

- 
- Charles Mok: Okay, okay, once again. The two – the agenda on the two sides are not quite the same. I’m trying to go to that other page. I can’t quite see it from here, but the num – the first thing seems to be roll call. Do we need to do a roll call? No. Yes?
- Male: Yes. Yes, we’re going to need that.
- Charles Mok: Okay, so why don’t we...
- Gisella Gruber-White: If you could just announce, then we’ll have it for the record.
- Charles Mok: Why don’t we just do around the table, okay? Let’s start from over here?
- Wolf Ludwig: My name is Wolf Ludwig, EURALO.
- Sandra Hoferichter: EURALO ALAC.
- Cintra Sooknanan: Cintra Sooknanan, At-Large LACRALO.
- Ron Sherwood: Ron Sherwood, ccNSO liaison.
- Dave Kissoondoyal: Dave Kissoondoyal, AFRALO.
- Evan Leibovitch: Evan Leibovitch, vice-chair, ALAC.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Olivier Crépin-Leblond, EURALO.

---

Charles Mok: Charles Mok, APRALO.

Carlton Samuels: Carlton Samuels, LACRALO and ALAC.

Darlene Thompson: Darlene Thompson, NORALO Secretariat.

Sylvia Herlein Leitte: Sylvia Herlein, LACRALO, ALAC member.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Sergio Salinas Porto, ALAC member, LACRALO.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Dev Anand Teelucksingh, LACRALO Secretariat.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani Ben Jemaa, AFRALO, ALAC.

Aziz Hilali: Aziz Hilali, AFRALO.

Fatima Cambroner: Fatima Cambroner, ALS of LACRALO.

Beau Brendler: Beau Brendler of North America.

Charles Mok: We have one more, two more.

Andres Piazza: Andres Piazza, LACRALO.

Charles Mok: Okay, welcome to the – oh, Michele?

Michele Tchonang: Michel Tchonang, CAPDA ALS, AFRALO.

---

Charles Mok: Okay, welcome to the APRALO, well, not the APRALO, but the At-Large Regional Leadership Meeting. I think we can go to the next agenda item, straight to number three. We're starting a little bit late, so item number three is the inactive ALSs and the criteria to measure involvement in RALO, ALAC, and decertification. There was a paper that was circulated before, was it not?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

Charles Mok: Yes, it was e-mailed around. Would there be any discussion on this or we just open up straight to floor for discussion by the members here? Sure, discussion by members? Yes, Darlene, please.

Darlene Thompson: Well, I guess this is directed to everybody, but especially to Wolf. When you circulated that, Wolf, I was wondering, are you wanting to get some kind of criterion that is used evenly through all the RALOs or is it the intention to have each RALO have its own set of rules for decertification of ALSs?

Wolf Ludwig: If this was a question to me...

Darlene Thompson: You started the conversation.

Wolf Ludwig: Well, it was an assessment of an existing problem. And of course, we are only thinking about those RALOs who are concerned about biases. And, there is a majority of our RALOs, of our ALSs, we don't have any particular problem. But we have to do something about ALSs who are not fulfilling the criteria and we would not

---

just let it happen. We now see the point to respond. Does this answer some of your questions, no?

Darlene Thompson: It's Darlene Thompson. Well, for example: North American RALO already has our own set of criterion, pretty much, that we use. Are you suggesting that each RALO should have the same criteria or are you saying that each should just have something that is good for their RALO?

Wolf Ludwig: Well, I think that on the one hand there is a need of a somehow coordinated, because it's ALAC who is certifying new ALSs. Therefore, there shouldn't be kind of a harmonized understanding and a harmonized procedure at the ALAC level, but besides this I think we could have, on each RALO level, somehow according to culture – according to other considerations – slightly differentiating criteria.

For example, if I now take the example of NARALO, this is to my knowledge, at the moment, the strictest rule. If you didn't comply to activity criteria's in NARALO within one year, you are in trouble. In EURALO, we are not as strict as such and let's say that there are ALSs who may not, within one year, because a guy who is our contact person is very busy with other engagements. So, he may not actively participate within a one-year time, but letting me know next year I will be back again.

So, I would not like to punish somebody like this. And we have similar cases from ALSs. We know they are very active in the

country where they are from. So, to me this is proof enough that they are active in the best sense of Internet and user and whatever, but they do not have the capacity for a given moment to participate in EURALO. So, I would not like to punish these ones.

Therefore, I would tend to be a bit more liberal with those and only start from a certain point now with the three ALSs who have not responded for the last three years, and I think this is a situation, which is rather unacceptable. There is no rule that the problem will change by itself and I really believe we should not just let it happen or let them go. I think now it's time to start with this reminding procedure and then to make a decision.

Charles Mok: A respond first because there are other people lined up, please respond first.

Darlene Thompson: Quick response.

Charles Mok: And please say your name. I just have to remind everyone again, sorry.

Darlene Thompson: Quick response. Just to clarify what NORALO does, we don't boot people out after a year. What we say is if an ALS has been inactive for a year that we then notify them of their status and then we give them another year to reply. So, it basically two years before any action may be taken. We have never actually taken any action at all, and when I did institute this conversation on the NORALO list, I had ALSs I heretofore hadn't heard from for years come up and

---

say, “Well, we do like reading the posts but we just haven’t felt we had anything to contribute or for whatever reasons, didn’t contribute.” So, as you say, they’re active.

