
YESIM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the APRALO Rules of Procedures Review Working Group call taking place on Tuesday 28th of November 2023 at 5:00 UTC. On our call today we have Justine Chew, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gopal Tadepalli, Nazmul Nazmul Hasan Majumder, Faheem Soomro, Amrita Choudhury, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, Bibek Silwal, Maureen Hilyard, Abhishek Gautam, Ashirwad Tripathy, Nabeel Yasin, Priyatosh Jana. We have received apologies from Satish Babu, Cherie Lagakali, and Mohammad Kawsar Uddin. And from staff side we have Gisella Gruber and myself, Yesim Saglam and I will also be doing call management for today's call. Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you Cheryl and Justine. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Welcome to a small but hopefully keen group to do our next part of our review of the drafting, hopefully near final drafting, of the updating and rules of procedure for APRALO. We had a question that we needed to respond to, which for whatever reason isn't actually annotated in the agenda, which it really should be. Can we look at our AIs then? That may be where it's kept. Okay. Right. Okay, so for today, one of the several questions that we want to discuss is in this call we need to have a look at the definition of an individual member, which we'll be bumping to page nine for, and discussing the hopefully final advice as to whether or not a representative or leader of a certified At-Large structure or just a

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.

representative of a certified At-Large structure cannot become an individual member. The individual member recommendations from the unaffiliated individual member mobilization working group had it limited to a representative of a certified At-Large structure not being able to become an individual member in their own right. In our conversation today we'll look at whether or not that should be expanded to be a representative or leader of such a certified ALS. So we need to put that to bed. We also need to have a look at the definition of quorum, whether or not we keep it to our long-standing eight or some other number, and happy to fill in some background on the advantages and disadvantages of large or small quorums for you if you would like to do that. We also need to look on the, as it's written here, interplay of the terminology full member and member in good standing and discuss what the implications may be for us as we go on with some of our later rules. Have I missed anything in terms of what our additional discussion points need to be today before we just dot the i's, cross the t's and go through texts? Justine, does that sound like the plan as it was at the end of our last call?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yeah, I think we had three items mainly, which is the three items that's in the Als.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay, all right, let's jump straight into the one earliest on, which is in page nine. And that is of course, whoa, it's been going seven, eight and there we are, nine, where we are going to be discussing the aspect of

individual member and whether or not a person who is unable to become an individual member in their own right, note we're not saying affiliated or unaffiliated, just an individual member at this stage. If someone who is a representative, in other words, one of the voting or possible voting representatives for an At-Large structure or whether or not that embargo needs to expand to the leadership of that same structure or any other structure, that would be an At-Large structure either in the region or beyond the region, remembering that people can in fact be a member of At-Large structures which are not within our geographic region. Let's open a queue on that and see what the current thinking is. Come on people, you've got to have some opinions. Okay, Amrita's open. She can go either way. Both Justine and I left you at last week's call with the fascinating insight into the fact that we both believe just sticking to the, as it is written in the recommendations from the Mobilization Working Party, and that would be then just as long as you are not a representative, a named representative, that you could also hold an individual member status. So let's have a look at what [inaudible] saying. Not at all sure, I understand that seems to be something to do with credit-worthy mentioning. Yeah, I'm unsure what that means.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

It's just that, you know, whatever happens on this MOU wording or whatever is happening as ROP, it is fine as of now. In case some concern comes, I'm not likely to link the comments of our other learned colleagues in the committee. I would rather like to proceed in a manner that is best fitting. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, but we're not actually discussing MOU at all at this point. This is more the definition of individual member and the restriction that currently is recommended by the Mobilization Working Party, whose recommendations were all accepted by the At-Large Advisory Committee and the extended leadership. Now their recommendation was if you were a representative of an At-Large structure, in other words, you were in a position where you could cast a vote if it was called for, that you would be disqualified from being an individual member. Justine, and then I'll go to Maureen's comment.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, I was quiet because I was trying to look back into the UIM Working Party report. And I believe it actually says the opposite of what you mentioned earlier, Cheryl. I think if I heard it correctly. What was recommended in the Unaffiliated Individual Mobilization Working Party report is that for individual member acceptance, the criteria would be a whole bunch of things. And then it says a RALO individual member must not be a representative or a leader of an ALS. So the actual recommended position is that it should be a rep and leader, rep or leader. So it's not just the rep.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, regardless of what it says, I still think that's a fallback position that we should just agree with the Mobilization Working Party then. So unless anyone's got a very strong argument as to why it should differ from the Mobilization Working Party recommendation, is anyone

