
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the AFRALO operating principles review working group call on Thursday the 10th of June 2021 at 17:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel, we have Isaac Maposa, Barrack Otieno, Seun Ojedeji, and Sarah Kiden.

From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Devan Reed, and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management.

On the French channel, we have Aziz Hilali.

Our French interpreters for today are Claire and Jacques.

If you can all please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise, and state your name when taking the floor so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels. Thank you very much, and with this, I pass the call over to you, Isaac.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Thank you, Claudia. We move to the adoption of agenda. I'm sure everyone has seen the agenda shown on the screen. Are there any additions or suggestions to the agenda? I don't see any hands raised, so I take that it's in agreement to the agenda. So we move on to the next agenda item. I give the floor to staff to proceed. Thank you.

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.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Thank you very much, Isaac. First action item is Sarah Kiden, Barrack Otieno, working group chairs to come up with a paragraph to capture decertification. They will also look at the other RALOs' practice for decertification and come up with proposed text by the next call. I believe this is ongoing and we will discuss this today.

The second action item is Isaac Maposa to include topics on termination and withdrawal process and [inaudible] in the agenda for today's call, and that is on the agenda. And then the final was to schedule this call. So that's all. Thank you. Over to you, Isaac.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Silvia. Now we move on to the next agenda item, which we did not manage to tackle on our last agenda. That is on the issue to do with individual members' voting rights. So I give the floor to Seun Ojedeji, the AFRALO chair, and Hadia. So over to you, Seun. You can take the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I think we should open the Google docs. So one of the major points of discussion was voting rights for individual members. During the previous discussions, previous calls—not the one of last week, I mean previous previous—there was suggestion that we should—it was clear that there was no—we had to have a voting right for individual members. And one of the things that was said by some of the members then was that we could look at the ALS with a minimum number of membership, and then try to equate that to one ALS vote for individual members.

So I took that, and based on that, I then proposed the text which you find below. The essence of the—can you scroll down to the individual voting part, please? Yes, so that's in there. What I proposed here is that to allow for growth—in some RALO for instance, I think in EURALO, they have just one voting rights. They have all the individual members under one ALS. I think it was EURALO. Under one ALS, and then one person casts the vote on their behalf of that single ALS.

But what I propose here is as the number of individual members increase, their voting power would also increase. So if individual members are up to 20, then they have one ALS vote. So if there are more than 50, then they have two ALS votes, and if they are up to more than 100, they have four ALS votes.

But if they are more than 200, they can have up to X number of votes,, but that X number of votes must not be more than 20% of the current number of ALSes.

So I gave an example there that if we have 38 ALSes at the moment, 20% of that would be eight, and [inaudible] number. So they will have eight votes that will be cast, assuming individual members is 200 or more in number.

That is what I propose. This ensures that individual member vote does not just remain as one, as a single ALS vote. This also ensures each of the individual members have the opportunity to actually cast their votes, so they can actually directly participate. But their collective vote is what will now be weighted.

So this also to some extent would encourage individual members to increase their number to some extent but it also at the same time grants the ALSes significant weight. So individual members' vote would only supplement, in the long run, since ALSes have 80% of the weighting. So individual members will only supplement the vote of the ALSes. ALSes still have the majority share, but individual members now have, in quotes, if it is to be put that way, a minority share of the total votes.

This is a new approach to what has been done in other regions where there's individual members. I don't know what the status of other regions is, but the one I know in EURALO, it was just one vote, but if we have something like this, it gives some more sense of power, a sense of participation to the individual members. One of the questions that was asked in the comment section on the Google docs was, I think it was from Hadia, she was commenting on the 20%, not sure why we have this limitation.

The reason why I've put in the 20% is so that individual members don't eventually exceed the votes of the ALSes collectively. So that is why this was pegged at 20%, at least for a start. Let's see how this goes. If we see that there's a sporadic growth of individual members, then maybe this can be reviewed to a higher percentage. But at least for a start, I think 20% of the entire vote is fine.