They’re still out there and they want to read the posts, but what we also need to look at was quorum for the meetings, because these people also do not vote. So, if we haven’t heard from them for a year, then they lose their status to be able to vote. That way, we won’t lose quorum at meetings, either. So, that’s kind of important. But as you say, for those that are actually defunct, and they don’t even have a web page any more, you phone them, there is no answer, the phone is out of service, I mean, we need to take them off the lists.

Charles Mok:

Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Merci! Thank you. Okay, the mail that was sent by you, Wolf, came after an e-mail I sent to explain why AFRALO did your device I like not to accept requests accreditation requests for an ALS. Wolf said in that document that the problem was shared. We have the same issue that was explained in the e-mail that was very clear, it was well explained; and I think that the case of RALO was very clear. After that, NARALO gave the procedure.

This is shared by all the RALOs, have an issue, of the same issue, the same similar issue. There is a problem at the level of ALS participation. Some ALSs never reacted. We don’t even know if they still exist or not. We don’t know anything about them

---

anymore. We have to do something. AFRALO also did distribute and tell us about their way of seeing it, seeing the situation. They have issues as well, similar issues. The question today is to know if this situation can be treated at the collective level or if each RALO can do whatever they please at their own level.

Wolf explains very clearly that as long as the condition has been through ALAC. That's one entity accrediting all the ALSs. Certification can only be done by ALAC and the procedure must be general, quite similar - quite identical. I think it's a crucial point, a crucial issue that would enable us to reactivate ALSs; because when they do know that after a while they won't be able to vote anymore.

I think their attitude will change and they're going to start reacting. We could have some stages, first. Let them know, make them aware that they won't be able to vote anymore, and they can be decertified at a certain level, just like Wolf said. Personally, I do think that a common measure is needed. A collective measure is needed, and we need some collective policies that could be introduced in our bylaws at our level. Thank you very much.

Charles Mok: Thank you. Next, I think, is Beau.

Beau Brendler: I withdraw. I don't think it matters at this point, thanks.

Charles Mok: Okay.



---

Dave Kissoondoyal: I think ALAC -- what can do is we set up certain guidelines, general guidelines; but it's to the RALO to decide its rules and procedures.

Charles Mok: Thank you. And next, I think, is Fatima.

Fatima Cambronero: Fatima, en Espanol. I'm going to speak in Spanish. In LACRALO, we also – we are also discussing the amendments of bylaws and it would be important for us to know if we are going to use same criteria or a different criteria from ALAC for all the RALOs to seize this opportunity of working together in this amendment, and of working and move on altogether so as not to waste time.

I also agree with Tijani, because I personally believe that the solution is not punishment to put them away and no participation. I think that the solution might be that they participate and give them a kind of warning or a loss of their voting rights. Perhaps they might not be considered in the quorum, but they shouldn't be decertified because in this way we are losing ALSs. We are not winning them, but losing them.

Charles Mok: I think, Olivier first?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Charles. Just to say that the ALAC will not tell RALOs what to do. It's the RALOs who tell the ALAC what to do. Thank you.

Charles Mok: Yes, please.



Wolf Ludwig:

Just a response to Fatima. I, in general, agree. As long as there is any hope that an ALS comes back to vote, they indicated, there must have been a motivation a certain moment to fill in an application form and to apply for certification at ALAC. And, we have two cases – they were certified in 2007 and from the very moment of certification in 2007 when At-Large staff sent the approval of the certification, there was not one single response after that anymore.

So, our question in between was, do they still exist? I check it once a year, and I know they still exist. So my interpretation, there was one person at the time who thought this might be interesting to be part of it, filled out the application until the certification procedure was done, the person was not with the organization any longer, so the people who are now – let's take a concrete example of a consumer association Slovenia. Heidi has very good contacts as far as Beau can confirm, with Consumer Organization.

Heidi tried repeatedly to get in contact with this ALS. No way. They do not respond. So I am not interested any longer, after four years by now, to have them just on my list because it looks nice if I have 29, that is better than 27. I see it from a different angle. I'd do anything to re-motivate, to re-encourage, to include ALSs in any discussion. I will understand a lot of circumstances why for a given period of time they cannot be very active; lack of capacities.

---

I know this, by myself; but, a dead duck; let's call it what it is. A dead duck cannot be revitalized, and I don't want to have them listed in EURALO. From a certain moment, I think the EURALO board will take it to decision. Now, we go for the procedure. We give them a last chance. If they wake up in between, then we can re-enter into a discussion and as long as there is a discussion going on.

So I will put down my gun, but if they are not responding within this period we offer them, then I think it's time at the end of the procedure to apply at ALAC and to say please decertify them. We get rid of them on our lists and I would like to concentrate my capacities on ALSs with whom I can discuss, on more or less active members, and where there is a hope, where there is a development in the future. But, I do not want to waste too much time with what I call a dead duck. Thanks.

