
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, 19th of December 2023 at 5:00 UTC.

On our call today, we have Justine Chew, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Amrita Choudhury, Satish Babu, Priyatosh Jana, Cherie Lagakali.

We have received apologies from Ali AIMeshal.

And from staff side, myself, Yesim Saglam, will be on call management for today's call.

And before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes, please.

And with this I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Justine. Thank you very much.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Yesim. Welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good night, wherever you may be. Or good evening, if you think.

So, we're starting just a little bit late because we're just working out some ... Pardon my voice. I'm sucking on a lolly but I'll try to get it out of my mouth. So, we're just going to go through some while waiting for few more others to join the call. We're just going to go through, for the benefit of some of you folks who weren't at the call last week. We'll just go through some of the action items from last week. Yesim, can you go over to the email? 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.

So, I tried to just provide summaries of what we discussed last week and also the action items that were recorded for last week and this week's call I guess.

So, in terms of, if you see the first few bullets, Satish had expressed some concern about [inaudible] to warn APRALO members at APRALO meetings. So we were focusing, things like quorum and voting, [inaudible] of APRALO members. And when we say APRALO members, we're talking about ALSes or individual members who are potentially registered or accredited or—what's the word? Accepted by whether it's ALAC or APRALO leadership team.

But we do recognize the fact that there are other people who also attend our very public, for example monthly meeting calls, who aren't necessarily categorized as APRALO members so they're kind of in the observer category, per se—some kind of observer status.

Satish seemed to have a concern about the fact that we aren't concentrating or there's no mention of that category of folks. So he was supposed to propose a solution that would address his concern. I haven't seen it, so maybe Satish wants to talk to it.

But in the meantime, just let me get through the rest of it. In the meantime, I was tasked to redraft section 13 APRALO meetings to reflect the two or the three levels of quorum that we discussed and agreed on that applies to the five types of meetings. And in association with that, also section 15 quorum, we discussed the thresholds for quorum for each of the [inaudible] of the meetings and it was pretty much unanimous, I think if my memory serves me correctly from last

week. So we didn't have a problem with updating, so I've updated those sections accordingly in the main Google doc. So please feel free to have a look at it and confirm that we've got it right.

Also, proxy, section 22. We discussed that last week as well. Again, we didn't have any objections to what was proposed, and in fact we have now shared the draft [AP][inaudible] document 08. That is the APRALO standard proxy form. I included that as a PDF because I realize that some people may not have access to the Google docs. So I pulled down the PDF in chat and I've not seen any comments to that per se.

Also the last one was that we agreed to expand the definition of member in good standing a little bit to include a reference to behavior outside of ICANN sphere in order to establish whether the member is in good standing or not. I don't believe there was any objections to that either. So those are all done. Satish, would you want to address very quickly the first bullet point there.

SATISH BABU: Yeah. So I have not done this. I didn't ... Other than [inaudible] document, the qualifications for the—

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, the [inaudible].

SATISH BABU: Yeah. What they wanted to say here was that the core of APRALO we have a legalistic organization but the interest of APRALO is [inaudible]

community. [inaudible] community and the community definition actually goes beyond the legalistic organization which we are talking about in the bylaws. The legal part should be there, must be there because that provides the foundation for it. But I felt that, like for example, we have a bunch of people on the list which are not members as we formally define. We have [inaudible] organizations in [inaudible]. We have multiple entities that we work with, organizations that we work with. We [inaudible] community.

Now I'm not sure at this point about what [inaudible] formal position that we can call to these organizations [inaudible]. But they do form a part of our community. So perhaps we could mention something in our bylaws that we have a community beyond members that is ALSes and [inaudible] members that form the larger organization. Otherwise we'd be missing out the real APRALO in the current form that we have.

So I just wanted to mention it. I'm still not sure how we can express that because the bylaws finally are a bunch of more legal kind of things. So we can't get a random [inaudible], rather that is a gap that I think. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. Cheryl, you want to respond?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I do. Thank you very much. Sorry. [inaudible] Satisfy exactly what you're saying and I understand [inaudible]. The original rules of procedures calls dealt with non-member status by ensuring that it was written in

that in the time prior to being a fully accredited member, however that accreditation is managed, that one has observer status in the email list and meetings and if we've lost that we can certainly resuscitate that but there's also a good place for that. I think there are probably two good places for that.