And I'll also give an example [inaudible] of how the votes can be determined. The vote is actually determined in absolute way. So if for instance total number of those that voted is 25, as on the current page, if those have voted yes for a particular question is 15 and those that have said no is ten, the yes would have it. So that means that all the four

votes, or whether it's one vote or two or eight votes of the ALSes would be casted in the yes direction. Or if it is the no that has it, then all of it will be casted in the no direction. But if it is equal, then it should be split. So that is what I have done about this proposal, and I hope I've clarified some things.

Sarah was also asking in the chat, in the comment section, about whether we should just use one ALS [vote or not. I just] explained why I felt having just one ALS, one vote, similar to the way EURALO does it, may not really give a sense of power or belonging as much as it should for individual members. So if we want to do it, we should just do it and make it meaningful. I don't think one vote out of—at the moment, we have about 39 ALSes. I don't think one vote out of that would really, [irrespective of the number,] would make a difference. So that's why I felt we should do it in a progressive way so that as the numbers of individual members increase, then their voting rights on the table also increase. [inaudible].

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you so much, Seun, for the presentation. And now, we give the floor to Olévié. I see that Sarah and Hadia—I don't know what [inaudible]. Sarah, you can take—

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Sarah had her hand up first. Yes.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Okay. Sarah, you can [inaudible].

SARAH KIDEN:

Hi everyone. So I have some comments about the proposal from Seun. Thank you for getting us started with that procedure. I don't know if mathematics are just hard for me, but I found the calculation a bit complex. And you've answered one of my questions about having—isn't it better for only one person to vote?

So the other question I have is related to ALSes, because the way ALSes work is only one person in the ALS votes. So not everyone who is a member of an ALS gets to vote, it's just one representative ALS, which would not make a difference if we make it for individual members.

So if we give each individual member a vote, it can be very unfair to the ALS members who don't have an opportunity to vote and only their representative votes. That's my first question.

Then my second question is, is there a way to know how many members are in each ALS? Because I know that as it is right now, we utterly don't know how many members are in each ALS, apart from the numbers they report when they're applying, which some people have been ALSes for eight years or so. So yeah. We don't know how many members are in each ALS. So, how does that work in this context?

And then finally, regarding the 20% and 80% vote, I don't know why specifically—I notice it says that when the number becomes bigger, we will calculate, but wouldn't it be maybe easier if we know like—if for example we have 40 ALSes and then instead of saying 20% is for individual members, if it's 40 ALSes, then you get the percentage based

on the total number of ALSes and not just like a random 20% figure. Yeah, that's my question. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thank you for this. Let me take it from the back, from the last. I think what you said in the last comment is that ... I think it's exactly what I was also actually proposing. It's 20% of the total number of the ALS. I'm not sure ... I think what you said is also what I have in mind, but if what is written did not communicate that, then I think maybe we should modify it. So the 20% that I suggested here is 20% of the total ALSes, so if current number of ALSes is 39, then 20% of that is what I mean, and the number does not exceed 20%. Because if we say that it should exceed 20%, then it means that at some point in time, individual members' vote may exceed that of ALSes. So the intention is to have this kind of weighting to make sure that the entire vote of individual members is still equivalent to entire vote of 20% ALS equivalent within the voting system.

The second question—sorry, can you remind me of the second question again?

SARAH KIDEN:

Sorry for asking many questions. The first question was that if each individual member gets to vote [inaudible]

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Aha, yes. Okay, thank you. So for that one, the way this is suggested or proposed is that—so when ALSes vote, we don't know what they have

done in their ALS, so we don't know what's the process that they have gone through before they actually got that one person or representative to vote. And that vote that that person is doing is actually—that means that that person is making that big vote. So let's not see it as one vote, let's see it as a very big single vote.

