

---

EVIN ERDOGDU: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the NARALO monthly teleconference on Monday, 14 August 2017, from 19:00-20:00 UTC.

Today on the call with us, we have Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Glenn McKnight, Judith Hellerstein, Eve Edelson, Gordon Chillcott, Susannah Gray, Javier Rua-Jovet, Yubelkys Montalvo, Marita Moll, Eduardo Diaz, Leah Symekher, Joly MacFie, Dustin Phillips, Howard Deane, John More, and Murray McKercher. On the French channel, we have with us Louis Houle.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's a lot of noise coming from somewhere.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I believe Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Excuse me?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Glenn has a second speaker open.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. All right, did we isolate? Was that [it]?

---

*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.*

EVIN ERDOGDU: I think since you're on two AC rooms or two lines, there's an echo from one or the other to the other. If you could mute the line if you're not speaking.

ALAN GREENBERG: He seems to have gone off the second line now.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes. Yeah, I've shut the one on my main computer. I think we're okay now. How does that sound? Is everything fine? Okay, I'm assuming that's the case.

Okay, folks, welcome to the call. We have a busy schedule today, so we're going to move right into 2.0, the Community Announcements. This is an open mic opportunity for people who have been doing some interesting stuff, forthcoming events in their community. So please put up your hand or, if you're on Adigo, just go ahead and shout out. Okay, Joly, go ahead, please.

JOLY MACFIE: I'm on mic? I'm just setting up live streaming for the Caribbean Internet Governance Forum next week, so that will be Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. It will just be workshops on Monday. It looks like there's also going to be one out of the St. Vincent and the Grenadines also on Monday next week.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Joly, can you provide the link for that please?

JOLY MACFIE: There is no link. I will send it out once I have it.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you so much, Joly. I attended it last year in Belize, and that's great that you're doing that.

Okay, Eduardo, please. Okay, Eduardo, go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, I just wanted to let everyone know that we have an event coming up August 25. It's called ARIN on the Road. That's an all-day event to make sure people understand what ARIN is all about.

Then after that, we have another event that we're coordinating for the end of October. We call it the Internet Day in Puerto Rico. We have several schools and universities participating all around the island that day in talking about [issues about the] Internet.

Just so everybody knows, we have the first North American School of Internet Governance next March, which we will send more information to the list once we have the program in place and all the information. So that's all. Thank you. I'm done.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Murray?

JOLY MACFIE: I have my hand up again just to say that also the USA IGF, I'm redoing all the videos and captions and everything and I'll be posting those up again this week. I do recommend looking at that stuff. It's very good [at that].

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thank you, Joly. Murray, do you want to go ahead?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I don't hear Murray. Go ahead. Are you unmuted? Okay, we're not getting Murray. Maybe when he gets audio, he'll join us in a second.

Thank you again, Joly, for that update. As John More in the chat box, he has acknowledged the great work that you did at the IGF USA. In fact, many of the people on this call today were participating. Particularly Judith and John and Dustin were actively involved as well with that event. Thanks again.

Last call. Anyone on Adigo or anyone else in the Adobe that would like to share that they're forthcoming up? Okay, go ahead, Howard.

HOWARD DEANE: There is – [inaudible] and I chat a bit about this. There's an international consumers conference in September in Ottawa. Ken [inaudible] has more information about this, but based on what's there, perhaps you

---

and Ken and I and maybe Leah should have a chat and get a sense of what may be pulled from there or may be discussed there or networked there. That's something we can talk about later this week.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you, Howard. I'm just going to put one more call out to Murray if he has audio. Murray, are you there? Okay, perhaps he can – okay, Joly, back to you.

JOLY MACFIE: Perhaps we can [inaudible] Legal Hackers International Summit. There's Legal Hackers groups, and now we're all over the place. We have people from Singapore, Kiev, Nairobi, Nigeria. This could be a good source of ALSes or [inaudible] generally worldwide – [Europe] and American groups. Just one in [Toronto] [inaudible].

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Okay, thanks again. Again, in terms of our newsletter, these are the sort of things that we need to report on and share forthcoming stuff so people are well informed.

Okay, I think we have Murray again according to the chat. Go ahead, Murray.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Hey, Glenn. I hope everybody can hear me. Just a quick note that I'll be chatting with Joe Catapano, Global Stakeholder Engagement, in

---

Washington next week, just getting a catch-up. If anyone has any issues, let me know in advance. I'm actually there later this week. Wednesday is my meeting in Washington.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you again, Murray. Just send the info how people can contact you as well that are based in Washington.

