MARIO ALEMAN:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Welcome to the NARALO Rules of Procedure Working Committee call on Monday, 29th of May, 2017, at 19:00 UTC. On the call today, we have Judith Hellerstein, Alan Greenberg, and John More.
	We do have apologies from Glenn McKnight, Eduardo Diaz, and Seth Reiss. We don't have any interpreters. On Staff side we do have Silvia Vivanco and Mario Aleman, myself, who is managing this call. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, and with this, I will turn it back over to you Judith, you can start the call.
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Thanks so much, this is Judith Hellerstein. So although we have very few people on the call, we just wanted to have discussion on a couple issues. John sent out the copy of the Rules of Procedures last night and just for clarification, when John sent out the document, he thought he was sending out a marked up version and a clean version, and it ended up that the clean wasn't a clean version, because it had all the comments on it, still.
	So we cleaned it up again and he sent it out again, so that's why you received a couple versions. It wasn't two clean versions, it's just one version that was really clean and one that was not clean. So, sorry about any confusion on that. Alan, do you have a question?

ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah, just to be clear, what I was asking for was a redline from the last version to this version, and I wasn't sure whether the redline he supplied was the definitive one, or more changes were made afterwards.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	No, that was the definitive one.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Yeah, so there was no -- when that document was -- when the clean version was sent out, it was meant to a clean version, since that one that he said was clean, was really not a clean version, it was exactly the same as the redline version, so you had two redline versions, but one masquerading under the name of clean.
	Okay, so now that that's cleared up, there were a couple questions while John and I were discussing last night, this is why we wanted to have the call with you or others. We wanted to have questions on metrics, accountability, and a better understanding of election rules and procedures, because that seems to be very unclear from our region elections.
	And then John also wanted to have some discussion on whether information we put in for decertifying an ALS is correct, or do we need more information. And I will turn that over -- before I do that, turn it

over, the document, the current version of the Rules of Procedure is attached to the Rules of Procedures document that is now on the screen. I have attached it there so you can just click on that if you don't have the copy, you can just click on that, and I've posted that on there. But I'll turn the call over to John More so he can lead the discussion, and thanks John for all your great work on this.

JOHN MORE: Well, I apologize, I know you really wanted to get something sooner. I think we can still leave it for further elaboration and work on it, but I also want to say that your comments, I didn't include all of them because I wasn't absolutely certain, and you have to give me a little, I guess a little pardon, since I'm not as experienced and adept at some of the intricacies of the relationship between ICANN, ALAC, et cetera, and the ALSs, and the only other point is that what the hope is with this is to have something that reads somewhat easier and has the principles that we want to operate under without being unduly, I guess, elaborate and legalistic, but that's a difficult thing to tread between, and again Alan, I just want to thank you so much for your comments, I think I included lots of it, particularly on many of the technical matters. I don't know whether I fixed the General Assembly issue that you pointed out, but anyway.

So, that's my thought. So I guess the major question is, say on the voting, whether we have explained it, whether we have it correct, well, voting in general, so the general rule seems to be we act by consensus, I think I've done some cleaning up of that language, where it's maybe not quite so difficult, and by the way, this can be, I think the next version

EN

needs to be read through just to make sure we have it consistent and don't have mistakes or misuses of terminology. But anyway, so the question is, so rough consensus, but then more specifically on the elections themselves, whether we got the provisions correctly. And I guess Alan, I don't know whether you have further thoughts on that or what your thoughts would be.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said yesterday, I have not had a chance to look at this at all, so I don't have a clue whether the wording is correct as it stands right now. I can look at it very quickly now, but I don't feel comfortable passing judgment on something that I'm reading on the fly. That's why I said I was happy to talk about generalities, but commenting on the actual document is somewhat problematic at this point. So, if you can point me to particular paragraphs, I'll look at them, but that's about all I can do today.

JOHN MORE: Well basically, so, just again to respond, I made the corrections about the non-com and that being a recommendation. We have a current discussion of that going on because of the recent election, but it's pretty clear, I think you made clear, that is a recommendation. If you have two people running, then both names go forward. And it doesn't seem that we can change that.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that's is not what I have said.