Okay, so that big single vote of one is what that ALS is doing, but in the case of an individual member, it's not doing a big single vote, it is after the individual member finishes his vote that the outcome will now determine how big it is. So individual members are just—because they don't have any ALS, they don't have any existing process where they can actually meet together and then agree on a single vote, this is just us having a voting mechanism for them, and the outcome of that voting mechanism is what they would now fit into the main voting. I hope this clarifies that part, because EURALO, one way or the other—just using EURALO as an example—they would have a way to determine what that one would be. They will have a way to determine what that one individual member vote would be.

And this is also actually giving individual members a way to determine how their vote would be utilized. So it is one ALS vote if there are 20, two ALS votes if there are more than 50. Those are the big votes. The other votes of individual members [inaudible] are the small votes that actually sums up to the big vote.

And then I think you also asked a question ...

SARAH KIDEN:

On knowing how many members are in each ALS.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. So that is a very difficult one. I think during the discussion, somebody was saying 25 or 20, that's why I just [inaudible] 25. But the suggestion was that we should use the minimum possible that we have seen during applications, the minimum number of members in an ALS that we have seen during applications. So I just came up with that 25%, but if the normal is much lower—even though I think there are probably some ALSes that have less than 25 active members, when we talk about active members participating in ICANN, there may be some ALS that's actually less than that. But realistically speaking, I've just put in that number, I really didn't have any facts to back that up. We can always change it, especially if we think this is the way to go. But of course, we can modify it entirely. I hope that answers that.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Seun. I just still feel that for example if a member of my ALS finds out that an individual member is actually voting—

SEUN OJEDEJI: Is it breaking from my side or from Sarah?

SARAH KIDEN: Can you hear me now?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, I can hear you now.

SARAH KIDEN: [inaudible]. So I was saying that I'm just imagining if I used my ALS as an example, just picture if a member of my ALS discovers that actually, an individual member has a vote, and for them as a member, even if we have one big vote, that they don't have a vote, I don't know if it will not cause concern. But I see that there are hands from Hadia and Aziz, so maybe they have other comments to discuss. But generally, I just feel that it may cause that issue of ALS members—it will look like it's better to be an individual member, then we will have a scenario where everybody is trying to become an individual member because they feel that their rights as individual members—I don't know. Yeah. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. I see your point. I see the psychology of it, even though we know in practice that it's not what it is, what has been said, because if an ALS has a big vote of one, and many individual members—for instance in this case, we are using 25 as a number—would only sum up to one. You get my point. That Work Stream what we were doing here. If we say an ALS has a single big vote of one, but before—individual members can have a big vote of one, they will have to be 25 in number. So that is what we are saying here. But I also see the psychology of some members of the ALSes feeling that they are not participating in the voting that has been set up for individual members. But of course, it's also expected that ALSes would actually coordinate with their members for them to actually cast that single vote. It is assumed that you have cast that single big vote on behalf of their members.

But again, I'm hoping for a suggestion on how we can work around this or any other proposal on how to implement this voting aspect. Thanks. I don't know whether Isaac was meant to coordinate the hands. Over to you.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Yes, sure, go ahead. I'm sure the hands are related to the presentation.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I'd just like to flag something. [inaudible] proposal. We can actually suggest a different way to implement this. So I just want to flag that it's not a must that we must [inaudible]. But when I was reading the text, I just thought—that's what came to my mind. Aziz, you have the floor.

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you very much, Seun, for this explanation. Thanks to the entire team. But I'd like to remind you of something, since I have a lot of seniority and I did participate in the creation of ALAC, and we at the time thought about having the participation of ALSes. Let's not forget about the participation of ALSes. We cannot compare the number of individual members and compare the number of people in one ALS. The measure of the participation in ICANN policies and all the topics we're working on, we have to know that those ALSes—and I'm talking about my ALS and the ALSes I do know—they do participate at the local level. Let's not forget that. Those ALSes are recognized in their country. They are well-known and they're very active. They do a lot of mobilization at

the local level. It has nothing to do with individual member. So please, let's not compare those numbers. I'd rather have an ALS with three people that are being active than ten individual members.

