seun's suggestion to leave it as it is, citizens or residents without putting a time limit, and actual practice will inform us more and maybe as he said, depending on our experience that we develop and the actual practice, we can add it later if we wish, or we could conclude that leaving it as it is is sufficient.

So I'm fine with keeping it as it is and experience will let us know if it's good or bad. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Hadia, and thank you, Seun. That's a nice way to end the comments about this particular item. Like you rightly suggested, when we started the individual membership in 2017, we said we would review it after two years, so we could leave this for review again and see how it works maybe for the next two or three years, and after that, we can [inaudible].

So moving on to the next comment, which I think we now have to delete because one does not have to be affiliated to any ALS. So I'll just mark this as complete. And then the other criteria is accepting the AFRALO operating principles and rules of procedure. I think this is non-negotiable. We should have this one. But let's hear what other people think. There was no comment on this, so I think people are happy with it.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yeah, I think the ones that we have comments on are the ones that are contentious, so maybe we can just ... [inaudible].

SARAH KIDEN:

Okay. So I think this one is also okay. We agreed that it's from the rules of procedure that for someone to be an individual member, they cannot be a leader of an At-Large Structure. So that's okay. I don't know if we want to specify and mention what kind of leadership are we talking about, Board member, chairperson? Do we want to specify, or we just say that they should not be a leader of their ALS?

Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I was just wondering based on your question whether [we should change leadership to officers.] Does that address it, is that more descriptive? But I think we should also probably check the particular word that was used by the ALAC individual members work party. Maybe Sarah can remind, or if there's any other person that has the document handy and check what particular word was used. If it's leadership, then I think we should just leave it as leadership, but if it's a different word, then maybe we use that. Thanks.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Seun. So in the unaffiliated individual mobilization work party, it just said leader, so it didn't certify what kind of leadership. So maybe we can just leave it like that so that it matches what is in that document. Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah, so I would just also agree to just leave it as leadership. I think this is clear enough. So if you're just a member and you don't have any other role, then you're not leadership. But then the structure of each ALS would differ and leaders would differ from one ALS to another. So for sure, Board members, chairs, vice chairs would be considered leaders. So I don't think that it needs further clarification, especially that each At-Large Structure could have its own way in representing its leaders. However, I don't think that this would be a problem.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Hadia. So we will move on, we'll just leave it at that, though I'm suggesting that we use similar text to what is in the UIM report just so that we have consistency. So maybe later on, we'll copy the text and put it here. Then I think the next one where there are comments is the one on being active in the local Internet end user community. I see there was a comment from Emmanuel who is saying that we need to be specific on the activeness, what do we mean by this. Does anyone have suggestions or comments about how to do this? Abdeldjalil, then Hadia.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG:

Thank you so much, Sarah. Being active in the local Internet users community, I think that in AFRALO, all our members [are not focused on] Internet. So I think that if we put it Internet, I think that we limit it. But the person can be in [active in] other sector also but Interested to be a member of AFRALO. So I think that being active member in local community is enough. Local is more technical for issues of Internet, something like that. Yes, we know that in AFRALO, we need to have a link with Internet, but there are some people who use Internet to do their activities. So if we see local Internet communities like more technical than other [inaudible]. So my suggestion is to be active, a local community. So I think that it's enough, it's open also. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Abdeldjalil. So one comment I want to make is that I think a lot of the rules are supposed to be in line with the ICANN mandate and I think that's why this one was specific, though I totally understand what you mean, that at the end of the day, we are all Internet end users and

we may not be active in, for example, if I use the Ugandan context, the Ugandan IGF, but we do activities and we use the Internet. So I understand that point of view and I'm interested in hearing what other people think about this particular issue. Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Sarah. My first question would be, does this actually stem from the [rules of operation] of ALAC, or is this something we added?

SARAH KIDEN: This is something that we already had previously, though if we look at the current rules from UIM, it has something in line with being active or participating. So I don't know if anyone has—maybe staff can drop the link for that, some people can take a look and see. On page four, that's the unaffiliated individual membership work party report. So maybe Yesim or Silvia can help us put it on the chat, on page four.

So it just says that the person must have an understanding of and interest in supporting the need of nontechnical, nonindustry individual Internet end users as they relate to ICANN's mandate.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So the reason I was asking is that I actually wanted to delete this bullet. And I will tell you why: because I do think that the bullet that comes later actually speaks to what we would like individual users to do. So if they have an understanding and interest to support and advocate for the needs of the ICANN, why do we need to say that they need also to be active local Internet end users in the community?

