

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the APRALO rules of procedures. ROP Working Group Call taking place on Thursday, 4th January 2024 at 5:00 UTC. On our call today, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Amrita Choudhury, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, and Satish Babu. We're expecting Justine Chew to join us shortly.

We have received apologies from Ali AlMeshal. And from staff side, myself, Yeşim Sağlam, will be on the call management. And before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes. With this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Cheryl. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And thank you, Yeşim, and I appreciate that. You shall just have to put up with some background noise from me. Australia is on holidays still. We are smack bang in the middle of the two weeks that is traditionally taken after the end of the Gregorian calendar. And so many workplaces, including that that my family work in, do not go back until next week. So, there will be entertainment going on in the background by way of explanation, but not really of an apology because they deserve their vacation time.

All right. So, with that, welcome to 2024 everybody. And we are perilously close to getting this document up to its next level. I am aware that whilst this is having a 90-minute time slot, that at least Amrita needs to leave at the top of the hour. So, I am going to propose that we

---

*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.*

---

do a little bit of a juggle in our review of our various documents because there really does need to be some discussion before potential decision to make some recommendations to the APRALO leadership team regarding certain things that at least I put into the email guide as proposals. and so, that's the sort of thing that needs to happen in the presence of the chair.

So, we know what the leadership team may or may not feel when we push it up to them in the not-too-distant future. So, that's the proposed change to agenda that I have. Anybody else got anything else they want to let us know about before we dive right in? Justine you're happy with that? Nothing from Satish. Thank you. All good from Justine. Okay. Let's have a look at our action items. Thank you, Yesim.

Now, in a way all of them were done, but there's this unclicked one with my name next to it which has been edited to say review options in the January 4th, 2024 call, because when I looked at transposing which was an action item that we had out of our last meeting, various paragraphs in section 27.4 which for those of you who don't live and breathe this stuff, of course you all do but that's the part that is the At-Large structures and the criteria for our large structures.

We really need to look at parity between what we do for the adjunct document relating to IMs and those At-Large structures. What is currently in the body text is all absolutely in keeping with the outcomes of the working group and the recommendations accepted by At-Large advisory committee for ILS revitalization and getting everybody on a different footing including the ability to reach into At-Large structures to work more with individual members within their own structures. and to

that end, I want to just note that, Justine, you did that work and so, I just want to make sure that you know who did what is clear on that. But I do want to just take you through Adjunct 7.

Perhaps not as the first thing once we get into the document, but recognize that it may or may not be exactly how we want it, but it's pretty dang close, and it's certainly in keeping with the outcomes of the previous working group from the At-Large advisory committee on the revitalization work that they did for ALS's out of the review. Let's now jump in right back into the document. Thank you.

There's just one or two points that were brought in. One of the action items which was to put in a chapeau or preamble is marked as draft here. I also put a point where you'll note in red line. I made a suggestion that we should consider putting in a table of contents once we get to a final draft. That's something that is more of an editorial thing in my view. Obviously, it may mean that some of things will be hyperlinked as classed as heaters at level 1, 2, 3 or 4, but we should get into that more in the dusting up and getting it ready for the for preview not our own work on that, because it should be autogenerated.

But Satish did raise a question to this proposed text here, as to whether or not there was some words missing in the opening section. As the author of it and to me it reads okay. But I really want to open a little queue here to see what we should do in terms of editing that very first bullet point in the preamble which states, APRALO community is a term that is applied to both the defined within the rules of procedures members of APRALO, the At-Large structures and individuals. and it might be, should perhaps have more words here. Those being

---

---

processed after applying to become members, and individual organizations and entities that regularly or from time to time interact with and they contribute to the purpose on and activities of APRALO. Now, it's a torturous sentence. I'm sure it can be better built.

Let's see what we can do with that. What we were trying to capture of course, was the fact that we will have members with a capital M, be they individual or ILS's and we will have entities and individuals who may or may not be either in process of becoming a member or being an actual member themselves and that we will still have a wider appreciation of regional or APRALO community to be as open and inclusive as possible. So, let's open a queue and can we fix that somehow? Very first. Satish, please go ahead.

SATISH BABU:

Yeah. Thanks, Cheryl. So, one possible way to fix this would be to have a bulleted list of categories underneath the first line so that we are clear that the first bullet would be the member with the capital M in brackets, At-Large structures etcetera. Then the next bullet would be those being processed. Next one will be it would be individuals, then organization etcetera. So that we have clarity on, I mean there's nothing wrong with it. I would understand what is meant here, but the sentence is a little convoluted. Just that needs to be taken out so it could be done either with the related list or by the language. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Thanks. Well, this is certainly one way to go. We've got bullets within bullets within bullets. I know we're fearful of how far off the

---

right-hand side of the document we'll end up shortly. Hey Amrita, go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Cheryl, I actually beg to differ here. I think if we mention it here and later on we are kind of defining who all our members or nonmembers etcetera. It kind of justifies it. Sometimes in this kind of texts you may have like we have a junk document. I'm sure we have somewhere where we are defining things or something. We are clearly mentioned. So, I'm not sure. We can go with members here and later on within the document, we are clearly defining who all can be dealt. So, I think we are okay to be vague here because we are defining it later but, I go with people.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. I know Shreedeeep said that the document is where the hardline definitions occur and the purpose as I understood it for this preamble, was to ensure that there was an expectation that some aspects. For example, behavioral expectations on how we work for example in email lists and things and meetings, would apply to the community whether you are a member or not and that of course we are not only limited to members with a capital M all those being processed for membership. But many of the things we do is open door and able to be contributed to and joined by nonmembers.

There's someone cleverer than me in the writing of unambiguous text able to do something with that sentence. Do we just put it away for now and come back to it later with a clear head? Justine, how do you

---

want to approach it? I think we all understand what it's intending to say. I just agree with Satish. I don't think it's being said very well. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW:

I'm not in edit on the fly mode today so, I can't really comment. My suggestion would be to try and revisit it maybe through the mailing list or something.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. All right. So, let's agree that we will wordsmith that doc, that sentence at first bullet point, we may need to trust it to the final editorial process to do that and what we will undertake perhaps Justine, you can agree with me that we will make sure someone who is not part of our group reads it and sees whether that any of the commerce average reader understands the intention that is there and we can make some text adjustments accordingly. Does that work for everybody?

Okay. All right. Great. Because we don't want to wordsmith it but I think the general feeling was let's see if we can publish that first part off. We understand what it's trying to say. We just need to find a cleaner way of saying it less convolutedly. The rest in that section, if you just roll down slightly. Thank you, Yeşim. Is pretty much just bog standard literally out of the rules that we've already agreed on. Whoop. Stop. I got you back. So, all the way through to c etcetera. I did also make sure that Adjunct 10, the APRALO email guide, is reference there because that isn't something that we had linked in but we from

experience, it goes back to the very beginnings of At-Large before there was any RALOs in fact. One of the most contentious places where bad behavior can occur is within email lists and so, to make sure that the community members or not recognize that there are expectations that it will be found in the email guide and if you are outside of those expectations, you can be sanctioned or removed or whatever from the use of those email lists for a certain period of time.