concerned if we just go with that? It seems that Amrita is in favor of doing what the Mobilization Working Party said. Maureen's pointed out that if you have a vote, you should not be an individual member, noting, of course, that individual members' voting rights are aggregated through a single representative in their own rights. So if anybody is concerned about sticking with the Mobilization Working Party as our baseline, let us know. If not, that's what we will be putting into the text. Right. One ticked off.

If we can move now to page 10 and if you can just refresh my memory on exactly where we are on our comments—

JUSTINE CHEW:

I believe it's [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. So here we needed to continue a quick conversation further from last week. On this, I didn't think it was a disagreement, but rather the need for a further discussion so that everyone understands that a member in good standing obviously has to comply with this whole list of things, including expected standards of behavior and that they have not in any way, shape or form been sanctioned or asked to leave a mailing list or pulled into line for perhaps inappropriate exchanges on a particular debate, whether that's face-to-face or otherwise. In other words, they are a particularly appropriate character, a character which one would see as a good ambassador if one was looking at that person as an example of what does it mean to be a good character in this region. It does, however, state next to "member in good standing" that

they need to be a full member of the region. Now here, a full member of the region means that they have been fully accepted. In other words, whatever criteria is required, they have met and that they have been administratively reviewed and accepted as a member of the region. That could mean that they are an At-Large structure member and that they are complying with the requirements or rules. In other words, whatever it may be, full payment, subsidy, being a member of a particular geographic or sub-geographic region, whatever it is. Whatever it is that means you are or are not a member of whatever the At-Large structure is, you have to obviously comply with those localized rules as well. If you are an individual member or a representative of an At-Large structure, there would be those additional expectations that, of course, you are also, in the case of a representative, carrying out your duties. So if, for example, your At-Large structure had not voted in the last three years because you had been unable to or unwilling to cast a vote, then that would probably indicate that you, and indeed your At-Large structure, are not fully functioning and that would be a question as to whether or not that would be in good standing. Have I missed any background on that, Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW:

I think the issue, if I may, was really what is the difference between a member in good standing and a full member. Because here it seems to imply that they are interchangeable, but when it comes to the definition of selection, it seems to diverge. So I think we just need clarity on what is it that we're trying to see when we say a member in good standing and what is it that we're trying to see when we say a full member.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And it's that aspect of being a full member being a requirement of being a member in good standing or maybe a full member or in some degree of application. So for example, with our leadership at the moment, the rule states you can be nominated even if you are not yet a full member of the RALO. So you could be transitioning from another part of ICANN, you could be most recently and about to retire or transitioning out from being a nominating committee appointee to the ALAC, for example. And if you were coming, you've been involved in your capacity as a NomCom appointee to the ALAC, you've been involved with the region, does that mean you are a full member? Well, that depends if you're going to refer to these other full members as having gone through that administrative approvals process or complying with the membership criteria of their At-Large structure, then there's that grey area for admittedly edge cases but often very important and very vital contributors who are coming from a slightly different pathway. And of course, if that's the case, one would perhaps see a situation where they could not step up to a leadership role until such times as they had served a particularly who knows how long process so that they were applied to and approved of as an individual member, unaffiliated or otherwise, or they were shown to be a member in good standing within an At-Large structure. And that could perhaps be to the detriment of getting talent to our particular jobs. So that's where we need to be very clear on what we define and how we define it, and it might only be a bit of wordsmithing required, but we do have in our rules that you can be at least for the role of chair currently and we are proposing for any leadership role that you do not have to be a full member but you do have to be a good character or in

