
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the AFRALO ROP Working Group call on Friday, 7th November 2014 at 15:00 UTC. On the French channel we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Aziz Hilali and Beran Gillen. On the English channel we have Alan Greenberg and Barrack Otieno. We have apologies from Michel Tchongang, Hadja Ouattara and Didier Kasole. From staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Terri Agnew. Our French interpreters today are Claire and Camila. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes but also for our French interpreters. Thank you very much and back over to you Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Terri. Good morning, good evening everybody. As you know, I sent an email because we are going to speak again about individual membership and today we need to finish and work on that item, because we are late and as we couldn't reach a consensus last time, I decided that we were going to speak today to discuss and reach a consensus. We need to try to reach a consensus. This is a good way to work, because when we go there is someone losing and someone winning, and we don't want that. So afterwards I'm going to ask the question I asked last time.

I've received some answers to have [attacked 02:21] that will reach our consensus. Now the first question was are we going to accept individual membership? Until now there is no negative answer, so I think we're agreeing to accept individual membership into AFRALO. The second question now I'm going to ask is the individuals that will be Members of

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.

AFRALO, will they have a way to participate in the decision making of AFRALO; not giving a vote to each Member, but giving a way to allow each Member to give his opinions.

I have no answer on this question. I know that two or three persons are against that. They don't think that the individuals can participate in the decision making. I haven't seen any positive opinion, but I have seen some negative opinions. Now I'm asking everyone participating in this call, please – the majority of our group is thinking that AFRALO Members don't have to be able to participate. If you want the Members to be able to participate, please give me a green sign in the AC. If you're not agreeing, give me a red cross so I know you're not agreeing. If you're not on the AC, if you want to have the floor ask for the floor. Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you Tijani. I'm going to repeat what you just said in the email, but I think I agree for individuals to be Members of AFRALO, and I think we have to try this experience. We can have experts or normal individuals who are representing the individual Internet users. Giving them the possibility to have a way to participate in our decision making, I'm against this idea, because I'm amongst the persons who participate to the creation of ALAC and AFRALO, and our objective was to represent the Internet users into ALAC and AFRALO.

I don't wish to repeat myself, but I prefer to accept individuals, experiment with it for one or two years, see what they can give us, and then give them the ALS statute, because an ALS represents a community, a group of individuals. So to have an ALS as an individual, representing

an ALS, to have the unaffiliated Members forming an ALS and having a vote, just as any other ALS, I think t's not good. I'm not agreeing. I don't think it's legitimate to have this kind of agreement. I think the unaffiliated can join AFRALO and give their opinions.

That will be good for AFRALO, because this person can give added value to our group, our work. I think these individual Members can't have a vote – I'm speaking about a vote and eligibility. They can give their opinions, they can participate in the meetings. It's okay, but they won't have the same voting rights. To give the possibility of voting to an ALS with people that we don't know where they come from, I don't agree with that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, thank you very much Aziz. I think Beran says the same on the chat room. It's okay. Michel is against also. There are a lot of people against. Barrack, you have the floor.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you. I wanted to say I support the idea, but with some reservations. I've been trying to understand the process well. What I want to suggest is that we can limit some of the rights that individual users will have in their ALS, so that we can encourage them to be part and parcel of our structure, because you may find that some people may decide to be an individual ALS and then they can't join the individual ALS, which might work, and then [unclear 09:45]. I'd like to suggest that yes, we give the users an [expert 09:52] home, but we limit some of the rights that they have, so they don't have the same full rights that any

other ALS has, so that at least we can [unclear 10:05] from [unclear].
[unclear phrase]. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Barrack. I'm going to give the floor to Alan Greenberg. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I have a question. I'm not sure whether you're talking about giving individuals a vote or giving individuals a vote through one person. I can explain what happens within North America. That is we have individual members but a single person is selected to act as their representative – essentially all of the individual Members all together for a virtual, distributed ALS, so there's only one vote for all the individual Members together. I'm not sure if that's what you're talking about, or if you're talking about each individual Member voting themselves and each having the same power as an ALS, which I certainly would not support.