The first one is the specificity of interactions with non-member in activities that are not bound by these procedures and these are the far more formal parts of what we do is what's bound by these procedures as you've rightly noted. We could ensure that the adjuncts that refer to things to do with email lists, for example, mention the observer status. When we dig into some of the "classifications" of membership, something that has happened in other RALOs and certainly could happen in ours is you have a more dormant At-Large structure and this is something that in the future may occur when we get those annual and biannual bits of feedback on activity we may find an At-Large structure—an accredited At-Large structure—which is relatively dormant, that dormant entity or individual could be moved into an observer status as well. So it's a useful thing to have and have to find even in the rules, but the other place that we could perhaps note what you're talking about is in a preamble which defines the At-Large community within our region fairly broadly and then specifies these rules, the procedural requirements for the formalized activities of blah-blah-blah-blah-blah. So I'm sure we could come up with something clever as the preamble or cover piece.

So maybe between [inaudible] and putting something up [inaudible] we can probably pick-up that potentially dropped thread. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Cheryl. Yeah. We did talk about potentially cleaning up the mail list and having ... I mean, I proposed the possibility of having two different mail lists, one for [inaudible] and one for specifically APRALO members by which we would conduct proper RALO business through. It's up for discussion. We didn't settle on anything but noted on that per se.

So I will mark an action item for Cheryl to do what she just mentioned earlier, noting also that when—and I was looking back at the ALS Mobilization Working Party report. When a member first applies or an ALS potential applies to be a member, I believe there is a provision for them to be a provisional member before they become a full member so we could look at things like that as well. So we can explore things [like that].

Anyone else wants to comment on this particular issue? Yes, Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURDY: Justine, I agree that having an overarching thing that there may be different people that may be joining in. Now, if you're looking at this going to join member, whoever is a potential can always join and then they become a member. But we don't have not necessarily someone who is on the mailing list will become your member. They may be a member of an ALS or something. So I think having an acknowledgement that we have ALSes and we may have community members as [inaudible] is fine because there are, as Cheryl mentioned, observers of various kinds. So that's it. When someone wants to become a member,

they will become a member. We don't even have to say potential members of anything on that.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. Is there any objections to the approach that we're going to take to try to provide for non-members as well in a general sense on the preamble that perhaps is the APRALO community as a hodgepodge of folks?

Okay, so no objections.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Since we are inclusive, we encourage everyone to come and participate, but then we have our members and our individual members.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yeah. Okay. Noting [inaudible], notice or disclaimer differentiating—I believe that covers what we discussed earlier. Okay.

So, moving on to the action of staff, which is to do with the two adjunct documents that were circulated together with the action item list from last week. The first one is the Adjunct 08 which is the standard proxy form. I don't believe there's any controversy around that, and as I said, I haven't seen any comments but it also could be that people either haven't looked at it or haven't had access to the Google doc to comment about it.

But if you look at the PDF that was circulated by email you have a copy of what's written up in the Google doc anyway. Satish, yes, go ahead, please.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Justine. I just got the proxy form this morning because of [inaudible] but it looks okay. The only comment that I have is about the proxy [holder] who must be a member in good standing or a full member. This member in good standing here isn't a self-proclaimed or self-declared status or is there a formal definition as to who are the current members in good standing in APRALO?

JUSTINE CHEW:

There is a definition of member in good standing in the section one I would say or two under the terms, the definition of terms. It's a question and I believe we discussed this a little bit last week as well. So, we try to be inclusive as possible and obviously we don't know what we don't know. But if we know someone can be arguably a member not in good standing, then we can at least do something about limiting their involvement somehow rather.

So, I'd like to hear some input from others about this approach of whether we limit proxy holders to just APRALO members or not. Yes, Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

If, for example, it is an ALS and the primary cannot make it and from the ALS they are allowing someone to vote on their behalf or a member

from another ALS who may not be a primary or a secondary representative of that ALS, I certainly think it is fine. Even if it is someone external, if they are attending the meeting and voting, since a proxy can only hold one vote apart from their own vote, it may not be [inaudible] to have someone [on]. So because we are restricting the number of proxies a person can have.

So, I don't know. I don't foresee any challenges, but if you feel that ... I'm open to it. But I may be missing something if it's an external thing. But I don't see that concern because we are limiting it to one.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yeah. So, last week I think I raised the same question and I think we sort of landed on the conclusion that it should be open to either APRALO members or anyone [inaudible] as a member in good standing. And that's how it's written up in the section on proxies. I think it's ... I can't remember whether it's 22 or 15 or whatever. And it's the same with the standard proxy form in adjunct 08.

So, the question I believe that Satish is asking is how would we determine whether someone is a member in good standing or not and therefore may qualify or not qualify to be a proxy holder.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Okay. So, [inaudible] that there are no issues, controversies, there are no cases of investigations, there have been no concerns raised about that. But some kind of [lines]. I think there is somewhere else we mentioned member in good standing, right?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. There's a definition for member in good standing.

AMRITA CHOUDURY: We have a definition, we follow that here also.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Cherie?