I think it is important. Let's think about that. This is extremely important in our work as RALO. So Sarah said something I agreed with. Let's not launch this number of figures, because this is going to be endless. 20% of 100% ... And I have experience with that. I know what happens in ISOC. I can bring friends. I have an ALS with people that never show up. But I can be like someone that brings 100 people. It's very easy to do that.

An ALS, when it is accredited, we do survey, we do study these ALS to get an accreditation, and they need a website, they need to be active. To be an individual member is very easy. I'm not saying that I'm against individual members. Absolutely not. But it is true that an individual member can bring a lot. But I am against giving a lot of weight to the vote of individual members and not with figures or 20% or 200. This is not going to work out. I don't know what will happen with that. I'd rather have individual members to help us out in our AFRALO activities, but let's not forget that our goal and primary goal in AFRALO is to have ALSes that work well in our community, in our country, in their country. So let's not mix everything up.

And in order to conclude, we could have other proposal, and I thank Silvia to give us the number. Only 16 individual members. In that case, if we accept one vote for those 16 members, that is going to be controlled by us. We're going to ask the individual members to vote and that will weigh one vote, that will cast one vote, up until 100. I do not agree with

having at the same level an ALS with individual members, even if there are 100. Thank you very much.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Seun. So first off, I would say—and I think you said it as well, Seun, that we don't need to worry much about this 20% or whatever it is right now or the exact numbers. Now we are talking about only 16 members. And what's the possibility of this number to double in two years? I believe we are going to revisit this in two years. It's just a suggestion, and we'll see how things develop.

And then to Sarah's point about ALSes casting the vote—and a member of that same ALS can be an individual member and cast also a vote. But again, the ALSes when casting a vote, they normally and typically should include their members, and that vote should be representative of the members and not only of the leadership. And maybe that would be an incentive, actually, for ALSes to try harder to really include their members, because they know that their members could have another independent path if they cannot actually—if they're not able to actively participate through those ALSes.

So I think the individual membership has two main benefits. One, it enables members that are not able to have an active goal within their ALS to have an active role independently, and two, it enables members, participants that actually would like to have a role with At-Large and

ICANN and cannot actually relate to any of the ALSes to also have a way to participate in ICANN's ecosystem through At-Large as end users. So those are the two main benefits of having individual users.

And then in accrediting, I think also Aziz talks about how easy it is to accredit an individual user. Though I definitely agree that accrediting a user needs to be easy, I don't think that easy does not mean that you accredit users who cannot actually have a role or actively participate.

And so here, I think we need to look at how do you look at users and how do these users need to look like, right? Because typically, you want users not as a number to vote but as to actively participate. And for that, yes, individual membership should be easy, but not to everyone. It should be easy to those who can actually actively participate and want to actively participate.

So again, I go back to this [inaudible] or whatever, and I say that it has actually no effect on us now up until we actually review this again. So actually, we can decide to review this in a year. We don't have to wait for three years. It does have an important item here, which is [inaudible] and we're not yet sure how things can look like after we put this in and how things are going to shape. So we can decide to look again at this a year from now or a year from whenever it is published in order to see what those numbers need to be, the 20 or we don't need to have a percentage. We can look at this again, because after publishing this, we will see how many members would actually apply, the quality of the members applying, where they come from, how active they are, and all this could actually inform us on how to proceed. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Thank you, Hadia.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Is it on my side? I'm not hearing Hadia.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Seun, can you hear us? Hadia finished speaking and Isaac was actually speaking. Isaac, please go ahead.

ISAAC MAPOSA: It seems that Seun can't hear. Aziz, is that an old hand or a new hand?

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'm back. But I have my hand up once Hadia is done.

SILVIA VIVANCO: I think Hadia is done. Please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay.