I think that's important to make sure that's up the top, up the front recognizing that many people will do no more than read the preamble. It's a bit like reading the fine print on a contract. Not many people go all the way through to Page 27 on the fine print. I'm sure some of you do but, certainly that's not the average. The addons and the ones that I wanted to make sure that you were all comfortable with was the sort of fluffiest that the bulletproof, bullet Proof. Try again, Cheryl. Bullet points at the end where I said I hope I've picked up what you all believe and have referred to that the community, the APRALO community operates openly, equitably and inclusively, that wherever possible allows for effective yet considerate consensus building where all interested voices are welcome to be heard and diverse opinions considered.

Notice. There is no indication that this is an inalienable right or that every voice must be heard rather that all voices are welcome to be heard because that's a very different thing. If we get to say everybody is going to be represented, then we literally can't do our work because it's just too many people, too great of diversity and too short a time to do anything. Actually, find out what all communities or even all that large structures and members think. So, there is no barrier to any voice

---

---

being heard as opposed to all voices will be heard. It's a very important differentiation there. Want to make sure you're all comfortable with that.

Then the final bullet point, because we're trying to keep it simple, says the APRALO community in general and APRALO specifically act in the best interests of internet end users primarily geographically within The APAC region and as a contributory part of... it should be part two. ICANN At-Large globally. So, it allows us to say we are focusing obviously within our geographic confines, but we are also a specific and important contributor to the global ICANN At-Large. Are we all okay with that? Do we need to go further? I'm not seeing anybody yell at me. Oops. Satish, go ahead.

SATISH BABU:

Yeah. I'm perfectly fine and happy with these last two points. But I'm not sure if I agree with Justin's edit. It's the original language sounds okay to me as a contributor part of At large globally. But I'll leave it to you just flagging it. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'll vote too. Okay. I'm almost willing to flip a coin and let Grammarly decide. I think that's a yeah. Off to yes. Contributing part. Yeah. Anybody else feel strongly? All right. We'll leave that as a something we'll have to have a final editorial look at and just so you all know Justine and I have discussed in our preparation for today's meeting. That we will try and bring in first of all one of us but one of us who hasn't been quite so entrenched in the work we've been doing as a bit



---

of an editorial reader as we go through the polishing of that. All right. So, if we're all relatively comfortable with that draft test and we've got that one action item that we need to do work on, that first bullet point. That is it for the work that went on in the body of the text accepting, if you can now go down to 27.4 please, Yesim. I don't think there's anything before that if they're adjusting. Don't think there is.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Yeah. I don't think there's anything major.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Great. Sometimes we get to really forest and trees here. Just to draw your attention to some little additions you can see in red. The original wording was very much in line with either previous text as you'll see it would compare on the left or from the work on At-Large structure mobilization. But some of it was a little bit won't work when you compare it to things like ALAC rules of procedure.

So, on 27.4.1, we originally read the ILTS subject to review by the RALOs, that in that sentence structure that suggested some sort of ordinance where the RALOs were superordinate to the ALAC and it's not the case. It's the other way around. The ALAC are the ones that will review influenced by recommendations made by the RALOs and the ICANN board to any procedures to confer or withdraw accreditation.

But it's very clear in the ICANN and ALAC rules that it is not subject to. It's with reference and input from the RALOs and I didn't think it would be wise for us to not try and make that clear. I did want to draw your

---

attention that I added the and recommendations made by the RALO and the ICANN board etcetera. So, that text is pretty much what you would see in just about any rules of procedure, but the red text is going to be. The red and the purple text is going to be uniquely APRALOs. But hey we do it better so, why not? Again a few little things such as here where we were talking about on 27.4.3 where it we've got this the rate that any all ALSs that are accredited by the process that's outlined for how ALSs are accredited by the ALAC because it's the ALAC to accredit them shall be deemed and listed.

Other words I added in here as APRALO ALS's which probably should be plural. No. ALS members so, it doesn't need to be plural. Because they may not realize that they belong to us, but we deem that they belong to us because of where they are geographically speaking and we do need to list them and that seemed to be a useful add on as is the other red text which says APRALO under 27.45. APRALO recognizes and adopts ICANN's established criteria.

We recognizing it's one thing, but actually working on it and working with it and adopting it as part of our rules does need to be specified there. Scroll a little bit further down. I don't think anything else substantial occurred, but I could be wrong. Keep going. Thank you, Yesim. Until I see any more reg. No more reg. We're good. So, that was it for 27.4 and should we want to make sure that the adjunct document which is Adjunct 7.

We do need to cross check. I believe it's in keeping, but we do need to cross check that the adjunct document is in keeping with all of that. With that I think we're up to reviewing the document and Justine, I did

---

indicate that because Rita needs to leave at the top of the hour, that we would go to the email one first. So, if we can now go to the next agenda item which is our adjunct documents and, in this case, Yeşim. If you can open up the email guide that's Adjunct 10. That looks like it. Okay. So, Here I have just brutally ripped off text without any apology. It's from the ALAC email guide.

Now, interestingly enough, the ALAC email guide as it is listed in that URL that I have there. And Yeşim, perhaps you could do us a favor and double check with other staff. But what is currently on the ALAC wiki does not indicate that this email guide has ever been adopted. So, double check on that. Anyway, it's poised and ready to be adopted and we may as well write our guide to be in keeping and mirror it.

But somebody needs to double check the fact that it appears that there is a reference to out of the rules and procedures for the At-Large advisory committee that refers to at least this their version which is not adjunct but some other adjuncts that's called the ALAC email guide and it's as far as I can ascertain, as ready for adoption, not adopted yet. But let's assume that it'll be adopted pretty much without major change.

What I've done here is rip it off without any apology, follow exactly the same form. If you could just scroll down a little bit that's it, so we can see from general terms to a little bit further down. Thank you, Yesim. Just so, we've got general oops. Just up tiny bit. Hang on. That'll work. Perfect. These general terms are literally edited slightly in text from the document so, we should be in keeping there. We have then the same layout as to quite a number of ALAC email lists which does and I'll ask you to scroll as I say these things.

---

The purpose of any particular mailing list the members of the mailing list and how one continues to-- Scroll please. Get them down to the next page. How you become a member, who can post to such a list, how you subscribe or describe, whether or not it is public or privately archived and viewable and whether there are any comments in particular relating to that list.

So, that's the format that the ALAC document uses and I figured it was probably perfectly reasonable for us to use the same format. If you can scroll to the... well just leave it there for one second. You'll see that the second list and there's only two proposed at this stage in this document, is the existing list and that's the APAC discussed list. That's the list we have. This name APAC disgusts, discussed. Sorry. That's me being Freudian. Sometimes it disgusts me what goes into it and this this list here all the members and everything else simply reflects what currently occurs.