CHERIE LAGAKALI: Sorry. Maybe because I'm joining the discussions late, I'm just wondering if we're missing, like Satish was asking how do we measure a member in good standing? Maybe we need something like an active and participating member who has attended this many number of meetings or something like that as like a minimum criteria, because I think we're going from ... I mean, in the Pacific, there are like ALS ... We will probably first go to pick [inaudible] and then we just have probably 300-500 of them of Pacific people who could join into any of these ICANN discussions. But then when members of the [inaudible] Board, as an example, want to join it's only the [inaudible] Board people who would get the voting rights, if that makes any sense.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Sure. Number one, Justine, if you could go to the Google doc and go to the top of the document and find the definition for member in

good standing, it's probably page six or something like that. Please go and find it.

In the meantime, just in response to Cherie's point, if you as an ALS want to exercise your vote but your primary and your secondary person can't attend a meeting, for example, for whatever reason, there is nothing stopping you from giving your, proxying your vote to anyone you trust. So that's not a question of how we ... APRALO doesn't tell you what you want to do with your vote. We're just providing a mechanism for you to delegate to someone else if you cannot exercise it yourself.

Just keep going until you hit end, Yesim. Just keep scrolling. It's ordered by [inaudible], so just keeping going until you get to M.

In the meantime, Satish, you have a point.

SATISH BABU:

Yeah. So, first of all, I was listening to what Cheryl was saying. The level of activity of a member is actually quite a useful metric for elections. So you look at what I've added on in the APRALO chair, etc., we need a kind of metric for activity. Someone who has not participated in any meeting cannot come in and directly stand for election for a responsible position. That's one.

Okay. But my original point was not related to the definition. The definition exists and we have covered that already in the last meeting. The point is when do we apply this—who applies this? That's what I'm asking. [inaudible] that I am a member in good standing because the proxy form comes up and at that point we have to decide whether this

guy—or a person, male or female—is a member in good standing. And who does that or is there a member in good standing [proxy]? I was just kind of joking about it. But the point is not that the definition exists, but how and when and who applies the definition.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes. Okay. So let's leave [inaudible] candidate criteria because that's something down the agenda a little bit further. So we're just talking about member in good standing. So, for Cherie's benefit, this is the definition of member in good standing. So we do allude to metrics in some form. So as you can see, part C refers to demonstration of minimum standard engagement kind of thing.

Now, in terms of ... And we're still talking about proxy holders, right? And this is something that I'm just putting out there and feel free to provide input on this. When the form goes in, it goes in to the chair so it needs to be sent to the chair and copied to staff. And then as you see the bottom of the proxy form itself, there is some kind of checking by staff done as to the eligibility. So the question is who gets to decide whether the person is actually a member in good standing or not? I don't have an answer right now. I would love to have suggestion if you think there is something that we really, really need to get into.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To some extent, this is a useful tool that is to be deployed usually by the chair or sometimes in a [count back] situation if there's been a claim of some untoward or unfair treatment or activity, an ombuds perhaps could come in and ask for certain information and dig back into the status or otherwise as a proxy holder.

It's one of those things a bit like art. You know what they're like when you see it. You tend to what is not a good member in good standing is when you hear them.

For example, if the chair was to make a declaration mid-meeting of unacceptable behavior and conduct unbecoming, that's an immediate default to that person is, at this point in time, easily classifiable as not a member in good standing and any proxy they hold would be null and void.

So, it's more a react on complaints and issues than it is an incredibly difficult and highly demanding analysis up front. So it's more of an [empowerment] than anything else.

But what I do want you to do is try and keep this as strong as it needs to be but as light a touch as possible, because if you get into too much detail, too great ... Convoluted and highly complicated is another word. I can't think of it right now—details, you are going to tie yourself up in knots and, in many cases, open yourself up for a challenge or for a loophole to be discovered.

So, a light touch is required and you've got to keep it so that it fits the purpose. But it's one of those things that even holding one extra vote means you could have two times in a meeting to make a disruptive

intervention or trigger a particularly unpalatable, if not outcome at least discussion, and it's the ability to avoid those sorts of things if this is the very useful thing to do. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Cheryl. So I want to remind folks also that to what extent do we need to provide for such detail, bearing in mind, number one, we already said things like you can only hold one proxy, so your influence is limited to two votes, if at all.

Number two is ballots by way of electronic voting is ... Proxies are not available for that because it makes no sense. So in terms of elections, which is done by electronic ballot, it doesn't count. There is no proxy so the question wouldn't arise anyway. So we're really talking about any kind of motion that is put for what in a meeting, whether it's verbal or whether it's by notice or whatever. So it's that kind of thing.

Do we want to tie ourselves in knots, as Cheryl says, to [inaudible] potentially edge cases? Do we also have this mechanism by way of the proxy form that there is some control of it. So, what Cheryl suggests, the chair could exercise some discussion to check on the eligibility of the person that claims to be a proxy holder or has been good enough to be a proxy holder?