Okay, we have a special guest for Community Announcements. I just want to make sure Olivier has audio. Olivier, are you there?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I certainly am, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, so the next item on our list is 2.1. It's the At-Large Community Response to the At-Large Review Draft Report. I want to turn it over to Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Glenn. I notice I only have five minutes, so I'm going to be skimming over this quite quickly and get you to have a closer look at various documents. We're actually not talking about the community response now to the draft report. We're looking at the actual implementation plan, so looking at the At-Large Review recommendations that were made by the contractors that were then amended by the contractors when the ALAC and the regional At-Large

---

organizations commented on those recommendations. New recommendations were drafted in a final report by the contractors, and now we are reaching implementation stage where the Board has received on the one hand those recommendations and we are basically looking at them and saying, which ones are we're going to be – "we" as the community – implementing and which ones we're not ready to implement or we don't recognize as being helpful recommendations.

To help people even more, the numbering of the recommendations now which was chosen by the contractor in their final report is different than the numbering that we had previously. So I would urge you to look at the actual report itself. There's a link in the agenda that takes you to a general page that will have both a link to a Google Doc, which is the document that At-Large Review Work Party is working on. You will have seen a number of representatives have sent an e-mail out to the different RALO mailing lists, and you've seen your representatives working on there. They're the ones that are able to make comments and bring some input into the document.

We're actually at the very, very last line the very long process. The completion of the template for input was done in mid-July. Then we asked the different RALOs from 17 July to 18 August to provide input on this Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan. A lot of comments and input was received. We're now making final changes again.

I hear someone typing, if somebody could mute.

We're making final changes here and until 15<sup>th</sup> of August, which is tomorrow. Actually, we're doing all this, and on 15<sup>th</sup> of August, I shall be

---

speaking to the RALO leaders to try and answer any questions or we could discuss any points that we would wish the RALOs to make in addition to what has been here.

The input to this plan, so this document was actually taken from the input both from the ALAC side and on the regional At-Large organizations, which hopefully should really give a very good idea of what our community as a whole is ready to implement on this.

From the 18-21 of August, we as in this small group are going to be finalizing this Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan. On the 22<sup>nd</sup>, it is going to be presented to the ALAC. The ALAC will discuss the ratification of the document. It is hoped that the document will be ratified so as to be able to submitted in a time between 20 August and 3 September.

Why so early, bearing in mind that it's only in October that we're going to have a meeting with the Board? The reason, of course, is because the Board has to read the darn thing. Not only do they have to read it, they have to discuss it. They have to then make up their mind and enter into a discussion as to what their response is and whether their views are aligned with ours. So it gives them at least a month, a month and a half for them to reach consensus. And then we'll be able to implement this whole thing and [sign] it all up before or at the annual general meeting.

Why am I talking to you now? Because I'd really like you to have a look at the Google document. It sounds like quite a few pages, but actually most of it is just tables. Each recommendation has got its own table. Each one has the independent examiner's final recommendation, a



---

summary of what the issue is really. Because sometimes you can be fluffy about things, sometimes you'll just hit straight to the target. Then does the ALAC support this recommendation? If it doesn't, then we obviously have to provide a reason why our community doesn't support the recommendation. If it does support it, obviously, then it needs to show it is going to be implementation, how we're going to implement it.

As with everything, it's a gray scale. So there's not just "we like," "we don't like," "we like," "we don't like." There's a whole range of recommendations where we might not like the way that it's presented or that it was presented, but we like the intent. The ALAC is making a recommendation by itself, sort of improving the thing: "Well, perhaps if we do it this way, would it be better than the way that is presented?"

That really is it for what I have to tell you. It's just to get you all to have a look. It's a working document, by the way. It's a little bit dirty. If you are wearing a new set of clothing, then take an old set just in case you get your hands dirty reading through the document. No, only kidding.

Alan Greenberg has been one of the main people working on this. I can see that he has put his hand up, so he probably wants to add a few more words about this. But I'd like to also thank Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Holly Raiche who have been leading that working party that has been working to accompany this document and make it what it is today. That's all I can say at the moment. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you. That was great. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Just to note three things. Number one, on the proposed implementation, we have had lots of suggestions, particularly on the wiki pages, on detailed ways to implementation. Those are all being captured. The document we're submitting to the Board will not have a very detailed implementation. Just some very brief bullet points on where we're going on the recommendations we're implementing. So if you've made suggestions in that context, don't feel that they've been ignored. Their home is just not in this document going to the Board. That's number one.