Charles Mok: Thank you. There are a couple of people that joined after we did the roll call. Please kindly just come and say your name – Edmund, Oksana – and then we can take it down for the record. Please go ahead and do that first. Please.

Edmund Chung: Edmund Chung, ISOC Hong Kong.

Charles Mok: Okay, Oksana?

Oksana Prykhodko: Thank you. Oksana Prykhodko, European Media Platform. I would like to support Wolf about activation and encouragement.

---

For example, before joining EURALO I did not know about what does it mean to be a member of EURALO. For example, I understand that for a majority of you participation in teleconference; it may be not very interesting, but for the representatives of eastern Europe, it's a unique possibility to learn about Internet governance, ICANN, and so on. And to describe this possibility is very important for motivation of future and for existing members. Thank you.

Charles Mok: Okay, first I think, Sergio. We got a few people also lined up. Sergio, yes please.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you. For the record, this is Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. I would like to make two points so far. First, Olivier is right in safeguarding democratic principles that respect diversity in each region, so it is precisely in each region where we need engagement or participation rules. On the other hand, if ALAC is the certifying agency for each RALO, it is ALAC itself the one that has to work out these problems, and there's no doubt about it. Thank you.

Charles Mok: Carlton, Dev, and Beau. Anyone else who raised a name and I didn't – yes, okay, and Patrick. Oh, okay. Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair. The issue about ALSs that are inactive really comes to the head because of the rules of procedure in which they are required for quorum for voting. So, that's the real reason. When we originally put out the rules of procedure, we anticipated

---

that this might be the case. That is why we always try and we've struggled so hard to say the decision should be by consensus.

They don't have formal votes. That was a reason for this emphasis on consensus. Somehow people didn't understand that, and since I can't depend on the first rule of procedure, that was the objective. Now, we went the other way and we wanted to have votes. Okay, it's democratic I guess. But here's the thing; when you ask people to volunteer to become involved with an issue, you are always subject to the vagaries of their interest. When they're interested, they will engage. When they're not interested, you will not get engagement.

As a fundamental principle, I personally – I have too many things to do to spend too much time trying to get people interested as volunteers, to get them to be involved in something that they're not interested. I really don't think that's a good use of my valuable time. And people may think it is off-putting, I guess, but to my mind I am prepared to spend time with people who are engaged and interested.

I am not prepared to spend too much time on people who indicate that they are interested but then by subsequent behavior tell me they're not interested. They actually don't give it a rat's ass. And that is my position. That is where I am going to stand. I will not spend too much time trying to engage people who are not interested in the subject that I'm interested in. I am sorry about that.

Charles Mok: Next I have on the list, Dev and then Beau, Cintra, Evan. Anyone else raised a hand in the Adobe room? I haven't noticed anyone yet, but anyone else? No? If not, Dev, please.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Thank you, Chair. I think I agree with most in the sentiment, and I think - there's actually two principles I think. All the RALOs have to kind of agree on that inactive ALSs that affect the work of the RALOs in filling out a quorum and a new kind of policy work that each RALO has to do in ICANN and so forth. And too, I think, defunct ALSs that are truly defunct, that is don't exist anymore, yes, then there should just be step-by-step procedures for each RALO on how to deal with those such defunct ALSs.

You know, you post a notice and then at the end of the notice you submit to ALAC. Based on this, and this is what we have done. We have checked, website no longer exists, phone calls unanswered, etc. Therefore, our advice is to ALAC is to decertify this ALS and then ALAC then appropriately take the vote. So I think we have those two principles, unless there's other issues. I think we all are seeing the same thing, so – that's it.

Charles Mok: Thank you. Beau, please?

Beau Brendler: Yeah, I know that this -- Beau Brendler from North America. I know this approach has sort of been rejected in the past, or at least viewed with some unease, but I'm wondering if in North America our rules may be, or could be seen as, as a little bit strict, but we

also allow individual members. So, I know some regions don't want to consider that, but I'm just wondering if that's – if there's a limited way to do that that would help save one or two people from an ALS that might be defunct.

In other words, you know, if an ALS is made up of three or four people and the person who is supposed to maintain contact leaves or something. You know, maybe there are other people in it that are interested who might want to be individual members, or maybe another name could be thought of besides individual members that could still save the person, or save the engagement of the interested people.

Charles Mok:

Cintra, next please.

Cintra Sooknanan:

Thank you, Chair, Cintra Sooknanan. While I do agree with the sentiment of this up to the RALOs and At-Large representatives to decide how to move forward to this, I do see value in there being some level of consistency among the RALOs simply because this is a point that goes to the heart of the legitimacy of ALAC as a whole. On the first hand, you don't want to strike off ALSs but again, it makes no sense having - and it takes away from the strength of ALAC – if you have ghost ALSs and ALSs that do not contribute and do not add their voice to us.

Also, it may be onerous for us to go through, go forward, with different processes of decertification just to ensure that one RALO doesn't – I suppose – force ALSs out when they shouldn't. So, I do

---

think that there is some strength in ALAC as a whole, reviewing this along with RALOs. I also don't think it's realistic for us to depend on consensus. I do see the strength of the vote and I think our views are so widely displaced that we do need to come down to something more democratic than always insisting on consensus or believing that consensus can be a way forward. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels:                   Actually, consensus is a different thing. A vote is not a vote for a policy...