And so my suggestion is actually to just remove this bullet because I think that the bullet that come after it covers our needs. So unless it was put somewhere in the ALAC rules of procedure, I don't think we need it at all.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Hadia. I'm in agreement that we delete this, because the following bullet—which actually comes from the unaffiliated individual member report—covers that. Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. Yeah, I think [I see some reasoning in] what Hadia is saying and I kind of also agree with removing that line. I think perhaps the reason why that was there initially was the ALS mentality in that ALSes are also expected to kind of be active within their local domain because you know that the work of At-Large also involves local outreach and so on. So maybe that's the intention. Maybe also the idea is that if you're not active on Internet locally, how can you be active internationally at ICANN? But I don't think it's necessary to have it—it should be a given and expected. What is important is that they participate in ICANN processes. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Seun. So we are in agreement and it has been removed from the list. Sorry to staff, I've added page numbers on the document. I realize it's a bit confusing. So we are at the end of page one.

So are there any comments about the other criteria? They look straight forward, and I think Isaac copied them directly from the other report. I see one comment actually from Hadia on the last bullet saying that AFRALO individual member must affirm his or her interest in learning about and/or participating in ICANN policy processes, and there's a comment from Hadia that AFRALO could have members that are interested in topics like outreach and other practical matters, not necessarily policy development. So Hadia is suggesting that we remove the final bullet, though if we remove it, then—well, we can decide what to do, but it was one of the recommendations from the work party. Any comments, questions about that?

Or we could edit the bullet point to capture ICANN policy processes and other activities, maybe. Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Sarah. I raised my hand to suggest keeping it and adding to it, as you mentioned, like policies and/or other related activities, or relevant activities. I think that works. So if the member is interested in topics like outreach for example, recruiting, of course, the member would need also to know about what's going on in order to be able to perform the outreach activities. However, the main activity doesn't really need to be related to policy development.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Hadia. So I'll mark this as resolved. There's a comment from Isaac. I'm trying to find where the comment falls. Okay, so we are now on page two, the first bullet which shows 5.8. [inaudible] to meet any of

the above criteria terminates individual membership. Like if you don't meet the above criteria, your membership can—

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible] the one that was added by Aziz is not yet resolved. Or is it resolved [inaudible]?

SARAH KIDEN: It is resolved.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Sorry. Maybe it's [inaudible]. Thanks.

SARAH KIDEN: Yeah, it's resolved. I think if you refresh now, you should see that it's okay.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, it's fine. Thanks.

SARAH KIDEN: So page two, it shows 5.8, but we will renumber them later. Do we all agree that if someone does not meet that criteria, their membership could be terminated? I think that should be okay. There's a comment from Barrack that we should build a process for terminating membership. For example, the secretariat can issue a show cause letter and give a member a platform to defend themselves, after which a

decision can be made. And I think I like the suggestion because for ALSes, we have decertification rules which talk about reasons why an ALS has been decertified. So I think we should not just say this, we should give a member maybe an opportunity to say why. Though I would not put it with this one so it doesn't look like this is a disciplinary committee or something. I think it should be more friendly since we are trying to get more voices onboard. Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. I'm just wondering if we could just add that the process used for ALSes will be used for individual membership. Should we just try to spell it out? I'm just wondering whether we could just put a note that termination process is used for ALSes would be used for individual members. But maybe since the word "termination" is not used for ALSes, we use decertification, so maybe we just need to copy out, bring in the process that we use for ALSes into this particular section and then we'll see how it reads, if it reads well, and then we'll [modify as we find applicable.] But I think that there should be a process. Thanks.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Seun. Barrack, I know you're on the call. I don't know if you have any comments about this. If you're in position to talk, maybe you can say more about this, or we can just proceed and you could make your comments on e-mail.

Yes, Barrack, you have the floor.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you very much, Sarah. Well, I want to pick up from where Seun has left. I think when we are looking at ALS, we are looking at a more institutional framework, and when you're talking about individuals, there's always a risk of a process taking a personal angle as opposed to when you're dealing with an institution.

So yes, I agree we can explore the issue from what is already existing in terms of how we deal with the ALSes, but we may just need to pay attention to the human factor and ensure that the process that deals with the individual members is human, for lack of a better word. And by human I mean someone is given a fair hearing, is treated decently before they are decertified—they're dismissed.