Number two, we are in the final stages of doing this. What we're doing right now has to be approved by the ALAC next week. So we're really looking for major discrepancies. The editing in terms of cleaning it up will be done separately, and I'm not worried about that.

Lastly, this is a document of the ALAC and the working party. Preferably, we have asked that any changes or suggestions be made through the NARALO, through the applicable RALO people on the working party. Staff can post who they are into the chat right now. But we're trying to do this in an orderly manner because, otherwise, we're just not going to get it done on time. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you, Alan. That's great. I just want to give Olivier a few more minutes. First of all, Joly, do you have a comment or a question for Olivier?

---

JOLY MACFIE: I put it in the chat. Are there any points of contention that we should pay particular attention to?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks, Joly. There are quite a few points where we disagree with recommendations. I don't think that there is any point where there is a lack of consensus in our community. We've had so much time to discuss our responses, both for our first response to the public consultation, and then since then as well.

So we're quite aligned as a group of people, and we're hoping that everyone else is aligned because as Alan said it's really the end of a very long process where there has been ample time to say, "No, I don't agree." So we're really hoping that we're reaching a point where it might just be a little detail that needs to be added or that needs to be changed. Alan, you might think, is there anything that you think needs particular attention perhaps in there?

ALAN GREENBERG: I really don't think so. There was remarkable agreement throughout all of At-Large, including the separate RALO document. Remember, we issued the RALO document partially for political purposes to make sure that it was clear that this was not the work of the elite few in the ALAC. But there was remarkable uniformity in the positions we took.

There may well be a lot more discussion and debate on the detailed implementation of exactly what we do, but that's something that will

---

have to happen after we go through this process of the Board deciding which of the recommendations they are going to ask us to provide.

I think we have made good arguments for the ones we are rejecting, and I hope we will be able to implement the ones where we are accepting the recommendations or where we're proposing something in lieu of the recommendations.

Have no illusions. There's going to be a lot of work coming out of this. So this is the end of the review process but not the end of what is now just starting the implementation of this, or what will be starting soon. So this is going to go on for another quite a while. But, no, I don't think there is very much if anything that is contentious within the At-Large community.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And finally, as I know time is ticking, I would like to just let you know that if you're interested in this specifically and would like to discuss this on a call, there is a webinar which is a webinar and discussion on Wednesday, 16 August. That's in two days' time, at 16:00 UTC. The announcement has been sent out, so you should have that in your mailbox. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. You ended it on a perfect note. You directed people to the webinar that's coming up on Wednesday. That's where you can actually get a lot of your answers to your questions be posted. Thanks again, Olivier. And thanks, Alan, for elaborating as well.

---

Okay, we're going to move quickly along on some of the items. I'm going to move to Silvia on any outstanding action items in 3.0. Silvia?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Hello. Thank you very much. Yes. Sorry. It takes a minute to unmute. Yes, I'll go through the action items very quickly. Basically, they are all completed.

The first one was to follow up with Constituency Travel on their cut off dates for travel plans for the substitute for Garth Bruen. That was completed. The travel list is completed now.

Then the second one was a formal vote on August 14 for the adoption of the new Rules of Procedure for NARALO. This will be addressed today in agenda item 5.

The next one is the request for At-Large staff to follow up on why the decision to abandon the HUBS in favor of READ OUTS. I just followed up on this, and I provided a response from Nick Tomasso on this that was posted in a blog back in June.

The last one is the At-Large staff is requested to clarify the use of discretionary funds. This fund is \$2,000 which are allocated for the RALOs for outreach activities. Tomorrow, the RALO Secretariat will hold a call to discuss the process and the criteria to allocate these funds.

With that, that's all completed. Thank you so much, and over to you, Glenn.

---

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you. Anybody have any questions for Silvia on the action items? Okay, Joly, could you put your hand down from before? Unless you have a new question. Okay, we'll see.

Okay, so we're going to move along. The item 3.2 where as one of the action items from coming out of the GA we're going to be doing our orientation for our new ALSes and unaffiliated members. So that's going to be scheduled in September. There will be a Doodle going out on the 21<sup>st</sup> by staff. We'll be inviting new ALSes and unaffiliateds to the call to help them walk through the process of what NARALO is as well as ICANN.

Moving on, in terms of news updates, Leah has been confirmed by ALAC as our NARALO NomCom member.

Secondly, we did a separate purpose call for the substitute for Garth, and we selected Evan Leibovitch. If Evan cannot make it, we have Louie Houle as the backup person.

