
DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the AFRALO operating principles review working group call taking place on Tuesday the 19th of June 2021 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel, we have Aziz Hilali, Isaac Maposa, Sarah Kiden, Seun Ojedeji.

On the French channel, we have Michel Tchonang Linze and Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong.

I don't see any apologies on this call so far today.

From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Michelle DeSmyter, and myself, Devan Reed on call management.

Our French interpreters are Camila and Jacques.

Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your name before speaking, not only for interpretation purposes but also for the transcription in case someone joins the French channel.

With this, I would like to leave the floor over to Isaac. Thank you.

ISSAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Devan. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. The person who's supposed to take the floor is Abdeldjalil. Over to you, Abdel.

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.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: Good evening, everyone. Thank you very much. Thank you, Isaac, thank you to the staff. As you know, the agenda as it appears on the screen, firstly the welcome and roll call which has already been undertaken by At-Large staff, and we are supposed to adopt the agenda before we can get started. So please have a look at it to see if you have any modifications that you would like to suggest or if you would like to add anything.

I take it there are no objections. I see no hands raised, so we will now go over the recap on action items. For that, I'm going to ask the At-Large staff to let us know what the ai-s from our past meetings are. Over to you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you very much. The first action item was for me to send the voting procedures for individuals in APRALO, NARALO and EURALO. That's completed. I sent it to the mailing list today, so you have it in your inbox.

The second one was for Seun to lead the discussion on voting rights via the mailing list. I believe that's ongoing.

The last action item was for Claudia Ruiz to schedule this call for 18:00 UTC. This is all. Over to you, Abdel. Thank you.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: Thank you very much, Silvia. Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. Yes, so for the action item of me leading the discussion of voting process, we've not really had that on the mailing list, but now that we have the information from Silvia in terms of the voting—because that was a prerequisite to the discussion on the mailing list. So now that we have that information, and since the meeting is being held anyway, so maybe there's no need to hold it on the mailing list.

When we get to that agenda item, we'll probably just look at the procedures that Silvia has shared today. So I don't know whether—I think that if we are in agreement with that, then maybe the action item may be closed or something, but I just wanted to make an update on the fact that we've not really been able to have a discussion on the mailing list for this voting process. But since we've now received the procedures from other regions, maybe we can have that discussion during this call. But if there is need to continue on the mailing list thereafter, maybe we can then decide on that. Thank you.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG:

Thank you very much, Seun. Thank you for your clear explanation. You're absolutely right. We have just received the experience from the different RALOs, so I think we should now be ready to discuss the matter. If Hadia is on the call, perhaps we could discuss the voting rights.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Hi. I'm only on the phone today and it'll be a little bit difficult for me to go ahead with this today. I'm sorry for that. But I could carry on over the mailing list if you wish. Thank you.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: Thank you, Hadia. I agree with the approach. We can discuss it on the mailing list to see what all the other members who would wish to contribute to the discussion think. So we are going to take that on the mailing list.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Excuse me, Chair.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'm on the call, so if we want to—normally, it's myself and Hadia, so I'm on the call so I can actually lead that particular item, because I think that we are on this call and one of the major reasons why we have this call is also on this individual voting. So I think it would be good for us to talk about it on this call even if we want to continue on the mailing list, but at least I don't think we should just push everything to mailing list considering that this call may be more effective than back-and-forth on the mailing list.

So if the chair is fine by me, I would suggest that we have some discussion on this now during this call, and then if there's need, maybe we continue on the mailing list depending on the progress we make. Am I good to go?

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: Okay, yeah, Seun. Sure. I agree. In that case, I think we should accept your proposal. So for the time being, I think you can present individual members' voting rights. Over to you, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. So just a quick recap. From the Google docs, we had two options that we were looking at from last meeting. But more people were trending towards option one, which is the one that kind of gives a single vote weight to the individual members. That just gives them a weight of one.

We now said that we should kind of check what other RALOs were doing. There was this question about how would individual members come to arrive at a vote of one. There were concerns of where they will have a vote and all those things. So I would just like staff to display the findings. That's the option one that we have on the screen right now. I guess we are all familiar with it.

But if we then go to the contents of the mail that Silvia sent to us, I don't know whether Silvia just wants to do a quick summary—I think the section that is most important is the one about the staff notes on voting procedure for each of the RALOs. I think let's just have a quick one from staff on that summary so that we can then have some decision or way forward on that.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes, Seun, so I will go through the e-mail displayed on the screen. So what I did is I took the articles pertaining to individual members, and particularly regarding votes on individual members.