good standing and you have to be a full member by the time you take the role on if you are appointed. So I could nominate Mary Smith who's coming back from the ALAC after six years. She's not an individual member. She's not an At-Large structure member but she's going to make the very best vice chair we've ever had. How does Mary Smith get that job or get nominated for that job if they are not already in inverted commas a full member? So that's the grey area we have to be quite clear on. I'm going to queue on this unless Justine wants to annotate further.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I'm wondering if people fully understood what you've just said. And perhaps to provide more context is if we scroll down to the bottom of page 13 where it talks about selection call, maybe to shed some light here, the intention is that, well, selection pertains to what we used to call as elections. So when we say nominations including self-nominations must be made by members in good standing at the time that they're made, and then it goes down to say nominees need not be full or member of the RALO at the time of nomination. So I think that's what's causing a little bit of thinking about what is it that we're talking about when we say members in good standing versus a full member or a member of the RALO for that reason or for that purpose. So just to clarify and perhaps if we need to, we can add to this text a little bit more to try and make sure that we are all on the same page when it comes to understanding what the intention is. And I would actually throw the question out to Maureen because she was the one who you know highlighted this thing to begin with. There was a little bit of a typo kind of thing but it eventually became a question of what do we mean

by we say when we say full member and what do we mean by member in good standing. So I would ask Maureen based on Cheryl's explanation, is it clear to you and do you think that we need to do something about the text?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thanks Justine. I think that because we use full member and member of good standing in in several sections I think there does actually need to be a clear definition of both so that when we're actually using it there is a you know that it's clear in everybody's mind what we're actually meaning. Especially for the newbies. People who are here in this discussion are going to totally understand it because we're actually giving it a good airing. But this section that we're actually working on at the moment, the texts that are used within our rules of procedure that people really do need to understand very clearly in order to like understand where we're coming from in regards to other areas anyway. So as I said before, I really think it's got to be especially those two definitions full member because they are two different categories, characteristics. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, so I think you mentioned something in the chat anyway, so you think that perhaps having a definition of member in good standing and a separate definition for full member and make sure that they're clear in terms of the text of the definition that might solve the problem?

MAUREEN HILYARD: From my perspective it would. But I'd be really keen to hear what people think. But yeah, in the chat as well. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: So what do other people think?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to add a little bit of color to some of our examples here, let's assume that my Mary Smith is not now a returning member from or a member of the ALAC who was a nominating committee appointee. This time my Mary Smith happens to be just a rank-and-file member of an At-Large structure but they are not a leader in the At-Large structure and they are not a representative of the At-Large structure. They are for all intents and purposes from an APRALO perspective unknown. How does Mary Smith, average but nevertheless exceptionally talented At-Large structure member, get a potential pathway to leadership or to be considered for leadership if we don't have these terms fully and carefully defined? So while you're thinking about what you want to have defined and how you want to have it defined, think about what we're trying to do is ensure minimal barriers but still a meritocracy. So anyone who has the potential and the capability of being appointed to something has barriers to be being considered and then the processes of the nominations and the reviews and the support and casting of votes if we don't get a consensus on who does what comes into play. But it means that we're not setting up artificial blocks, roadblocks for pathways to have emerging and discovered talent offered an opportunity to contribute.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, absolutely. Maureen points out that a full member doesn't consider talents and character. Member in good standing does. Absolutely. As does one's ability to promote one's skill sets and experience once one has got into such a process as a leadership. But we also want to make sure that if Mary Smith is put forward and someone decides they simply dislike all Smiths by definition and all Smiths by definition in their view, geopolitical, religious, socially or otherwise, should be wiped off the face of the earth and they start to interact on our lists with what many of us would declare as unfair, unseemingly and perhaps even highly inflammatory interchanges about all Smiths, that that is something that would mean we could bring the behavioral aspects, the in good standing aspects in and that anti-Smith would no longer be a member in good standing. So it's not just the people who are being seen as pathway nominees. It's also got to do with how we conduct ourselves around conversations, discussions, discourse and of course supporting of each other.

JUSTINE CHEW: So I'm not sure if anyone is opposed to what you're saying Cheryl. I think it's just a question of—And I could be wrong because no one's actually spoken up except for Maureen, right? So we have to make certain assumptions. So I think what Maureen suggested in terms of maybe us looking at having two separate definitions and being clear about those

two terms and then apply them accordingly to what we intend to based on your explanation earlier, I think that would solve the problem.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Oh, we need to pin that up. Okay, so that can be an action item. Good. Otherwise, what happens ladies and gentlemen is you know Maureen and I and Justine could pop off and write this and give it back to you and you can all go, yes, thank you very much and two-thirds of you won't ever read it and then in 10 years' time there could be a loophole that's exploited to the disadvantage of us all because we didn't have enough thought put into it or we didn't think it all through or we didn't see the risk. This is important that if you see a risk or a concern or the opportunity for confusion that you bring it up. You're our sanity check if nothing else.