The next item, 4.2, is the Global Indigenous Fellowship. I want to turn to Judith to give an update on that.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. We're going to be announcing I think today or tomorrow who the two ambassadors are, but officially they are Ruben Hilare and someone from [Loris's] ALS. I'm just blanking on his name for the moment. We are in the process of selecting a mentor for them. We will decide on the mentor tomorrow. We had over 25 applications for the ambassadors and over 30 applications for the mentor. So we're getting lots of good

---

[inaudible] for the process on this. We had a lot of great work by the committee, and we're really looking forward to them getting started. Then we will shortly in a few months be starting the process all over again for the Puerto Rico ambassadors and the Puerto Rican mentor. If there are any questions, just let me know.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, great. Okay, any questions from the floor? I think the gentleman's name was Geoff Blackwell, if my memory serves me right. I'm pretty sure his last name was Blackwell, the mentee.

All right, moving on, we now have the big segment of our component. I have John More on the call here. As you know, we distributed an early version of the Rules of Procedure. I'm going to turn to John to walk us through the updates on the rules.

JOHN MORE: Can everyone hear me?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes.

JOHN MORE: Okay. We've been working on the draft that was sent around. We got a lot of comments from Alan, very helpful, and I've been working very closely with Judith. Some of it was just tightening up the language and getting things in the right place. I think that the people – we will be

---

sending out a new version after this that will be more consolidated, but there were several items of discussion here where we had put in changes.

One question that comes up is whether we should have elections of the Chair and Secretariat similar to the ALAC members. That is, each of those positions would serve for two years, and they would be elected on a rotating or staggered basis, just the way the ALAC members are. This would give overlapping, and you would still have an annual election, which I think is an important part of the activities of the NARALO that shows people's commitment. But you would have someone serving for two years as opposed to having to rerun every year.

So that's one question that's on the table, and I think it's a good time to get comment on that rather than running through the whole thing and then coming back.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you, John. Let's deal with that item right off the top. Did you want feedback from the community right away on that, John?

JOHN MORE:

I think it would be a good idea because it would focus on that particular issue and then there's a second one that potentially is linked to it and that is, is there any appetite which is not in the document yet but I discussed with Judith about having a Vice Chair that could assist in the many duties that go on, including holding the meetings and stuff where



---

the Chair is not available because we're all busy people. But, yeah, I would appreciate having comment at this time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Glenn. I didn't see you telling [inaudible].

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Are you muted? Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Glenn, I didn't hear you and I didn't notice the comment in the chat to go ahead.

Just a couple of things. I don't have any strong feelings on the issue of two-year terms versus one-year terms. We do have two-year terms for ALAC members and, effectively, two-year terms for the ALAC Chair. So it's certainly not out of the ordinary within At-Large.

Some of the groups, or maybe all, but some of the groups that do this, and I think AFRALO is an example, do it staggered. That is, the two years for the Secretariat are not the same two years for the Chair. That allows you to have overlap in continuity. When on changes, the other one typically stays the same.

There is an issue if you do that of not prohibiting the Secretariat from moving up to the Chair, or in the other direction for that matter, which would mean applying for another position when you're only halfway through your term. So presuming that's allowed, I don't think you want

---

to prohibit that. You just have to word it very carefully to make sure that you're not stopping that from happening. But other than that, it's not an unreasonable thing given that other RALOs do it.

The other thing that's semi-linked to that is, do you want to have term limits? Currently, we have no limit on the number of consecutive terms a person can serve in any one position. And, again, I'm not a strong advocate of term limits. I'm a much stronger advocate of encouraging people to vote for someone or to elect someone if they think they're doing a good job and kick them out if they're not. But it's something to consider at the same time.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay, John, I think we have a queue here I think responding to the same item. Okay, Judith, you're next and then Eduardo.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes, I had seen the idea of a two-year term both in AFRALO and in APRALO and I think maybe in EURALO as well, and I kind of liked the idea. I really like the idea that AFRALO has of staggering the terms. That's something to consider, but I do also like the idea, Alan, of not prohibiting the person from moving up. I'm not so sure if term limits are a good idea or a bad idea because I think it's a better idea just for people to feel like they can volunteer and they can – when they can do an election, so I don't necessarily think that.

My other question I think is on the Vice Chair, especially as we want to increase outreach and engagement and working with all the RALOs on

---

the – working closely with each one of them, I do think a Vice Chair would be helpful be Glenn and I spent an enormous amount of time [inaudible] up the ALSes and talking to each [personally]. So it takes a lot of time, and I think having a third person in the mix would be very helpful in that item.