And also, let's consider the fact that with AFRALO, we're dealing with members from different jurisdictions which might mean that we may need a more global outlook that will take into consideration the different nuances that might be taken from different regions when you try to get someone off the ALS. So that's what I wanted to ask.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Barrack. And before I go to Seun and Hadia, I don't know if Barrack, you'd agree. Are you happy to draft for us a very short paragraph? Maybe even a sentence to add on to that, to capture what you said. I don't know if you're happy to do that. We can work with you and the co-chairs, Isaac and Abdeldjalil to do that. So maybe as an action item for staff to take note that Barrack will work with me and the co-chairs, Isaac and Abdeldjalil to try to come up with a paragraph or sentence to capture that.

So Seun, you have the floor. I see, Hadia—sorry, Barrack, go ahead.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Yeah, I'm saying it's okay, but in addition, I would say we can also look at the work that other At-Large Structures have done so that we don't necessarily have to [inaudible], especially if there's a RALO that has successfully implemented this, and maybe there's this process of decertifying or removing individuals that are not active, we may want to borrow that. And I think this is what even the court systems globally do, by looking at different jurisprudences.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Barrack. I see staff have already captured that as an action item. We will also need to look at the other RALOs. I know EURALO already has been doing this for a while, and NARALO, so we could look at how they handle decertification and then go from there.

So Seun, you have the floor. And as you speak, I just wanted to note that we have a few minutes to the end of this call.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thanks. I think I wanted to say that in the work party report, there was probably a section on termination. I think it would also be good that Barrack also look at that session when doing the drafting. Maybe it should also help, and then I think we should put—again, the drafting is against the next meeting, so it would be good to have the suggested text before the next meeting so that at least [inaudible] Google Docs before

the call so probably, we can move faster as well during the next call.
Thanks.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Seun, so we will look at the current report as well as we draft this short text. So that is done. I think this might be one of our last comments, Isaac talked about trying to integrate withdrawing because there is termination, because it's coming from the side of the rules of procedure to terminate, but there's also maybe someone wants to withdraw their membership, and we've already seen this in this work party where someone joined as an individual member, then they registered an ALS, then they applied. So I don't think we have a clear process as to how this works right now. I don't know if anyone has comments or maybe you can add them to the document to talk about both, so termination and withdrawal for someone who opts to leave the At-Large Structure.

Then the next comment is, I think, from Remmy. This is about the survey, which we already did, so I think we just mark this as resolved. So there's a comment from Barrack on 5.11(f), attending AFRALO face-to-face and virtual events. And the comment from barrack is if we should add a threshold on the number of meetings or we leave this to the rules of procedure.

I think going by Seun's suggestion of looking at the ALSes, there is a minimum—I think it says if you don't attend I can't remember how many meetings, like six months or something like that. So I think we should look at both the ALS decertification rule as well as what the

unaffiliated individual membership work party will say, but definitely, we should not leave it open. But that's just my opinion.

Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes, Sarah, I totally agree with you. I have read it, but I don't have the text in front of me right now. So in relation to ALSes, there is a number of figures in relation to participation. And similarly, we should do that with individual members as well. So let's take a look at what's there and see how this could be applicable to individual users or like modified to fit individual users. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Hadia. Before I go to Seun Ojedeji, I have a question for staff, because I'm not sure how it works in operation. I know for ALSes for example, there's a rule that if you don't attend I think six meetings—does anyone actually keep a record of this, or it's just a rule that doesn't ...?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes, Sarah, I can mention something about that. Staff keeps attendance of people participating, both ALSes and individuals. However, it's upon request of the leadership that that information is provided to the leadership, and then they will decide whether or not to enforce any type of threshold of participation. But currently, there is no practice to go after—from the staff perspective, we don't review and say after such lack of participation, you don't have the right or anything like that. So

it's up to each RALO and each leadership team to take a look at the data and decide what to do.