APRALO, all APRALO individual members treated as a group will be responsible for selecting their representative when required to from time to time and or to contribute to the Regional General Assembly. So they do select one individual. The unaffiliated individuals treated as a group will adopt a verifiable process to ensure that consensus is achieved, or if required, any votes cast to follow, in general, these rules of APRALO. And if needs be, any metrics or requirements to ensure that their selected representative reflects the view held among the membership.

So this means that staff manages—and I put in there a staff note on voting procedure—the individual polls, which is launched simultaneously with the general big poll open for all ALSes. The results of the individuals' poll will be added to the general vote for results with a weight of one ALS. So that's the practice for APRALO.

The EURALO, they have an ALS, the EURALO Individual User Association. This includes all individuals. In voting procedures, the ALS representative casts the vote on behalf of all the individuals. They organize themselves independently without staff intervention to decide the candidate choice they will vote for. So that is one ALS treated as if they were one ALS.

Then I have the articles of association if you want to go through the actual language to have more detail. And it says voting, one person elected by the individual association, votes within EURALO.

Then NARALO. The NARALO rules say the governance of NARALO shall be exercised by the membership which consists of one voting representative from each ALS member in good standing and one voting representative for the body of individual members.

And the staff note is staff manages the individuals' poll launched simultaneously with the general big poll which is open for all ALSes. And the result of individuals' vote will be added to the general vote with a weight of one ALS. So NARALO and APRALO both have the same practice.

And then LACRALO just recently approved these procedures, but they have not implemented them yet. They are in the process of preparing the application and they are in the process of adopting, implementing these rules.

As you know, in LACRALO, they have a weighted voting mechanism. So in the case of LACRALO, section seven says vote by the ALS of individual members is equivalent to the weight of the ALSes [with lower] weight. So they will have a weighted type of voting procedure. There is a country coefficient allocated to each country. It's quite a complicated formula, actually. They haven't yet implemented it. So in the case of LACRALO, all individuals will be treated as one virtual ALS. That's how they do it for the purposes of voting.

So that gives you an overview of how individuals are currently voting, [but it's pending] in the case of LACRALO. I hope this is clear. And in the e-mail, you will see the hyperlinks with the relevant rules so we can go through every specific language that you may want to consider for

something similar perhaps for AFRALO. Thank you very much, Seun.
Over to you.

ISSAC MAPOSA:

Thank you very much, Silvia. And there we have it. Sarah, you have the floor.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Seun. Thank you, Silvia, for presenting this. So I have one question and one comment. The question is to staff. What do you mean by staff managing the [rules?]. Does that mean that each individual member votes? Or like the management part is a bit unclear.

Then the comment, I think I'm more inclined to go with the NARALO and APRALO format because the individual members are not required to create an ALS, though their vote is equivalent to one ALS vote, which I sort of liked. So that's my comment. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes, Sarah, I don't quite understand the first question you had. If you could kindly point out perhaps which RALO you're referring to or which language isn't clear.

SARAH KIDEN:

Yes, Silvia. Kindly scroll to the top where we had the NARALO or APRALO, one of them. So where it says staff manages the individual poll launched simultaneously, that's the part I'm asking about.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. Yes. In both APRALO and NARALO, there is a big poll open for the group of individual, and they will cast a vote and the result of this vote will be then counted, added to the general poll with a weight of one ALS. So if you imagine there are like two simultaneous elections, if there are elections for leadership, the staff is managing two polls: one of are all the ALSes and one for the individuals. And whatever the individuals decide collectively, that's what they will be counted with a weight of one vote in the general poll.

SARAH KIDEN: Okay. Sorry to come back again. So the individual members, like if we have three candidates, for example, each of the individual members is presented with three candidates and then the one who gets the highest vote is the one that's selected [inaudible].

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes. That will be the case. Exactly.

SARAH KIDEN: Okay. Thank you.

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

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Seun. So actually, I believe what the other RALOs are practicing is not that different than actually what we were thinking of. So we were thinking of one vote representing all individual members. And this is also what they're doing.

The only difference is that we were thinking maybe that this one vote could be increased with the increase of the number of individuals. But anyway, it doesn't matter if we today adopt this one vote representing all individuals, and maybe in two, three years, we could change this if we think we need to.