If something untoward should happen then maybe it's something that we have to take up at another point in time. But do we really, really need to go down that rabbit hole at this point in time? That's the question that I have. Satisfy?

SATISH BABU: Yeah. Thanks, Justine. We don't want to get into splitting hairs. I would agree with Cheryl that [inaudible] approach. Generally, personally I am a bit kind of—what shall I say? Cautious [inaudible] particularly around different organizations. I think that that's avoidable.

But in our case, I see that ultimately when it comes to anything structural [inaudible], we have a fairly clearcut process for that and none of these things that we're talking about by way of proxy. Incidentally I've never seen proxies being used in the [inaudible] context. So I am personally overthinking this probably. So I think this is fine. Let's go ahead. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thank you for that. Anyone else have last say or can we consider the matter settled? Going once, going twice. Done. Okay. Settled.

So, moving back to agenda. What else do we have to deal with? Okay. So we have to deal now with Adjunct Document. Yesim, can you move back to ... Yeah, okay. So, what do we have now?

So, it's now back to Adjunct 06 which is the criteria for candidates. I'm wondering whether we should skip this over for now and just deal with Section 27 because that might be lower-hanging fruit so to speak and I'm hoping that people would have read 27 because that was the action item for everyone to do last week. And if we don't have anymore substantive comments to get through for 27, then we could consider that done and come back to Adjunct Document 06. Yesim, sorry, do you

mind just going back to the Google doc and then just find section 27 and do a quick scroll of any comments that were made? Then we can just have a look. Okay, great. This is a bit too [inaudible] so I'm going to look at my own copy.

So, just keep scrolling until you see a substantive comment and Cheryl perhaps can help guide while I pull up the document on my screen.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's it. In the red zone now, 27.5

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Okay. So one of the action items that was given to me a couple weeks ago was to try and establish whether there's a need to [inaudible] 27.4 to look to the criteria for ALSes, like the way we've done for 27.5 individual members.

I haven't gotten around to that exactly but I don't think it's a big issue to leave 27.4 as it is. There was a discussion about whether we want to move certain of the criteria under 27.5 individual members to an adjunct document. So I wonder if anyone had further comments on that.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Sorry, Justine, could you repeat again? Something came up and I didn't hear you. Sorry.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sure, no worries. So what I said was, at a prior meeting, about maybe three weeks ago, something to that effect, there was a mention—and by me I believe it was—as to whether we need to make 27.4 which relates to ALSes a bit more consistent with 27.5, which relates to individual members because 27.5 lists down a whole bunch of criteria and so forth, so it’s actually more substantial than what we have for 27.4 ALSes.

And most of this content in 27.5 is gone from the UIM, the Unaffiliated Individual Members Mobilization Working Party report. Because there was a substantial change because we’re introducing individual members as opposed to just keeping UIMs, unaffiliated ones.

So the question then is do we take the same approach and see what’s in the ALS Mobilization Working Party document and pulling out whatever is relevant from there and plunking it into 27.4 so that there is a consistent treatment between 27.4 and 27.5? That is the question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I’m all for that. I think that makes perfect sense. It allows us still to slim down 27.5 and be cautious with what we’ve got in to 27.4, leaving the more detailed criteria and options in both the mobilization reports, the ALS and the UIM to be in the realm of adjunct documentary but still keep similar and consistent high-level [calls] within the rules of procedure. That way, when we, for example, at some future point in time may wish to specify or alter a metric or change a certain rubric, that can be done at the adjunct document level and we don’t need to

fiddle with the main rules. I'm happy to give you a hand with that Justine, thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Great. Thank you very much. Does anyone object to what Cheryl has proposed? I see Amrita says makes sense and Satish says good to be consistent. So I think unless anyone has major objections about that, we'll go with that approach. I'm happy to work with Cheryl to reject 27.4 and 27.5 and the idea is to move things that we think is movable and put them into an adjunct document, probably two separate adjunct documents, one for ALS and one for [inaudible]. Okay, great. So that's going to be another action item, 27.4, 27.5. Cool.

So then should we go through Section D and see if there's any comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It should be a quick run-through Justine? There's not a lot of any concerns under our belt and it means we can do [inaudible] break.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yep, exactly. So I'm asking if we can just go through Section D to see if there's any substantive comment. And if I'm scrolling down, if someone has put in a comment and they want to discuss it, please put up your hand and raise it. Otherwise, I'm going to assume that it's just grammatical or a typo correction kind of things or things that we can address by way of adjunct or fix.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Did we go through D at all? [inaudible]. Okay, so Amrita's question on criteria to be added hasn't been dealt with and on this page.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry. We are up to page 89.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 89, yeah. Can some criteria be added, for example, [inaudible]. Okay. So, replacement process. Okay. In the context of not just the [inaudible] can apply for any leadership position, so we said before that. There is provision for removal of people, for whatever reason. It's already provided somewhere. I can have a look and find it and come back to you on that.