Charles Mok:                       Carlton, please say your name.

Carlton Samuels:                   This is Carlton Samuels. I just want to interject a vote for a policy is hardly a good thing. I mean, it just means that all people of different views then your views prevail because there are too much of you. That does not give you the best policy at all. A consensus policy is inherently a better approach than having a RALO-whole vote for a policy. It's the same thing with the politics.

Charles Mok:                       Okay, I think we have to move on because of time, so I'm just going to close this round of discussion after Evan and Carlos; and anyone else, last chance. Sorry?

Wolf Ludwig:                       I had raised my hand in the...

Charles Mok:                       Okay, okay, I didn't... ok, four – after the four of you. Evan, please.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi, there. This is Evan Leibovitch. I just wanted to respond very briefly to a comment from Sergio about the role of ALAC. And that is, while yes it is ultimately ALAC's job to certify ALSs and at a certain point also to decertify finally, it has always done so based on the advice of the region.

So, it is still – at least in my opinion – something that is left to be handled in to accordance what every region believes is necessary and should not be something imposed top-down by ALAC. While ALAC does have ultimate responsibility to do the certification or decertification, that this should be done in following the advice of the local regions as opposed to dictating them.

Charles Mok:

Thank you. Sergio, you want to answer this question first?

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Yes, this is Sergio Salinas Porto. Evan, this is what I had said. That's exactly what I said. I'm sorry if I was misunderstood. I want to reiterate that you have echoed my view. Thank you.

Carlos Aguirre:

This is Carlos Aguirre from LACRALO. Little comment in relation with Carlton said. I think the measure of interest or engagement must be born, I guess, from the proper participant. So, I agree with you, Carlton. Are we doing what we are doing to achieve the engagement, but an important part of this participation or engagement departs from who is volunteer, hmm? So, I agree with you. We need more engagement but the engagement also departs from participation and participation departs or come from



knowledge. We need to give more knowledge in our regions.  
Thank you.

Charles Mok: Thank you. Next, I have Tijani and then Dev and Michel.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani, for the record. I didn't really understand. I haven't really understood. I think that this need to take steps is being felt here. There is a problem for everyone. Everyone has identified this problem and we need to do something. And the best thing would be to do something that is coordinated amongst all of the RALOs. I don't think that the rules have to be absolutely identical, but we need to follow a line that is similar obtained through consensus amongst the five RALOs.

I really believe that if we have this problem, we are suffering from it and I come from a region where we suffer a lot from this problem. We could have taken steps ourselves, but I would have liked that we do something together amongst all the RALOs - something that – an action that is jointly taken through consensus.  
Thank you.

Dev Teelucksingh: Thank you, Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I think that's it essentially, what Tijani has said. I think it's good to have a coordinated response from the RALOs in coming up with different ways of how we measure inactive ALSs and measuring involvement, because I think the goals are – they are for all the RALOs are shared, so that's it. I think the next thing that I would like to suggest is the next step forward.

Charles Mok: Okay, finally, Michel.

Michel Tchonang: Michel Tchonang, AFRALO. I would like to follow up on Tijani and Evan and make a proposal. For those ALSs that are not up to it, compared to those that are dynamic country ALSs that have never been the most active in their region, those that should contribute to pushing them to become more active. Thank you.

Charles Mok: To make a quick summary of what has been discussed; seemed to be at first very divergent views about whether or not we should be even looking at this problem. But I think we're coming to a consensus that while we probably agree that we need to take some steps to form a procedure to handle those defunct ALSs – those that really don't respond and don't exist anymore, I think everyone really still agrees that there should be and there can be different procedures for each of the RALOs or their particular situations.

And Olivier made it clear that the procedures should come us bottom up, rather than coming from ALAC telling us what to do. However, I think there's a strong agreement that there needs to be a baseline of agreement between the - a similar set of procedures, but each RALO probably would be able to come up with slight modifications according to its own different situations, circumstances.

So, the final question might be how do we come up with that baseline? What is the next step? Should somebody among the

---

RALO come up with a set of this baseline or would the assistance of ALAC, what would be the best approach to do it? Yes, please.

Wolf Ludwig:

I think there are enough baselines or proposals already on the table, and I think the principle ideas are clear; encouragement of our members, inclusion in reach as far as possible. That's what we are talking about in the last three years. So, up to now we have been too patient with each and everybody. And there should be a point where a RALO can decide. It's not ALAC; it's a RALO who has to decide when it's the end of patience's reach. And then it's up onto RALO and I take this independence for EURALO that it's our board who decides when we go for decertification procedure in our reach.

We will not decide; we have not the authority. But, we should be in a position like LACRALO, like AFRALO. They know their members. I cannot judge about the situation AFRALO, even if I follow it with interest. So, each RALO must do its own homework and then ask for it, and then we can only suggest it to ALAC. It's not RALO; it's ALAC who will take the final decision as it did for certification. If, at the end, ALAC shows up and says we don't do it. Okay, then we have to re-enter into the discussion with our ALAC members.