But then that also discusses other ideas of how do we work in the system and how do we... How Glenn and I had worked is we treated the leadership, the Chair and Secretariat, as pretty equal and we split up the duties. I think if we have a third person, we should all split up the duties equally because then that gets to be some problem where the person may get all of the work but none of the benefits. So that's just some of my comments.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay, great. Thank you, Judith. I'm just going to – we have a lot of items to cover and our time is really slipping away quickly. But Eduardo then Alan.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

A comment very quick. On the two-year thing, I'm like Alan. I can go one way or another but we have to cover the case and nobody wants to put themselves in the position to be a Chair or Secretariat, so, you know, we should allow where I want if somebody if up to the term I want to continue and nobody else cares to call that [feed] then that person should, if interested, should go.

---

Again, on the thing about the Vice Chair, I would say just keep a Chair and Secretariat or call the Secretariat the Vice Chair and then we'll go for that because you have three people and two of them will be able to go to the ICANN meetings. One will stay. How do you manage that? Even though everybody is doing that [leadership], doing something for the region. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a very quick note that I know Judith and Glenn are aware of it but I think we should make sure it's understood across the board that if we have a Vice Chair in addition to Secretariat and Chair, there's still only two travel slots to each meeting, so somehow they would have to be shared and allocated. What other regions do who have that kind of thing is they ultimate or fix for each one.

And lastly, remember, a two-year term does not mean you are obliged to serve. There's no slavery involved here. So, it is conceivable that someone could take a two-year term then for whatever reason resign after a year, and that's something that the roles we'll have to allow and it's not necessarily a negative. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Gordon, you're next and it's on the same subject. Go ahead.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: I was about to mention the travel slots myself but thanks for Alan, I don't need an [update]. Just a note that the Vice Chair, if timeslots are arranged properly, it might be a nice solution to the difficulties of the Secretariats have if that person attempts to become a Chair.

That's about all of it. I have no real really strong feelings about any of these. Thanks [inaudible].

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thanks. Okay, I'm going to turn it back to John to go through. Carry on.

JOHN MORE: So, I think all those are good points are noted. I think, Alan, yours are particularly useful. The issue of the travel is important although it could be handled. So, I think we probably... in the next one we should actually leave open as to whether or not that should be created. I can create a document that would be easy to take it out of.

So I think the other place which I'm still trying to make sure that the two parts of it are consistent and that is what are the metrics for being active? I think the point here is it's not meant to be punitive but it is to encourage members particularly the ALS members, the active in the organization.

Now, remember, the ALS members have a voting representative and they have alternates. So, for any of these activities of an ALS member, it

---

only takes one out of the two or three persons that have been appointed by the ALS member to be active to continue the fact that the ALS members are active.

The idea also is it's not to force one activity over another. I think one of the ones there was a question about voting in consecutive years or voting in elections in consecutive years or voting in elections or other votes over a three-year period. And I think we're going to modify that to make sure that it is flexible but still shows commitment to the NARALO and to activities in the NARALO.

But there are other ways to be active including making comments on the ICANN level, on the ALAC level. So I think we have something that is not burdensome but does represent some activities. So, if there is no activity at all, I think then there are reasonable grounds for proceeding after consultation and work, which is something that Glenn and Judith had been doing along to really saying, "Is this an organization that's still wants to be or should be part of it?" right?

And so, that is a question of still doing some more work on making sure that that's fine-tuned. Again, Alan has made some good suggestions there and we will take those into account.

The only other thing that had come up that Alan had raised an issue about and that is I think in the past right before my time but there had been elections by consensus. And I guess after some [plot] and also talking with Judith also and whatever but I'm open to it.

It seems to me that an election is something that is fairly crucial element of any organization and participation in the election is

---

something that is an important element for the ALS members and the individual representatives.

So, I guess my feeling, I would like to carve out and so if it's contest, there should be election. We have provided that if there is no contest, if there's one person agree to continue, that can be done by consensus. So it does not require voting unless they're more [inaudible].

So that's my thought on that and I'm open to comments.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. I think we have a queue. Okay, Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. On both those issues, first of all, on the latter one on elections, I simply pointed out the current rules say decisions on the Chairs, the Vice Chair if there is one, the Secretariat, the ALAC members can be made by consensus. It does not require a formal call for nominations and elections, and a vote if there are multiple candidates.

In NARALO's history for a number of years, virtually all positions were selected like that. Sometimes there was contention, sometimes there was not but the group had an open discussion. That's done in some other RALOs as well. And, all I pointed out is that if we are going to have a rule saying there must be a formal call for nominations and an election if there are multiple candidates.