JOHN MORE: Oh, okay, I'm sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is up to the RALO to decide what they are doing. In the past, when there has been contention for the position, some RALOs, sometimes, have simply had a vote or a consensus call, different RALOs do it in different ways, and have come up with a single name. Others have passed on both names with or without a preference from the RALO, both, or multiple names, in the case of APRALO, right now they have passed on four names. So it is up to the RALOs to decide.

There are certainly people within the ALAC who would like to see options and there was a comment from Sebastien in this recent discussion saying that his preference is that multiple names be passed on and given the ALAC options. From my point of view, I prefer if it options, with some guidance. The NARALO at one point passed on two names and gave the reasons why the ALAC members and the Chair did not feel that they could make a selection, there was some division.

At that point there was no consideration of going to the members for that selection, that just wasn't being done at the time, and so the standards have varied. NARALO can leave it loose and let NARALO leadership make the decision at the time, or NARALO could put firm, hard rules in place. The only externally governed rule is the selection is actually done by the ALAC. The ALAC will generally accept a recommendation if a recommendation is made, but there have been

times when it has been overridden for reasons that the ALAC believed were appropriate.

JOHN MORE: Okay, so based on that, would your suggestion be that we leave that possibility, or acknowledge that flexibility within the document?

ALAN GREENBERG: Or be silent on it.

JOHN MORE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: My preference is to give discretion to leadership because the situation changes from decade to decade and year to year. The document can be very descriptive, or can give a list of options and say there is discretion. I can give you my preference if you want me to make the decision, but I don't feel it's really my role to make those decisions unilaterally.

JOHN MORE: Right, I understand. I think what I'm suggesting, which is following up what you just said, is that we don't necessarily put all the options in, some discretion with respect to this position, because of its nature.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: That's certainly my preference. For instance, if there is a vote and it comes out to be 19 for one and 20 for another, you know, that's not a clear direction from the RALO. Technically, someone won, but it's not a clear direction, and in times like that, I think it's more useful to give the ALAC some discretion. Those who do not believe that is appropriate will say pass on the one name. The ALAC still knows who the other name was, should someone choose to do the equivalent of a write in. Judith has her hand up, looks like she has some opinions.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. My thought was because in Rules and Procedures we go through very detailed descriptions on voting and on tie breaking and that type of thing, it seems that we should treat the non-coms the same as we treat the ALAC elections, and that we should have one name selected.

It also seems from the response of people who are writing, that they were also confused about why the non-com is different than the ALAC. And I think if we're going to keep to having a non-com different, we need to do a better job in explaining it. Yes, it was explained on the election page, but I don't think people saw the election page.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, it's not going to change. It's in the bylaws, it's in the ALAC Rules of Procedure. If it changes, it's going to be a long, complex process that's not going to be done in the next two months. So, let's presume it is not changing. That doesn't mean it couldn't change in the future, if there's sufficient will, but that isn't what is written right now in

the ICANN bylaws, and the Rules of Procedure echo that. So it's not going to change from that perspective.

To what extent, the ALAC chooses to either document the fact that it is different and set specific rules about it, not the ALAC, should NARALO choose to document and set that it is different and set specific rules about it, that's up to NARALO. I've given you my preference as Chair, going back with a long history of some of the potential problems we have.

For instance, there is, without naming names, there is one candidate in the APRALO list that I think if that person were selected, if that person had been selected by APRALO, and passed on unilaterally, the ALAC would probably not accept them. It's someone who has a long history of volunteering and not delivering.

So, if the ALAC had no discretion according to the bylaws, if the positions were picked by the RALO, we would have to live with the RALO's selection. Given that the ALAC does have discretion, I suspect in that case the ALAC might take some action.

And I'm giving you an example, not saying it's going to happen. And the RALO did not give us a single name, so we're not faced with that decision. There was one case where the RALO had multiple people, they passed on the preference along with the other names, and the ALAC had a vote, and the secret ballot selected the one who had come in second by a little bit.

There were people in the RALO who didn't take it kindly. So, you know, this is not going to happen without consideration of how the RALO will

EN

react. But the reality is the ALAC does make the selection. So, I have no strong -- I'm not going to push the RALO in one direction or the other. Each RALO has taken a different view on this, and it has varied from year to year. My preference is to keep it flexible in the rules, but that's only one person saying that.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: John, you were next.