However, I do think that adopting a team where there are no representatives to the individuals is a good one where each individual member gets to cast his own vote and then depending on the vote, the final result is determined. That is, they do not have a representative that actually casts the votes for them.

I would say let's go with this. Let's not have a representative casting the vote for the individual members, because we don't want to turn the individual members into an ALS, because if we do have a rep that is going to cast a vote for them, then it is slowly turning into an ALS with individual members. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thanks, Hadia. Abdel, you have the floor.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG:

Thank you very much, Seun, for giving me the floor. I share the point of view that Hadia gave us. I think we're looking at the other RALOs, and

we talked about that already regarding the voting rights of those individual members. I see that EURALO enables individual members to vote, and I think this is something that puts everyone on a level playing field. There will be no representative voting for and getting votes.

The example of NARALO is very clear and is very good for us. Each individual member votes, and we have to see how we're going to determine the result of the vote. The total amount of votes compared to the general vote is another issue.

But I agree with the example of NARALO, and I think that we will, with time, adapt to the situation. Thank you very much, Seun.

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

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Seun. I see the NARALO part actually says one voting representative for the body of individual members. And I think that's the same text I saw for APRALO. So does that mean that everyone votes if it's saying one voting representative? Maybe some clarification on that.

Then the other comment is the comment I made last meeting we had where I said that I'm just worried that people will end up leaving their ALSes and thinking that it's more beneficial to be an individual member than to be an ALS member. It's just a concern that I have. But I'm happy to have individual members having a right to vote, though the implementation is where I sense some challenges. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. On the question with regards to votes—Hadia, is that a new hand?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. And this is just to address Sarah's concern in relation to members leaving their ALSes. Here, I'm not sure which comes first. If the ALS is there first and this ALS has individual members, and this ALS with its members is there for a purpose, working on the ground for a purpose, and then based on that purpose they join ICANN or AFRALO and start participating. If this is how it is, then a member wouldn't leave the ALS because he's there not only because of AFRALO but he's a member of an established structure that actually is there for a purpose doing something on the ground.

So that's what I would think ALS members are. But then maybe not. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Sorry, Hadia, kindly explain that again. I missed it because of a connection problem.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So I think the basic idea is that you have an At-Large Structure, a structure somewhere, say for example, in Egypt with some members, and this structure with its members is established because it is actually for a purpose doing something on the ground in the country.

And then this structure decides that it also would like to join AFRALO and ICANN in order to participate in maybe policy development, in outreach, but my understanding, this is not the only thing that the ALS is actually doing. Or is the ALS established only in order to be an AFRALO member or part of AFRALO?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thanks, Hadia. Basically, I think your explanation kind of addresses the second concern of Sarah in terms of ALSes being an entity on their own. So if the members from that ALS then decide, each of them or some of them decide to be individual members, if the rule allows that, fine. That does not [inaudible]. So the ALS will still have their vote to cast. If individual members from that ALS ... We need to check the rules. Does the rule allow for members that have affiliation with existing ALS to be individual member? If it does, fine. If it doesn't, then it doesn't.

I think focusing on the voting aspect alone may not be the approach. The main approach would be in terms of the membership. Are members from the ALSes able to become individual members? If they are, fine.

The first one, in terms of clarification on voting, yes, each of them will cast a vote, as staff have explained, using the [Big Polls] platform, and the vote will sum up to one. So it will just be seen as one person eventually casting the weighted vote. But each person will cast a vote. And whichever is higher in the votes being cast is what will determine the direction of that single weighted vote. That is the way I understood it. If there's any clarification that needs to be made by staff, Silvia or any other person, please, you have the floor.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, Seun, you're correct. That's exactly how it works, as you have described it.

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

SARAH KIDEN: So regarding the rules of if you can be an individual member and an ALS member, in AFRALO currently, you cannot. If you are a member of an ALS, you cannot become an individual member.

However, as per the UIM, unaffiliated individual membership work party, it's left to the RALO to decide. So I think the work party decided that if a RALO decides that it's okay for somebody to be both an individual member and an ALS member, it's okay.

But I'll just raise some of the things we discussed in the work party so that you see them from that point of view, because the other issue that comes with if we allow someone to be both an individual member and an ALS member is that there'll be double voting. That means there are ALSes casting a vote for a particular candidate and the individual is also casting a vote. And I remember we discussed that, but we didn't really come to an agreement. But it may be something we want to really think about.