The rules, could the current revised rules do call for a single candidate to be acclaimed without any action of the membership? But I was

---

simply pointing out that if we make it mandatory that there'd be elections as opposed to selections, that it's a culture change and if we're going to do that, it should be a conscious one and not just slip into the rules without anyone noticing. And again, I wasn't trying to make a value judgment on one way or another. I'm just noting it.

There was another issue... What was the other issue, John, that you raised? The third one.

JOHN MORE: Let's see. What was the other one?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, criteria.

JOHN MORE: Yeah. Right. You're right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Performance criteria.

JOHN MORE: That's right and that's an important one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.



JOHN MORE: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, we've had lots of disagreements then and agreements on what the criteria is. I've suggested that like for the ALAC, we do not necessarily list the criteria in the Rules of Procedure, the equivalent of the Bylaws but have a separate document, which can change from time to time, and adjusting that is far less onerous.

So, the NARALO may want to consider doing that. And, going forward, John did say something however which was wrong and I think it's really important.

The formal representative or alternate are the people who speak on behalf of the ALS. They are the people who vote. But they are not the only people who can work. If an ALS has a hundred members, then any of those people participating in ICANN activities counts.

So, we are not just restricting activity to those of the formal representative. Formal representatives are administrative. Essentially facilitate administrative issues but not necessarily active in ICANN policy issues or other activities of At-Large. Thank you.

JOHN MORE: Alan, I agree.

---

GLENN MCKNIGHT:                    Okay.

JOHN MORE:                            I stand corrected, absolutely. I was focusing on the fact that there are at least two or three people. Of course, it's anyone in the organization and that stands for the organization. So, absolutely, I did not intend to make any limitations. So, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:                    I didn't think you were doing it deliberately, I just wanted to make that clear. Unfortunately in the past, it very often has defaulted to only the representatives but that's the problem we have to fix, not a feature.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:                    Okay, thanks, Alan and John. John, I want to give you a couple more minutes on this, so carry on.

JOHN MORE:                            Okay. John?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:                    Sorry, Glenn. It's Evan. Can I just have a quick word in?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:                    Thanks, Evan. Go ahead.

---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, I'll try and keep this [quick] because I'm in a really noisy environment. I wanted to speak first of all in support of everything that Alan just said, perhaps considering a middle ground of putting out a formal call for candidates for every position and then after evaluating it, perhaps deciding at that point whether or not the decision could be made by consensus or requires an election.

It's pretty easy to determine if consensus is impossible, then we go to an election. But I agree with the idea of having a formal call for nomination in any regard. So, I'm wondering if that's a way to bridge the gap that deals with what Alan said that if being consensus is possible in the rules but not required. So, we can pick either way to choose the candidates but putting a formal call for interest is probably a good idea. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thanks, Evan. I'm sorry. I guess you're only on the Adigo. I didn't see your hand but that's great that you added that.

Okay.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Yeah. You're right, I'm not –

GLENN MCKNIGHT: You've got a couple of minutes, John, go ahead.

---

JOHN MORE:

So I think the two points is the more specific points. I think Alan's point about the possibility of having a set of criteria that are in a separate document that are not enshrined by word in the rules make sense because things do change and they still can be made clear.

So, I'm very open to his idea of having the criteria be more flexible but still clear because the [whole point] is to have people know what they are getting involved in.

And then, I still don't quite understand why consensus is advisable over election in the election. I haven't heard an argument, so I'd be happy to hear that. Again, I'm not absolutely opposed and I haven't involved in and Evan would [doubt] that I was very big on having rough consensus being the way that the Chapters Advisory Council for the ISOC would work, so I am open to it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Glenn, it's Evan.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Judith, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Oh.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Yes, go ahead, Evan. All right, Evan, are you going to respond to John?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Yeah, briefly. And right, I'm on Adigo, so I don't have access to Adobe Connect right now.

Okay. So, I guess my only point, John, was consensus when it was possible that is that there was overwhelmingly overwhelming consensus in favor of one [inaudible] that that simply alleviated a lot of the formalities of the election process. It was simply – I don't know if expedient is the right word but it seemed a very efficient way to do things if it was possible. But if we have a situation where you have multiple people that want to contest and there's no clear consensus in the group, then by all means, we go to the formality.

So, it's just a matter of if we do have a consensus, then we can basically save staff effort, we can save people's time and effort of going through all the formalities that are required once an election comes. That's it.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you, Evan. Please send your comments and suggestions to the document, and I appreciate you're attending the call today.

We have only two minutes left. I want to turn to Judith. Go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. This is Judith Hellerstein for the record.