JOHN MORE: So, this is John More, so Alan, I find your, both the history that's come out in this on Skype and various places, and then your explanation right now to be quite persuasive. My suggestion is to have that flexibility, but actually say something about it. I think leaving it unspoken actually creates more confusion. So, just up front, everyone is going to know that this is how the non-com election – not election – non-com recommendation works and the reasons why more than one name might be put up. So I'll try to capture that. But anyway, that really is helpful.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks John, it's Judith, thanks so much. I tend to agree with you, I think we want a documentation of it. We can keep being flexible, but I think we want documentation on this and more spelled out, so that we can point to it, because Glenn and I did a lot of different explaining about the election rules, but we did not know this.

And I think it helps to explain to people that this is how, that a non-com is a recommendation, and that's what we have, and then we can point them to different rules and procedures on this so they can read it, and I think that would be very helpful, because I think it's confusion otherwise.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't question that, clearly it is, the amount of time we spent discussing it indicates confusion. And it is different from any other position, but we're stuck with it.

JOHN MORE: So, I think that's what answer we put out, and people can react to it, I think that's a really viable and respectable position and it really reflects -- I believe in trying to have the documents reflect how things really are, and I think that's a good example. Next.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Great, okay, so now...

JOHN MORE: I'm sorry, I was trying, okay, what's next, another agenda item?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So, John, you mentioned accountability issues, that you want to discuss that.

JOHN MORE: Okay, good, so on the accountability, I think there has been expressed and it certainly was one reason I sort of signed in, was to be able to have workable accountability that actually reflects how the ALSs operate, how the staff, you know, what thing is going on, what the staff information can collect.

And so the question there is, I think it was made pretty clear, both Seth, and you, Alan, made clear that having to do three consecutive elections because elections only occur every so often, so is there some, basically, it was to have one element being some sort of formal vote, whether it's a vote or a participation election, but it was really calling on the ALS's representative or someone from the ALS standing up and doing something.

So we don't want to go through that, Alan, until you have a chance to actually look to see whether we fixed that sufficiently. I wanted to bring that up. Is there any issue about there wanting to be accountability? In the organizations I've been in, one of the real issues is that people need to be accountable and self accountable for living up to being part of something, or otherwise they've just got their name there and that's it. I'll hand it over now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, first of all, on voting. I have no problem at all saying if someone doesn't participate, and coming up with the number, the actual metric, is a little bit difficult because as I pointed out, NARALO tends to have lots of elections. Other RALOs don't tend to have any. NARALO has

gone through periods where we probably did not have a vote for two years. Nevertheless, if there are votes going on, then not participating is a dandy sign of lack of participation.

So, if we word something about not participating in elections to the extent that there are elections, and you have that as one of the criteria, one of the measures for lack of participation, I think that's fine. I recognize it probably shouldn't be the only one, because we may be in situations where there are very few elections. So that's part number one.

What else we use as a measure of participation is something that is a significant discussion going on right now in ALAC and in At-Large, driven partly by our knowledge that we are having significant problems getting real contributions out of ALSs, and the At-Large Review has driven it home in such a way that we cannot stick our head in the ground and pretend that it isn't an issue.

So, we are looking at that and we are looking at both identifying what the responsibilities of ALSs or individual member are, and then try to figure out how we can hold them to it, or at least measure whether they're doing it or not. It's easy to come up with some metrics, but, like, did the representative who is only one person representing the ALS, and if it's only a representative that active, it's useless, we may as well not have an ALS.

But, did the representative show up at monthly meetings? But, that doesn't show any real contribution or any way of making the ALS effective in the ICANN infrastructure. So, I'm reluctant to put measures

in that indicate active contributions, when indeed those are not really good measures of it. It's easier to put measures in like the voting one to demonstrate inaction. But I think the NARALO rules are going to have to stay somewhat cursory at this point, pending the discussions that are going on within the ALAC on how do we recognize an active ALS.

I presume, John, you're aware, and certainly the others are aware, we have a report on our hands which is essentially saying abolish ALS, it doesn't have the nerve to say that, but it's close. Now, we're not likely to do that, but at the same time we are looking to say how can we make ALSs effective, and means not just the representative, but the 10, or 30, or 200, or 2,000 people that are supposed to be ALS members, and that's our real challenge, and that we don't have anything on the books for but we will, we have to in the next 6 months to a year. So, I'm leery that we can put the definitive rules in right now, I guess is a summary of what I'm saying.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks Alan. I had I quick question, but then I'll let John go. But I guess my question is – it's Judith for the record -- what about, Glenn and I had talked about, which we had suggestion to John, about, Glenn and I want to make people come to our monthly meetings, I know you disagree, but we thought that, one of the reps to come to most of the meetings, I'm saying they should be there for two or three is not an onerous task, but we thought about that, and also we wanted them to couple it also with people to make comments on the lists, either on the working group, on a list, or something else, to show that they are alive and reading, and cognizant of what is going on.

