
EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone, and welcome to the NARALO Community Discussion on NARALO Rules and Procedures today, Tuesday, 28th March, 2017, from 17:00 UTC to 18:00 UTC.

Today on the call we have Glenn McKnight, Judith Hellerstein, Wes Boudville, Gordon Chillcott, Ricardo Holmquist, Marita Moll, Alfredo Calderon, Alan Greenberg just joined us, Leah Symekher, and Matthew Rantanen.

Today's apologies we have Seth Reiss and Javier Rúa-Jovet.

On staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Evin Erdoğan who will also be call manager.

We just had John More join us as well.

I'd like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and with this I'll turn it back over to you, Glenn. Thanks a lot.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you so much. I'd like to welcome everybody to the call. We have a pretty busy schedule today and I just wanted to ask Judith, is John More joining the call? Yes, he is. Great.

Okay. Thank you all. And the first item on the list is an overview on what other RALOs are doing in terms of their Rules of Procedure. Perhaps Alan could give us an overview.

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.

Back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: We seem to have an echo. Can you hear me?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Echo's gone.

APRALO rewrote their rules several years ago and, of course, make periodic, minor, changes to them their stand. They're patterned very heavily after the ALAC Rules of Procedure which we rewrote culminating in 2013 if I remember correctly.

The EURALO was in the process of making some adjustments and changes. They have had a bit of a problem in that the person who was leading that effort left and went to take a job which meant they were no longer working with the EURALO. EURALO, their Rules of Procedure were patterned after German legislature. They have decided to rewrite them from scratch and patterning them on Swiss law, and it's a big job. They are proceeding but it's going slowly I'm told.

AFRALO is in the process of revising their rules. I believe they are not attempting a full rewrite but are looking at the rules and making revisions, and that's proceeding and they hope to have that done pretty much by the end of the year.

LACRALO is, as some of you know, was in a mediation process to settle a number of disputes, some of which were caused by unclear Rules of Procedure, and their intent is to rewrite their rules from scratch, and the timing at this point is a little bit unclear but will probably be starting sometime over the summer.

Who have I left out?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I think that's everybody.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's everyone. So that's where we stand right now.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Judith, just one second I'll turn it over to you.

In terms of your view, Alan, do we have a sort of a consistent approach or harmonized approach to these Rules of Procedures, or will they vary from RALO to RALO?

ALAN GREENBERG: Given that the APRALO ones were patterned very closely after the ALAC ones, these are going in somewhat of a different direction. EURALO is patterning them after Swiss law and LACRALO, I will not even hazard a guess right now what they will look like. I suspect I cannot say that we will be all in uniform lock step.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Great. Thank you.

Over to you, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Also what [inaudible] also I know – we’ve been having some discussions with APRALO in that they are trying to figure out some other application process for individual unaffiliated members, and so it would be interesting to see what they come up with an application because we’re thinking about some of those same things along those lines as well. So that also I thought would be interesting.

ALAN GREENBERG: They have some different problems than we – not problems but different situations – in that they’re dealing with a number of countries where potentially the numbers could be very large and they have some issues with how to address that. If that becomes our problem, I think we will be really happy. So I’m not quite sure the issues are the same, but surely we all have to watch what the others are doing. As you’re well aware, there’s an At-Large Review going on right now. The draft report advocated that there be individual members and that the rules be identical for all regions. We’ll have to wait and see how that proceeds. And of course, if any of the recommendations related to members – both ALS and individual members – end up being implemented, that’s going to have a significant effect on all RALO Rules of Procedure. But at

this point I think we have to proceed going in the direction we believe is correct and deal with the future in the future. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Any other questions for Alan from anybody? I didn't check there was anyone who was on Adigo, but if anyone's on Adigo you'll have to just shout out. I can't see your hand if you raise it whatever Starbuck's you're in. No more questions for Alan?

Okay, I'm going to turn over to you, Judith, and just give a thumbnail sketch on what our history has been with NARALO's Rules and Procedures, and why we actually made this effort to start revising it.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. Last year Glenn and I had done a review of looking at an analysis of the current ALSes and the reps and the individual members and how do we increase engagement? And so we've been working with the ALSes we had and there were several of them that were defunct or just not at all interested anymore, and so we found that there was a very difficult and undocumented, well, decertification process and that led us to look at to review the whole rules and rewrite the rules to make them very simpler. And so that was sort of why we went to looking at the rules.