So, list two here in this adjunct document, this draft document, is what we have. If you scroll back up now, Yesim, and this is why I wanted to have this conversation with everybody for Amrita Leave. I'm proposing that we add a list and that the added list is an announced list. The ALAC has an announced list which is extremely useful because people can pay different levels of attention to the two different lists. What goes in and announce is formal. It's calls for polling. It's requests for input. It's important stuff.

What goes on in the discuss list is the rest of the conversations that may or may not go on and at the moment we have a discuss list and what I think we would benefit from, is a more compulsory, more structured

---

and more specific, albeit rarely perhaps used discussed, sorry, announced list that means that representatives and active people don't miss or they don't have an excuse to miss stuff. So, that's a whole new list that we're proposing. Should you all agree that that is a good idea, then we will have to go back through the ROPs not all of us, just one or two of us I guess, and make sure any references to the right list is changed. Satish?

SATISH BABU:

Yes. So, it is not about the exact point, but from the earlier discussions on the overall ALAC list. and I'm not sure of the date of preparation of this particular document in the ALAC. I mean the reason why I'm reasoning this is not because it's what I'm going to say is completely relevant for us, but in another part of ICANN, we made that is UASB we have this chronic problem of brigading.

This happens when one individual uses multiple email IDs like proton mail and so on and insert themselves into the list and then start supporting himself through different handles. So, this has become a very serious problem and we had raised it to ICANN and this time ICANN has taken it very seriously.

They have kind of commanded the UASB leadership to use the device and clean up the list etcetera. I'm just basing it that we do not have any checks. Now, since the structural anomaly there is that everybody in the analysis can vote which is a very stupid kind of an arrangement and there the brigade becomes a very difficult kind of situation. For us, the voting is completely distinct. There's nothing to do with the announced

---

or discussed list. So, I guess we are safe and we don't. What about the secondary or anonymous email address?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, we still do pick it up to some extent, Satish. Because we have mentioned I believe up in the general, but whilst we recognize more than one identity may be requested by a subscriber. It's an exception not a rule. It would be the sort of thing that you access via work email at certain times of your interaction life and via private one because you don't have access to your work mail, unless you're at work or something like that. But normally, the expectation is especially on this announce list which you are subscribed to it by staff when you get appointed to something.

So, when you become part of the leadership team, when you are defined as a representative of an At-Large structure or you become an individual member etcetera then the email you provide for that process is subscribed to this list. It's the formality of that. If you for whatever reason, if I wanted to say I want my Gmail but I also oh, sorry. I want my normal mail, my personal, my vanity email, but for the purpose of working on documents, I also want my Gmail then that's more control. It's my name and both those emails and we've still got that auditability. So, hopefully that combined with the annual renewal where any particular requirements or permissions, etcetera, could also be refreshed and done is an important part of the of both lists. Justine?

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Let me get it straight. So, you said earlier that this particular one to announce it's for members to be subscribed, but there is text here, that says that anyone else may be me self-subscribed. So, I just want to clarify with that it is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There is a well, if you are appointed, you don't get the option of self-subscribing. You are subscribed.

JUSTINE CHEW: So, we don't say Justine, you are now part of the ALAC, please subscribe to this list. Staff says Justine, you are now part of the ALAC. You are subscribed to these lists. But if I wanted to just listen in on the ALAC discussion list and I do. I'm still subscribed to it. That's a self-subscription and if I want to leave, I can. But if you want to leave as an ALAC member, you have to have a damn good reason. Does that make sense?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: I suppose you have to read it in conjunction with who has sending rights or emailing rights. I guess you do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Quite probably, you do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Because I mean the whole point about this exercise is to try and clean up the APAC discuss list. So, we think that the APAC discuss list is too difficult to clean up then we have a separate one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What I did with the CISSPIT and it was a CISSPIT of the ALAC At-Large discuss list when I became chair back many years ago, was leave it to exactly what the discuss list is for us. Anyone can join. Anyone can do whatever. As long as you behave yourself within norms, we don't really give a damn. Have assets children. But the formal work and the formal notices and the formal lists, will be going elsewhere and just sort of left the crap behind and the crap still exists. People still post to it. I still read it but, I don't have to read it. I just can. Does that make sense?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. It does. The only practical difficulty I would have, would be and this is the situation which was raised to be problematic. So, when we have a call for selection in this scenario, that call for selection will be posted to which list? And then who can respond to that message?



CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Only those in the announce. And if we need to add a blackout for sales subscriptions around certain posting rights, that's fine too. We can make self-subscribed people may or may not be able to have posting rights. All of that is up to the leadership team. So, that gives you that flexibility which really is important because you don't want to have John come lately and unknowns having undue and unnecessary influence at important times.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Exactly. So, that answers the question and I suppose the next question would be, is it an idea to run this by staff to see whether what we intended is actually doable.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, it was doable when I made it happen.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Just staying busy. I'm sure it's more work, requires staff intervention I'm sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well actually, I argue that I don't think it's any more challenging to staff to subscribe and a new noncom appointee or a new RALO appointee to our APRALO list, because they suddenly become part of the leadership

---

---

team. You know that's what? Three names maybe once every two years?

JUSTINE CHEW: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's the bit about the self-subscription being blacked or blocked. We have to find a way that it's automatic so that staff intervention is needed.

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, quite often, it's easier to leave subscriptions open and manage posting rights.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's much easier. Yeah. Okay. Yeah. Well, either way just find a technically viable assumption that doesn't require staff intervention.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. But remember even a nonsubscriber could try and post, but it would be held. and that's what this Marmon system does anyway. So, it may get kicked out for management review.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Amrita, we've held you up far too long.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: No worries, Cheryl. So, I had two questions. One was if the say for example the election, the call for nomination etcetera goes only to the announced list which is of the leadership team the members representatives or the accredited member, individual members and the ICANN staff. And when we also say that any other community members based upon criteria can apply for leadership position, how do they get the information? So, then it would be circulating to the discuss list also that look there is a call from [CROSSTALK].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I may answer that one first, how that's managed where is by CC or BCC. But it's required to go by your rules to go to the announced list. It's a courtesy to send it to the other list, but it's a good practice to do so.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Yeah. The other question was and I'm okay with two lists but considering the amount of mails which flows with other working groups This and that. Having two mailing lists, would it not be filling up people's mailboxes more because you may have the same mail going in both of them. I'm just raising it because this maybe we are thinking that people will read the announced list. We may wish that to happen but, wishes at times like just now in the chat someone was saying, what is the share the link of ROP whereas the mails are going to everyone, but that's how things are relevant. My thing is are we going to add another spamming mail not spamming. Those are relevant mails but will people

---

look at it as another mail coming into their box? That's a practical kind of a--

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They may very well do so, but if they're appointed to a role. Be that representative or leadership. Suck it up and do it. Don't give a shit. It's their job. Keep on top of what's required of them. If that means they have to read. Oh, dear two identical ones. Delete the second one. Well, we'll take that 14.5 seconds out of their lives. Perfectly happy to do so. All they can do, what I possibly would do which is Not bothered to read a discussed list at all but just take it as a digest. So, once a week or once a month I get to see what's please said on a discuss list because I'm not going to miss anything that is of functional importance to the work of RALO, because that's always happening on the announced list. Does that make sense? Satish?