And we thought that was also important, and that's why I think why those were in the draft that John has. And I know some people will view it differently, but that's sort of what we were looking at. And I know John has his hand up to, so I'll let him also speak.

ALAN GREENBERG: John has a tick mark, I don't see a hand.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: He has a hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: It turns out the tick mark might be a hand.

JOHN MORE: How do I do that? I just say I disagree?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, no, it's clear, I see it, I have a thing that comes up.

JOHN MORE: Okay, now I've got it. Okay, so this is John More for the record. So, I think maybe the answer, and this is responding to what you just said, Alan, is that so that we don't have to go through and revise the bylaws again, that we would have some provision in here recognizing that the ALAC may come out some standards and what we would do, I would suggest, is to reference any standards to be developed would be

incorporated and circulated, or something to that effect. Would that help?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I think anything that ALAC does and it's decided at the ALAC global, you have no choice but to adopt. So, yes, certainly a reference to that is fine. You could also reference an external document, which isn't quite as onerous as changing the rules, certainly the ALAC does that in a number of places. But let me go back to Judith's point. In terms of the monthly meetings, I hesitate to say this, but I'm not sure how many I'd attend if I wasn't an ALAC member and didn't feel obliged to attend them, or wasn't on the agenda.

I think you've got to go to the people who aren't attending or the people who only occasionally attend, or even those who attend regularly, and ask them, are these meetings useful? What can you do to make them useful? Because that certainly has been a problem over the years. So that's part number one. But part number two is activity of the ALS rep is not sufficient.

And Judith is right, if we can everyone to contribute on all of our mailing lists, if we could actually have substantive discussions on our mailing lists, go back on the NARALO list, look at how many discussions of ICANN policy there are, there are very, very few and far between, because NARALO rarely focuses on these kinds of things.

And I think we need to have more focus on the policy issues and the things the ALAC is talking about are distributions which will be essentially tutorials on policy issues to try to get people involved, and

then if we have discussions, maybe some of them will participate. So, it's a multifold problem, it's not just criticizing people because they're not participating, they don't know what we're talking about when we talk about the policy issues that are relevant to ICANN.

Occasionally there is something distributed on the list that usually is not even related to ICANN, that touches people's fancy and they start discussing it. Or a procedural issue always gets people going. But we rarely actually talk about the policy issues, and the challenge I think for the RALO leadership is to figure out how to get those lists active and actually get people involved in them.

So yes, I think posting on the mailing list is a marvelous way, we of course need to be able to recognize who are members. If someone posts right now, do we know, if they're not the rep, do we even know what RALO they're a member of? So we need to find a way of mapping contributions into our ALS structure. So I think those are real problems we have that we need to solve, and it's not just a matter of writing the rules, we need to solve the problems.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, this is Judith for the record. What you're saying is exactly also right, but it is also behind why the technology task force has launched, put in for the special budget, or the policy drafting document, because even for policy decisions, when Glenn and I try to do metrics on how many for our annual report, and how many policy decisions people in NARALO contributed to, we could not get the answer. Mostly because in NARALO we hadn't done a NARALO only policy, people in NARALO

contributed to ALAC, or people in NARALO contributed directly or comment on a policy, directly on there, and there was no way of tracking it.

We've talked to Laura Bangford now about creating a better mechanism of having fields that are mandatory on the policy thing, and also having constituencies, that they have to list the constituency, so that way, when people comment, we can identify them and they can go automatically into our database, and that's something that we're working on in the technology task force, and I closely work with Laura and her staff.

And I think that will go a long way for regular comments and then we can use a type of system, too, when we do, coming out from her general assembly, we have some people in charge of helping out with policy and they will be preparing some documents for NARALO ALSs to talk about and to discuss. So I think that is something that I know Glenn and now Eduardo will be heading up in the next fiscal year.