I guess I was a little unclear on that. If we do a formal call for nomination but then if we have more than one person running, we

---

---

would do election. Because I can't really see how you would do consensus when you have more than one person running and I also don't see how it would save time because we would still if we have more than one person running, we would still do a candidate's call and have all discussion and have the candidates to [go to] their viewpoints, and that would take us time. The only time that we would say would be in that we have the elections open for a week. So I'm a little unclear about that but that's just my point.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. I'm going to give Alan quickly and then John, the final comment to John. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Glenn, thank you very much for letting me get enough before you close the queue.

Let me give you an example because it's not only saving time. It's an issue of how things are presented. Let me give you an example. Let us say in some future date, NARALO, ALAC member is the Chair. Not me, I'm leaving. But someday, you may have another Chair and that Chair is up for reappointment as an ALAC member.

The [inaudible] may well decide that we are simply going to only nominate that one person and we're not going to have an election. NARALO will decide to reappoint that person because they feel they're doing a good job and they're being a good Chair of ALAC, and they want

---

to show their support as opposed to having an election and that person happens to win.

And, it's somewhat of a cultural issue and certainly, that's how other RALOs have done it at various times, and that's the reason I raised the issue. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you. Our final comment to John, please.

JOHN MORE:

I just want to thank everyone for the comments. I think the next draft will be tighter and clear. And, I do think unless folks can send me a message about the criteria. I do like Alan's idea about having them in in another document, which would allow much more freedom for the NARALO membership to make changes and the leadership to make changes as time is fit.

We also don't know for certain what requirements are going to be sent down on it. So, I would want to get caught and having to go through yet another redraft or revisions of the rules to reflect that new situation. So that's probably useful.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thanks everybody. Thanks. Great. Great discussion today. I'm going to leave. We've got to put some kind of terminus to this. So, we're going to leave the discussion open for your comments on the Google Doc and to the committee, and then we hope to have a vote in our

---

September meeting. So, we have to put closure to this eventually, so I'm going to suggest we keep it open for another week and for your comments, and if you endorse any of the comments you heard today, that would be great.

So, I'm going to move on in the agenda. So, we, the outreach and engagement that we saw and we talked about this earlier on about the readouts. So, Susannah and Joly, do you guys want to mention anything about your readouts that you had?

SUSANNAH GRAY: Hi Glenn, yeah. This is Susannah.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes.

SUSANNAH GRAY: The readout was – it was really successful actually. It went really well. We had 20 people call in. We had over 40 people register as opposed that it was a free event [inaudible]. And, we had Joe Catapano and Chris Mondini give an overview of the key topics that would assess that ICANN does not [inaudible] Leah give a really interesting video of her experience as a first time meeting attendee. She's also on the call, so maybe she wants to mention something about it.

But, yeah, I think it went really well and I hope to do another one as ICANN [inaudible].



GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. Joly, did you want to add on your readout?

JOLY MACFIE: We didn't have as many people as San Francisco. And so, I'd hope that we might involve people from the UN but it coincided with ECOSOC, so we just didn't do it. So then he came and so Alejandro was also a remote participant. We had a good presence.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. Yeah, thanks for both of you for doing that. Leah, do you have something to add?

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yes, just to add to what Susannah has shared, yeah, it was a great time out and I really think there was a lot of positive feedback from those who attended and really being able to get a summary of the main quality discussion was really valuable for those who could not attend but [inaudible] what are the main policy that are being discussed, and hopefully they can get more involved.

As for my feedback from my experience, I think that was good for people who've never attended ICANN or would like to attend, and their challenges and experiences, and benefits for being a first timer and [inaudible] discussions as a participant [would have been] in ICANN meeting but not at this capacity.

---

So, I think it's great and, Susannah, that we should probably do it again.  
Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. Thank you folks. Okay. So, I'm going to move on to the next item. As you know, we had a strategic plan we drafted for our CROP trips – that's with one P now. The CROP is now an integral part of ICANN's funding. It's not a pilot project anymore. So, I get a call out for a person who's interested to attend the next ARIN session, which is in October in San Jose.

We've gotten two letters of expressed interest, draft number one and draft number two. We have William Cunningham and Yubelkys Montalvo. They both completed their forms. So, I just want to have an open discussion on the – and I'll turn to Judith as well in terms of the CROP program. We have tried in the last year definitely to urge newcomers, new travelers to attend these events. So, I want to – Judith, did you want to add comments on the two applications?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Sure. I think it's very important to have good objectives and good draft of why you think you are the best, why you think what you tend to [get out] of going there, what is your outreach plan, what is your engagement plan. And I think that needs to be printed into the document.