I'd just like some clarity. Which are you talking about? The original purpose for individual Members – and it started within North America – is to allow people to participate in At-Large, who may not be in a city or country which has an ALS. They may not have an organization where other people want to participate, but they want to contribute. This gives a vehicle for someone without an ALS to contribute, and all together they form the equivalent of a single ALS. I'm just not sure which it is you're discussing. Are you talking about a single vote for all individual Members together, or a single vote for each individual Member? Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. I need Claire to translate exactly this to Alan. Alan, we have sent a draft proposal in which we proposed that individual Members, when they reach a number, can form a group into AFRALO and can select among their individual Members a person who will vote in their name. One person will vote in the name of all the Members, which is what Beran, Peters, etcetera, don't like. They don't like that idea. The idea is not to give a vote to each Member, but to give a vote to a group representing something. If we have only one or two persons on this group, this group is not considered. I hope I answered your question Alan. Now we're giving the floor to Fatimata.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA:

Good evening everyone. I think that individual Members, as Tijani just told us... We are going to give a vote to a group. I don't know... We have to take a decision and we have to take a decision online, and if each time we discuss about that and we go back and compare it to what was decided during the last meeting, I think it's wrong. If we are asking to recognize the individual Members, and if we need to recognize an ALS formed by individual Members in a country, I think that if you don't agree with the Members of an ALS and if you don't want to participate through this ALS, if you want to participate as an expert...

If you have no ALS to participate with, this is a problem. So this person has to look for an ALS that will accept him. I think it's wrong. I think an expert has to be able to offer his expertise to all the Members and to all the Internet users.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Fatimata. Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you Tijani. I think that I need to answer to what Fatimata just said. I gave my opinion online.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Aziz, you don't have to answer Fatimata. We want to save a little bit the discussion. We know your opinion. I know Fatimata's opinion. When you feel that your opinion has not been understood by Fatimata and by Alan, ask for the floor to explain it.

AZIZ HILALI: First I want to repeat that I'm not against these individual Membership. On the contrary, if there is a country in Africa that has no ALS, an individual can participate, contribute, give added value. The only thing that this individual won't be able to do – and I think Alan is not understanding what we said – I explain that the proposal is to group the individuals in only one ALS, and in this same proposal we say that this ALS will have the possibility to have a vote as any other ALS.

This is on this last Item, that I don't agree with, because we need to establish the number of individuals. It said five, and I don't think it's correct – related to the African ALSes, because we have some African ALSes with 100 or more people. Five persons, even if those five persons are experts, they can't have the same vote and the same influence as

the other ALSes. I'm speaking about the right to vote and the eligibility. An individual can be a Member, can participate, that's okay. individuals can participate. The problem is not that. I hope that will be clear now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, it's clear. I didn't give my opinion until now. I'm in favor of individual Membership and I want to give a vote to the ALS grouping these individual Members. We spoke of about five persons. Another person said seven persons for this ALS. The problem is not that. The problem is that we're going to give a vote to this ALS. I see that Aziz and Beran are against. Peters was also against, I know that. There are a lot of people who are against this possibility to give a vote to this ALS. We're losing a lot of time. If you agree, I propose that we have an intermediate step. AFRALO currently is not ready to integrate individuals in their RALOs.

AZIZ HILALI:

I don't agree with you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Aziz, I didn't give you the floor. Aziz, you don't have to interrupt me. I'm not finished. Please, you can't interrupt me. AFRALO is currently not ready for that. We're going to work step-by-step, and my proposal is to first integrate in our Rules of Procedure the individual Membership and to give all the possibilities to participate to individual Members, except the right to participate in the decision making. We will say that these rules will be reviewed in two years, and we'll analyze the experience

that we had during those two years. If you agree with these principles, please tell me. Aziz, you have the floor.

AZIZ HILALI:

I'm sorry for interrupting you. You said AFRALO is not ready to accept individual Membership. That's not true. AFRALO is agreeing. We all agree about that. We are not agreeing on the different rights we're going to give to individual Members. I agree with the proposal you just made, and they can even form and create an ALS. This ALS during two years will be considered as a Member without voting rights. There is a name for that. It can be an ALS. They can be an ALS, but if there is a meeting with all the ALSes, the representative of this ALS can be invited and participate, but it's important that they won't have eligibility and voting rights. Okay?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Aziz. I want to repeat what you just said. I wanted to say that AFRALO was not ready to accept individual Members as a whole. Now, I made a proposal and Aziz, I don't agree with what you just said, because if we have the representative of this ALS coming to a Summit, that means that he's eligible if he comes to the Summit. So I prefer that person to be able to participate to debate and to discussions. We are going to analyze the experience we have over the two years, and in two years we will review the topic and take a decision. What do you think about that? Fatimata, what do you think about that?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: It's a good way to address this topic. I think it's okay. It's a good way to address this topic, to see how the ALS can work. Aziz we can [unclear 25:10] people, if they are... It depends on the type of group they want to create, because if they can only observe what we are doing, it's not very good. I agree that your proposal is okay. For me it is okay. I have a proposal. We experiment with this over a year and then we'll see. We will review our decision.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I'm going to prepare the draft. The draft is ready. We don't speak about ALSes. We only speak about individuals participating to the debate, initiatives, projects, all what we do, without any rights in decision making. I'm going to send you this draft. One of the rules will be for one year, and after one year we'll see how it works and we'll take a decision. Is there anyone who doesn't agree with this way of addressing the question? We need you to know what we are speaking about. We propose that we'll have a year, to try it over a year with the individual Members. They will be able to participate in debate. They will have some initiatives, but won't be able to participate in the decision making. Pastor Peters, you have the floor.