But was also want to get some of these basic documents down, and I think that comment is good, and I think also activity, you need to better track, also, I don't think staff has done this, who comes to each of the working group meetings? I know they do them for RALO meetings, but I don't think they take attendance at the working group meetings, or who even comes to the meetings we even have in face to face.

I know they all have attendance records, but we've always mixed it and the metrics has said, no, we don't really count those, and we haven't put that together. So, I think we need a better focus on metrics, and I

know Glenn and I have been pushing for this for a while. But I will be quiet now and let others talk.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, the only thing we don't keep records of is people who attend the meeting that are not part of the formal ALAC and region leaders. So if someone is on their own dime, or part of a general assembly or something at an ICANN meeting, no, we don't track those in general. We do track attendance at virtually every other meeting, every teleconference. We have not been very good at tallying them, and that's something we have to get better at, there's no question about that.

But the real crux of the issue is if you look at, you know, I look at pretty well every ICANN policy statement that's written, and I look at the Wikis. We can identify the non-ALAC, non-regional leaders, plus another four or five people that comment, and that's it. It's not a matter of divining which ALS they're from, there just aren't any, and that's the challenge that we have to fix. Trying to cast these things in concrete in the NARALO rules based on the timeframe of we're rewriting the rules is an exercise that we can put a lot of effort into and will have very little degree of comfort that it's really going to be the right measures.

So, I just don't think it's something that we should be focusing on today as being in the critical path of getting these new rules approved. That's the point I'm making, not that we don't need these things, not that we don't have to fix the core problem underneath it, we have to do all of

those, and we probably need better tools with which to do it. But I just don't see putting that in the critical path and solving the problem, and solving the Rules and Procedures problems.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks so much, Alan, I want to call on John More.

JOHN MORE: This is John More. I think, Alan, you're making excellent points. I guess the one thought I would have is without getting into specific measurements, we could have something that really draws attention to the need for activity within the ALSs and not just the voting representative.

So that can be put as encouragement, we have other places where it's not a strict legal requirement, and it is aspirational, and I think we do have something that we can do that. But I fully agree that until that is worked out, and the other way, as I said, which you mentioned, which is to have a reference to any documents, standards developed by the ALAC as being incorporated without requiring a complete rewrite or another rewrite of the bylaws.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: John, thanks so much, it's Judith Hellerstein speaking, for the record. I guess also I wanted to make sure that Glenn's point was also heard. And Glenn does twice a year, a review of the ALSs who haven't shown up to meetings or have been active, and he puts together a list. And as

Silvia would know, he's always asking who's come on the calls, and for the metrics and the attendance.

And the idea behind this is that we would like to send notes to people who haven't really contributed, and asking what can we do to get you to contribute? Is there something you need? Are there some questions you need answers? And we've been sending these to all our ALSs and trying to have personal one on one meetings with them with the rep, explaining again NARALO, because as reps change, we lose all the work we've done in the past, since the reps don't necessarily inform the new reps of what it is, and so we go through the process again.

But we need some process to ones that don't respond to us, some better way of kicking them out than waiting a year, like we have now. We now after 3 months, put people on notice, but they're still hanging on, and I know we would like to kick them out, the inactives. And I think what we had hoped in this Rules and Procedures is to have a better method to do that. So, Alan, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A couple things. First of all, if an ALS voluntarily says I don't want to be an ALS anymore, it's a done deal, there is no waiting period. The problem we had is they were being fed, at one point in any case, they were being given incorrect information on which they made that decision, and that's, specifically, they were told there is a rule saying you must attend the monthly meetings.

If you do not want to attend the monthly meetings, then you should resign, and several of them said fine, I resign. But if they do it simply

saying they're not interested in being an ALS anymore, it was a nice idea by their predecessor, but they just have no interest in being an ALS, that's a done deal, there's no question about it. But the year waiting rule, if I remember correctly, was if they are suspended essentially from voting because they have not participated for whatever reason, then they have to be silent for a year before they are kicked out.

In other words, they haven't actually said I don't want to be there, they're just incommunicado. At that point the easiest thing is to just let them sit in suspension for one year, they don't affect the operation of the group, and a year later, they will be withdrawn. Now, we can argue that year should be 9 months or something, it can't be 3 months, people go on vacation and disappear for that length of time. So we have to differentiate between the different types of rationale for no longer being an ALS.