JUSTINE CHEW: Absolutely. And once this is adopted by the correct forum, then all of you who have participated in this particular working group should be familiar enough with the APRALO rules of procedure to do sanity checks and to call out any wrongdoings whether intentional or not when we do certain things in running APRALO.

Okay, I think we can move on to the next item which is to do with quorum. Moving up to bottom page 12. Yep, this is Maureen's point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So at the moment it reads that at least four members of the leadership team must be present and that the quorum level is, it's quorate with

more than one-third of APRALO members present or eight of the eligible APRALO members present. The history on this is we had a higher quorum in our very, very first set of rules and we had enormous difficulty on the monthly calls going forward to get a standard of quorum that was reliable. When you have just something like a third of a number that's an expanding number, it can actually be difficult to get a quorum. So having a floor of eight was what the rules were changed to and the term eligible there meant is really where we will be talking about full members in relationship to At-Large structures. Now when this quorum rule was put together, we did not consider two things which you might want to consider now we have the opportunity to look at quorum. Do you wish to have some form of sub-regional geography considered in your quorum for certain types of meetings? I'm not suggesting that monthly meetings go under this, but your annual or general meetings may very well be better off if they have a guaranteed sub-regional geographic diversity and distribution looked into. That's not an unusual thing to have as part of a quorum requirement. You might also remember that early on, when these original rules were put together, we tried and were successful in ensuring at that stage that the leadership team was in itself a sub-geographically diverse group. So the choice of leadership team locale built in a diversity aspect. That is no longer part of the design, so you might want to consider whether your quorum for certain types of meetings need to have other than just raw numbers. You also need to consider that how we treat the voice of individual members, unaffiliated or otherwise, needs to be considered now for quorum because it would be perfectly reasonable if a quorum is only related to a rule number that we could have a quorum in a meeting where only three or four, well four by the look of it unless we change it,

of the leadership team are available and only unaffiliated or individual members were present because they're all members in their own right but when it comes to voting, they aggregate to a single vote. So how do you want to deal with that, with the difference between a quorum for an ordinary meeting and a special or general meeting? Have I missed anything?

JUSTINE CHEW:

No, I guess I suppose, to cite an example so that people can maybe visualize it a bit better would be, say, we have 10 members and let's leave aside the individual persons, we have 10 ALSes, well we have ALSes in 10 countries within the region. Do we want to say for example limit the quorum such that ALSes from eight of those 10 countries have to be present in order for a major meeting to be quorate? So that is the thing that we're asking whether that's a necessity or not. And it's really a safeguard. We don't want to have a meeting where it's controlled, in inverted commas, by ALSes from the same country and then they get to determine everything for everyone else. So it's that kind of safeguard that we're looking at asking whether there's a necessity for that.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

I think there are two three things here. If you look at the ALSes the way they are distributed, it is not equally distributed. There may be some countries for example India which has more ALSes. And that is not by design. It's just happened. Might be the population is higher. It's the second most populous country. Now when you're having a particular meeting for example and if you want to geographically divide it or have

representation, sometimes it may not be possible because say for example some region has an event happening or something and people cannot join. It's not that they do not want to participate but they are not there but then you don't get your quorum. So those are certain things. I think keeping it a bit more open may make sense rather than trying to be restrictive because we don't want capture by one region or one block but again most of it doesn't work even in blocks. Say for example you are looking at if you have some 50 ALSes and if we are dividing Asia-Pacific region into say the Middle Eastern part, the South Asia part, the ASEAN part and the Pacific islands, broadly the five places and then you are saying okay, three each from every place. Number-wise, the Pacific might may be less but they may not be there but the quorum will not come. So I think that's a challenge. So I would rather say keep it as a number as we have now because we've not had issues. This has not affected us. If something had affected us, we could have thought of changing. So that's where I am.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I guess the other question which we need to ask ourselves is the safeguard in the way things are written right now is the fact that you've got at least four members of the leadership team required and so using a representative model looking at the fact that your leadership team should have the trust of the region, and if they don't, they get ousted and you don't even have to wait for a new election cycle, you can just have them ousted. If you fail to perform in any role, be it the chair or a liaison or even a representative, you can be recalled. Any remedial help given to you if you simply don't understand what the role is or how to do the role, and failing that remediation working, you are ousted. You