SATISH BABU: Yeah. So, I mean in many places we do have two separate list. EPC has to separate list just like this announced and discussed. Now, having said that I see couple of points that might require attention. One is that a community member who sent prescribing might have to do it in two places. Second is that we are looking at this ROP, but the community members may not look at the ROP. They may post any of this thing anywhere without any such kind of division between the two. So, then we have a blurring of boundaries and the potential kind of loss of quality of these lists. Thanks.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, Satish, I guess my response to the blithering of boundaries issue is when they get back, you can't post to something, do not subscribe to message, they'll either attempt to subscribe and be told self-subscription is possible as a read only or that they are welcome to now post, now that they are subscribed. And so, yeah it puts, it pushes it back on the individuals. But remember basically what you're looking at is just literally what the ALAC list email lists state should happen. And within the rules on the ALAC email guide, it specifies what each of the regional discuss lists will do. We as a right region never set those up. ALAC sets those up.

We don't. They're kind of not actually our lists and the rules, the limitations that you will see on the discuss list. If you scroll down please, Yasmin to that yes. A little bit further. All of that all that said any all thanks. That that'll be fine. All of that on screen now. The only changes were adding IP, because this is the stuff that it says every rollout and in the ALAC email guide, it has a block of information exactly the same as you are looking at here that simply says I t n I l a c u on top.

And they are absolute duplicates but that's the cause. That's the foundation. That is the creation of what we use as our discussed list actually comes from that original ALAC pausing of those lists occurred and should be controlled by this, I like document that this is referring to. So, what we've done here with the discuss list, is copy what the discussed list is already defined to be and to do and popped IP in front of where Norman just said RALO.

Now, an etiquette guide is an additional thing and I would certainly suggest that this document adds to it a section on etiquette. And there

are plenty of standard ones of those if you want us to do, grab whatever. Yeah. Send us some of your favorites and we'll pick and choose to make a good model of an etiquette. But yeah, it doesn't have to be extensive but there is always a usefulness of the etiquette part. A lot of the etiquette of course is actually picked up in the effective standards of behavior however. So, because we have that superordinate to the standards of behavior, we do get a less requirement for those email etiquettes to be written down. Yes, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Right. So, just need to go back to what I asked before, just to clarify and make it clear in my head right. So, in the case of the selection call, the call is first question is made to both lists or just one list?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. The requirement is if we had the two lists, the requirement would be for it to go to the announce list at the moment the requirement is for it to go to the discussed list. The new requirement for us would go to the announce list and it is copied for information to the discuss.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And so, everywhere in our rules and procedure that says discuss we have to check is that what we mean or does it need to be announced?

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So, then the second question is who can nominate a candidate?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: A member in good standing.

JUSTINE CHEW: Which could be anyone really that is subscribed to the discuss list.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. And if they're keen, I'd like to think that they have self-subscribed to the announce. Otherwise, I would question their commitment.

JUSTINE CHEW: But they may for argument's sake, like remember the standing they subscribe to both lists. Right? But the first one, the announced one they can't post so they can't nominate a candidate in the on the anomaly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, again within our rules just doing a quick flick through. I would simply do a minor adjustment that says the publicly facing Wiki page and the copy to staff because it always has to be copied to staff is

---

what's critical. And so, it's the presence of the name on the Wiki page which is then updated to be even weekly.

These are the candidates we've got rather than at the moment the old rules are the old rules because we didn't even have bookies in those days. And so, what we're trying to do is make sure that the transparency aspects that we all want are maintained, rid ourselves of the crap we don't need that much of and still make sure that there are mechanisms for those principles of transparency and accountability and openness to go on.

Now, right now I will say, you have to send to the discussed list and all this bullshit has to go on. And I'd love to get rid of that totally. The less gentle towards that dark night by getting at least that managed in an announced list and then eventually, it would be more like a nominating process where if I'm not even subscribed to the announce list, but I am aware of the opportunity for a call for a role,

JUSTINE CHEW: The selection.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, that I let staff and the leadership team know, but I am interested in either selection or sending somebody to be a nomination for the selection that is then managed. You asked the nominee; do you want to do it? Now you do. Do you, don't you? Then you publish to the announce list what you've got on the Wiki that stops this business



---

where I say Justine, I'd like to make you president of the world and your name goes up because I've sent it to a list.

Public or otherwise. And then you go, no, I don't want to touch public president of the world with a barge pole. And you actually have to withdraw and decline publicly where what should happen is, I nominate you, staff or somebody or preferably I've done it before I nominate, you check with you. Are you willing? Have you accepted? Are you interested? and then as a more face to complete open and ready nomination, it goes public. Right now, it's us up because it's all--

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You can throw names around all over the place. You know what I mean?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. I totally agree in principle of what you said and I think that's what we're trying to get at to clean up this nonsense that goes on in the discuss list tonight. The question the question is, how far can we go with the cleanup process to the point where someone might argue that we're not being transparent anymore. I like what [CROSSTALK].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's why we've been saying for now.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I like what you described in terms of having a process by which someone reaches out to the candidate and say, hey. Are you interested? Are you prepared? And I would in fact Even go so, far as to say that someone should be checking whether they are qualified or not and that's where you'll we come back to this Adjunct 6 where there's a criteria by which candidates should meet in order to be eligible. I'm in favor of that. I just don't know whether we have support in this group so I'd like an indication of whether we do have support.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Interestingly enough, we can actually do that within the rules. The only awkwardness is right now, it says we've got to put these names to discuss list, and that's what I'd like to get rid of. Satish.

SATISH BABU:

Yeah. I have a little bit of discomfort in the member in good standing nominating candidates. First of all, we did discuss the definition of member in good standing, but I don't know whether we have closed it. Some of the people in our current list, going by what happened in the last election, are actually not necessarily what we mean by member in good standing. I think we have-- I mean, there should be a fair and high bar of standard as to what we mean by a member in good standing, if they're going to permit that person to start the nomination process.

We can actually have anyone on a list. We have no problem with that. But if anyone can walk in and anyone without any checks or balance

---

sheet automatically becomes a member in good standing and is allowed to nominate candidates. That's going to be a little bit of a problem. Because in many cases, only the electorate can nominate. The membrane good standing is not a part of the electorate. And given the fact that we are very open with the definition of member in good standing, for me, it's a potential kind of problem, which we need to examine a little more closely. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, Satish, let me do a little coaching from the sideline here, and now I'm going to declare that I actually have worked in behind the scenes in real politics. Not this bullshit we go on with in things like ICANN and this and Internet governance where real millions of dollars are made and lost and real cities are designed or otherwise. And this is a very fine balancing act to ensure the openness, the lower, if not removal of barriers, if you are going to be claiming to be a fully democratic process, and we are. You really have to watch. As soon as you get into only an electorate, only an electoral college, only a subset of those who are in power can nominate. You are opening yourself to quite valid, in many people's views, criticisms of having one finger on the scales. So, it really is a very fine balancing act.