And I still want to come back to this NARALO rule. I don't know. I feel that the way NARALO explained it is different from having each person getting access to [Big Polls,] but I'm not clear on that.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. Thanks, Sarah. NARALO, I think APRALO in this case, I think that one actually explains it much better. And of course, NARALO also have it clear. Let me read the NARALO one. Staff manages the individuals' poll launched simultaneously with the [Big Polls.] The result of individuals' poll will be added to the general poll with a weight of one ALS vote.

NARALO, in their paragraph, they wrote that individual members shall have one vote. How does that individual member cast that vote? That is the process by which all individual members will now have to vote, and that is how they determine how that one vote would be cast. I hope that answers the question.

I think the main thing is that there is a voting for the individual members that would determine the direction of the individual members.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Exactly. Yes, Seun. This is exactly the way you describe it. So when the general poll is configured, then that vote from the representative reflects the will of all the individuals. So that's why there is a voting representative, because the actual software gives voting right for one representative per ALS. So that's why they need to select one voting representative.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. So just to declare, they need to select one—so from there, if there's an election, for instance, or there's a voting that needs to be done, my understanding is that there's going to be a vote, each individual member will have to cast a vote, and the outcome of that vote is what the one person will then cast. Is that correct?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Exactly, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: All right. So I hope that addresses the question for Sarah.

SARAH KIDEN: Yes, but then there is the issue of double voting which came up at the work party level, but we didn't really ...

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, so that is a question of ... Apart from the aspect of the implication of actually having multiple membership, one of them is what Sarah has just mentioned, the double voting.

And I think in our rules on Google Docs, if we go to who can be an individual member, what we said there was that any Internet end user within the AFRALO region may become an individual member but must not be a representative or a leader of an ALS to any RALO. So that means that we only restricted this to leadership of the various ALSes. That

means that members of an existing ALS may actually be individual members.

So if we are saying that we want to change this—and I think [this is the section] that we can change, we can review. I believe that we have already discussed who can be a member in the past, and we marked it as resolved. But if we then say we want to go back to it, should we reopen it and then restrict it to any member of ALS cannot be an individual member? Is that something that we want to do? Hadia, your hand is up.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Seun. So I would say no, that's not something we want to do. And to address Sarah's concern in relation to double voting, actually, limiting it to members of ALSes that are not in leadership positions sort of limits this double voting thing.

Let's all remember what Alberto said during the end users' participation in ICANN session during ICANN 71. He told us about a case where an individual member came asking him about policy development, about a certain policy, he wanted to know more, wanted to know how to participate, how to actually have a role. And then it ends up that this member is actually a member of an ALS, an At-Large Structure, and he didn't know that this At-Large Structure is part of ICANN and they actually participate. So though he was a member, he was totally disconnected.

And I think this new approach of actually allowing ALS members if they're not in leadership positions to take a role, a significant one,

allows us to include more active members. And I think this was the logic behind allowing members of ALSes that are not in leadership positions to actually be individual members and actually have the right to vote.

So this is more of empowering people to be more active and engaged. And again, if you're not in a leadership position, I don't know how much is your opinion taken or how much actually are you engaged. And I would say if you're that much engaged and involved, you wouldn't think about being an individual member. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I see Isaac Maposa's hand is up. Actually, I think maybe Isaac wants to remind me that my time is up. Isaac, you have the floor.

ISSAC MAPOSA:

Thank you, Seun. Yeah, I think our time is also moving fast. It's quite an interesting subject we are discussing. I just wanted to highlight the issue that Sarah was raising. I've just been thinking of it. Take for example if someone is within an ALS and also decides to be an individual member. I think what you suggested earlier on—do we need to go into this, the area where we said only the leader of an ALS cannot be an individual member so that we also say, [inaudible] individual member maybe should [renounce] their membership from an ALS or ... I'm not sure how to go about it to avoid double voting. Or do we say if you're an individual member and a member of an ALS, you're not allowed to participate in voting in your ALS or as an individual member, you only vote in one? How do we actually go around it, how do we put it in a way that we don't get double volte's? Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you, Isaac. I think Hadia made some intervention on this particular concern. Yes, allowing members of ALSes to be individual members could result in voting from two sources, assuming that ALS actually have voting process for their members. Let's not forget the ALS is a structured organization. So whether they conduct votes for their members before they actually eventually cast the vote of the ALS or whether it's just leadership that does that, we don't really know.