can be asked to be sensible and withdraw or retire, but you can certainly be you know dismissed as well. And that now is something that can go through ICANN wide, right through to appointments to the Board, and that's only since 2016. So when these rules were written, that was not even on the horizon. So if you have trust in your leadership team and if four of your leadership team are part of the floor, the lowest amount of presence and diversity that you can expect in a meeting for it to be quorate, is that a good enough safety net? Maureen's noted that NARALO lists the ALSes and the participants that attend. We just take the role by name. We don't say Cheryl Langdon-Orr, representative number one of Internet Australia. So if Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Holly Raiche are both there, that's representative number one and fallback representative number two that really is just one ALS presented even though two active people are in the meeting. Do we want to associate more information with our attendance as well? That's another option.

JUSTINE CHEW:

So if you go back and have a look at the definition of APRALO member, that refers to ALSes as well as individual members. So that's why we've become you know becomes a little bit tricky. So when we're counting quorum, looking at the different classes of memberships, you're counting quorum, because of ALS, we count the ALS, not the reps representing the ALSes. So it's not the people, it's the ALS itself. And then with the unaffiliated individual members, it's the person. So then you add that on. But now when you add the complication of individual members, I'm not quite sure how that would work. But the point being

that minimum is eight out of the entire APRALO membership, which is quite low if you consider how large the membership actually is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] and we've got to stop just looking at names as we go forward. We need to look more carefully at not just the names but the At-Large structures that are representative.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. The other thing also is it's only really important to be quorate if you're taking decisions on certain things. So like for example, our monthly meetings, we don't normally take decisions on anything so there is no necessity for us to declare quorum or anything like that. It's mainly the like I said the big meetings where we're discussing issues of major concern that we need to take a decision on. Then that's important for transparency and governance purposes to make sure that the meeting has quorum before you take a decision.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that's where sometimes geography also needs to come into play.

JUSTINE CHEW: Correct. So what do people think that we should do about this? Leave as it is? Do we want to add additional criteria for quorum? Do we want to specify what meetings quorum is needed for?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If we're going to be free-flowing and in keeping with engagement of that—remember what the ALS mobilization recommendations say, and those recommendations want us to be working more and more with the individual members within the ALSes. But this is the other reason why quorums and when quorums come into play for what particular sorts of meetings, it would be wise to clarify that and have that written and accepted so that we don't find confusion at a future point in time where we might have a very active At-Large structure where 20 or 30 people are playing a very major role in all sorts of bits of policy. They're definitely fully engaged, members in good standing, amazing talent, but we need to make sure that it is just the At-Large structure if we're looking at quorum for some decision making, not the 20 or 30 people. So there might be a real need to see the difference between average day-to-day activity and caring and sharing type monthly meetings and the occasions when a call for decision making is made. Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Cheryl, I agree that if there is a special meeting where decisions have to be taken, perhaps we need to have the number of ALSes and the representative individual member, some kind of a criteria because there you need the representative individual member which is one at this point of time and certain number of ALSes. If you want a geographical overview for the decision making or something that could come in, but for decision making, I think the ALS primary or secondary needs to be there as well as one of them and some particular numbers for decision making. But generally I think that eight and general leadership is fine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, for example, what I've literally just done to my Zoom name, which is put myself, Cheryl Langdon-Orr-IA, Internet Australia, primary rep. That should be a roll callable name. And then if I've got Polly and 15 other members of Internet Australia on a call, if for whatever reason we need to have quorum, if I'm not there, then the secondary rep can fit in. If it's not a requirement to vote, but simply opinion, then it could be whomever is identified for the purpose of that meeting as representing the ALS's views. That's okay. If I get it wrong, it's up to the ALS to, you know, hang draw and quarter them later. But I think we need to be much more careful about how we therefore record our presence and apologies and who we are in meeting, if that makes sense. And that can be written in as well.