We wanted the idea to make something very simple that could be easily read and understood also define a series of terms so that will make it easier to decertify inactive ALSes and also to write some sort of rules of what we mean by "active." And so that was the guidelines on [inaudible] the history of it, and I think maybe I'll let John then go and

talk about the updates he did because I think that would be most helpful. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. John?

JOHN MORE: Can you all hear me? Can you hear me? Hello?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. [Inaudible] echo.

JOHN MORE: There's a bad echo? I should connect some earphones. Can you continue one second while I get a set of earphones?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think we're going to have to [inaudible].

GLENN MCKNIGHT: [Inaudible]. Back to you, John.

JOHN MORE: Okay, is that better?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes.

JOHN MORE: Okay. Basically when I was given this task I was told what Judith just told you. I've been involved with lots of activist organizations. I was specifically involved in the writing of basically Rules of Procedure Charter for the Chapter's Advisory Council for the Internet Society. My basic approach when I was doing it was to look at the structural... basically how the NARALO operates and what its desires were and really come up with what I would call a clean, more plain English, version of a set of rules that people could walk through and understand easily. I tried initially to revamp what was already there but it was too difficult to really do that, so I just started out clean and incorporated everything I saw.

I would say the only significant change that I made was that I felt that the elections, while I'm a big believer of consensus, I worked with Evan on creating a consensus ambiance for the Chapter's Advisory Council, but election of officers and people probably is really better done in a straightforward electoral fashion. I think the At-Large staff has a good history of being able to run elections and then I kept the provisions that we had in your existing rules for tie breakers and other issues like that.

Judith also helped me a great deal on some of the technical things of the fact that one ALAC member is elected on a staggered basis each year, there's one NomCom member chosen, but I guess the both of us were a little unclear on what the length of term of the NomCom member is.

This is a structure. I have no pride of authorship. One question that Judith had brought up is should it be “the” NARALO or just “NARALO”? I’m open to removing all the THEs. Then I tried to put in the purpose and principles collect in there the operative things that should cover everything that NARALO does and how it participates and how it operates. Again, I’m completely open to editing and to further suggestions to strengthen it. I think we have room in all these areas to as things get developed at ALAC and where things are going, there might be some changes need to be made but the structure is pretty open to shifts in what the Code of Conduct is, for example, which is incorporated and other things unless we get a mandate down that we have to change how we operate.

That’s the general point, and I guess the other thing that is that I’ve basically created made the “General Assembly” which is basically the voting representation loosely, it’s not just the meeting of the General Assembly but the Assembly in Operation, whatever it’s called upon to vote or be involved in a process.

That being said, I’m open to any questions or comments.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay, folks. Let’s set up a queue here. Alan is first. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I must admit, this is the first time I’ve had an opportunity to really go through this and I won’t say in detail, but to go through it and I appreciate all the work that’s gone into it. There’s a

number of issues that I will raise now and I will follow up with something in much more detail in the next week or so in terms of specific comments. In terms of your question of “the” NARALO or “NARALO,” I believe the usage that has been consistent since the start of it is no “the.” That is “NARALO is a proper name and we just use it without “the.”

JOHN MORE: I’ll remove the “the.”

ALAN GREENBERG: I’m not the God here but certainly that’s how both NARALO and the other RALO names are used in general parlance.

In terms of the General Assembly, we use the term “General Assembly” to mean an explicit physical meeting, and that has always been at odds with how the old Rules of Procedure which were patterned after the United Nation’s Rules of Procedure used the term “General Assembly,” and I would strongly suggest that we define a term such as “the Membership” – capitalized “M” – to refer to the global body that participates in elections or in other discussions and things like that and not confuse the issue with General Assemblies which we use in quite a different sense on a regular basis and two weeks from now we’re having a General Assembly which is the multi-day meeting, so I would strongly suggest we don’t use the same word in two different ways.

JOHN MORE: Fully agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we're not likely to change it from "General Assembly" for the physical meetings, though.

JOHN MORE: Fully agreed. What about other meetings? Are there ever any special meetings of a "General Assembly" or just would use other meetings of the membership?

ALAN GREENBERG: There are potentially other meetings. There certainly are teleconferences and things. There may be face-to-face meetings. At-Large typically holds what we call an "At-Large Summit" which consists of representatives from all RALOs every five years so that essentially is five meetings of the five General Assemblies at once.