One of the advantages of having a system that, as we are proposing, has a definition of what a member in good standing is. You said some people on our list wouldn't qualify. Once they don't qualify, then they're not member in good standing, and they can't nominate. They can't make a proposal. But anyone could propose. I could compose my great aunt Mary, but my great aunt Mary still has to get the support,

right? What we want to manage is the unengaged individuals coming in in some time pseudo support of possibly highly biased and unqualified individuals.

I'll come to you in a minute. The point that Justine made was that if we get the process where even in the nomination process to even get the nomination up, that the criteria, the expectations for that job is well understood and agreed to by the potential nominee. I can't put someone into local government unless they qualify to be put into local government. And if they're found to have falsified or fallen short on certain expectations, then they are removed, even if they are fully elected by the community.

So, you just got to watch where you put your control points. So, I understand the point. I just want to make sure that if you suggest the control points, you watch very carefully where you put them in. Satish and then Justine.

SATISH BABU:

Yeah. Thanks. So, I will support Justine's point about some kind of a process that ensures that there is-- The optics is good. We don't want the optics of a person who's never contributed to the list suddenly nominating PP. My second problem is that when a new member subscribes himself or herself to the list, they are automatically a member in good standing. We do not have any process to define or apply the definition of a member in good standing either at admission time or periodically. So, that makes everybody a member in good standing. And then we have to scramble at nomination time, and the

---

---

nomination is already done to figure out if this person is a member in good standing. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm going to let Justine take that because I'm talking too much, and I'm quite sure she's well and truly ready to respond to that one. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Unfortunately, I am not. Sorry to disappoint.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Oh, that's all right.

JUSTINE CHEW: I think it's something valid that we need to think about. I don't have immediate solution. Well, I guess my default would be someone is automatically a member in good standing unless proven otherwise. That would be my personal position. I don't think you have to prove yourself first especially if you're not known, right? The question that I wanted to raise in this context is in terms of candidate criteria. We also have to be careful in terms of not inadvertently excluding good people who have not had the opportunity to demonstrate leadership skills. So, insofar as the criteria for candidates is concerned, we have to be careful about certain things that are a must and certain things that are preferable.

---

Because we can also say that if someone we know is a good candidate by virtue of them having shown that they are good candidates elsewhere, but they have not been APRALO member, for instance. And do we really want to exclude that person from the ability of running for a role when we know that they're good? And in that sense--

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Or make them work for 3 years before they can. Yeah. Exactly.

JUSTINE CHEW: Correct. Yeah. So, there is a balance to be had in terms of, number 1, automatic member in good standing unless proven otherwise, and 2, the criteria for candidates being mandatory or preferable. And then there is this extension of it is that if this person is elected and then for argument's sake, 6 months, they have not performed, then what do we do?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, we've already got the removal. That's already built in. We can remove anybody through the recovery process.

JUSTINE CHEW: So, the argument being that the criteria for candidates could be preferable, not a must, or they must be able to demonstrate after being in office for such and such a time that they meet those criteria.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To some extent, it is a self-declaration that they will meet the criteria and an undertaking that they agree to continue to meet those criteria or aspire to meet those criteria. We don't require other than an email to staff that say, yes, I accept a nomination. What we would probably be doing with a well-written and designed process is make sure that what you are accepting is the must haves, the should haves, and the could haves.

So, those desirables and those more flexible points should be established before even the call for nomination goes out. That should be part of the designing what you want in that particular role, regardless of what the role is. And that then to accept a nomination means you are accepting. You either believe you possess or can perform within those particular criteria or expectations.

Now I agree with you, you should have the "you are in good standing unless proven otherwise". But to Satish's fear, what our rules do say about a member in good standing make it very clear what isn't a suitable set of things. So, if you've been removed for whatever reason, standards of behavior, at home and then attacks, all of those sorts of things. There's a whole lot of if you are this, then you are not a member of good standing that is established in the definition we have. And so, it does give you something to say, I'm sorry. I don't believe Justine is a suitable candidate able to nominate because of the following. And so, that can happen as unpalatable as that may be.

What you could try and do is make it so difficult for talent to be considered, noting that being considered doesn't mean you get the job. You still have to get the support. And we have many opportunities for

---

building consensus where even in pitching with interviews and with presentations, the community can say, I like Option A as Option B because we believe Option A fits more of the criteria and desirable traits than Option B does. That doesn't mean a or b would have been unqualified. It means that the community who are trying to build consensus, and if they can't, then they'll vote, has the opportunity to gather all their information and make their choices. Satish?

SATISH BABU:

Yes. So, I think, perhaps I'm overthinking this, but we work within in an honor system where we believe that people serious, where people are good by default and they're not trying to gain the system. And in that case, this is fine then. If people are working with a certain integrity, then things should go fine. Secondly, most of the people that we're talking about, people who would be proposed as candidate, we would have worked with them in the past.

It is when a person can bypass or work around this honor system, which means, I go get a new email ID out of any of the public providers. And each time I want to do something, I use a different ID. We have no means of verification of this. And if you're going to say automatically the person is in good standing. And if it's actually a person who wants to gain the system, then all it takes is for him to get an email ID from somewhere and join the list.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Hang on, Satish. A member in good standing also includes being active within the community. It's not just having your name on a list.



SATISH BABU: Correct. But there's no checks on that. At what point are we checking?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd like to think, Satish, that if Prateek, Laxmi, Priyatosh, Adarsh, or your name came up, because I have worked with you, seen you, interacted with you, that I would be relatively confident that you're not another five identities.

SATISH BABU: Correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, if you are a new identity, you actually have to work a whole lot harder to get the support.

SATISH BABU: But what is preventing a new identity from proposing a candidate?

CHERYL-LANGDON-ORR: Well, okay. Let's assume that happens. If that becomes a Problem, then the solution to that is and this is common amongst all sorts of entities and organizations, is you have a period of time—and it's a management, it's not a cure, but it is a control point—which is established, it's acceptable, it's still within the bounds of transparency and good accountability. You have a point before which if you join a list,

you cannot make a recommendation. So, it may be that you have had to be on and active six months before you're able to put or whatever.

So, the six months, I've seen six months used, I've seen three months. What you're talking about is called branch stacking in other political party models, where I get every one of my employees to come and join a particular part of a larger entity to get support for a candidate who would not normally get support for a candidate to go through a system. That abuse is a democratic process. It's done all the time. It's quite an artful thing. The way to manage it is to have these blackout times. Now it doesn't mean you can't branch stack. It just means you've got to work a whole lot harder to do so. But it does take the ease of the operation off, and that that's easy to do. But that doesn't happen in the list management. That happens in your rule elsewhere.