But the other thing is that we cannot practically have a member from an ALS [renounce] his ALS because he wants to be an individual member. Because let's face it, the ALS has other things apart from being an ALS of ICANN and of At-Large. So their membership did not just emanate because they're an ALS. The membership emanates because they are within that particular ALS. And their membership is actually because their ALS is a member of the RALO.

So I think that yes, we have a devil in the possibility of double voting, but we would probably have a bigger devil to handle if we actually want to go through a process of renouncing and denouncing. And ultimately, I would also like to flag that the individual membership vote, the weight that we're attaching to it is just one. It's just one single vote.

So that means that if I'm a member of an ALS and I happen to be an individual member as well, my vote is just going to be 0.00 whatever it is that's the number of individual members. So it also would not significantly determine the outcome of that particular process.

So I think that we just need to go for the one that is the lesser devil here, because ultimately, both options are not 100% perfect. So, which is the lesser devil is what we need to go with. Which one will encourage individual members to participate more? Especially if the person becoming an individual member will make them participate more. Because ultimately, it's not also about the vote. I mean the vote should not be the only thing. It should also be whether they're able to participate more if they become individual members.

And I joined some of the calls from the work party on the unaffiliated individual members, and that's one of the motivations, that if we restrict ALS members not being individual members, then it may also impact—some people will want to actually still feel that they want to participate and do some things, though they've been an individual member on their own.

So it's neither here nor there. I just think we need to weigh which route we want to go. So I'm just going to take note of my time now. I'm going to quickly just ask that we look at the section where we have the option one, and if on that option one, from what we hear in here, it's obvious that we don't want individual members' vote—the weight of their vote, we don't want it to be more than one. So that means that option two is actually off the table, from what I'm hearing here.

Even though it's not my preference, but at least from what the majority is saying, option two is off the table. What we have is option one. And I hope that—there is just bullet point three, which Sarah initially highlighted. I hope that this discussion here has now addressed the bullet point three and we can mark it as resolved, because each

individual member will have a vote, and that vote is what we'll now then sum up to become one vote, which is what has been explicitly made clear in bullet point three so as to avoid any form of confusion that this vote is actually going to be one vote out of the main vote of the election or the voting process.

So I think on this note, if we agree—Sarah, option three, if some of the things that we discussed provides further clarification, even if you don't feel that—so long as it's the right clarification, you may actually mark that as resolved. At least let us note that if not for anything, let's make sure that this is the only achievement that we have made for this call. I think we just need to have some sense of progress.

So I don't know whether Sarah is opening the document. But if any other person is on the document, maybe we should just mark it as resolved so that we can know that we have [lines, bullet points.] Before we continue, is there anybody that does not agree that we include line three, bullet point three on option one? Bullet point three reads total individual members' votes shall be equivalent to a single ALS vote.

Anybody in disagreement with including that bullet point, please raise your hand. Okay, Aziz, you have the floor.

MICHELE DESMYTER:

Aziz is not speaking.

ISSAC MAPOSA:

Okay. So we're not hearing from Aziz. I don't know whether he was just raising a hand to make other comments, but he seems to have raised it

when I asked that question. So I think we should just resolve it for now if—

AZIZ HILALI: I can speak in English.

MICHELE DESMYTER: [inaudible]

AZIZ HILALI: [inaudible] Okay. I have just one question, because I don't intervene in the discussion because it was the same discussion as last time. But just a quick question to Seun. What you mean about total individual members? You take the majority of the vote—for example, if you have three candidates and you have five for one, seven for one and eight for one, I think you have to explain the details of the point three to explain how do you mean what you mean about total individual members. That's my question. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I think what that section means was that irrespective of the number of individual members, they would not have more than one single vote. That is what is meant. But from what you're saying now, a thought is also coming to my mind that we should probably put majority of the total individual member—do we need to put those details just to inform that it is actually the majority that will now determine the direction?

But what this bullet point three was trying to say is that we are no longer saying that maybe if we have 20 individual members then we have one vote, if we are 50 individual members, then we have two votes. We are not saying that. We're saying all individual members, [regardless of] their number, they can only have one vote eventually.