JOHN MORE: Your point is well-taken. I fully accept it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Whether we even need to refer to meetings of the membership explicitly, I'm not sure because we do do an awful lot of things remotely. My preference, although I don't have a really strong feeling, is to call these whole things Rules of Procedure because that is what the ALAC has used and it just gets confusing going from RALO to RALO as to what they call things. So my personal preference is use "Rules of

Procedure” instead of “Operating Principles,” but I’m certainly not a strong advocate of that. I just think it’s easier.

I guess in terms of your comment on elections, I would like to see selections with the option of using an election if necessary. I don’t feel particularly strong about that, but certainly if we collegially decide that just one person is going to be nominated, the de facto it becomes a consensus decision. But again, I don’t feel very strong on that.

JOHN MORE:

That’s actually provided for that if there’s only one candidate there’s no need for an election.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And that’s what I was now going to get to. You do have a provision that if there’s only one candidate the Chair may ask for a consensus election by acclamation without a formal vote. I would strongly suggest that if there is only one candidate, that person be acclaimed. That is the formal rules within the Rules of Procedure and it is the thing that caused the severe fracture of LACRALO because they held an informal poll which completely overturned the person’s selection. Informal polls to confirm are fine as long as you know for sure they’re going to say yes. If there’s a chance they’re going to say no, it wreaks havoc.

JOHN MORE:

Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

So I would strongly suggest we not do that, but again, I'm open to be convinced otherwise.

Under "Performance Rules" you talk about elections whereas we also take other votes for things. My question is – and I'm not answering it – but the question is, do we want to count participation in a vote as participation or only in elections? That's something we can discuss on a longer term.

Your section 7.5 says, "The NARALO can decertify an ALS." That's not correct. The NARALO can recommend that an ALS be decertified but that's an ALAC responsibility.

And I'd like to talk a little bit about participation rules but I think that's a separate discussion so I'll keep my mouth shut for the moment and let anyone else talk about other things until we get on the overall issue of participation.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Let me jump in. Evan was actually jumping on one of the things you were saying and I want to turn to Evan if he can... the last thing that was in the chat box if Evan wants to jump in on this.

Okay. I'm not getting [inaudible].

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Evan says he has no microphone.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I'll read it. "What Alan is talking about actually is none of the above choice in a field of one. It's usually a bad idea." That follows up on that acclaimed concept.

Okay. Back to Alan. I think he's responding to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Whether none of the above is a bad option or not depends on who you are. Some of us know of one person who is a very strong supporter of it. But regardless, what I was talking about in this case is whether we need to hold any sort of a decision process if there is only one candidate, and I was suggesting that in that case we do not, that we follow the standard rules that apply in most of our civic elections that if only one person puts their hand up then that person wins.

JOHN MORE: I'm perfectly open to that concept. There is no need for further action. It would] be automatic. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We should have a statement in the rules saying that that person will be acclaimed in such circumstances just to avoid any doubt of some people. Anyway, that's what I'm [inaudible].

Glenn, Judith has her hand up.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes. Go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. That's what I think John was putting in about acclimation by voting but the Chair still needs to call for the motion that if there's no objection by people that this person will be acclaimed and I think the Chair still needs to call for that motion about that. But I had another question but I don't exactly... the question was on votes. When you mentioned should the voting be only the election, maybe the qualification should be whenever we have a big pulse vote. So if we're voting by big pulse, then whatever the formal voting is, that counts but I don't know, is that what we've done before or what the [rules] on that is but that's one thought I had on that.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Judith, are you looking for feedback from Alan or Evan on that?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes. Okay, thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. My belief is that when we have looked at voting records we have looked at voting records not only for elections. Recognizing that it is possible we could go several years without having an election of any sort or a vote of any sort. But in the past when we have looked at

performance, for instance, on decertification or inactivation of ALSes we have looked at votes not necessarily election votes. And I would certainly not put words like big pulse in but use generic votes because votes may take multiple forms.