I don't think we need to have a specific process or just the [IM] rep and I'm pretty sure Amrita's not asking specifically in that context anyway.

I had a mention here that the requested process is more or less initiated through [inaudible] 33, the rationale for recall is what we need to work on. Then I mentioned that we now started Adjunct 08 criteria for candidates 06 or whatever it is.

In terms of when you want to remove someone, you need to have a reason for doing so. So it's more seen in the context of the person is not performing. So that means we need to have some criteria by which to judge that person before we can initiate a removal.

If we go to paragraph 33, which is on page 93 onwards. So then in this context, I'd like people to consider whether this process is sufficient to deal with the potential removal of someone, leaving the criteria by which we judge that person [inaudible]. Satish, your hand is up.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Justine. I thought 33 was for the removal of leadership team members, not just members of individual members. So what I wanted to say was in 33, follow the certain system for removing deadwood. Basically once a year they send out a mail and you're expected to respond to that mail and thereby ensure that you continue on the list, otherwise you're dropped. Now we don't have to be that descriptive, but deadwood gathering across many, many years is a problem and we have discussed in the last meeting. Also, Justine, you have said that cleaning up could be [inaudible].

But the thing, also, the periodic renewal to our response is something that we could consider, providing there is an appeal mechanism because of the fact that emails can tend to get lost and spam and all that. So maybe you can consider something like that. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, so a few things. One is you're right, 32 is regarding removal of a member, whereas 33 is regarding removal of a leadership position type person. I wanted to mention also that in the context of the ALS Mobilization and the UIM Mobilization Working Party report, there is provision for periodic tap on the shoulder and say, "Hello, you are listed as our member. Do you still want to be a member?" And if you don't

respond by a certain time, then we will consider you as not interested to remain as a member.

So there is already provision and discussion by that and that has been approved by the ALAC, by the way. So we'll have to see whether 32 and 33 ... More 32 than 33 ... 32 is sufficient to over that basis, so that something with another action item that we need to look into. Okay.

And in terms of what Amrita was talking about is actually more leadership role, if I'm not mistaken, and that is paragraph 33 when you withdraw the appointment, somebody or the selection of somebody from a position ... Okay. Bearing in mind that this is the process that we're talking about, not the benchmark.

Amrita, you're saying yes. I'm not quite sure what you're saying yes to.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

No, no, no. I am saying yes to [inaudible] benchmark because how do we kind of [inaudible] or how do we change things [inaudible] which is fine [inaudible] but we had a challenge with [inaudible] and how we can kind of amend those [inaudible] would help. So I think [inaudible] would help.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, understood.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Only the [inaudible], not only as an individual member [inaudible] but [inaudible].

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. In the overall scheme of things, each leadership position that is selected has a fixed term, per se. And if you don't perform, presumably you won't get reelected or reappointed or whatever it is.

Now we're talking about while during the person is still performing in their term, if they are not performing for some reason and we want them replaced, that is the process that we're talking about now, which I believe is provided for by paragraph 33.

So again the question is do you believe this process is sufficient to deal with that kind of situation? And if not, what is missing? Apart from the benchmark.

Everybody is studiously reading paragraph 33, then? Yes, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's solid. It'll work. It's hopefully going to be an extraordinary rarely used part of our rules of procedure. Hopefully it'll never be used but you never know. The thing is if you need to use it, it's important to have it properly outlined and it certainly outlines it in detail.

Whilst I am in no way objecting to any of this at all, I am however always very aware that just as we should always try for consensus as a first port in call, yet we should also try for some form of remedial action as a possible and practical, and that really is something that whilst we can

write it in, the potential for reputational harm done to members of our community that has a trickle-over effect because the [inaudible] and technical community is quite small into other parts, including their working life and their professional lives is something that I do find problematic.

So, things like requests submitted to public distribution mail lists, things that can always get searched up later and that's only the bits that say Cheryl Langdon-Orr is an untrustworthy individual who is utterly useless and undertakes criminal activity or something, the mere fact that that can be very quickly and easily proved wrong might not get searched up. It might only be the initial slander.

I'm just always a little cautious of processes that go "and we'll make sure everything goes off the distribution list" as a first port of call as opposed to goes to the leadership team and the opportunity for [inaudible] work is an option.