AZIZ HILALI: I don't know if Hadia totally understood that—this is a question—how to measure the activities of those individual members in our community? Those individual members must have some weight in their community,

not only participate in our meetings—that’s easy—but let me repeat—and I want to make sure to be understood—an ALS has a local activity that represents a community regarding the development of ICANN policies. When decisions are being taken by the ALSes, they're transmitted to the ICANN in order to represent several voices. You have ALSes with thousands of people. So, let’s not reduce the value of those ALSes compared to individual members. So that’s it. Could you please ...? I'm not in front of my PC so I'm not going to raise my hand anymore, you can bring it down. Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Isaac, we have Daniel and Hadia with their hands up.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Thank you, Aziz. I'm not sure who was first in the queue, but over to you, Daniel. After Daniel, Hadia, then Seun.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi Daniel, if you're speaking, you're on mute. Okay, Hadia, can you go please while we try to figure out Daniel’s audio issue?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. I just wanted to agree with Aziz that the value of the members in ALS or the value of the ALSes is actually their role in their community. I totally agree with that. And I also think that individual members should have the same characteristic. Individual members

should actually be members that have an active role within their community. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Hadia. Is Daniel now on? Okay, Seun, you can take the floor. If Daniel connects, we can give him the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thanks. I hear everybody, and I think ... I'm not sure we want to do this process again in a year's time. I would really suggest that we put in something that would actually at least be sustainable for a couple of more years. If experience would tell us—we have spent over a year on this review at the moment. We have spent over a year. For us to do this again in a year's time, I don't think it would be a good use of our time. I would really suggest that we reconsider that. I did not consider that we will be doing this review again anytime soon, and that is why I factor in some level of growth in the votes of the individual members, and that's why I factor that in. I know individual members at the moment are not even up to 20, 25 yet that I indicated in the option two proposal. Future was factored in and that is why we have those numbers.

But nevertheless, I think I'm fine with whatever it is that we decide. From what I'm hearing, we are saying that no matter the number, it should be equal to one ALS vote, which is similar to what EURALO does. So I've actually separated the options. I've put option one, which is what I think the majority is supporting, then I've turned the one that I initially proposed to option two.

However, I would really suggest that we review this rules of procedure in a way that we would not have to do it again in a year's time. Definitely, I don't think it would be a good use of our time. Let's put in rules that we actually make it sustainable at least for a couple more years, otherwise we would not be doing justice to our time. We have spent almost a year on this one already right now.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Can I speak now?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I'm not done with ... The other thing I wanted to mention is that we need to look at—what we are saying basically, I just hope that we are all on the same page that ALS—individual members will actually have votes, because [occasionally,] I was hearing some of the things Aziz was saying in terms of not having vote for individual members. I hope we have the understanding that one way or the other, they have to have a vote. And please, if we have that understanding and agreement, let's then look at the option one that has been proposed, which is actually trying to replicate or imitate whatever it is that EURALO initially had.

Probably, we need to find out how individual members in EURALO conduct their votes. So maybe it is not staff that gives them that platform or whoever gives them that platform, we need to factor that in so we can move forward on this as well.

So for me, I'm fine either way, whether it's option one or two. Option two was more elaborate and thinking of much more future good, but it

looks like we want it to be single votes irrespective of the number of ALSes that we have, which is fine. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Seun. I think now the working group is to deliberate if it's to use option one or two, but so far, it seems more people tending to lean towards option one. We can hear from the other members. I think now, because of our time, I'll give the floor to Sarah, then Hadia, then we can move on. Sarah, you have the floor.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you so much, Isaac, and thank you, Seun, for the comment. I definitely agree with you that individual members should get at least one vote. So I think on that, we agree.

I wanted to just make comments about the option one that you have listed. The way it's explained, I feel that the three bullet points sort of contradict each other, so I would propose that we separate bullet three into different options so that option one will have bullets one and two, because it almost feels like they still contradict each other.