In terms of the acclimation, I am strongly disagreeing with Judith. I am recommending, and as the ALAC does in its rules, that if there is only one candidate at the end of the nomination period, that person be acclaimed. There is no action of the Chair required or action of the electorate to not object for that. Because if you do that, you're going to end up in a situation where you may have one nominee and that person is not confirmed and what do you do then? And I think if people are completely silent in the nomination period, no one else is willing to put their hand up, then I see no reason to require any further action to proceed. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you, Alan. Before we go to Evan, Judith, do you want to reply or rebuttal, or John on this suggestion?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Maybe John can.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, John. Would you like –

JOHN MORE: I think it's perfectly reasonable not to require any further action. Just to automatically at the end... What I would do is if it's a single candidate for a position at the end of the period of solicitation, that person is automatic takes the position.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may for a second. We can write whatever we want into the rules. I just like writing rules which we know will not cause you an, "I got you," and a problem later on.

JOHN MORE: Alan, your point is absolutely taken. I hate rules that are going to cause problems.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, so the question... why I said the Chair acclimate is that I was only interested in promoting transparency and that we be clear on that. But if we can write it in the rules, then that's clear for me. But I just wanted some transparency and accountability on that area. That was why I suggested that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no problem if we say the Chair will acclaim, but why require an action when the rules can simply make it happen?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. I think it's always Alan [inaudible].

JOHN MORE: Understood.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I want to turn to Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. Is my mic working okay?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I just wanted to deal first of all, Judith, on the issue of accountability and transparency, there's not a whole whack of difference between acclaiming somebody and having a single candidate and having it confirmed. There's not really a big difference in transparency and accountability. If the process is open, if the nomination process is open, if the rules are followed, we have our transparency and accountability.

The only reason for having a decision-making process after a single candidate is nominated after the election closes, the only purpose behind having a decision process is the possibility of a decision to reject. Otherwise, it should be automatic.

Let's be clear about this. If this is not an acclamation, this is not a automatic process, then by insertion of a decision-making process of any kind, that leaves an option to reject. So let's just be clear about that. Thanks.

JOHN MORE: The one question I would have is, this assumes that the nomination process will only permit a qualified person to be the sole nominee. So the vetting process during the nomination is part of it presumably.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: John, it depends on what you mean by "eligible." We can say who's eligible to run and so the people eligible to run must be in good standing in NARALO and so on.

JOHN MORE: That's what I'm speaking of.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. So basically anyone who's eligible to vote is probably eligible to run [inaudible].

JOHN MORE: True.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Beyond that, I don't know if there's a vetting process. It's not like NARALO needs to make its own NomCom. I really hope that doesn't happen. But in terms of that, I think the situation Alan's talking about is one where nobody runs and then one person runs, and then after the deadline is over people get up in arms. And the answer to that is somebody should have run because then that throws the entire process into question. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Alan, response?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure it's a response but the issue of qualification is interesting and I don't think it's covered in here and it does need to be. If someone does not have the qualifications to run whatever those qualifications are – three noses on their face or something – then if we ended up in a situation where we have a sole nominee who does not have three noses, then they are essentially disqualified and aren't holding the office and we have to start the process over again. I'm not worried about that. And you're correct – to the extent that we have rules of qualification we should be checking them along the way and the nomination process should require perhaps the person certifying that they are eligible in whatever the rules are.

The more interesting question is who is eligible? And Evan suggested that if you're eligible to vote then you're eligible to run, and I would strongly disagree that that is not what we want to look for. That would imply only the ALS representative is eligible to take office, and that sort

of defeats the purpose of having an ALS. So I think we need it to be wider than that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I meant that as a minimum. [Inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand but I'm just I'm just pointing out that in my mind it's a much wider one than that.

JOHN MORE: It would seem to me that my understanding of what the requirement is is that you be a member of an ALS in good standing or a unaffiliated member in good standing.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what I would assume also.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. So Evan, before I turn to Leah, is there a clarification point or something else you want to add to this or is it a new point?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I think it's all been said.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. Thank you. Leah, Go ahead.

I don't hear Leah. Leah, can you speak up. We're not hearing you.

Her hand is up but we're not getting anything [really], Leah.

I just want to take a level set for a second. John, you've heard a bunch of comments up to this point. Is there any intersession, any comment that you would like to do at this stage?

JOHN MORE:

No. I think the comments are all useful and from what I see, deserve to be incorporated.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. I'm trying to get Leah to type her question into the chat because we're not hearing her. And I'd like to invite anyone else on the call, perhaps Gordon, Alfredo, I thought I saw Louie earlier – yes, Louie is here – and Marita and Matthew, if any of you would like to jump in, we welcome your comments as well. I'm just waiting. I'm seeing a lot of people typing.