JUSTINE CHEW: Absolutely. I think it's always good practice to, whenever you have a meeting, to determine whether you have quorum or not, whether you need it or not is something else. But it's a good practice. But it's a good practice to actually have a roll call and find out whether you do have quorum. And I think what Amrita suggested might actually work. Like we could look at, and this is just talking off the top of my head, right? We could look at saying that, you know, whenever a decision needs to be taken, then quorum has to be established, right? And quorum can be satisfied with the presence of at least four leadership team members and one third or eight of the eligible ALSes, certified ALSes and the IM rep, the individual members rep. So we limit to the certified ALS and the one IM person that that matters.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

In which case, we need to do two things if we can agree on that. And I certainly support that way going forward, Justine. We need to make sure that we also add to decision-making process that step one needs to be the establishment of a quorum. That needs to be a requirement for a decision-making process. And it's not a difficult thing, but if it's not written, then it's possible to skip. And we don't want to skip it. And the other thing is the ALAC rules of procedure allow for if a meeting has lost quorum or if a decision needs to be made and quorum isn't present, for a switch between a current convened meeting, in other words, a Zoom call or a face-to-face meeting, however a meeting is convened, to have a carryover on a decision-making process into an online situation. So you could call for a motion, you could call for discussion, you could put forward a call for a vote, but the vote isn't completed in the non-quorate fora. It can be completed, for example, with an online voting platform up to, and I think I'm correct that the ALAC rules give it, I think, up to something like 72 hours after that particular issue. The aspect there is occasionally you're quorate at the beginning of a process, and for whatever reason, somebody has had to leave or is called away, and you'll no longer quorate when the vote is called. So you can start the call for a vote for a decision to be made, but you can go, oops, hang on, we don't have, let's assume, the full geographic distribution if that report is required. And if that is the case, then we have 72 hours for that to be fixed by going into an out-of-forum and onto online process. That would be a new aspect of decision-making that isn't even in these rules. Maureen, any of these new definitions will need to not only be given a second thought and read through by all of us, but when they become a red line, then yes, before anything gets further than our sub-team here, it does need to go out for a comment and a review in both a pure form

and a red line form so people can see what new definitions have been added in. And part of the way forward that Justine is using in this particular document where you've got the left-hand column and the right-hand column is to allow for ease of seeing where it is new definitions. On review, the rest of the region really only needs to look down the right-hand column and see what is different. It doesn't matter that much when the differences came in rather than that the differences are captured in the right-hand column.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I don't know about APRALO list, but I think we are working as a small team. So I think the full product of the small team will go to the full APRALO for discussion, really, but not what we're doing right now from a day-to-day basis, a week-to-week basis. That is retained within this particular working group. Otherwise, it gets out of control.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I notice Gopal refers to Roberts Rules. Roberts Rules, in fact, are mentioned within the Rules of Procedure and are referenced because they are a fallback position for advice and recommended processes where we do not have a specific APRALO, ALAC or ICANN rule. So if in doubt, if there isn't something in our rules, then Roberts Rules are, of course, quite globally, albeit originally US-based, I think anything in something like 27 languages is probably fairly accessible globally and it is simply a good set of guidelines and far less cumbersome than the only competing set of more globally or universally accepted rules, and that is

the UN ones. If anybody's ever worked with the UNGA rules, they will know what an absolute joy they are not to deal with.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, so are we good to move on? Do we have enough input?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So we do need to decide whether or not we need to put into when quorum is required. I think that's not clear enough. There's a bit of a rewrite when a decision needs to be made.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, but no one else seems to be telling us what they think about which way to go. So I'm kind of inclined to come up with something and then have people have a look at it and then see which way to go. All right, then I think that that covers our action items from last week. We can carry on from there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's a huge amount of time. Anyway, can we get into selection call? I think we've pre-empted that to some extent.