Then regarding the EURALO way of doing it, it's actually not just EURALO because I know NARALO and APRALO follow the same thing. Yeah, I see Silvia has posted the same on the chat. So it's not just EURALO. We can just look at the three RALOs, like the text, maybe staff can help us get just the voting part from the three RALOs and then we can see how to edit it to fit our needs. Yeah, that's all. Thank you. And yeah, maybe

Daniel can also, because he's been putting up his hand forever. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Sarah. Daniel, you have the floor.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much. I've been following the discussion closely, but I see that we as AFRALO right now in this discussion are trying to complicate issues. Let's critically analyze how EURALO, APRALO, have done things, because I've been trying to go through their process and procedure, and I see it's perfectly fine and it can best suit us in AFRALO.

So following the discussion, I'm in agreement with Sarah's suggestion, and I think if staff support starts compiling the differences or to compare all these respective procedures, would best help us, because I don't see the need for us to try to reinvent something new, yet it has been having challenges.

Another point to note is that all those others have been having the issue of individual members. So, why can't we adopt the best practices that have made these communities successful instead of creating something that is going to give us a headache and a pain? That's my view. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Daniel. Now I give the floor to Hadia. I'm sure she also wants to respond to your comment as well.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes. So I do agree with option one, that all votes will be counted as one vote. However, we are dealing with this after the EURALO, NARALO and APRALO have done it. So we are the newest RALO, we are the latest one doing it now. And we can do, in my opinion, something that I would [see as better.] So at this point, we can do like they do, which is all votes will be counted as one vote regardless of that number. So if there are 16 members, it's one vote, if there are 50 members, it's still one vote.

But [inaudible] I don't agree—or not agree. I think we can do this better in terms of who casts a vote. And I would take here a part from Seun's option two, with his every member would be able to cast a vote, and then the final vote depends on the number of yeses and noes or the number of ... Seun gave an illustration. He says for example [total] number of individual members' votes [cast] 25 votes. You have 15 yeses and ten noes, then the end result is yes. So that's one vote with a yes. So I think this works better because the individual members do not have a leader. That leader lets them agree to a vote. Because it's an individual member, everybody can cast the vote which they want.

So again, why do we want to have individual members and then make them like an ALS, have individual members with a leader? Why do they need to have a leader? What's the merit of having one person cast a vote for all members? What's the advantage?

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Hadia. And I do get what Hadia is saying. And I think now we're going to hear a response from the other working group members.

Sarah, you have the floor. Then after you take the floor, I think [inaudible] time, you can then move on to the next item. I think this issue needs to be further discussed. I'm sure we can continue discussing it on the mailing list on the document. Sarah, you have the floor.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Isaac. Just to respond to Hadia, it's the same thing that happened with ALSes, like just one person has the vote. And as Seun was explaining earlier, the ALS, we normally expect that they will consult among each other to decide, "This is the vote we have for our ALS." So I think it's the same practice. Because if we still give each individual member their own vote, it comes back to the issues that Aziz was raising earlier on. I don't know. I just feel that you will have a scenario where everyone is leaving the ALS to come and say, "Okay, at least as an individual member, I have a vote" or something like that. And I think Aziz already spoke extensively about this, so I don't want to repeat the things that he said, but that's basically why they could have a vote. And they can coordinate amongst themselves. They don't have to have a leader per se, but they can just coordinate and decide, "This is our vote as a group." Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

I see two more hands, Isaac.

ISAAC MAPOSA:

Thank you. I said Sarah should also proceed to the next item after she ...

SARAH KIDEN: Okay. Thank you, Isaac. We have three minutes to the end of the call and I don't think we've finished. I see two hands, from Seun and Hadia, so I don't think we can discuss the other items. Maybe let's just finish this. That's my proposal.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Yeah. All right. Thank you, Sarah. I think because of time, we will not be able to move to those, so I give the floor back to Hadia, then Seun. Over to you, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I'd say let Seun go first.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Okay. Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I just wanted to flag that, let's not forget that EURALO actually came up with this, forming, creating individual member under one ALS before this rule that actually now empowers individual members to have a vote. So that is the structure that they had before, just to create an ALS, and that ALS is the one that is now having a leader representative.