Okay, so Leah's question on to the chat is asking what the qualifications for the candidate. I guess I'm reading into her... Judith, can you perhaps address this issue? What is a basic qualification for a good candidate for NARALO?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I believe we talked about it. The basic qualification is that you are a member of an ALS that is in good standing and that you are an unaffiliated member but I think so far that is the only qualifications we've had. And I don't know if we need any more qualifications but my only guess if we do then we need a certain level of familiarity with NARALO and its processes and procedures.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you.

JOHN MORE: So for the membership in the ALAC, there are separate requirements of non-interest in ICANN gLTDS, etc. so that [inaudible] if there's a requirement for membership on the NomCom. So those are two additional requirements for running for those office that would be applicable by virtue of the governing body's documents applying to anyone joining their membership.

There's also if you're an unaffiliated member you have a requirement of living within North America and not being a member of an ALS. So those are the minimal requirements. I think other than that, the idea is that people who come forward probably are people everyone knows and they will have their credentials or not credentials and it's a question of really people stepping up to the plate during the nominating period.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you, John. Before I turn to [inaudible], I want to point out that Silvia made a good suggestion, in the document itself to have some

core definitions for the sake of the new readers, so that might be something you may want to incorporate into the document, John.

I'll turn to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just for the record, I don't believe there are any qualifications for being an ALAC member in terms of who you're employed by or what you do. Now, a RALO may choose to say, "We will not select people for the ALAC who have certain characteristics but right now, for instance, the current NARALO rules say the representative of the unaffiliated members cannot be an employee of a registrar or a registry. It makes no such rule about the Chair, Secretariat, or its ALAC members. And going forward it could make such a rule if it chose, but there is no innate rule within the ALAC or within ICANN's rules about that. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you.

JOHN MORE:

The language I had found was in the existing Rules and Procedures so I'd be happy to delete it if it's not applicable. I didn't go looking for it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It is there for the unaffiliated rep. I don't think it's there for ALAC members but it might be. I may have forgotten that. But in that case it's

a NARALO rule, not an ALAC rule or an ICANN Bylaws rule. We do, in fact, have ALAC members who are also representatives, for instance, of ccTLDs and we have had an ALAC member who is the President or CEO of a gTLD.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. We're moving right along here. We have just a time check. We have 20 minutes left into our meeting. Joh, do you want to point us to any other section in the document itself. It's roughly eight pages long and if we start to add definitions and all, it could be roughly nine pages or a little bit more than eight. The suggestion by Silvia was to run [inaudible] this document and have it as a shared document so we can incorporate the additions to that.

Judith, back to you. What is the timelines in terms of the draft itself, discussion at the GA, and when do we look at ratification of these rules?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

I don't know. I don't know if we decided about that. I would like to get them done before the – during this [current] term. So I don't know. Maybe staff can know when we could have... We have to know when these are going to be finished and then afterwards when we could put them in stone.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

I just want to point out, one of the things that we talked about is a possible ratification in June at the meeting in Johannesburg, but we don't have a gun to our head on this thing so we can have flexibility. But

I want to turn to a comment that Evan is talking about. Judith, Evan is typing in about the addition of an officer, a liaison to ARIN and Judith, maybe [inaudible] about how we approached Susan Hamlin and the people at ARIN [inaudible] exactly this issue and it's a good point Evan is bringing up. So Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. Evan, we had your point. Unfortunately, ARIN does not want an official liaison. [Inaudible] CEO that it would prejudice them and that people would see that their favoring NARALO and [we're just] one of the members of their group and so they don't want an official liaison. If they change their minds, that's a different story. But we did try to broach it with them last year about this. And we could have another discussion with them and maybe facilitated by Ron da Silva about why they think this way. But that's what they thought.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry, Judith. I'm talking about the idea of us designating a single point person to [inaudible].

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Yes. Can you hear me?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes. Go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Evan, I can hear you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I'm simply saying that this basically shouldn't matter to ARIN the fact that we designate a person that's a specific point person. They don't have to create a liaison to us. The idea is having amongst our group a person officially designated to be the point person for our relationship and our communications with ARIN. ARIN doesn't need to approve this. This is not making anything preferential for them. And frankly I'm quite unsure of when they say preferring NARALO, NARALO over us. I'm not sure there's organizations that are competing with NARALO for their attention.