JUSTINE CHEW: Oh, the other thing about selection call, I think the point that Amrita brought up was criteria for candidates in short term, so we haven't come to that yet but I suggested that we look at that again when we come to another section, I can't remember which section, where it talks

actually about those positions itself. And also perhaps one thing to consider is to have an adjunct document. I don't know whether it should be an adjunct document or just a separate appendix to list down the criteria that we come up with rather than put everything into the rules of procedure. Then it's easier to change it, amend it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah, I think my personal preference is to have a set of core things in the rules and things that are beyond that in an adjunct because it is easier to change those. But just in case everyone isn't as advanced ahead, although we did have a quick look through all of the documents in our general assembly, the service section goes into what the expectations are of all sorts of roles, right down to liaisons and appointments in far greater detail. They are still high-level expectations and criteria. It's perfectly reasonable that quite specific expectations and criteria may from time to time be set for particular roles. And if that's the case, then what we're suggesting is they belong in an adjunct document, not in the rules themselves. So when we get to that part of our rules, they will refer to and as outlined in adjunct documents as listed. And then it's those adjunct documents that you get to play with more easily. Does that make sense?

JUSTINE CHEW:

So that being the case, unless someone's jumping up and down and vehemently objecting, I guess we are good to continue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think we are. But the next section is very much, even though there are a few additional add-ins in terms of text in the definitions, they really are just tidying up. I don't believe there's anything else contentious in there. Is there or no?

JUSTINE CHEW: No, not really. I mean, I did a round of cleanup yesterday and based on the comment that Maureen provided to redefine, sorry, to re-term chair to become APRALO chair. So then I had to move the order up in order to be alphabetically correct. And then wherever chair appears in the document, I just add APRALO chair to be consistent. So those are just cosmetic changes, really. I don't think anyone would be objectionable to that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In which case, we'll have a quick preview of the next bit.

JUSTINE CHEW: So are we moving on to... So we pretty much covered the defined terms, right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's right, yep.

JUSTINE CHEW: And then so we're moving on to page 17, is that right? 17 is where the paragraph three starts. Okay. So we don't see, I don't see any comments on page 17. That's all clear. Page 18 is all clear.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just so everybody knows, at the moment, 3.3.2, it says, and accepted as individual member by the APLT. Just make sure everyone is happy with giving that power to the leadership team. I am happy with that, but everyone else needs to be. I am aware of other regions, for example, which would have apoplecture if one gave that much power to their leadership team and didn't have some other form of quadruple cross-checking ad nauseam discussion. Sorry, my biases are clearly showing when I make comments like that, but you know, it's almost designed to fail. I personally think if you can't trust your leadership team, you oust them. But let's make sure everybody's happy with that.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, I mean, the other thing is applications for UIM memberships are actually approved by leadership team, right? So there's no reason why the same can't happen for affiliated individual members. And sorry, I just did another cosmetic change just for everyone's benefit, is whenever Asian, Australasian and Pacific Island appears in document, I'm just going to shorten it to become AP, because we have a definition for AP. And that's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep. It can loop back. Well, that's in the new terms. Yes. The old ones were cumbersome. I'd appreciate that tidiness. Thank you. All right. Scrolling down. Keep going. I think we're pretty clear on the next page. And the next. And the next. Oh, look at that. Zooming along. Keep going. Keep going.

JUSTINE CHEW: [inaudible] is really cosmetic. It's really grammar correction, right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Keep going.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Maybe 23 deserves a comment. Okay. So 5.5.3, instead of APRALO activities, I'm proposing that we use the word such functions, because it talks about functions, administrative functions in the earlier part of the sentence. So just to be consistent, so rather than have functions here and then activities, you know, at the end of sentence, just keep it consistent to the to function. And it means the same thing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

JUSTINE CHEW: And 5.5.4.2. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to be clear and where the number of successful nominations exceeds the roles to be appointed, then a vote shall be held. So we don't have to have a vote if only the number of places are filled. There are some places that insist on having a vote regardless.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So any issues with that? Please folks, if you have issues, just stick your hand up or put something in the chat. Otherwise, we're going to assume that everything's okay and we can.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: I think the secretariat part is fine, it's just that if that is not happening, what we move them out. As in that's a different question, but it's not for here, but.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, remember, we've got the overriding principle that we work by consensus wherever possible. And so really that is in keeping with working by consensus wherever possible that of course, if you've only got X number of nominations and X number of roles, unless that X exceeds that number of roles, then you don't need to have a vote.