There is no practical way where we expect that individual members will just magically coordinate themselves without anybody shepherding them, without—especially this part of the region in our world, in this

region. There's no way you'd magically expect that people would just coordinate themselves without somebody coordinating them. Let's be frank about this.

So I don't expect individual members, all of them, would just agree, especially when it's matters that are contentious. [inaudible] just agree by consensus without anybody [inaudible]. So one way or the other, there has to be a way to—it's either we want to say let's have a representative for them whereby they determine who is their representative and [inaudible] be the one that will be coordinating amongst them, or we allow them to vote as the issues come and then the entire vote comes up to one vote, which, I believe the intention is that we don't want the individual members [who have more than one vote equivalent to one vote.]

If that is the case, then we allow them to [inaudible] vote, and the outcome will still be equivalent to one vote. But leaving them for them to not have a leader like EURALO has, how do we coordinate them to be able to determine how that single vote will be used? So that is the main point of what I think that we need to [inaudible]. For me, I think voting is the easiest option. Even if somebody is coordinating them, that person may eventually also ask them to vote for them to determine what that single vote is going to be. That is just it. But again, I hope that we can perhaps—maybe staff can actually, at this point, let us know if they have insights on how the EURALO individual members normally come to their decision. They can actually share with us as well. That may be helpful. Thank you.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Thank you, Seun. I'll give the floor to Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. I would just quickly agree with Seun. So [inaudible] procedure by which the other RALOs [inaudible] members. So we do know that they have a leader [inaudible] cast the vote, but how does this member determine this vote? This is what we're seeking. Again, I think each member just casts their vote and then it's counted as one vote depending on the number of yeses or noes. I think that works as well. But again, I agree with Seun, let's look at [inaudible].

ISAAC MAPOSA: Thank you, Hadia. What we are going to do, I think Seun, this can be taken as an action item. You can lead on the discussion on the mailing list on this issue so that we can deliberate on this issue on the mailing list, and as always, the comments on the issues under review, I can see there are some comments coming in. Some are suggesting that the easiest way is to have them as observers. If they want to have a say, they can join an ALS or create an ALS. That's from Barrack. I don't know what others would say about that. I think it's discuss more on the mailing list and also on the document since we have ran out of time. So, Seun, you can lead on the discussion on the mailing list. I can give the floor to staff to wrap up and suggest on the next call dates. Over to you, staff.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you very much, Isaac. And I will go to the procedures for the other RALOs, and I would provide you that information, to all of you. So

for the next call, since we have the ICANN 71 meeting and then we won't have interpretation, I would like to suggest that we reconvene this working group on the week of June 28 if that is okay with you. Maybe we can already set the same time and day, so that will be on ... We could do it maybe on the 29th if everybody is okay with the 29th. So that will be Tuesday, June 29th at 17:00 UTC, or we could do it even on Monday the 28th, or Thursday the 1st at 17:00 UTC. So you have several options. Maybe the sooner—

ISAAC MAPOSA: I see most are saying Tuesday is okay with them, I see on the chat.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. I'm sorry. I see a call on the 29th. We have an internal call. So maybe if you're okay with Tuesday the 29th at 18:00 UTC. Would that be okay?

ISAAC MAPOSA: It's good with me.

SILVIA VIVANCO: 29 June at 18:00 UTC. Hadia says okay.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah, I think it's all fine with me too. I can always join it. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, so that will be sufficient time, I think, for the working group to go through the pending items and discuss. So everybody, please prepare to continue the discussions. So yes. Thank you very much, everyone, for this great call. Now the meeting is adjourned. Thank you. Bye all.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining. Please enjoy the rest of your day.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Thank you all. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]