NATHALIE PEREGRINE:	Thank you Cheryl. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. This is the APRALO ROP Review Working Group meeting on September 11th, 2013. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, KT, Ali Almeshal. We have an apology from Gunela Astbrink. And from staff, we have Silvia Vivanco and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Cheryl.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you Nathalie. This is Cheryl for the purposes of transcription. Well, gentlemen it shouldn't take us long to do a round robin of introductions, but before we jump into that, I would like to just ask you both if you had time to have a quick look at our proposed agenda and is there anything you would like to add, or indeed whether or not you have advice or any other business that you know now that you would want to bring forward.
	I will ask again at the end of the meeting.
KARATIANA TAIURU:	KT speaking. I have nothing to add, and I'm happy with the agenda.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Terrific.

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.

ALI ALMESHAL: This is Ali, Ali Almeshal. I have nothing to add [?]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. We'll be catching up our five minutes very rapidly. This is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I wanted to do a very quick round robin of introductions, recognizing that at our next gathering we will undoubtedly have to do the same when other than we three again are together in the name of reviewing the operating principles of our regional At Large organizations. But to very briefly begin with, KT, he is one of the original and founding team, and we're also going to see how Wolf is along with me and a bunch of other people of the original operating principles if he'll make a very briefing [?], and only Ali if you would like to follow along with that.

KARAITIANA TAILURU: KT speaking. Thank you for that introduction Cheryl. I'm based in New Zealand with the New Zealand [?] Society. And yes, as Cheryl said, I'm one of the original members, and yeah. I'm looking forward to updating our operating principles and getting more in line with the ALAC principles and a little bit more comprehensive than what they are right now. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you KT. They are a little… This is Cheryl. [?] Ali have we lost you? Are you on mute? Can the staff fix the unmute?

ALI ALMESHAL: I just [?]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There is an echo, I hear you loud and clear. I was just asking if you would do a very brief introduction of yourself please Ali.

ALI ALMESHAL: Sure. I'm Ali Almeshal [?] At Large [selection] member, and since three years now, [?] … board member and [?]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. Thank you very much for that Ali and KT. I'm very briefly, I have served again as a founding member, along with KT, with the APRALO.   I've done four APRALO on the At Large Advisory committee. I've served for the ALAC as chair and have had a number of other opportunities to serve the At Large community within ICANN.

Most importantly, and for purposes of this exercise, I've been heavily involved with a number of regional rule reviews discussions, and I've also been an integral part of the ALAC new rules of procedure and review.   So I'm looking forward to getting down to reviewing our current operating principles, which of course, [?] in 2007, were modified in 2009 and it is that set we will be looking at.

But as KT quite wisely pointed out, I hope we're getting this work group agreeing that what we should be doing is bringing our regional

EN

operating procedure, or rules [?], more in line with what is now the new At Large Advisory committee rules. So that end, that we might now move straight on to item three in our agenda, which is [?] …probably a good idea if we can have some aim and objectives that is easy for the rest of our community to understand.

And indeed I wanted to ask whether or not you had some concepts of what you, as volunteers to this work group, would like to see as an end product. Perhaps because I think KT probably has a little bit of experience in this field, and I don't want to take all the [?] … Ali, I might ask you for any comment or what you would see as our scope of work, and perhaps some bizarre other outcomes and then go to KT after that.

That way you can take all of his good points without him saying it first. Over to you Ali.

ALI ALMESHAL: If I hear you clearly, I would just [?] …just to mention that one of my big involvement now with ICANN, before I get to your questions, is the – I'm working with the team of [?] working strategy group [?] …this is one of my biggest involvement with ICANN. Going back, [?] …I'm able to understand exactly what you were just [?] …so if you just repeat what you were saying.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly Ali. It's Cheryl for the record. And I've now got the microphone, it's loud as humanly possible. Is that any better?

ALI ALMESHAL: Now I can hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Well I'll do my best to literally speak into the microphone on my phone. Ali, what I was asking is if you would like to give some comment on our discussion for item three of our agenda. In other words, what do you think our literal deliverables should be. You may have had some thoughts on what our aims and objects might be, or indeed a comment on the scope of work.

If you haven't, that's fine. But if you have, I'd very much like to hear them.