JUSTINE CHEW: That's the intention behind the clarity, increased clarity. Okay. Maureen seems to agree. I think she says just gives more clarity. So I don't see any objections. Okay, so moving on to page 24, part 5.4.3. This is where we come to the elections. And I have a question for you, Cheryl. Do we

still maintain the word elections or are we porting over to selection altogether?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My personal preference is always selection because selection includes things like appointments and what we have previously indicated, nominations filling roles without a ballot being held.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, so with appointments, there is no voting process. Would there be?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There may be if the number of nominees exceeds the number of appointment opportunities. That would be up to the process put in place. You could take it that way, but we don't have to.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, this section refers to APRALO roles. Okay, we can have a look at that to see whether we need to replace the elections with selection. It's just really adding an extra...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And to be very clear to everybody, selection is a higher order than election. And election is a method of selection. But if you state election, you are usually expecting a ballot. And that's where some people get into the argument of even if you've got three positions and you only get

two nominations, that you still have to vote for two nominations because you've got to have the right to go yay or nay or abstain regardless. And that forces an election, which is something in the previous section we've said we don't need to do. So I'm always for selection as opposed to election.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, so Maureen's asking whether we need a definition of selection and election.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, this should be the definition. If we don't use the word election and we only use the word selection, and if we have a part that says when the number of nominees exceeds, as it was before, the number of roles, an election is held. You could also say a ballot is held because a ballot is simply a form of election. Then that kind of does that tidying up, I would have thought.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, so because 5.5.4.3 refers to voting, I'm still wondering whether we need to keep it as election or make it selection. Notwithstanding that point, the amendment actually refers to the fact that we should give one vote to the IM representative, which actually currently happens anyway for election purposes. That person has a vote, it's just not written in for some reason. So that is the substantive amendment that we're proposing in the 5.5.4.3.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: When you're looking at the wording there, Justine, and I'm just loading this with you now, I apologize for that. There might be a few places such as 5.5.4.3 where the word election could be reasonably swapped out for the term ballot because then a ballot is a very specific part of an electoral process. That might make some sense as well.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, all right, we can have a look at that. So following on from 5.5.4.3, 5.5.4.4 basically just says that each ALS will have a vote, one vote, and then the IM representatives will exercise one vote collectively for all the UIMs, and only the UIMs, not the IMs. Because the IMs fall under the ALSes anyway, so it'll be double-dipping, really.

And then 5.5.4.5 basically allows for the UIMs to be part of that process instead of just ALSes. So now we're trying to introduce all this updating that whenever you have an ALS, then you also need to consider whether it's ALS and IMs or ALS and UIMs in order to not neglect the UIM. Because as Cheryl said, we're moving towards more individual engagement, so it's important not to forget about the UIMs. And then that's pretty much it for page 24.

Okay, so 5.5.6 talks about—This is something that we probably should ask folks here, right? So there's a proposition to make the IM representative a key member of the APLT, the AP Leadership Team, but at the discretion and the sole discretion of the APRALO Chair. Are folks comfortable with this or uncomfortable with this? Because the whole idea is that we're trying to give more prominence as well as responsibility to the IM rep to support all the UIMs mostly in all the

leadership teams doing in terms of like, we have been focusing on the ALSes and not so much on the UIMs. So we need to bring that up to be a bit more balanced. So that's where the IM rep comes into play. And if they are expected to do similar things to leadership team members anyway, then there's no real reason why they shouldn't be included in the leadership team. Then they'll get information, they'll get to discuss stuff, they have to raise stuff with the leadership team. But I'm keeping an open door to say that it is at the discretion of the APRALO Chair, whether the chair decides whether the IM rep should be a leadership team member or not.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I like it. I think it's a forward way of ensuring more obvious recognition and pathways to better engagement.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, cool. So I'm not seeing any objections to it. So 5.6 is very similar to what we discussed under selection in the definition section. So I don't think we need to go through it again. I think it's basically the same thing. And that's the end of paragraph five.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's five done, yay. Okay, in which case we can look towards six, which does bring us into a slightly more detailed area at our next call.

YESIM SAGLAM: Just checking right now. Yes, it is available. So it would be next Tuesday, 5th of December at 5:00 UTC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. All right, ladies and gentlemen. Well, thank you one and all. And put comments in.

JUSTINE CHEW: Especially if you think you can't make the call, then it'll be useful to at least put your comments in so that we know where you stand on certain things.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely. Thank you, everybody. Okay, bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]