And I would remind that we have an MoU with them. So I'm talking about simply having somebody appointed to manage our side of the MoU.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Evan, thanks so much for that clarification. We would like to do that but then I guess would only have a designated person for NARALO but ARIN would not... but I'm not sure exactly what the purpose of having this person is. I see Leah has the question on that that we don't need a designated ARIN officer. It is an interesting option but we just originally thought of this idea of just as not an official position but like an unofficial position so that we can have someone tracking it for us their activities but we could formalize it if people are interested but I'm not so sure how much people are interested.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

My question simply relates to the fact that we have an MoU with them, we have an officially established relationship that they've signed onto that we've signed on. This doesn't preclude any ALS from talking to them directly, but then what's the point of doing the MoU if we can't have an established relationship? Right now, who is the main person who is in charge of communications with ARIN? Who's in charge of making sure they're aware about us, that we're aware about them? Is there a specific person designated? And if not, then it basically means that our activity is scattered and unfocused.

I'm simply going to the fact that we have an MoU that was signed with ARIN. We have an officially established relationship. So they should not be complaining that NARALO has a special status. We do have a status. They signed onto that. John Curran has his signature on it. So I'm not really quite sure what the problem with this is. We have a formally established relationship with them. Either we designate somebody to manage that relationship or basically it goes away and we don't do

anything much the same that we haven't done much with them until we're meeting alongside them. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. I'm going to jump in here because I think Alan has a comment on this. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, a few comments. Look, we have a NARALO MoU with ARIN. It's nice to quote it. It really only means that should we choose to cooperate on something, then we can use that as the rationale. It doesn't require us to do anything in particular. That being said, I think the concept of having someone in our community who is actually active in ARIN, who is monitoring their policy processes, who can report to us on a regular basis or alert us to something that we should be aware of and perhaps wanting to get more involved in, I think is a really important issue. And whether we have something in the Rules of Procedure to say we have a liaison or whether we simply name someone on a regular basis who acts as that conduit, I don't much care. I don't think it needs to be in the Rules of Procedure. I think having someone who is in fact monitoring and active in ARIN activities and can talk to us on a regular basis is really important and we haven't done that and I believe we should do that. But I don't think it needs to be more formalized than that at this point.

Certainly no reason to try to force something on ARIN which they object to. They may take us saying we want a formal liaison meaning it's someone who sits on their Board or something like that and they may

object to that for valid reasons. So I don't think we need to push anything on them but we should know what's going on.

GLEN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Thank you, Alan. So we have two differing views on this to enshrine it from our perspective, not from the ARIN perspective of this designated liaison or we can have it as an informal process. If I can read into what Evan is saying –

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Glenn, maybe you want to [inaudible].

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sorry, Judith go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Glenn, let me clarify myself. I'm interested in seeing the [role]. Whether or not it's in the Rules of Procedure to me is less important than actually having the [role]. This was a point to introduce it. If the consensus is that it's a good idea to have it but that it doesn't need to be in the ROP, that's fine with me. I just wanted to raise the issue that we should have something either formally or informally. Which it matters less to me than having it. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Thank you. As I was saying earlier, we have two different opinions. We're not going to settle this today, but I think in the chat box

we're getting some views. I understand what Evan is getting at. He's making extremely good points here and we've clarified what we mean by this position as opposed to what ARIN defines it as. So let's table that. We'll see where we move forward on this. We only have a few more minutes left and I want to make sure we move on to any other issues.

Anyone else? Evan, do you have anything else in addition to the issue we just discussed?

Okay. Alan, please go ahead. He wants to talk about activity.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think that's one of the more crucial things and we're not likely to settle it in this meeting but I think we need to start discussing it. I think we don't want an ALS that does nothing and is not contributing to us being able to serve ICANN well because again, remember we're here to serve ICANN in its policy processes – and all of its processes, not just the policy processes – and an ALS that is just adding a number onto a count and never provides any services to us, never provides any input, is not worth an awful lot.

On the other hand, I think we need to be flexible in terms of things like – and there are statements in here about participating in our monthly meetings or participating in the NARALO mailing list. That mailing list can go for months with nothing really substantive on it. Occasionally it wakes up and there's some really good discussions. The same has been said if you look at over the years to our monthly meetings. Depending who the Chair and Secretariat are, some of those meetings are really

interesting and active and some of them are really good times for taking a nap. I've got a – forgive me – an 11-year history with it.