So the direction of how the votes would be cast will be dependent on the outcome of the individual members' vote. I think that's an implementation detail that staff will need to carry out, just like other RALOs also did not put the implementation details in their rules. I believe staff can carry that out [on their end.]

So if there are ten individual members, each of them will cast their vote. If six of them say yes, then four of them say no for a particular vote, then it means that it's a yes. So that single yes is what will be cast in the main voting that involves the ALS. That single individual member vote of yes. I hope that clarifies the question, Aziz.

AZIZ HILALI:

Can I just tell you something about this point? I think it will be complicated for the vote if you take this, because we don't know the different examples in the vote, you can have yes and no, just two different possibilities. You can have many possibilities. I think it is better to batch all the members in one ALS, like I think EURALO, and these individual members can appoint a person to vote on behalf of them. I think it's the best [inaudible], because we have some rules and all our rules are regarding ALSes. So I think it's better to bunch all members in

one ALS and they can appoint a person to vote on behalf of them. I think it's the optimal way to not have a problem in the future.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you, Aziz. I'm not sure. I think maybe we are speaking—because I think we're actually saying the same thing. They're going to have a single ALS vote. But the process for them to arrive at what that single vote is, is the implementation details which I've just explained, which is what EURALO is doing, which I believe—I think we are saying the same thing, Aziz. I'm not sure how else we need to explain this.

AZIZ HILALI:

It's not clear. Total individual members' vote. It's not clear.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

So if we need to—please. I actually suggested a text. We all understand what needs to be done. If there's any wording that better describes it, let us put it. I'm seeing chat from Sarah which says EURALO is not like that. I'm not sure what [she meant.]

AZIZ HILALI:

I think I prefer EURALO.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Staff, can you explain, how does EURALO come to [inaudible]?

AZIZ HILALI: When you said total individual members' votes—

SEUN OJEDEJI: Aziz, let staff explain the EURALO process, please, so that we can make some progress. Staff, how many more minutes can we take?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, Seun, we have the next call with the leadership that you have requested.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Sure.

SILVIA VIVANCO: We have another Zoom room for that call. So I don't know if there are people already on that Zoom room or if it's open. I believe we can go over just for a few minutes because it's a different Zoom room.

Just to address quickly the EURALO practice, they are like that. They are a single ALS. They have their own bylaws, they have their own rules. You can click on the link I said and you will see they have their own website and they do manage their own elections and any votes. Staff doesn't have any involvement in how they do it as an ALS. So they have a representative and the representative will cast the vote. So we don't have any insights on how they manage it internally. But perhaps if Roberto is invited to the next call, you could all hear the practice that is implemented in EURALO to have a better understanding of this.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thanks. Please, let's put an action item for Roberto to be invited to the next call. Or if Roberto can just do a summary of how they do it for us so that staff can actually let us know for the next call.

Also, so from what I'm hearing, Aziz prefers EURALO's approach. Sarah I think is also supporting that. Hearing Hadia prefers the—what's the other one? Hadia does not prefer us setting up an ALS with bylaws and other things. So that means that Hadia prefers the APRALO approach.

So let's get clarity on how the EURALO one is done, maybe, so let's put an action item for that. I think I will hand this back to the chair, and I think we spent too much time on this. Sorry for taking so much time. Thanks.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Abdel or Isaac, would you like to please close the call?

ISSAC MAPOSA: Yes. Thank you so much for your contribution, and as action item, we're going to invite Roberto for our next meeting. It seems that for our next meeting, we can let some time, two weeks, if it is okay for everyone, assuming that it will be [inaudible] Staff, can you confirm that, because it would be Tuesday?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes, so we are going to invite Roberto Gaetano, so what I would propose is that we send a Doodle. I already see some calls conflicting on week 13 scheduled, but we will try to send maybe Doodle a little bit earlier on the 13th so they don't conflict with the afternoon calls already scheduled and also to offer Roberto some choices.

So staff will send a Doodle out for the call during the week of July 12 through 15, with preference for Tuesday the 13th.

ISSAC MAPOSA:

Okay. Thank you so much, staff. And also, on the document, so we can make some cleanup. After that, we can put the issues that we want that Roberto can explain more so I can put it in Google doc. Thank you so much, and bye. Thank you for your contribution.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. Bye.

DEVAN REED:

Thank you all. This meeting is adjourned. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]