ALI ALMESHAL: So you wanted to [?] the discussion of [?]…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct.

ALI ALMESHAL: All right. I'll do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Ali, would you like to share any of that now while we're together?

EN

ALI ALMESHAL: Cheryl, I have nothing now to share.   [?] …discussion [?] …certain objectives [?]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. Thank you Ali. It's Cheryl again for the record. So we'll note that you're happy to hold the pen on the recording and the development of our scope of work and [?] objectives. But perhaps I'll ask KT if he might have some suggestions to contribute to your early drafting. KT?

KARAITIANA TAIURU: KT for the record. I think it will be good to give some clarity on APRALO procedure on the role and generally give some consistency, which has already been stated, with the ALAC rules of procedure. I think that if we do that, it will stop a lot of the past debate and confusion over what the procedures are, and what the [?] have been.

                         And I think, yeah, that should also include things like the voting, quorums, how we conduct our meetings, and perhaps more importantly, participation if we maybe look at some participation rules and try and pickup our members being more active. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you KT, that's an excellent set of suggestions. Ali, to assist you in penning this part, I would very much hope that you would be able to do the drafting and have it placed directly on our [Wiki space], but I can assure you that if you need any assistance with that, that staff would be

more than happy to give you a hand, even if it's loading a document onto the Wiki.

So Silvia will be your main point of contact for this, and the same goes for you KT because you're inevitably going to get a job as well. The transcript and recording of this call is going to be available quite quickly, the turnaround is excellent these days. So every work that KT just said, will indeed be available for you. So if you didn't catch all of that, possibly the standard of the audio on today's call, you will be able to capture everything that KT has just said.

So fear not if you think you've missed a little bit of it. I'd like to suggest that… This is Cheryl for the record here. That one of the things we need to look at fairly early on is what we don't need to do as well as what we do need to do. For example, I'm not sure that it will be a certainly productive exercise, if we were to replicate great lumps of cut and paste out of, for example, the new ALAC rules of procedure.

I would prefer to think we could come up with something relatively [green], but still [accepted], and that if we want to refer to a particular title, standard, or behavioral norm, or voting norm, or proportional quorum, or whatever that was referred to in another reference such as, the ALAC rules and procedure, that we just reference and link to that rather than replicate. Obviously, if there is something specific to our region, then that needs to be drawn out, and deliberated, and agreed to.

But I'm certainly not hoping that what we come out with is an even larger document than the some 30 pages that the other ALAC rules of

EN

procedure had stretched to. Obviously, it would be in my totally biased view, and [?] KT makes some reference to [using the] introduction, if we were able to be harmonized as much as possible with the At Large advisory committee rules, so that we don't have a situation where our At Large structures have a set of expectations within the region, and then an entirely different set of rules all in the expectations when they work in the larger At Large Advisory committee framework.

So we can harmonize, I'm hoping we will be able to harmonize. And KT coming to a couple of your points, perhaps one of the things that could be useful is if we were to take the major headings out of the ALAC rules of procedure, and see how many, or if any, of those major headings are going to be, in our view, applicable to our region.

You mentioned, for example, [?] performance and expectations on our members, etcetera. The local performance metrics are outlined in the ALAC rules of procedure, so while we may not want to have I think [?] metrics, the topic – the subject matter is probably is still relevant. How do you both feel about that way forward to create [?] that way?

KARAITIANA TAIURU: KT for the record. I think taking the headings and adapting or deleting, is a useful pathway forward. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. All right, perhaps… KT could I encourage you to do that stripping out and creating just a wireframe for us to work on between now and our next meeting? Obviously directly out of the ALAC rules of

procedure, but also that integrate everything that is currently in our somewhat [?] three page, rules of procedure. Also operating processes. We have necessarily light set of rules that we are currently operating on, but there is still a couple of those categories which I think can be quite reasonably put into a wireframe.

So would it be okay for you to have a quick go at that?

KARAITIANA TAIURU: KT for the record. Yes I can do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Well we should be well ahead when we next gather with a hopefully larger number in our workgroup. Is there anything else that you would like to discuss at this point from item three before we have a quick look through our existing APRALO rules?

Hearing nothing, let's jump right in. This is Cheryl for the record again, or should I say still? And thank you very much to Nathalie and Silvia for putting up the existing operating principles of APRALO as amended in March 2009.