SATISH BABU:

Right. I mean, this is good to have a 6-month cooling off period before which they can start endorsing or proposing candidates. But we must also realize that our list currently has a bunch of suspect email IDs. When I say a suspect, I don't want to be unfair, I don't want to accuse anybody of doing anything.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

But, Satish, remember, that's the discussed list. Let's treat that like toilet that it is. You can flush it. You can use it. You can leave this empty bidet in the corner if you want to. And if you want to look into it and see what's going on, feel free. But the business will now go on in the new fresh announced list with much better control.

---

SATISH BABU: Okay. Right. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: So, I just want to add that people can still attempt to nominate people in the discuss list. It's just ignored. So, we can put in the rules to say that selections has to be done through the announce list. End of story. And then if we still have dodgy people trying to nominate people on the announce list, we have this filter already about who can post. And then anything that is not allowed, approved, by default goes to staff. Staff can have a look at it, staff can forward it to leadership team, and we can have a look at it to see.

And to be honest, I am less worried about the people who are nominating. I'm more worried about the candidates that are being nominated. So, I think attention should be focused on the candidates rather than the nominator. So, if there's a way that we are filtering candidates, we're good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that's where your conditions, expectations, essential criteria, desirable traits, that's where that's so important. And that's where I think we possibly just need to go back to our earlier rules and make sure we adjust based on today's some text, some draft language based on today's discussion about some additional checks and balances. So, it's not just a matter of the name goes to a list. In the future, it will be the

---

announce list. But that a nomination has a little bit of preparation and assessment associated with it.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. More work.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. But it's not difficult work.

JUSTINE CHEW: It's important. It's important work, though.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's important work, and more importantly, it's work that we're going to use established elsewhere precedent. It's not like we have to come up with something original here. We don't have [CROSSTALK]. Exactly.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. That's fine. By the way, then I will still need to ask folks about Adjunct 6, if we have the time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think if we are happy with 10, let's leave 10 now. I think there's enough support for us to bring in this new list. Just not get rid of the old one. Just put it in the corner and let it rot where it belongs. Who knows? Something useful may happen to it. Something brilliant may be sent to it one day. Stranger things have happened. Occasionally,

---

something useful happens in the ALAC discuss list. I've seen it. It doesn't happen often, but it does happen.

JUSTINE CHEW: Just one final thing with Adjunct 10, the email guide. Do we need to provide for additional list that could be established from time to time?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Probably and then established from time to time with working groups as you've done. Yeah. I like that.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Okay. So, point number 3 is okay with everyone?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And with point number 3, if I can just add on a little bit, I think what needs to be the process of forming that list needs to be in keeping with the wider ALAC and At-Large expectations. And so, that means that you actually have to proactively join the list. Even though you say I want to be part of this work team or this working group, you have to actually fill out the Google form that says this is my email address, this is the address that's going to be subscribed for this purpose, and I accept and give all the necessary permissions to ICANN to do all of those things. It's not an onerous task, and that's the same process that would be used annually or however often as we want to get refreshments, new people in, and old people to be able to decide they no longer wish to continue. Does that make sense?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Similar to what we're trying to do with the APS list.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly. Identical to what you're doing with the APS list. That's one of the few things that I can thankfully use for. All right. 6, and it's all yours.

JUSTINE CHEW: All right. Okay. 6 So, what we agreed to last time was that I would restructure the document to pass out all the criteria that we consider as generic, that we might want to consider as generic. And Maureen's got a point about whether we should be using generic or general. Okay. I'm not going to get into that yet. And then to identify specific criteria for each of the positions that can be filled.

Now, I must apologize that I don't know whether this document was openly available for comment at and at what point in time. I think it was, has been open for comment for some time. And I don't see too much movement in terms of what was put into the document earlier and what we see now. I think there's only been a couple of edits here and there. And so, for example, there's nothing on the specific criteria for APRALO vice chair. So, I don't know whether people just don't believe there is a specific criteria for vice chair or just haven't put something down.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you scroll to what it says the vice chair, please, Yesim? Okay. So, immediately, you need to have an ability for any vice chair to step in and act as chair. So, they also need to possess. So, it's be able and capable to meet the above and because any vice chair needs to be able to step in as chair should the need arise. So, if nothing else, we need to have that referenced.

JUSTINE CHEW: Satish has got his hand up.

SATISH BABU: Yeah. Thanks, Justine. I support this point that Cheryl has suggested because vice chair actually could become a chair at least even on a semi-permanent basis or even for specific meetings. So, it's important to have list down some skills. And secondly, vice chair is an entry level post. A lot of people might want to kind of apply and we need to clean out. So, priority is required there to ensure that we can clean on people. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So, is there anything within the list under the APRALO chair that shouldn't apply to vice chair?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Honestly, the only difference is experience, the degree of experience. Satish, what were you saying?

SATISH BABU: I was saying pretty much the same. We can relax a little bit with the length of service to the community, but, otherwise, the fundamental skills is the same.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So do people want to try and put in some text, or do you want--

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Can you do and add CLO and I'll have a go? But what I will do is going to be very much all of the above. Be able and capable to, all of the above. To some extent, it is a in training, understudied role. But in some situations, it may be a very active role. For example, some ALAC chairs have deliberately used their vice chairs for very, very specific leadership purposes, and there is a huge amount of autonomy provided to that vice chair for that particular portfolio when we've had vice chairs holding portfolios.

And so, they have to be every bit as capable, as Satish said, of not only stepping in on a meeting by meeting or in an actual step up to the role at the drop of a hat or the death of a person. But also, if they're given a portfolio or a delegation, some form delegated authority, they have to be every bit as capable, every bit as good in all of those areas. So, that's what it will reflect. Okay.



---

JUSTINE CHEW: So, then the next question would be, does anyone have concerns about what has been listed as generic and what has been listed as specific? And the third question associated with that is, would these be a should or a must to be met? So [inaudible 01:15:18] said it, you look at the introductory paragraph. Candidates should or must meet all of the generic criteria and ideally meet all or a majority of the specific criteria. Are we comfortable with that? Do we want to change that? And if we want to change that, how do you want to change it? Satish?

SATISH BABU: Now it may be very difficult to have everything ticking on all the boxes, but I would support the majority of this. Majority of the conditions for both, for the generic as well as for specific because the logic is that the larger number of points you qualify, the better, but that's hard to kind of put in as a rule. So, I am happy with should and not must. Thanks. But I'm open to your suggestion for that.

JUSTINE CHEW: So, Satish is suggesting that it should be should rather than a must, and a majority of the generic as well as specific criteria.

SATISH BABU: Yeah.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Just a second. Does anyone disagree with that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't disagree. Obviously, we need the flexibility. And I just said in the chat, I think what's in the general needs to be the more required and desirable. And in some cases, the whole list of specific is going to be impossible. We're going to be looking for unicorns. And so, there may be parts of the specific that are more requirements for some appointments. I don't know what that will be yet, but we need to be able to pull from the specific. If you have a particular appointment, whether we need a vice chair. Let me hypotheticalize here for a second.