To my knowledge, none of the RALOs have actually enforced very harsh participation thresholds because of the voluntary nature of the community.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Silvia, for that. Seun, as you make your comment, maybe you could also talk about this. Since we haven't been as strict with ALSes, do we actually need to have anything like this on the individual membership rules?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thanks, Sarah. It's good to hear that staff keeps the records of participation. I personally think it should not be as strict in the sense of strictness for individual members. The participation with ALSes—ALS is a body, so it means that if one person from the ALS participates, it probably would tick the mark to some extent. But for individuals, even if we're going to put an expectation of the number of virtual meetings, a threshold, I think I would suggest that it should not be similar to that of the ALS because that one is much higher expectations. I think we can start on a lower threshold and then we see how it goes. But my personal preference is that we just be silent about this one. But of course, I'm also fine with putting a not too strict threshold.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Seun. So I would also agree that we should have something not very strict but at least we should have something, because I can tell you, now I think we have 15 individual members, but there are people who, after their first application, they've never come to any calls. I think they read e-mails, I'm not sure, but we have people who have applied and have never come to any activity. So I don't know what happens in that case. Do we just leave them as inactive members? I'm not sure how to handle this. Hadia, I see you have a comment on this.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Sarah. I think for example if we say attending at least one meeting in two years, that's not too much demanding. And you have said also something good, that we could leave them but they could be marked as like inactive members, and maybe later, this mark could lead to something, maybe when we do another review for example in two years or something. So we either put a very low threshold, like one meeting in two years for example, and also, we could take your suggestion about that would lead to the member being marked as inactive, but that's about it. Like that won't really lead to dispelling the candidate from—taking the membership of the candidate. So I think yes, we do need to do something, but it should be very simple and not too demanding.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Hadia. We have four minutes to the end of the call, so as we conclude, I agree with you, we should just make it very—because as Silvia said, it's a volunteer community, so you can't expect too much

someone from coming—like I know when you say you volunteer, you should at least contribute, but maybe there are some challenges that people experience, so we should be a bit flexible, though I don't know from the point of view of outreach and engagement what we need to do to encourage people to feel that they should contribute. So maybe it's something that as we come out of this process, we should think of a way to actually engage our individual members more, because if you notice, many of them are actually not very active. So yeah. I'll hand it back over to the co-chairs. Thank you so much for participating in this process. Please keep your comments coming in the document. Isaac and Abdeldjalil, back to you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Sarah. I give the floor to Seun to just briefly go over the section on voting rights. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. Do we have time for that? Okay, I will just quickly say that for the sake of time, [inaudible] because I was actually thinking we'll get to this part today and get to finalize on it. So our proposed text for the voting section, the only comment I saw was from Hadia which is in terms of the 20%, and I provided an explanation on that.

The essence of the 20% is that if at some point in time in future we have 500 individual members, whatever it is, their cumulative votes should not be more than the—they should have a 20% power compared to the cumulative vote of ALSes. That is the idea behind this. So one way or the other, the vote of ALS and individuals will also have to [inaudible] each

other, even though the [inaudible] vote of ALSes will always be above 50%.

So that was the intention and the reason why I actually put 20%. So if the total ALSes is 28 for instance, then 20% of that will be eight ALSes. That is what the individual membership votes will be equivalent to, no matter the number of individual members that we have, even if we have 1000 individual members, their votes would be equivalent to eight ALSes.

And I think that this would be [increasing] the threshold, especially from our region, because in some of the regions, they just have all their vote equivalent to one ALS vote. So if we are having this much for the individual members, I think it's a good start, and perhaps it will also encourage individual members to feel that they have a stake in this process. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Seun, for the presentation, and I think because of time, we can proceed to discuss that on our next call. Thank you so much. And I see Sarah is also suggesting the same. I think because of our time, is there Any Other Business from staff?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes, hello. For next week, we do not have interpretation available, so if you wish to have the call of the week of June 7th, perhaps you can give us the date already. Or how do you wish to proceed for next time?

ISAAC MAPOSA: I think there'll be need for interpretation. [When will be the best?]

SILVIA VIVANCO: We have the week of the 7th through the 11th of June available.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Yeah, that'd be fine. I don't know other working group members, but I'm fine with that.

SILVIA VIVANCO: If you wish—I am already looking at the calendar. It looks like Thursday the 10th is a good time, good day at the moment. So maybe we can already say Thursday the 10th of June.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Yeah, that would be okay.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, and the time? Okay, Seun. Yes.

ISAAC MAPOSA: I think the usual time for our call. Would that be okay? I see Sarah is saying same time as today is okay. Okay.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, so that's 17:00 UTC. Let me see. Yesim, if you can confirm that 17:00 UTC is okay.

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi Silvia. I'm at the same time checking the calendar. On our Outlook calendar, [it seems fine,] the 10th of Thursday at 17:00 UTC. Just super quickly looking at the Gmail calendar to see if there is something. No, it seems fine, Silvia.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Perfect. Thank you so much. This is much easier to do it right away while the calendar is still not quite busy. So it's Thursday June the 10th at 20:00 UTC then.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Awesome.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Great. Okay. Thank you so much, everyone, for your participation today.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]