And once we do that, I don't see a problem. Now yes, if we come up definitively rules saying to be an ALS you must do something or other, and if you don't, you will be decertified with a certain amount of notice, then that's fine, but I think it's going to be really difficult for the RALO to set that criteria when we're looking at real contributions from the ALS which is an ALAC and At-Large wide problem. It's just a larger problem that we have to address on a more global scale. So I think it doesn't make a lot of sense for the RALOs to put the specific effort into that, but the overall rules on decertification or inactivity I think are fine, and they should be there.

EN

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, this is Judith for the record. Thanks for that comment. I do think, though that what we've had listed in this draft about being, attending at least 10, if we're going to have 12 monthly meetings, that they need to attend at least 2 out of the 12 meetings. It is not an onerous thing. Actually, I think it should be more like 3 or 4, but we went to 2. We want some pulse. We want something that they have engagement, and that's what we were saying in the letters, is that they either have to attend a large majority of the meetings, and we put a lot of focus on our monthly meetings because we do a lot of work at our monthly meetings, and also, or that if they can't attend, they should get another one of their reps to attend, and that will also help the other reps to get involved.

And so that we thought was important, or that they should have some comments that they're making, to show that they have a pulse. I know that's what Glenn has also been active on doing, and so we managed to get a large number of people to come to our monthly meetings. And now many of these same people are coming to the ALAC meetings, who had not come before. So it seems what we're doing has been working. John had his hand up first, I'll go to John and then Alan.

JOHN MORE: Yeah can you hear me?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, we can hear you.

JOHN MORE:
Okay, so I think what you are doing is exactly what the RALO needs to be doing, same way, encouraging participation. And so in my view, the procedure for decertifying is really a last step. In most cases, unless the ALS only came in because of one individual, really, working with the ALSs to get more of their folks interested and I'll say just from my own point of view, because I've only just begun becoming involved, I have not done within the DC chapter of ISOG what I should be doing.

Now, we have people that are involved for one reason or another, but anyway, so then it really is a question of encouragement. So the last stop is decertifying and I guess the only thing I would say about being silent for a year, well, if you have to be silent for a year, then who is going to come back and become active during that year period? So, anyway, and maybe during the silence period you can't have a vote, but you can be involved during that period. But, I'll leave that to Alan to think about or give us more insight on.

ALAN GREENBERG:
The period of the year was indeed involvement, you're not taking off the mailing list, if you become active in other ways, then you've redeemed yourself, and that was the whole purpose of the year. Okay, look, in terms of the letters that were sent out in the past, it's fine for the current leadership to believe you should attend meetings, but quoting that as a rule and a rationale for decertification was the problem at that point, because it wasn't a rule, and to have quoted it as a rule was the problem.

Whether there should be such a rule in the future, Judith clearly has her position, I have my position, and a debate on this call with no one else here is not a really productive way of resolving the issue. We can go to the membership we can go to the wider drafting group and have a discussion, and then to the membership, if necessary. We can each present our cases. My concern is that even if the rep is exceedingly active and comes to every meeting and doesn't do anything else, and they don't involving anyone else in their ALS, and sadly, John, in many cases, the ALSs are involved because of the interest of only one person. I don't think they're being a very useful ALS, just because they come to 10 monthly meetings a year.

So, I think we still have an issue, and that's the real core issue that we have to address. If we make our meetings really useful and use them as tutorials and other things, maybe we would get more people, but that doesn't tend to be what our meetings are used for. So I just don't think it's a useful discussion to have between me and Judith here, we each have our positions, we're not likely to change, and I just don't think that's a very productive use of our time right now.

Certainly from the ALAC Chair point of view, I want to see rules in the RALO that will be effective, usable, and enforceable, and that may mean you have strict rules, or that may mean you're simply silent and have some guidelines. I'm just this drafting group, I'm just one person. Unfortunately, we don't have much attendance at this meeting.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, this is Judith for the record. Just for clarity's sake, it's not just my position, I'm stating the position of Glenn and mine, we have discussed this many times.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't say it was just yours, I said on this call, it's just you and me.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay, yeah. So that's one thing, is Glenn, and as Silvia can attest to, has often many times tried to get her to get him metrics of who has been active, who is not, and has been calling up everyone and drumming up support, and we're trying to make the meetings more interactive and get more viewpoints in. We also have not expanded, though we're thinking of doing it, going to an hour-and-a-half format, like LACRALO and other RALOs have done. But you know, time is important, so we hesitated to do that. But anyway, John has a question?