As I say, I'm not going to draw a hard line in the sand, but it does bother me on a personal level. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, fair enough. Part of the remedial steps that can be taken that's not necessarily written down any way is that if you believe someone is not performing, then you speak to the person. There's this thing about justice where you give the person three warnings before you kick them off kind of thing. So you have to probably kind of understand why that person may not be performing. There could be circumstances by which are out of his or her control or whatever. So those are things that we

don't necessarily want to write down somewhere because it's just too detailed. So it's management of people at the end of day. Satish?

SATISH BABU:

Yeah. I think I completely agree with what Cheryl just said and also what Gopal said earlier. We are volunteers and we have to have a compassionate approach to these things. Okay, sometimes we won't perform but we don't have to distribute that information to the world because some of this online stuff is nearly impossible to remove and we are leaving a permanent trail that can be damaging to the person for the future. So minimal online debris can bite the person back later and generally being compassionate about these things because we are volunteers. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes, Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Yeah. Part of my Google doc is acting up. I can check it. But are we talking about listing it somewhere or something? Because I think when we are talking about a candidate performing or not performing, for some reason, obviously we understand we are volunteers but if we have taken up something, we can either step down at that point of time because we have other issues or something, or even if that doesn't happen and we give the warning and it's not happening, we can move. Not necessarily we will name and shame, that's not how we do. So I'm not sure. Was there something like that somewhere? I didn't read it but

I may be wrong. The other thing is at a point which came, like for our ALSes, etc., we have a primary and a secondary. For the unaffiliated individuals, can we have a primary and a secondary just in case the primary cannot be there in the meetings we have a secondary stepping in or something? I don't know. It's an idea but would it be possible, so we don't have those kinds of situations?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Well, it's kind of different because the proposition is the [IM] rep is going to be a leadership team member so you don't have an alternate position really. It's entirely different than the ALS having primary and secondary members.

At the end of the day, as we always say we try to decide things on a consensus basis.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

I'm good with it deciding and [inaudible] on consensus basis and I completely agree we should not name shame, try to resolve things. But then if things don't resolve, then taking [inaudible]. But on the point that we are volunteers and we give leeway, yes we give leeway but if you signed in for something you might as well deliver [inaudible] if you've taken a leadership position, that is.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Right. That's why I'm saying in terms of normal human resource practices, if you find someone is not performing, first of all you talk to them and you understand why they're not performing because they

could be circumstances which not everyone is aware of and then we work around the circumstances.

But if it so happens that a person, after being spoken to a number of times and still doesn't perform, that's when you would encourage them to step down so that they can free up the space and then we find someone else.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Let me be really clear where I have my problem. I have my problem specifically in 33.1 point 2 where it says a request submitted by an APRALO member specifying a member to be recalled and the reasons for the removal from their appointed position must be posted to the approved distribution list and supported by at least five APRALO members. That's what I have a problem with. The ability of the chair is the powerful part, 33.1.1 and that we've had 33.1.2 allowing members to alert the chair and/or leadership team with all due confidentiality. So they are requested to actually do some remedial work and we can write up what happens if the complaint is about the chair, then how do you complain to the chair about themselves? We can fix all that very easily by having a process that talks about leadership team. But then the chair, as a result of whatever the leadership team does in response to a member request can still be a member supported by five other members. Hey, if that's what we want to do.

But what worries me is this sticking things out on public and permanently searchable distribution lists. And that's what 33.1.2 does. And that bothers me deeply.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. So is there a proposition to amend 33.1.2 to reflect as what we discussed, a softer touch? Okay, thumbs up from Satish. Yes from Amrita in chat. Yes from Cheryl in chat. I don't see any objections, so that's another action item. We'll see if there's any other affected clauses of paragraphs with the same kind of language that we want to tweak to have a softer touch. Okay, thank you very much.

So, is there any other things in Section D that bothers people? Because if not, I will consider Section D as done subject to what we just discussed and we can probably just revisit that by email. It's probably a better way to do it anyway when we're looking at text changes. So if there's no others issues with Section D and no other issues with 27, then I will now go back to Adjunct 06 I think it is, which is the criteria for the leadership positions and I think that's what people have most interest about.

Firstly, I apologize if you haven't had earlier access to this Google doc. It's a 90-minute call, Cheryl. So that's why I want to try to devote as much time as possible to this section.

So, the point here that we're discussing is that we want to institute some kind of criteria for candidates to leadership positions that would encompass the leadership team members, the liaisons as well as the [inaudible]. That is the questions.

One of the questions is that do we want specific criteria for all or some of these positions? And if it's either all or some, what should the criteria be?

The second question is, at the moment, it states that this criteria or a candidate should ideally meet all or a majority of the listed criteria because it would potentially be hard to have someone who perfectly meets every single bullet point. So that's why ideally to meet all or a majority of the listed criteria. And if nobody has any issues with that, then we can stick to that at the moment and we can go down to the actual criteria itself.