As you can see, these documents – sorry. This document is very much a highly appropriate set of boiler plate, as some of us would call it, principles that were sufficient for the regional organizations to be formed. I'm hoping that you are able to scroll at your leisure and that I'm not making you dizzy as I'm scrolling up and down. But I would like you to, in the next couple of minutes, take a little bit of time with me…

Thank you Nathalie. I was dragging you up and down, I probably made you all dizzy. Take a little bit of time to go through this so that we understand that whilst this was a foundation document, it still has a great deal to offer, but some things, for example, we can probably agree on this call, we will be suggesting or either changed or even deleted.

Let's roll back up to the top of the document if you haven't already done so, and in the absence, sorry. I just realized I had my mouth away from the speaker. I apologize. In the absence of any other suggestions in part one, I would note that the same sort of topics and headings will be in the new rules of procedure where the document does start out with some simple definitions and some objectives or activities of the entities.

So in our case, the objects of procedure are probably likely to continue. Do either of you disagree with that top [?] that we would be starting with some simple definitions and then moving into our primary purpose and objectives?

KARAITIANA TAIURU: KT for the record…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If there are no objections, I would suggest that whilst we can recommend that to our workgroup, in case it might be worthwhile annotating that section in our wireframe to say that we would recommend maintaining that section, as opposed to editing drastically or deleting it.

It may very well be that we should also note that we should take a look at the current ICANN bylaws to ensure that our objective and primary purpose do accurately reflect the current ICANN bylaws and expectations. It is possible that in the case of the ALAC review, and some of the bylaw change that happens as a result of the implementation, the things out of the ALAC review that we should perhaps get some of our turn, or make an addition or two.

So that might be a side note. If we move down to membership, again I would suggest it's probably a section that probably can be just adopted, but this may very well be KT, where the aspects of how one maintains a membership by setting some expectations upon our At Large structures, could be inserted.

I'll leave that up to you, but my natural inclination is to suggest that under membership probably somewhere in that tree structure [?] membership is where the expectations of what we have on an ALS should probably [?]

The next section, of course, is interestingly enough designed – described under management. That is possibly a turn that we may find jarring to some, some of the other regions have found the terminology certainly, Ali I accept that I do accept your apology. And I hope next time we meet that we have a far better line for you as well.

And we'll be sending out a Doodle so please make sure you select a time that is perhaps even more suitable for you. Thanks Ali. It's okay, KT, I'm just talking to you now. I certainly aware that some of the other regions

EN

have found terms like management, indeed the At Large Advisory Committee found terms like management a little bit jarring.

So we might need to be a little careful on selection, so perhaps what we can do is ask one of the other members of the workgroup to take the job of going through and seeing whether there is change in terminology that might be desired. How do you feel about that yourself?

KARAITIANA TAIURU: KT for the record. It's a good idea.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: With things like management, there has been a strong push for use of team language. We'd even had some considerable criticism in the At-Large advisory committee rules when using terms like executive and things like executive committee. So we probably could have an opportunity to even call our At Large structures and see what these feelings are on some of these headings once you've got the wireframe.

But that's certainly one that I think I would be highlighting as a term change, not what's under the term necessarily, but certainly the term itself is management. And this is one area that does sometimes cause confusion in our calls. KT you probably have painful memories of the fact that there has been some confusion in the past, and still continues to be the case, as to whether or not the secretariat is a necessary annual or bi-annual renewal, or whether or not it's a discretionary appointment.

At the moment, I rules say it may be appointed, and we tend to allow for a continuation and a reaffirmation. That's probably going to be another area that we need to go out to our community to see whether or not that's what they want to continue to do. In other regions, the secretariat is a standard set of elections, and I'm not biased one way or the other.

But I do think we have very good reasons simply making it an appointment in the first place, and we may need to talk through that. The other thing, of course, is in the days when these rules were put together, we had a vastly different level of collaborative tools to use as well as a very different level of staff support. So that's probably something else that we need to consider.

I think the rest is pretty much standard and I'll leave that to our next meeting. Although the one thing I would suggest, we probably should be encouraging evolution of, and that is the, in the witness thereof. That was fine in the last paragraph when it was a founding document. I don't think it has any place in an ongoing document other than perhaps in our preamble where we might make some mention of when the originating operating principles were created.