And my last remark, I think there is a certain need for an end of this patience. For me, this also has a credibility component. If we, on the one hand, as we say at EURALO – we want, our aim is having one ALS per European country. This would be marvelous

---

to have it. And we will invest a lot of energy to reach this goal. But, this aim cannot be collecting ALSs who finally will prove to be inactive.

So, get as much ALSs as possible, but make sure the ones you have are real, existing ones with a certain level of activity. Otherwise, we can easily damage the reputation of a RALO when we are under suspicion that you are collecting, like stamps, ALSs and afterwards you don't care whether they are active or not. This can be very dangerous.

Charles Mok: Thank you, loud and clear. Olivier, would want some response?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Charles. I'll put my ALAC Chair hat on for this response. I hear that the dialogue is starting and I think it's very good that the RALOs are speaking to each other. It's actually part of one of the missions that I've set myself to get the RALOs to stop being in silos but also talk to each other. We, as ALAC, keep on complaining about ICANN working in silos.

So here, it's great that there's a cross-RALO dialogue. Ideally, it would be great if the RALOs could have a common policy for decertification and that's something which you will need to continue discussing and working together. If this is not the case, and regions wish to have a slightly different policy then of course you can all present those different policies; but it would be great if those policies could be all batched together in a document and then

---

sent to the ALAC so that the ALAC can study it and give the green light for it. So, thank you.

Charles Mok: Yes, who goes first? I didn't look while I was talking.

Aziz Hilali: Yes, Aziz from Morocco, AFRALO. This is a discussion we already started in San Francisco, and I had proposed, and I think we are going toward the solution of having a charter in which the different RALOs can be placed. We could put the minimal number of criteria in the charter – lines of conduct – that everybody would be in agreement, and they would be the basis for being accepted by the RALO.

And then the problem, as Tijani said, is – and it's a problem in our region – if we establish some conditions to be accepted that could also ensure the survival of an ALS within EURALO.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani, very good. To continue what Olivier has said, of course the best thing would be to have a procedure or common lines of conduct for all ALSs and all RALOs; but if we cannot have an agreement, if we cannot come to an agreement we should try to coordinate with most of the RALOs to establish a system or to establish a way to manage this problem in a way that is more collective – even if one RALO cannot. But, we need to have the agreement of all the RALOs, if we can.

Charles Mok: Olivier?

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Charles, I'd like to speak in French so that Tijani doesn't have to keep putting his headset back on each time. I think that – I'm Olivier Leblond. Today I am going to speak as a member of EURALO. I put on my other hat. I simply wanted to add a little suggestion; that is that each RALO appoints a person to create a working group that would work amongst the different RALOs and they could call each other every two weeks and report on what's going on in the region. That would be maybe five people who would be reporting, and they could establish possibly a common line of conduct for everyone. Thank you.

Charles Mok: Two more hands, Sergio and Darlene, and we've really got to close; and – Fatima. Yes, yes. Three more, and very short comment. Please, we're really running way over time.

Sergio Salina Porto: Just to ask you if this the proper moment – I'll start working on this – if I can offer myself, I would like work on this. I volunteer for this. So, again, if this is the time I would like to volunteer to work.

Darlene Thompson: Just as a direct response to Olivier's comment. Is that not what the secretariats are supposed to be doing? Isn't that the secretariat's job description?

Charles Mok: Fatima please, yes?

Fatima Cambronero: I will speak in Spanish. In LACRALO, we have already proposed in one of the teleconferences the creation of a permanent working

---

group with one member of each RALO to be constantly in contact in order to be able to work with these issues related to participation. I don't agree with the fact that the member of each RALO should be an ALAC member.

I think it should be a member from an ALS participating actively, but not a member of the ALAC. I would like more people participating, different people. We do have the people there, and I do agree with Wolf in the fact that we are running out of patience when we work actively and that our ALSs are not working so we want them to disappear. I do agree with him, with his comment. Thank you.

Charles Mok:

Okay, do we have a consensus to set up a working group with one member from each RALO to continue to work on this topic and then to report back and try to find out the best way forward? Okay, so we will take that up. I'm sure that staff will also notice that and help us set it up. Action item. Okay, this is an action item coming up from this meeting. Okay, we've all got it.

The next item that we really need to move on to is improving regional involvement in the policy of process. Let's open it up for discussion from members. Are we warmed up to the next topic yet? I believe obviously that it's been a constant problem that – at least I felt in my RALO – that we really need to – we don't feel that we are doing enough in terms of getting the right level of responses from our ALS members about responding to policy comments that are put up by ICANN.

One thing that I have tried to ask for is whether or not we can really get much more sustained and summarized version of many of these comments that can help us really get the right kind of response, at least interest, from the ALS members because oftentimes these documents are too complicated. People don't know how relevant they are to them. So, let me start with Beau – you put up your hand – please.

Beau Brendler:

Yeah, Beau Brendler from North America. I've been wondering lately if there might be means to use the – or a similar tool such as the – post tool to try to focus ALS's attention on participating in just about any sort of policy discussion. I think there sort of needs to be a very concentrated pinpoint of asking involvement.