PASTOR PETERS: Thank you very much Tijani. I'm sorry. My phone was not with me, so I missed all the call. I guess you're so far already into the discussion, but I will follow up. I think the only area I've missed now is giving individual Members one year of probation to see how they can be involved, or to consider them for full rights of Membership. I don't have any problem

with that, as long as they meet the other criteria that we set out in the draft, and also taking into consideration some of our proposals – I don't know what the others have discussed, but I wouldn't want to drag anybody back, but I will follow up and if there are other areas I feel I can contribute to, I will make my submission by writing. Sorry I'm a bit late. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Pastor Peters. I will repeat the proposal. If you have another proposal, please tell me. We're going to have a year accepting individual Members in AFRALO. They will be able to participate in the debate. They will participate in the different projects and ideas and in giving ideas, but they won't have the rights to the decision making. We are going to say that those rules will be reviewed after a year of experience. Afterwards we will review the individual Membership participation. If you are against this decision, please express yourself. Aziz, you say one year of Membership? What are you saying?

AZIZ HILALI:

We need to say when we are going to begin, when that person is going to be a Member, and from that date onwards...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

If you all agree, we have been working 40 minutes on this item, so we won't have time for the rest. We'll reach a consensus. I think it's important to say that the idea is not to vote. The idea is to reach a

consensus, because when there is a vote there is a person who's losing. That's the idea, to avoid that. Now, I'm going to send you the text I'm proposing. Please give me your opinions. Now, we're going to move to the next Item, that is to say the weighted vote. We've received a text from Pastor Peters about the weighted vote. All the ALSes will have a vote that will be a concerted vote.

All the ALSes will need to express themselves through only one vote. Everybody is not agreeing. For example, in NARALO they don't work like that. We're going to give a vote for each country, because if in some countries you have five ALSes and each ALS has a vote, the ALS of the country where there is only one ALS will have only one vote for this country, and if there is a country with five ALSes they will have five votes. This is not good. Small countries who have only one ALS are losing out. Each country has to speak and have only one vote. I see no comment on what Peters just proposed.

Please send me your opinion on what Peter just said. What do you think about that? Do you think that each ALS needs to have a vote, or do you think there should be one vote per country? Pastor Peters?

PASTOR PETERS:

My comment is very brief. I don't think we need to debate it further. If there is no counter argument to my proposal, if there is no opposition to the proposal, automatically the Working Group has to accept the proposal, because if there was an alternative they should speak now, or they should have written before now. If we are pressed for time, I don't see why we should drag it again, as we dragged the issue of individual

Membership. If anybody has anything to say, you have to say it now, because before today this draft has been online for almost two weeks now.

So I don't propose the idea that we should continue on with this again in writing, because there's no need for that. I think we should speak up at these opportunities like these. This is the way I see it. That is my position.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you Pastor Peters for your proposal. I wanted to react to the proposal Peters just made. During the week I had a lot of work with the ICANN Board because they wanted to postpone the Marrakech meeting and I couldn't think about this weighted vote. Now that the Marrakech meeting is postponed for a year I wanted to react and say, Peters, this is a very good proposal. Unfortunately there is a little contradiction with the AFRALO period, when we created AFRALO and all the RALOs [unclear 36:15] there is only one proposal and it's the same, so it can be the same for AFRALO.

Peters' idea is good, but I'm hearing something, if we have five or six ALSes in the same country, I imagine that if it's a country as big as Nigeria, for example, the problems with Internet connection, freedom etcetera, in the Internet governance, I'm afraid that among the ALS their

worries won't be sustained, and so we'll have an opinion of an ALS different compared to another ALS.

We have this digital gap in the country also, so if we have an ALS in Morocco, in the south of Morocco they won't have the same problems as me in Rabat. We won't have the same problem in the Sahara Desert or in the capital of Nairobi. I think the methodology used in other RALOs is better. We have to leave the other ALSes the possibility to express themselves, and to express themselves and not to give a vote for a whole country. On the contrary.