So let's start with the position of chair and all of these bullet points have been entered by Satish. Satish, if you would like to speak to some of them, that might be helpful and then people can jump in and ask questions or contribute to the discussion.

SATISH BABU:

Right. So the chair is a very key and critical position that requires the person to be very active, has the [inaudible] of the organization. They'll be able to take forward a very diverse, multi-cultural group. So what I tried to put in here is basically chair should have [inaudible] the chair will have been either vice chair or having would have played some in the role in the management of APRALO [inaudible]. This role is not really meant for [inaudible]. Some prior experience is required including working with ALSes, individual members, and related organizations. A PR role also there because the RALO chair is an ambassador to the regional organizations, the other regional organizations that we work with and we partner with. Some of them we have MOUs with.

Then they should be [inaudible] participation and they should have been significant in our activities. In any role that person has played

before, he or she should have delivered consistently and dependably [with skill] and [inaudible] multi-cultural group and communication skills. This is what I thought was important.

But all the definitions are [inaudible]. You can go with any kind of combination of this and others. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Satish. Comments? Amrita, I noted that you put in some generic ones for leadership team positions so I don't know whether you want to be specific whether to cover all or some.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Yeah, Justine. I had just made when we were discussing we wanted to kind of keep it open for people to participate but also have some engagement. They may come from different stakeholder communities instead, but what I said, because perhaps they need to show some interest in APRALO, have attended a couple of meetings, etc. I just put in some numbers but it could be [inaudible] later on. Perhaps not having any leadership position currently in any other SO/AC would be good. Obviously it can be moved out or anything.

Perhaps they not hold positions somewhere which may be in conflict in user interest and I'm talking about currently. You can scrap. These are just thoughts. You can refine it, scrap it, do whatever but I put it in.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, thanks. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd like to start just reorder this section, just listening to you all now, because I think what we should do is have the opening gambit being the more generic "these are the criteria in addition to any specifically specific on a role-by-role basis" because there are some of those and they're in a particular section. But these are overall what we expect leadership team members to be or prospective leadership team members to have these criteria or as many of them as possible.

Then I would, after establishing these general ones, then I would have the specifics for APRALO Chair and Satish's list is as good as any. And a specific listing for what we think an ALAC member needs to have, etc.

So, I'd start with the general all leadership team members need to be or leadership team members [inaudible] meet all of these good things and here are specifics to follow. Does that make sense?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, make sense and I doubt the new one is going to [inaudible] approach but I could be wrong. Okay, we can definitely rework this to meet what was suggested.

In terms of some people have noted specific criteria for specific roles. Then the question is which ones would apply to all of them, which ones would apply to certain ones of them and which ones do you think would be more highly desired than not? For example, if you scroll down to the ALAC member, I had a list of those that would be desired and those that are preferred. And this is ... Apart from the ones that are in red, these

are consistent with the ALAC job description that we've given to NomCom. So this is actually what NomCom uses, hopefully, to select ALAC appointees.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Justine, we could take a few points from here to fit into a generic one or select, for example, you know some things of understanding the DNS system, etc. Any leadership team, from my understanding, needs to have this commitment to ICANN's mission also is important because some of them are generic, even here. They are great, I think since it's there we can always have it a generic thing, apart from the specific things which you would want in the ALAC members part.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Yeah. Thanks, Justine. So, the generic things could be things like, one, they should have an interest in the work of APRALO. Two would be that they have enough time to spare for the responsibility that they're looking for. And three that they do not have any active conflict of interest. So maybe this list can be expanded, but these are some of the things that I would think [inaudible] generic ones. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So when you say conflict of interest, are you talking about financial interest or are you talking about something that Amrita

brought up which is should not be in a leadership position elsewhere kind of thing?

SATISH BABU:

Yeah. I don't think it's financial really because we don't have much financial activities. But the [inaudible] that we predict as a leader should not be conflicting, meaning it should not be mixed by the fact that you're in too many positions or too many roles which are not particularly aligned with each other. I would tend to leave it be but that's what we are probably looking for. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. So I'm just wondering how we would decide what is generic and what is not. And I'm just thinking off the top of my head. Would it work if, say, we left this Google doc open for people to put in whether we think certain things are generic and certain things are specific or do you want someone to ... I'd rather do that than have someone look at it and try to reorder it and reorder it again and reorder it until everyone is satisfied. Can we go with what I originally proposed which is that people go into this document and mark what you think is generic and what you think is not? Is that okay with everyone? Because that at least gives us something to work with rather than Cheryl and I try to come back and dream of things and hopefully we're channeling you in some way.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

[inaudible] let me tell you this also. Whether or not they are not ... So don't worry on that. But we can do the [inaudible] if you want.

JUSTINE CHEW: I'm trying to spread the workload a little bit rather than [inaudible].