It might take some work on the part of whoever sets up the discussion or the poll, but I would be glad to take on that work in my own region and put out polls for particular motions on things; because otherwise, we tend to – in the North American region – get the same group of diehards and loyalists on there. It just would be better if there were a more representative way.

At least with the polls, or the big polls tool, you can have a period of time, you know. You could leave something open for 48 hours. You don't have to be sitting in a seat at a particular time for a call. You don't have to mess with the annoying buzzing, you know. So it's one suggestion. I would like to see if anybody else is interested in this.



Charles Mok: Thank you, Beau, but for the tools for the poll, Beau. I want to ask you this. For the tool that you use, do you just collect – is there a discussion, or are they just for voting or polling purpose?

Beau Brendler: Well, I think you could use them for kind of an in-between. I mean, a lot of times on our calls, what I wind up doing or what the previous leaders have been doing is saying, should NARALO make a statement on – whatever, you know? And maybe there's no response. Whereas, you know, if we were able to use the polling tool for some basic elements like that it would cut down on a lot of time that we spend trying to get people to participate. Does that make sense?

Charles Mok: Yes.

Beau Brendler: So like I don't necessarily mean create votes - policy votes - all the time, but just create consensus points for taking a step.

Charles Mok: Thank you for the clarification. The reason I asked that question – this is Charles, for the record – the reason I asked that question is because, at least in my region, the biggest problems seem to be for ALS members to become even interested in understanding or reading the documents, let alone coming to consensus.

That's the biggest problem. And so, that's why I asked whether or not some of these tools can encourage more discussion or understandings about the issues; because to me that seems to be the

biggest problem that I face. Ok, I think – Evan, did you put...no?  
Okay. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Charles. I just wanted to mention one thing, because I was asked a question. Are any ALS members able to hold the pen or do you need to be an ALAC member or do you need to be a member of the executive committee and in fact anyone who is a member of an ALS or an individual member in the case of regions that have individual membership is able to hold the pen? Of course we'll have to follow, is good about writing their initial statement but you don't follow the procedure to have it released as a statement, so I just wanted to make sure of that. It's a great opportunity to get more involved, so thank you.

Charles Mok: Anyone else would like to make a comment? Charles. Yes, Tijani, please?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, Charles. I would like to say that it's better to have summaries so that people read. It's my experience that – I can guarantee that – those who do not want to be interested, they will not even read one line. This is a problem of simply their level of interest. It's a question of interest. If they're interested they will read, they will participate.

This issue takes us back to the preceding question, the participation of the ALSs. If we can recruit ALSs that are interesting and interested, then this question of participation in the development policy will be easily resolved. It's the quality of the people we get.

---

We need to recruit really high-quality ALSs, and especially high-quality individuals.

I know here, the At-Large people who have just arrived, who are very engaged, who participate very well and others who have been here for a long time who do not participate well; and the question is whether they are interested, and we need to look for them. We've talked about this for a long time, about summarizing, translating into different languages – and despite all of that, we don't have participation.

Charles Mok:

Agreed, but at the same time I think it's also recruiting and training these people at the same time, also. Darlene, please.

Darlene Thompson:

Yes, I agree, too. When we put it through the NARALO list as on the previous topic as to why ALSs weren't participating better, one did come back and say, well they see too much discussion on the list on process rather than on policy, and it seems to be the same issues being brought up again and again, and has been discussed for the last four or five years.

So, that can be rather off-putting to ALSs as well, so it is important to try to discuss policy issues more on the list and keep it in front of people – interesting discussions that they can engage in. Also what we try to do in our monthly meetings is to always go through the upcoming issues that we have deadlines on, and go through the policy issues that are posted by ICANN with their deadlines, and go through and say which ones would our RALO like to engage in

---

and pick and choose those that people are interested in and then form working groups. And so if these are maybe kept in front of people a bit better, maybe they might engage in policy discussions a bit more as a discussion.

Charles Mok: Olivier, please.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Charles. Olivier Crépin-Leblond. Work Team D, I believe, is working on this specific problem of how to deal with the information flow to get RALOs to engage more in policy; and I believe that those recommendations will be given to the ALAC and then be looked at and – I would hope – being implemented. I think that they will, because they absolutely make sense.

So, it's just worth noting that this is a work in progress and hopefully the whole process of responding to call for comments, which has been very well put into diagrams by Dev Teelucksingh will be a complete part of that process so we will know exactly where we stand. You know, there's always the problem of how much time do we have to respond, how much time do we have – we as a whole community – to ask our members, and for some reason we're always running out of time.

We're always running, like running after a bus that always a minute before we arrive at the bus stop. It's a concern, and I have a concern as well when we have a statement then we only have 48 hours to send it out, and the statement has not been circulated so

---

widely. I have a concern whether it reflects the whole community. But, there are times when we're asked to do a statement and there are times when if we did not file a statement at all it would be seen as an utter failure of At-Large to make the voice of the Internet user known.

So, I'm aware of grappling with these problems and I hope that together we can make it better and really push the voice of the Internet user forward. And I'm sorry to take too much time; I think I'm rambling. Thank you.

Charles Mok:

I think we're running out of time in this meeting as well, just like everything else; but, do we have any further discussion on this item? Because I don't think this is something that we can immediately take up on a particular action item. But, it will be an issue that we have to deal with in each of our RALOs continuously.