And, right now, I haven't seen Yubelkys' yet but I told William that he needs to put that in his because we can't have that without a good one.

---

And I think until we see those, we need to [inaudible] both but also we're running up against a very tight timeline, and so we need to have something. I think Ariel said before September 22<sup>nd</sup>. So, that is before – I mean, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, so that is running tightly. So, we need something this week or next to do that. So, that's just my comment.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. The good thing about the ARIN, there's two trips we've allocated: one for San Jose and one for Miami. And, this first call was for the first one coming up. In theory, one could go to the San Jose and one could go to Miami if that's the only expressed interest. Right now, we only had two that are interest. In theory, we can do the Solomon approach by cleaving the baby but I'm not going to ask you to vote on which one is the best one, the best proposal for this meeting due to time limits.

Judith, any other comments?

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM:

Yeah. Can you hear me? This is Bill Cunningham.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Oh, yeah, go ahead though.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Great. Go.

---

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM: Yeah. So, basically, I appreciate Judith's comments. I was making my application based on the experience that I had with [inaudible] that I provided in the last ARIN meetings that I attended, the one in New Orleans.

And basically, what I would say is that my goal is to meet them and extend that experience, and also to rest on the input. I think I'd provided good input as I review candidate meeting. Now, that being my first meeting, I wouldn't say that I was the most familiar with the policies, procedures and – yeah, it's out of the way that ARIN operates. But if you need additional insight, I would certainly look to the experience that we shared in New Orleans and I certainly can write that up. It's just that hasn't been memorialized or documented anywhere so far. But that's it in a nutshell.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you, William. I think given the fact that you've made – had an opportunity to chat, I would like to give the same opportunity to Yubelkys. Yubelkys, are you there? Can you speak on behalf of your proposal?

Okay. We're not hearing her.

Okay. So, folks, we're not going to make a decision. Right now, we have two proposals in. Judith and I were both [inaudible] our key people. We're going to discuss them in detail. Thank you. I'm going to give one last chance for Yubelkys to say something. No, I'm not catching her. I guess her audio is not working.

---

Okay. Any questions anybody have? Judith, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, it's Alan.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. I'm a little bit confused. These are CROP proposals, which are outreach proposals, so they're not proposals for either mutual, either personal development or ICANN contribute well to that meeting but opportunities for outreach and trying to find new people to get involved.

So, I think we need to be really clear about that and I haven't read these proposals, so I'm not [calling here]. I just wanted to make sure that that was really clear.

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM: Yeah. Let me be clear. That's a good point of clarification. What I'm referring to are the outreach suggestions that I made at ARIN and at the NARALO meeting that we had post ARIN in New Orleans. Now, I made a bunch of very detailed, I think somewhat innovative if I do say so myself, outreach proposals that sync in with that. So that's what I'm referring to.

---

GLENN MCKNIGHT:                   Okay. Judith, comment?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:               I'll let Susannah.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:                   Okay. We're going to put closure to this.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:               [Inaudible] in a long time.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:                   Judith, what did you say?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:               Susannah has been waiting a long time.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:                   No, it's not on this topic. So, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:               Oh, it's not. Okay.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:                   Judith, please, let –

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. Sorry. I didn't realize it was not on the topic. So, as we said, I think we will look at the ideas. Yes, it is CROP and yes, we don't need the approval but we want our members' ideas on this and we want to make sure we're open and inclusive, and that's why we're discussing it among everyone so that we could get [new] ideas. But Glenn and I will discuss these two and make our decision on that.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Good. In fact, we'll probably ask Eduardo to join us, so there's three people making that decision so to be fair.

Okay. I'm going to close that for now and I'm going to – Susannah has something to say at some other business, go ahead.

SUSANNAH GRAY: Hi Glenn, it was just a quick clarification on the readout for the benefit of the people on the phone. I posted the link to the recording and the slides here in the chat but I will also post it to the mailing list so that everybody can see that. That's it. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Okay, thanks, everybody, and thanks for the people on Adigo. Any other comments for anybody before we close?

I don't see anyone. Okay. Time has gone quickly. Thank you for your comments today. Thank you, John, for your hard work and I appreciate all the effort you did, and we will be following up on the outstanding issues. Thanks again, everybody. Bye for now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:       Bye all.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:       Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:       Thank you all.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:       Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:         Bye all.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:                [Inaudible]. Please don't forget to disconnect your lines from the Adigo room as well as the bridge. Thank you all very much for your participation and have a wonderful rest of your day. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**

---