I think I'm among the persons who, when we created AFRALO, we wanted to have a certain number of ALSes with a vote for each ALS. So, if we have only one ALS for one country, it's a group of ALSes. It was not the idea we had at the beginning. We wanted each ALS to have their opinion and express it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Aziz. Fatimata?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Hi Tijani. I wanted to thank Mr. Peters for such a wonderful contribution. Personally I agree with him, as regarding his approach. My sole concern is that it won't be easy to get ALSes to work together, so I'm not sure if it's feasible, but Aziz suggested a different approach. Maybe there could be a number of ALSes per country, but someone needs to know what's going on in the other ALSes as well. We don't know how this is going to be instrumented, how it's going to work in

each country, but it would at least be good to know the other ALSes are working as well and wish to participate.

Perhaps each ALS could work to try to know what the other ALSes are doing, and we could try this for a while and see how it works out. To me, that is the issue I see. That's it. Otherwise I agree with this proposal.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Fatimata. Are there any comments? You know what I think? To me, this is against the notion of an ALS. Having several ALSes might mean we won't be able to work properly, and to AFRALO what matters is to hear from our community. As long as they participate we will know what they think, but really the best thing is to hear from them directly. That's what ALSes were created for, otherwise ALAC will be speaking amongst themselves and ALSes will be discussing amongst themselves, but there will never be a bridge communicating both. What we need is to know the unanimous point of view of the ALSes.

This might create a conflict actually, and for instance if we have a decision that is actually quite narrow in terms of votes, an individual ALS might have a significantly different opinion to other ALSes in the country. I think this might bring about issues if we don't do things properly – that regards our way of working. I think each ALS of course will have its own viewpoint, but they each have a share of the vote if they're individual ALSes. I think that's how it should be in any event. Pastor Peters?

PASTOR PETERS:

Yes. I think we're missing the whole point all together. We're not trying to use this proposal to fuse all the ALSes in the particular country into one single ALS. That is not the spirit. Every ALS from my proposal still has its independence to discuss, to contribute to issues. The proposal only reflects that if there are issues of a particular concern or interest to AFRALO, [unclear 44:37] a decision. Now, we've said that to be fair it's [nice 44:44] that we allow the votes to be per country, because AFRALO represents countries. Agreed, ALSes constitute [unclear] AFRALO represents the African region. That is number one.

Number two is that if AFRALO would want to achieve the purpose for which it was created, that is not to satisfy just the desire of single individual organizations that viewed upon the corporation or collaboration of all ALSes within a particular country, then this proposal is one sure way of achieving that purpose. Nobody is saying that the ALSes should be denied their right to give AFRALO a vote. We are saying what are the discussions or issues that require us voting, but are of particular interest to AFRALO. It's good that we take one vote per country.

If not, a country [unclear 46:02] country – if we proceed for instance to [galvanize 46:07] 100 ALSes in Nigeria. [unclear] particular agenda and we want to pursue it in AFRALO. All we need to do is to propose the agenda and call for a vote, and they will push through our agenda down the throat of every other country. So I want us to look at the spirit behind what we are trying to achieve by this proposal. It is not to speak for ALSes rights, but it's to encourage ALSes to work together, because agreed that when AFRALO was set up, it was for the benefit of ALSes, but now we are evolving, we are developing.

We should also move along with the development that's taking place. We are talking about [the organization 47:01]. We are talking about one Internet, one world. Now we are [unclear] majority. So we should move away from that [unclear 47:12] move with the times [unclear]. That is what I wanted to look into in this issue. If we want to look into it again, [unclear], no problem, but I don't want us to [unclear 47:24]. In the long-run, [unclear] to bring all the ALSes together in the countries, and they will be [unclear] for the African region. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Mr. Peters. As you say, AFRALO represents Africa. We represent the region. The goal is to have more participation from the community, of course. Fatimata, do you wish to take the floor because you still have your hand up? Now we have two different opinions here and we have three minutes remaining. I think we should take this discussion up online. I think we should work in order to be able to finally reach a text that we'll propose for this letter and continue the work offline. That is my proposal.

I would like to ask Aziz, Fatimata, Mr. Peters, and everyone who participated, to add their proposals to the Wiki, not only to the list, so that everybody has the ability to see what we're discussing. I will work on the draft of this proposal, and I hope Mr. Peters will help me with that, so that by next time we'll be able to approve a text, to adopt a proposition. Are there any remarks on that?

PASTOR PETERS:

I'm okay with that.

AZIZ HILALI: Yes, I agree.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, so no one opposes this? I think this is the way we should proceed then. If there are no oppositions to this move, I think we should actually not waste time and take it offline. I think the debate and the proposition must be made online, and then the drafting work can be taken offline. Are there any other subjects that anyone would wish to add to the Agenda at this point? In the absence of any other important matters that anyone would wish to discuss, I will adjourn the meeting. Thank you all for participating.

TERRI AGNEW: The meeting has been adjourned. Thank you all very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great rest of your day.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you Terri. Thank you everyone. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]