And again, because probably, our next agenda item; Dev, with your presentation on WTD proposed flowchart and so on that might be also relevant. So, would we be able to close this round of discussion on the policy advice process improvement and move onto the next topic? If there's no disagreement? Okay, yes. So, lets move on to the next item. So, Dev, would you take over and can help us with the review of the flow chart?

Dev Teelucksingh:

Thank you, Chair. Dev Teelucksingh/ Is the flow chart can be shown on the screen? Otherwise it's going to be hard to describe

this process. While it's coming up, team D was to look at how to strengthen policy advice mechanisms. So some of the things that poses for that recommendation was that the policies from ICANN and its ACs and SOs should be available – wrong one – should be available in at least English, Spanish, and French at the start of the public comment period.

I posted the link in the Adobe chat room, if you want to get the PDF and bring that up. Also, the deadline for public comments on a policy can be longer than 30 days and there's a flow chart of a policy advice development process as was illustrated in the flow chart. But, one of the other things that was proposed was that ALAC will establish a policy review committee, and that will review current and upcoming ICANN policies out for comment as well as policy issues raised by At-Large.

Instead of trying to react simply to ICANN policy issues you are trying to bring end-user issues up from the bottom-up process to ALAC so that any statements could then be drafted and sent to the appropriate SO or even to the Board if need be. So, the ALAC policy review committee would then be a standing committee consisting of the ALAC Rapporteur, the ALAC liaisons to the various ACs and SOs and any cross-constituency working groups, and at least – it could be more – at least two representatives from each RALO. When I say two representatives, not necessarily the chair and the secretariat.

---

So by having that policy review committee, ALSs in the regions have more say in the review of policies out for comment and also what I mentioned before was that ALSs and RALOs in At-Large can then raise awareness of ICANN-related policy issues or concerns to ALAC. That has not been considered by ICANN. This such of policy review committee would then look at what is actually being implemented to some extent by ICANN, to have upcoming comments tracked and the policy or review committee would look at those upcoming comments and then decide what we need to do. Do we need to have a conference call? Do we need discussions? And so forth. Okay, so thanks.

I know we're running out of time on this, so let's try to be brief on this. This flow chart has been around since March, when presented in San Francisco. It hasn't been changed since. So, essentially there are several stages. If you begin from when the policy is available for comment, it is distributed to all of At-Large. At-Large and RALO submit comments to ALAC, and has ALAC decided to submit comments on this policy. If the answer is no, the RALOs can still take it upon themselves to draft the comments.

If the answer is yes, ALAC will then decide on what working group will be tasked to come up with a draft statement and also decide whatever we need, will this take longer than 30 days; and if so make the formal request to ICANN if it needs more than 30 days. Let me just scroll down quickly -- also, one of the other things, and I'm going to just jump ahead -- so, when it gets to this stage here, that the working group does its deliberations, it may

---

even request a briefing call if needed by ICANN staff or whatever is needed to get better understanding

And then that working group then requests that, hey this is an issue that does require more working time needed, so please ALAC, please submit a request for an extension of time. Once the working group produces the draft comments for the policy, it's then circulated – you can scroll down now -- the announcement is posted to the lists, comments are brought in from all the RALOs, and then the working group takes that into account and then comes up with the final statement for ALAC to then vote on. So at that is the summary of that process. I'm open to any questions or comments or suggestions. Thanks.

Charles Mok:

Thanks, Dev. This is Charles. Any question or comments? We've been discussing this for some time, and everybody loves it, eh? So the question is how and what specific steps RALOs need to take in order to take it into action and follow this flow chart.

Dev Teelucksingh:

Well the At-Large improvement is going to have to – the Work Teams have to submit drafts of a report to ALAC for ALAC's consideration. And I believe once ALAC – I think the timeline is before end of July, early August – for that final report to be submitted to ALAC for its consideration in time for it to be voted on in August. Because there's a lot of other things that – for example – work team B looks at how to engage ALSs and looking at use of social media to spread the message and so forth, and



---

things like that so it's not just this work team's work, it's the other work teams – B, C, A is practically done already – but B, C, and D.

Charles Mok:

Thanks, Dev, this is Charles. Actually, when I look at this flow chart I liked it very much that it can make the whole process much more systematic and we follow a particular procedure. The only thing is, I think at least from my experience in our RALO – the problem only occurs when we miss deadlines.

Again, some of these deadlines that we're talking about in this procedure – are still relatively short. What happens if, for any particular reason – you know sometimes when something comes up you need a response within very short periods of time – that particular person that is involved or in charge happens to be unavailable for a couple of days and everything just got missed out.

Is there any consideration for particular situations like that, because I would imagine that would be the biggest problem that a RALO might have in following the procedure as much as they like to be following it?

Dev Teelucksingh:

Thank you, Chair. Dev Teelucksingh again. Well, I think the process of reviving or retiring the At-Large working groups is – I think – critical to this, so if there is an issue such as the persons on the working group unable to then come up with – members are unavailable due to other time commitments, then they should report back to ALAC and let that be know so then a further

---

decision can then be taken; whether to then – again, for example – extend the public comment period formally. So, it does require the working groups to be functional rather than defunct; because obviously if it's defunct and nobody's listening to those mailing lists or whatever then yes, you will have problems.