For whatever reason, we suddenly decide we need a privacy expert, experience in privacy and jurisdiction as one of the vice chairs. Then that would be a particular specified for this coming set of appointment years. It wouldn't be part of this list. We need to be able to add job specific requirements as well. Does that make sense?

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So, meaning to say that this is not exhaustive?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay And then we can note of that. Just who would determine that special Position description? Would it be the leadership team, the sitting leadership team?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, you can, in fact, workshop it with your wider community should you have such an effort and energy to do so, but it still has to come through the leadership team. I mean, they have to hold the responsibility just the same as if the leadership of the ALAC, it's their job to tell the NomCom what the desirable, essential, and absolute specific to this coming couple of years, these are for the appointments of NomCom would be making from our region. So that's sort of that particular tweaking. It's the responsibility of the leadership. But they can be as inclusive as they want to be.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Then the next question. I've got a few more. We've got only 10 minutes left. Anybody disagree with changing generic to general based on Maureen's point, which is this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm okay with general, but Satish has his hand up.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Satish, go ahead.

SATISH BABU: To the previous question, who decides? Now the criteria, of course, the leadership team has to decide. But they're only kind of-- I mean, there's going to be an election or selection afterwards. So, if there are multiple

---

candidates, then there's going to be an election. So, I don't think we need to really bother about because it's a self-declared adherence to this point. So, if the candidate can look at these things and say, do I fit or do I not fit? If I'm fitting, I'm willing to go ahead and kind of participate in the process.

So, this can be as detailed or-- I mean, there has to be flexibility, but it can be as detailed as you want because it is not going to be applied on directly. There's going to be an election process if there are multiple candidates. So, I hope you're not looking at the nomination committee kind of process because I don't know whether we want to go into that. Currently, the process would be somebody nominates and can be taxed. And if there are multiple people, then there's an election. Otherwise, automatic by selection. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Noted. So, coming back to my most immediate previous question, are there any objections to changing generic to general? I don't see any. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm okay with general.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Okay. So, that's fine. We will do that. The second thing is okay. The next thing is under general criteria, I have I think yesterday or today, I can't remember, additional point at the bottom, which is they must submit reports. I think this is something that we should have, and

---

then we probably neglected to put in in the first place. Because that is one way we can establish a responsibility for whoever gets elected or whoever gets selected and appointed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

So, with regard to reports, I also my experience with volunteers in this community is such that I would recommend that there is a public facing repository, i. e. , a wiki or web page, where updates and information can be put from any appointee. All right? Because reports can go to just the leadership team or just a meeting, and it may or may not be recorded fully in the meeting. It needs to have a more archival repository as well. And I don't actually care whether or not like some of our ALAC liaisons they use their wiki space more for their regular reporting, or they push things out in it to one of the email lists. I don't care as long as both match. Does that make sense?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes. I would consider that more administrative point rather than something that goes into the criteria for candidates. And it's something that the leadership team can stipulate outside of this document.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, let me play the devil's advocate. I am about to tear down the structure of all RALOs. I want to destroy all RALOs. I'm going to find mechanisms to do as much harm as possible to as many RALOs as possible. But, yeah, a hobby. Everybody needs a hobby. This is going to be me coming in from that aspect. One of the ways I would pick out

---

failure to comply with your own requirements and regulations is what is the nature of the report. Where are the reports? How are they archived? What's the accessibility to them? Who are you reporting? Is it just to the leadership team? Where does the leadership team then have the requirement to pass this on in a full and unedited way, with or without annotations to the membership? There's so many little chewy, nasty, little loop holy bits that you can play with.

And also, the report that a phone call-- Or sorry. A phone call that shows how old I am. A Zoom messaging to just one of the leadership team meetings does not a report make. A one line in a report out of a leadership team meeting, if they even make such things, that goes to the membership is probably not good enough. If the membership was up in arms to want to know what was going on with one of their vice chairs, for example, they should be able to find that out without having to troll through any minute from every meeting. Do you see what I mean? Instead of that--

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes. Okay. So back at you, again, I think that is something that should be inserted somewhere else. It's not part of the candidate requirements list. So, I'll take your point, and I'm going to suggest that we revisit paragraph 8 under APRALO leadership team responsibilities, requirements of responsibilities. So maybe something that can be inserted there.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, maybe here, we should be reports as defined in the rules of procedure, so that we know what is a good enough report. Because it's not just good enough for it to be the chair. Because if I'm sleeping with the chair, that may not be a good enough method of trust. Do what I mean? I'm being very naughty today, but I'm still on vacation. Sorry.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. That's fine. It's just worth submitting, I think. Okay. If we can move on to just conclude on this Adjunct 6 at least. All right. So going down to page 3. I don't think there's any controversy in other edits, but in terms of the specific criteria for the APRALO individual members representative, Maureen is suggesting that it should be an affiliated member as opposed to just an individual member. So, comment on that, please. I think where she's coming from is and I suppose I'm putting words in her mouth really, because she's not on this call, is she?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No.

JUSTINE CHEW: In terms of like, for example, you talk about voting, the individual members' representative votes on behalf of just the unaffiliated members, not all the individual members. So, in that aspect alone, should we stipulate that the rep must be unaffiliated individual member? Although that person is supposed to be directed by people rather, not voting on either or.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is perhaps odd if one was a rank-and-file member of an ALS to be seeking to not just be an active individual member if they are formally registered and accepted as an unaffiliated member. Surely, that's the grouping from which, at least at this stage, the representation should come from. I see what Maureen is saying.

JUSTINE CHEW: Remember that we've now created this new class of individual members who could be also members of ALS. And we're saying that the individual member's rep looks after all these, supposedly looks after very high-level sense. But they are meant to engage with them, but they will only vote on behalf of the unaffiliated ones.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Unaffiliated. Exactly. Yeah.

JUSTINE CHEW: But they're still open to engaging non-affiliated members So, the question then is, are we going to stipulate that the rep must only be an unaffiliated individual member? I'm open either way. Yes, Satish.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I think I am open either way too.

SATISH BABU: So, when you say a representative, what does that mean? If you're not a part of a group, then how can you represent that group?



JUSTINE CHEW: You are part of that group. If you're an individual member, you are part of that group, But the rep. So, the rep is for that group, the individual member's rep. Is not an unaffiliated individual member's rep. It's individual members rep.

SATISH BABU: So, do we have two member categories? One is the unaffiliated individual member, and the other is the individual member?

JUSTINE CHEW: Correct. The UIMs are assumed as part of the IMs now. So, the larger group is the IM, the individual members, and the subset of that would be the unaffiliated individual members.