JOHN MORE: So, what I have to say, I'm actually very sympathetic to Alan, your point, I think rather than having it expressed in sort of the rules require, something more than a minimal thing that you can use to say this person is really not active, as a general matter, otherwise, the encouragement should be not because the rules say you ought to be involved, but because the program is attractive, interesting, being able to be a part of the commentary on the ICANN on this central core of the internet, that's why we're here.

So I think that my view was that the rules should be written, you know, to do that, to encourage the activity and what's good for the whole organization, and then have the fallback for if someone really just isn't going to show up and you need to have something to say, okay, this ALS is not doing anything, we do need to decertify him. So my view is, just from experience with organizations that really depend on people volunteering to do it because they're interested and they're motivated, is to encourage that side of it, and not so much use the rules to hit people over the head with -- not that I'm saying Glenn and Judith are doing that per se, but I think they have a certain level of frustration.

So, my suggestion is that we have the draft as it is and we give time for folks, Alan, you specifically, but Seth, who also gave comments, and really again encourage some others to really look at it and say is this the right balance for where we want to go. And also look for any further technical issues. So I think to me this has actually been a very helpful discussion on these couple of points, and the others tend to be more technical and looking closely at the language.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, I think on some of these critical things, it shouldn't just be up to a drafting team. I think we need to go to a wider audience and at least solicit input.

JOHN MORE: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think there's anyone who questions that a completely inactive ALS should not be hanging around, we should decertify them. The only question is how do we recognize that. And not attending meetings I think is a dandy way of recognizing there is a problem, but not necessarily as the metric used to rationalize a decertification. But in any case, again, that's my position, it's not necessarily held by others. Anything else you want to do this meeting?   We're almost over the hour.

JOHN MORE: No, I think this is what I had hoped to get on these points, and really have benefitted with what you have to say, Alan. And my suggestion is that we look, the smaller group look at it again see what it is, see whether it has done some of what is wanted, and that we come up with a draft that we can send out to the wider group for solicitation of opinions.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think on some of these critical issues, you may want to put in option A B and C, or a commentary about it, to expand on, these are the words we settled on, but these are the core issues that really need to be reflected on in deciding what the detailed words are.

JOHN MORE: This is John, it would be a question, basically present creating a discussion document that did have those points where really more input

EN

should be put in, and also suggest some of the different possibilities. I absolutely agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: If all the ALSs say, sure, if we don't attend more than 4 meetings a year, then we're toast, and everyone says that's findings, okay, I just think it's not the measure that's going to produce the desired results. But hell, if that's what everyone wants, so be it.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks. Silvia has her hand up, and I think she wants to talk about she made a Google doc of the draft. Silvia, over to you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes Judith, thank you very much. This is Silvia. Actually, Mario, while we were talking, he already put the document on Google Docs so everybody can work at the same time and edit it. So at the moment we will open up for you members of the working group only, and then you can expand it to a wider audience, I think that's what you want to do, correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: John, are you comfortable using a Google doc as the main document?

JOHN MORE: Yes, I am, now that we're at this point. When I was sort of rearranging, I'm more than happy to go to the Google doc, because then that does

EN

allow for what we're now talking about at this time, which is really getting a broader input and reaction in for the suggestion. Absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, did you want to do a further edit before we open a Google doc? Or is the version you're comfortable with?

JJOHN MORE: There may be some typos, I noticed some numbers may not be, I think it's good.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, and I had some edits I made.

JOHN MORE: So I think it could be done in the Google docs, why not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, as long as you're comfortable, I wanted to make sure that you're comfortable working at this point.

JOHN MORE: Yeah, I'm comfortable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

EN

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, and I can add my edits, it's Judith for the record, I can add my edits to the Google doc that I made last night and I can add those.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, gotta go, I'm afraid.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, thank you.

JOHN MORE: Again, Alan, thank you so much for being willing to participate.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's what I'm hear for. Bye bye.

JOHN MORE: Thanks to all the staff, too.

SILVIA VIVANCO: You're very welcome, thank you for your hard work, thank you.

JOHN MORE: Also, give a high five to Judith, who keeps me on the straight and narrow.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you everyone for joining. This call has been adjourned.   Please disconnect the remaining lines.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]