Charles Mok:

Ok, it seems like there's no further discussion on this particular item so we have noted the discussion and looking forward to the proposal being tabled to ALAC. Let's move on to our next agenda item, which is the secretariat's improvement plans. Any particular discussion on secretariat's improvement? Yes, Tijani please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Well I think that work was done for a while, and it would be great to have it on the screen. We don't want to reinvent the wheel, so let's put it on the screen, please? There was a document we worked on for a while with Evan – particularly with Evan – with other members of the Secretariat for the RALO, and I don't know where this document is. This is a chart—

Charles Mok:

Since staff is trying to find the document, why don't we move onto a particular AOB that Olivier would want to bring up about the finance budget. Olivier, can you take that over in order that we can save a little bit of time?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yes, Charles. Thank you very much. Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the record. I'm putting my ALAC Chair hat back on. We have a diagram which Dev has very kindly put together which appeared on the screen a bit earlier, the other one, which is a little

explanation of some creative thinking with regards to the use of funds for financial year '12. As you all know, we've been provided with an answer for ICANN finance as to – well, three regions asked for a general assembly to take place in their region and rather than having 30 ALSs, 19 ALSs, and 20 ALSs for a general assembly in that region, we were provided with six, which does not make a general assembly at all.

It just boosts the numbers a little bit. So, one possible solution – one suggested solution – and knowing the current political importance of the Philippine countries in light of the launch of the new gTLDs, we have the JAS working group on one side, joint applicant support. The next meeting is going to take place in Dakkar, so there was an idea of perhaps pooling those resources so that rather than each region not getting a general assembly, one region at least would be able to benefit from this in the first year, knowing that next year there's likely to be more funding since the new gTLDs will have been launched.

So ICANN will theoretically be richer, except if it does something majorly wrong. So, here is a diagram which Dev has very kindly put together based on something I scribbled quickly and we were thinking that if - well have a great discussion here and perhaps at that point, I know the executive committee is meeting with Akram, Akram Atallah, who is Juan Ojeda's boss - on Friday afternoon and perhaps we could show that diagram over to him to show him what kind of thinking we've been looking at and maybe a proposal to have a solution to the current dilemma that we're faced with.



Bearing in mind that we would then be pushing afterwards for Latin American general assembly – or whatever we call it, a summit – as well, as a matter of priority So, I'll open the floor and I know that I have discussed this and some of my vice chairs have discussed this with the regions separately and in formal chats outside, but I thought it would be important maybe to discuss it here prior to us speaking to Akram if that's the case. Thank you.

Charles Mok:

Yes, Sergio please.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

For the record, I am Sergio Salinas Porto and I will speak in Spanish. Mr. ALAC Chair, Mr. RALO Chair, it is difficult when one is confronted with this and we are in Asia, so I'm going to use two ideas that come to mind; first, the Chinese ideogram of crisis – representing crisis – that also represents opportunity and also the Yin and Yang, that duality that we are permanently faced with.

No doubt LACRALO, in this duality, will show solidarity towards our colleagues and friends from Africa, especially because we do understand the need and urgency of a general assembly as we do have. However, it is also necessary to raise awareness and alert in that this may become a dangerous precedent for our ALAC organization if we continually give up in the face of these circumstances; and I am going beyond my region and I am speaking about all the regions that make up the ALAC.

---

It is hard to face arguments that are almost facetious. It is hard to confront them and have to fight in this reality. It's poor people fighting against poor people. So, let us consider this and should this be approved. Let us bear in mind that we are doing it only as a pure and simple exception. It is only this one time that we are doing this. We are not going to give up all future occasions. I do not think it is a good idea to send ICANN a message that we are going to give up our expectation to hold annual regional meetings. Thank you.

Charles Mok:

The end of this meeting, I found out. And, actually first of all, this is Charles for the record. And I totally agree with what Sergio has said. You basically have covered what I would have wanted to say for APRALO as well, so I won't waste more time. Olivier, why don't you respond because I think the views from all the RALOs are pretty clear on this topic. We've discussed it before.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Sergio, and I absolutely agree with you. Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the record. I absolutely agree with you, and I would hope that if the regions approve this there would also be a statement from the regions attached. A strong statement from the regions. I think that the ALAC has – several of us have tried to find a compromise solution. I don't think we can live on compromises, and certainly I don't see why the At-Large constituency should be the only consistency that has to compromise all the time. So, this is a clear statement that we need to make. Thank you.

Charles Mok:

Thank you, Olivier. I see that we finally have the document that is about the secretariat improvement up, although it's too far away from me. I cannot read; but we're running out of time. I think we need to give up the room to someone else. It's a hot stop. So sorry about this, we really couldn't be talking about this topic at the moment. We might have time tomorrow to quickly go over this or not – probably not. I was told in the agenda that it's not a high priority item, but unfortunately in any case we wouldn't be able to come to this at time. So, thank you very much. I think I have to declare the meeting closed. Thanks for your participation.

[End of Transcript]