And indeed, therefore whether at the very beginning of APRALO came from, but I certainly don't think it belongs to in a witness thereof, the facts of the matter could probably come into a preamble. And you might want to consider putting a placeholder in for a preamble in the wireframe.

EN

I can't manage to do much more in reviewing that, but what do you think?

KARAITIANA TAIURU: KT for the record. No, I think you covered it quite well. I've got plenty of notes here. I have nothing else to add at this moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. It's Cheryl for the record. Let's move on to number five and we might be going for a nice and extra short meeting, which would suit us all fine I'm sure. Collaboration tools, KT are you comfortable with Wiki?

KARAITIANA TAIURU: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. And I'm sure with any staff assistance, the rest of the workgroup should be equally comfortable with Wiki. I would like to propose, however, that we do ask our staff, though it would be an action item out of today's meeting, to set us up a mailing list. Are you in agreement with that KT?

KARAITIANA TAIURU: Yes I am.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Terrific. I did propose in one of our emails that I thought it would be a good thing for that mailing list to have two layers of the description. Everyone is subscribed, some of us our subscribed and are also listed as working group members, but that we leave it open so if someone wishes to subscribe to just keep up to speed, or to make the occasional casual contribution, they would be more than welcome to.
	Do you want to go with that open model? Or would you prefer a closed model KT?
KARAITIANA TAIURU:	KT for the record. I prefer transparency, so I'm all for an open email list.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Cheryl for the record. I'm not exactly surprised with that answer from you. I also want to note at this meeting that we had no comment criticizing that approach from our regional mailing list. And so to that end, what we can do is ask staff to setup the mailing list and ensure that it is an open one, but that our Wiki page will record two types of subscribers to the list that I just, list subscribers and those that are list subscribers and active working group members.
	And that would allow for lurkers, which is a good thing. Nothing wrong with a bit of lurking [?] Any other tools you want to suggest at this stage. I'm a little hesitant to get to this because it is only you and I and I'm sure we'll agree on everything anyway, but it's probably better to include the rest of the workgroup on a list discussion once we've got our list.

EN

But if you've got some suggestions KT?

KARAITIANA TAIURU: No. I guess I'm pretty happy with any collaboration tool. But, yeah, I guess Wiki is probably the best idea for that output anyway.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I think we probably, Cheryl for the record, need to recognize now for the record, quite literally, that a number of parts of our region do have particular difficulties with certain types of collaborative tools. And it maybe that even in drafting, we may need to use a hybrid approach.

For example, other regions have found it quite useful to use things like Google documents, but that of course is something that significant proportions of our region cannot access or use live. So unlike many other regions, Asia Pacific does need to be more sensitive to the firewall and accessibility issues then perhaps many other regions.

So if we have to come up with some hybrids we will. And I think what we'll do is carry over that discussion for our next meeting. Now we've been given a job, KT, but we haven't actually been told when we need to do it by. That's kind of interesting.

However, we could say 2016, but that's probably not going to be acceptable. What do you think is achievable?

EN

KARAITIANA TAIURU: Yeah. KT for the record. I'm not too sure about timeframe. I guess, it would be good if we told the others that we're going to a tougher pace and for a level of commitment. I don't think it's a big job.

SILVIA VIVANCO: This is Silvia. If I may just comment that APRALO is the first RALO that is actually reviewing the operating procedures and comparing them with the ALAC, the new ALAC operating procedures. So the timeframe, perhaps to you, but of course, we would like to have all of the RALOs completed the operating procedures, definitely before the London summit.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Fantastic. Thank you for that Silvia. It's Cheryl for the record. One of the milestones that I thought we might be able to aim for, KT, and I'm just checking with [?] … I don't believe it should be too difficult, is if we aim to have a discussion on acceptance of our new rules at the Singapore meeting.

KARAITIANA TAIURU: KT for the record…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that makes sense. It comes in before London, it means that we are taking advantage of things first [?] and showing the way. And I thought that no problem with Asia Pacific taking the lead here, I'm quite sure you don't either. But we do have the benefit of having a meeting

EN

in our region in Singapore and that means that we have a high likely hood of a larger number of our At Large structures having a face to face opportunity.