I think we ought to be careful. On the other hand, when we're looking at the current ALAC process of trying to engage ALSes, one of the things that we've identified there – which is not a rule yet. It may or may not become a rule – that there may be ALSes with specialized knowledge and involvement which may sit in the back ground until their area of expertise wakes up and it happens to become relevant at which point they essentially are saying, "When you need our services we will be there and the rest of the time we're going to simply stick to our knitting and do what we do best," which may not coincide with what NARALO is doing that particular month.

I think we somehow want to find a set of rules which recognizes value and not necessarily just dialing into a teleconference or sending a +1 to a mailing list. And I don't have the answers to that but I think we want to be flexible enough in our rules so that we're not getting rid of ALSes that are in fact useful to us or on the other hand, keeping ones that we know are really dead wood. I don't have the answers but I think we have to be careful as we write those rules. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Okay. Thank you so much, Alan. I was just informed by staff – one second Judith – that we have to do a hard stop because another call is coming in so we'll be finishing a few minutes before the end of the hour. I'm turning to Judith and please make your comments short to allow other people to make final comments.

Back to you, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think I sort of disagree with Alan and maybe we need to create a second class of membership for people who are like associate members or something else like that because I do think they may have one issue but we still need someone in the organization to engage and if the issue doesn't come up for two years, that's a problem. So maybe there's some kind of affiliate members or something like that – associate members. But also I don't think it's so hard to come up and to come to a meeting out of [inaudible] there's only [inaudible].

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Go ahead. I think we've lost Judith. Okay.

Louie, go ahead.

LOUIE HOULE: Yes. I just wanted to say that [very shortly concerning] qualifications and [concerning] participation of our membership I think we should have some more discussion on that because it's very unclear to me that we can make a decision today. So maybe in New Orleans, maybe later, but I would suggest that we still have to discuss that and arrive at something that's very comprehensive, very simple, to understand. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you so much.

Evan, comment?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi. I'll be brief. For a long time I've been of the opinion – which I've stated within the forums – that NARALO should be very open into what it accepts and very, very, careful about what it rejects. I mentioned in the chat about the concept of a hibernation mode where we should have a [inaudible] where an ALS goes to sleep, they don't have interest in some of the day-to-day affairs what we're doing, and so they don't get counted against quorum or anything like that, but that they don't get kicked [inaudible] such that they may have, as Alan said, specific talents or skills or interests that only wakes them up from time to time.

So I would really suggest going forward that rather than have hard metrics of what justifies disqualification that there be sort of a case by case review where there has been long-term either dormancy or not caring at all or not even responding to e-mails. There has been a protocol in place that has enabled us to decertify a couple of ALSes cleanly but in terms of what constitutes active, I would be very, very, careful about this and possibly the suggestion of something like a hibernation mode that allows an ALS to only wake up on the handful of things that interests them. We kicked them out because they're not active all the time, that's our loss rather than theirs. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you so much, Evan.

Judith, and I think we'll need to wrap up pretty soon because, as I mentioned, the staff has to be on another call and it's a hard stop for them to prepare for the next call. So the final comments, back to you, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

I hope people can hear me now. I didn't know that my system had dropped.

I like the idea of a hibernation mode or some kind of associate membership. I do think we need something. We are asking in the ALS criteria for at least two members so that if we have one, we could have a second alternate and that person could come to meetings but I think it's not a hard thing to say that someone from your ALS has to come to at least two out of the 12 meetings of the year and that's not such a hard thing or to make a comment on the mailing list that is much more than +1. So I do think we need to try to figure out some part of engagement and that activity is important and is a way of judging engagement and is also a way of moving people to a different category if they are going to be in hibernation mode.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. Thank you, Judith. It's been suggested that we huddle together and we'll have a chance to continue this dialog. We're not going to solve it today but I really appreciate everyone's excellent comments back and I have to acknowledge Judith and John's excellent work in getting the document. The document isn't much different than the original. We're just tightening up the language. We didn't intend to make a wholesale

change and make this the document of documents. It's meant to be clear so that the legacy we have on the leaders in the future that they have [inaudible] misunderstanding of how to interpret the rules.

I'd like to, if I can be indulged, so staff can get ready for the next call I'd like to thank everybody for the call today. Again, thanks John and Judith for their hard work and we'll see you all in a few days. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you. The meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all of the lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]