SATISH BABU: I'll have to take a look at the language. So, I'll withdraw my comment. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I see Maureen's point, but I'm not so concerned whether they're a rank and file, not in the leadership, not casting a vote, but just happen to also be a member of some At-Large structure. Because it's directed. Their role is directed. They're doing something after interaction with and on the behalf and instructions of the unaffiliated members. So, it really shouldn't matter too much if they're a trained monkey, surely.

JUSTINE CHEW: Whether that person is a leadership team member that's we said that it's up to the chair.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. No, but I mean if they were just an IM, not a UIM. So, they're an IM, they happen to be a member of ALS. I don't think that's important as long as they're not part of the leadership in a representation of that ALS.

JUSTINE CHEW: Correct. Which they cannot be. In order to be an IM, they cannot be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So as long as they're meeting that other criteria we've got elsewhere, I honestly don't think it's important because they are being directed in what they do. So maybe we want to make it clear that they just need to be an individual member, an IM and say UIM or IM. I mean, make it clear that it could be either.

JUSTINE CHEW: No. That's in the definition of IM already. So, I'm trying not to repeat things because otherwise you've got to change. Yeah. So, the question now is only whether it has to be an unaffiliated individual member.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not for me. I'm happy to let it be just as IM.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Does anyone else have an opinion, especially the individual members in this call in this group? Come on, guys.

SATISH BABU: This is Satish. I have to take a look at the differences once again before I can give my opinion. I would assume that if individual member means a member of ALS, then it could be mild conflict of interest, but I'm not so sure until I see the definition. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Remember, in this role, Satish, and we agreed on all of that text a long time ago, but in this role, all they're doing is acting on behalf of. It's not "representational role". They're not acting in the best interests as much as-- Well, they are, but they actually have to do as directed. So, if it came to a vote or a poll, then they should actually be able to either say I am confident that the individual members believe that this is the way forward, or they should be able to say I'm going to abstain because I'm not confident which way the individual members will go. Does that make sense?

SATISH BABU: Yes, it does. Except that the individual member already has a pathway through their ALS, but the unaffiliated individual members do not have any other representative. Naturally, it would follow that. I mean, for

---

me at least, that it should be someone from that group rather than individual member who might have some kind of--

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You agree with Maureen's points that they need to be limited so that the larger group of individual members can only be represented by someone from a subset of that group.

SATISH BABU: Yeah. But they already have they are represented through the ALS. That is the primary kind of line.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you thought in an ALS there is 70 people. , how much is one voice going to make?

JUSTINE CHEW: Let's not get into that political debate because that was had during the UIM working party, mobilization working party work. There was a big war about whether we needed a category of IMs and the majority said yes. So here we are. So, the question just remains of whether you think that the individual members representative should be an unaffiliated IM, or doesn't it matter.

I don't think we're going to come to a pass today. And Satish wants to have a look at the definition, which is fine. I think we can take this up on amazing. This is something I'll come back to it another day. I just

---

want to end by the point, the last point, because we're overtime. The specific criteria for liaisons and appointees. The language says do not need to be APRALO members. And this is direct taking off from the existing ROPs paragraph 93. So, we have an agreement from Amrita and Priyatosh, but we have a disagreement from Maureen. So, I just want to resolve this, if we can today on whether people think they agree with the current text or they agree with Maureen to say that she believes that-- she disagrees that it should be do not need to be APRALO members. So, she thinks that this role has to be from the pool of APRALO members only.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What's the rationale for that? Can we look at it?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not seeing it.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yesim, you'll need to help me click on Maureen's comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ah, there we are. Okay. Well, I see her point. There's probably no harm in flipping the existing to a new way of thinking if we believe that's going to strengthen something. That the likelihood of someone who is

---

not a member being appointed and staying not a member. If we make them part of the leadership team, if we give them delegated authority, yada, yada, yada, I'm not sure how much of a non-member they're going to be for very long.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Sorry, Satish. We could take the approach that we do with other candidates to say that they don't need to be APRALO member at the point where they are nominated or whether they are appointed, but they must become when they perform, when they start performing their role.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. To me, that's the best of both worlds because I think you have to have that once you're performing the role, you're kind of doing the membership bit. And to make it so, that's a voice for me.

SATISH BABU: Yeah. Actually, I agree with Maureen, but I also agree with the proposal that Justine just put forward that they become members immediately thereafter. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Cool.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's more open to allow non to come in and then make sure at the time of they are. That's fine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Good. Good. I'm done with that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Now with the others, I'm not totally sure that the others needed to be on today's agenda for much more than a were there any comments. Because we've discussed each of the other ones extensively. And I'd like to suggest before we close that this group gives us now a week, if not two, to create what is going to be then a final draft or penultimate draft document, which is not a comparison document, but more of a fresh read. Does that make sense to everybody?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, I agree. But I do want to point out that with Adjunct 08 in respect of individual members, there is some new text that people may not have seen yet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, they probably haven't.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Because of this issue about the Google doc being made available for viewing, the settings, which I want to point out is, the process of

---

acceptance. Now because we know that ALS accreditation is done by ALAC, so that is an existing process that's documented somewhere else in part of the ALAC adjunct documents. But there isn't one for individual members, which is the domain of RALOs. So, it's the RALOs the acceptance of individual members, not ALAC.

And in the UIM mobilization working party report, there are certain recommendations in there that basically says that RALOs has to establish a process by which individual members are to be accepted. And so, long as it's clearly documented, it's fine. That's the RALOs. But it doesn't have clearly documented.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Isn't that what you put in 8?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. But it's new. It's new in a sense that earlier on, it was just a criteria and expectations. It didn't have the acceptance process. It had a membership withdrawal, but it didn't have the acceptance process. So, the acceptance process text is new, which is what you see in the part C.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, let's give the group the two weeks because there's a few things that need to happen with the adjunct documents. But let's give the group the same amount of time over the next two weeks to review the adjunct documents in general, but 8 with the new text in particular and use the email list to raise, leave it open for comments, the adjunct documents open for comments. And we can then deal with those



---

because by the time we get to the adjunct document, it's going to be the far end of the two or three weeks. Then it is we're not going to start with the adjuncts, and that should give the working group more time to dig into that. Does that work?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, it works. I just want to bring it to light that people know that there's this text that they probably need to review if they haven't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So yes. And whatever email goes out after today with the recordings and everything else, we need to make clear that all of the adjunct documents need to be looked at by all of the working group members with specific attention taken to Adjunct 8 and Section C of Adjunct 8. Yes?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Worthy work people. We're almost there. I can see some light. End of tunnel? Oncoming train?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Sorry, Cheryl, Justine, if I may. So, when are we planning to hold our next call? Are we going to or are we going to--

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We won't be meeting next week. And Justine's out all of next week anyway. We will see how far we get if next week and the week after, working with staff, with you and Grisela be back, and probably pick someone like Maureen to come in with her experience in editing as well, to try and make a final draft document, which is not a comparison document. It is a fresh read document. Because we need to get closer to a and here is something for everyone to read and consider end support or otherwise.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, people. Works for me. Thanks, everybody. Bye for now.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.