So how about we make that our current, albeit just an aspirational, endpoint? And at our next meeting, we try and workout a timeline that is a little more concrete backwards from that?

KARAITIANA TAIURU: KT for the record. I think that, yeah. Ample time and yeah. I think it's great that we aim for the Singapore meeting for a wider discussion of the draft. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Cheryl for the record. And it has another advantage and that is on the presumption that one of the things that probably won't change in our rules, is that we will be making our appointments in – completed in June in here. It would mean that we would also have ample time to actually do whatever electoral processes are required as a result of these new rules.

Okay. Well in that case, I don't there is too many other administration matters we can discuss at this stage with just you and me. But what I would like to do is to find out from staff is there any questions or clarifications that they would like on the couple of action items that I think we have. [?] a couple of penholders and a couple of tasks, and we specifically asked for a list to be setup. And Silvia I would very much appreciate if you reach out to Ali and make sure he gets pushed, the

transcript and recording of this call, but to also to ensure that he is comfortable with the use of the Wiki for creating draft.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. Sure. Will do. And the clarification I need is do you want a monthly call? What is the frequency of the call of this working group?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yup. That's the very next part of this item. I am particularly concerned that we have a very small turnout for today's call. So what I would like to see is if we can do and find another call in this month, so towards the end of September. And if you consider in another call, between now and the end of September, I'd like to use the opportunity for the group as a whole to give feedback once we've got our timeline and established how much is going to be done offline and how much is going to be done in teleconference mode.

I predict however, that a minimum get together time [?] monthly. So let's sketch in or pen in the likelihood of it being monthly, but as we come closer to March, and especially after a number of our people may be occupied for a small amount of time in December and again in January/February, there is various Lunar New Year celebrations. We may have to come down to a couple of fortnightly meetings towards the end, but that is not unusual.

And if need be, we'll do them a couple of times a week, but that's all a matter of just meeting the timeline. So let's say it's monthly now. What do you think about that KT?

EN

KARAITIANA TAIURU: KT for the record. I think monthly is suitable, as long as we've got the mailing list in between. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can always ramp it up if we need to. That was Cheryl's comment. Okay, so you agree KT we'll try to sneak another one in before the end of this month sir?

KARAITIANA TAIURU: Yes. KT for the record. Yes I do agree.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Today that brings us to the end. Oh goody, five minutes late in the 45 minute meeting, so a 40 minute meeting, I do like 40 minute meetings. And our next meeting will be determined by Doodle poll, and it will be held at a time that is the most popular, and that indeed has a date somewhere between mid to late next week and then end of the month.

One little thing, if I may Silvia and Nathalie, with the Doodle, can we also include some of the times around the 20:00 to 23:00 UTC? If memory serves, that does suit some people out of Asia, so you certainly cluster them around our 05, 06, 04:00 UTC times that we've met for our [?].

But I'll remind you of having alternatives between the 20:00 and 23:00 UTC times. It's because half of Asia is waking up as well, and that may even suit some of the more western parts as well because that would be closer to ending their working day, I guess.

EN

Is there anything else KT?

SILVIA VIVANCO: So Cheryl, between 20 and 21 UTC?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 20 and 23, so let's see what the people want to do a 20:00, a 21:00, a 22 or 23. We need to give a few more choices and we might find that we get more takers.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. We'll do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But also, stick around the 05:00 as well, because that's our traditional meeting time. But I've just noted that we've had reasonable success getting people in those 20 plus hour UTC calls from time to time.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. And that's actually good for the staff as well, so thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, that has some benefits I know.

SILVIA VIVANCO:	I am across the ocean from you in Peru, so it's about two in the morning here. That's okay.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	…now you know how KT and I feel all the time.
SILVIA VIVANCO:	Exactly. That's why I said okay, no, if APRALO does it, I can do it.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	All right. So I'm going to [?] KT, have you got anything else to say do it now or hold your peace until the next meeting.
KARAITIANA TAIURU:	[?]
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Terrific. Okay. So a bit of homework for Ali and KT, I look forward to seeing this all happen on the Wiki. And we'll all get the list started and get the discussions going on the list. Thank you KT, thank you Ali for joining us. And thank you very much Nathalie and Silvia. And look, you've got 15 minutes of your life back.

[Various people saying thank you and goodbye]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]