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: [inaudible] and others, please do speak. Don't be new spectators please.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, because when we start introducing metrics, it's Cheryl's favorite topic. It's not just attendance. We want you to actually—

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: No, no, really. I would like [inaudible] just looking at this list we have but we don't have them. I think, Cheryl, we need to follow that [inaudible] kind of a thing and start being ruthless. Honestly, [inaudible] participating.

JUSTINE CHEW: We can always take the teacher approach, just call on someone and tell us what you think kind of thing. Let's leave it for the [inaudible]. So if that is the approach we're thinking to do with this document, then I would also extend the invitation for folks to add onto the bullets. You see something obviously missing, please do add the bullets in and tell us whether it's generic or specific to a particular role. And then in this respect, I'm going to ask Yesim to make sure that this document is commentable and you don't have to request access to get into it.

So, if that is the case, then Cheryl, I don't know if there's anything else that we need to cover, per se, because we've pretty much gone through the entire Google doc now and now we're actually working on the adjunct documents.

There are some other adjunct documents which are still to be worked on. We have one potentially for the email [guide] which deals with the email, cleaning up of email list and that sort of thing. But we don't have anything to look at, to discuss in any case at the moment. So maybe we have to think about coming up with something soon.

So, anything that we need to cover, Cheryl? Anything else that we need to cover off the top of your head?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Not off the top of my head. I just want to remind everybody that these adjunct documents are still very powerful, that they're important and powerful things in their own right and I'm more flexible in as much as with due process they can be more easily updated than rules of procedure so they tend to be more agile. But they are very, very powerful so I give them the same [inaudible] and concerns as you have the rules of procedure.

The only other thing obviously is if can set some deadlines [inaudible] input that would be most helpful because we want to be able to spend a little bit of time between the next meeting on the fourth of January to just go through what everybody has put in and start doing our [dreaming].

JUSTINE CHEW: Good point. So how about since we're not going to have a call next week, so this is going to be homework time throughout the [inaudible] period and we're going to be conducting our business by the [inaudible] mostly until such time that we come back on the first week of Jan to discuss. So we hope to get most of the discussions then through the mail list and that would support folks who are not here today to participate as well and provide their input.

Okay. So, I think that's all I have for today, really. It's a question of us coming back and tidying up everything and sorting whatever needs to be sorted and sending a message through to the mail list to say, hey, guys, homework, this, that, and that.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: My suggestion for the [inaudible] and everything, we have time to end of the month or do we want to give a timeline so that when you look at it in new year, you may look at it earlier also knowing you, but you have something there to look at.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. I'm just looking in terms of we would have Our next meeting is on the fourth of Jan, presumably. So, Cheryl, do you want to put a deadline for homework or something?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm just literally looking at my phone. I think it's perfectly reasonable because we're meeting on Thursday, the fourth of January, not the Tuesday because ICANN only goes back to the offices on Tuesday. Let's

set a deadline for this homework of either the 28th or the 29th and then that gives us a couple of days, Justine, to dig into the docs with a little bit more measure.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. 28, 29 sounds good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, done.

JUSTINE CHEW: Close of business. So I'll note that and then we'll put it in the email to everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Rather than close of business—it's just another one of my things—if we just do 23:59 UTC close of business, it means that it's technically 11:00 my time the following morning. It'll be 1:00 PM your time. It's not unreasonable.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, so any other business? If not, we can—

YESIM SAGLAM: The next call, are we going for 60 minutes or 90 minutes?

JUSTINE CHEW: Make it 90 minutes and if we don't use up 90 minutes, that's fine, we can let people go earlier.

YESIM SAGLAM: Okay.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So we've actually done well. We haven't taken up all of 90 minutes today. We've done 75. I'm happy to note that we actually got quite a lot done in the last couple of calls, really. I think it's a question of tidying up a few things and we're good to go. Any other comments or business to raise? If not, then I'm very happy to wish you all a Merry Christmas, Happy New Year.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thanks, Justine. We have [inaudible] so keep on extending.

JUSTINE CHEW: No trouble.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We have more things to do before the end of the week and the end of the year, yes.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Happy holidays.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: For this group.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thank you very much for your participation and don't forget your homework.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Justine and Cheryl for leading it. Yesim, if you want to have access to the adjunct documents now, at least to make suggestions, I'm going to change the [inaudible] to make sure that people are able to [inaudible] so it will be [inaudible] and everyone with the link will be able to access.

JUSTINE CHEW: [inaudible] saves the trouble of giving individual access to each person. So we'll make sure that happens before we send out the note on the homework, so that the links function the way it's supposed to function. Okay, take care everyone. Bye-bye. Thanks, everybody.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, all.

YESIM SAGLAM: Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]