CR - At-Large Regional Leadership Meeting
Wednesday, March 14, 2012 – 12:30 to 14:00
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. We would like to start with the At-Large Regional Leadership Meeting. First of all, my name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh, LACRALO secretariat. First of all, apologies for the late start. Unfortunately the LACRALO – unfortunately we are starting this call 30 minutes later than scheduled, so we only have one hour and just under an hour now at this point. So I think we may have to review our agenda to decide which ones we want to prioritize.

Great. Okay, can I just kind of do roll call quickly, very quickly. Beau, you want to just quickly start. |
Beau Brendler:	Beau Brendler, Chairman NARALO.
Yaovi Atohoun:	Yaovi Atohoun, ALAC.
Aziz Hilali:	Aziz Hilali for AFRALO.
Fatimata Seye Sylla:	Fatimata Seye Sylla, AFRALO.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani Ben Jemaa, AFRALO.

Ganesh Kumar: Ganesh Kumar, NARALO.

Darlene Thompson: Darlene Thompson, Secretariat, North American RALO

Michael Ford: Michael Ford, Barbados.

Andre Griffith: Andre Griffith, Barbados ICT.

Roosevelt King: Roosevelt King, Barbados.

Carlton Samuels: Carlton Samuels, Jamaica.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Dev Anand Teelucksingh, LACRALO Secretariat.

Jose Arcé: Jose Arcé.

Heidi Ullrich: Heidi Ullrich, ICANN staff.

Silvia Vivanco: Silvia Vivanco, staff.

Natalia Encisco: Natalia Encisco, LACRALO.

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

Sandra Hoferichter: Sandra Hoferichter, EURALO, ALAC.

Eduardo Diaz: Eduardo Diaz, NARALO, ALAC.

[Frederic]:   [Frederic], EURALO.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Very well. So if you look at our agenda is there any particular suggestions as to regarding the agenda items, because I don't think, I can honestly say I don't think we're going to cover them all. So is there one that we could say defer until a future conference call with the secretariats?   Suggestions or I'll offer one. Sorry Wolf, go ahead.

Wolf Ludwig: Well due to the time constraints let me suggest reflecting more or less priorities to drop agenda item six – individual membership is in the RALOs, and to postpone it until the next secretariat meetings in June in Prague.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Wolf. Okay, does everyone agree with that suggestion, which is to remove agenda item six regarding individual membership? Going once, going

twice, okay therefore we will defer item six for a future call. Okay, so the next agenda item is sorry, Tijani, so sorry.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No problem. Dev, perhaps it will not be enough to drop this point because we have half an hour, we have a third of time lost. So perhaps we have also to drop the improvement because the improvement, as you know, is not, we didn't advance on it so perhaps we have to schedule it for another meeting.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Right, thank you Tijani. Okay, item number seven we will defer to a future call. Seeing no one objecting to that will – oh I'm sorry. Okay, number five then – improving regional involvement in the policy advice process will be deferred for a future call. Very well. So moving on to agenda item number three, regarding inactive non-quarate ALSes – the review of the framework for dealing with inactive At-Large structures.

There has been some proposals made by all the various RALOs, NARALO being the one that already has in their Bylaws how to deal with inactive or non-quarate ALSes. If you go to the Wiki page, At-Large staff has kindly broken down the various draft texts all in one page. So, now I have to admit I have not given, the constraints with all of the LACRALO events, I have not made much progress in consolidating this information. So, does anyone have any particular suggestions or recommendations regarding the proposal that was put on the Wiki page? Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Dev. So, can we agree on framework, as we said before, on a framework without parameters? Any RALO will do its own parameters. So if we can agree on first define the criteria without parameters. Second, define the threshold also without parameters. And then define how we will act regarding those two elements so that we can have, more or less to have harmonious behavior.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Tijani, that's an excellent suggestion. So we should look at first three steps. One, looking at the criteria. The second, possibly defining the parameters. And the third proposal is what do we should with such non-quarate or inactive ALSes? I would just suggest that perhaps for item number two – definition of parameters – that could be left up to the RALOs themselves, they could offer that suggestion, but I don't think we need to do any comparisons but Tijani go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Dev. Even in the first setting the criteria there is parameters, so we will not define the parameters now. If there is an agreement there is no problem, but if there is not agreement, every RALO will define its own parameters. For the second, I propose to agree on a three or two status of the RALOs. For example, active or not active or contributing or not contributing; anything like this, but we have to define that. And inside those categories, every RALO could put whatever they want.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Tijani. Okay, so let's look at the criteria that we should consider that will be used to measure ALSes involvement in their RALO. I'll offer the first suggestion, attendance and monthly calls. Any objections? Okay.

Roosevelt King: I'm a bit lost. I'm not finding the document.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: It was posted in the chat, in the AC room. If you check the AC room Roosevelt, the link is there. So okay, we have that as one of the criterion; any objections on that. Second suggestion then as a criterion, let's see, amount of emails posted to the RALO mailing list. Comments, Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa:	That's swell, but I will make it wider. I would say contribution into the RALO activities. Inside this we have contributing on the email list, contributing on the comments, etc.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Okay, so contributions to the RALOs activities, such as emails and comments on the Wiki; so posting on the Wiki, posting on the RALO mailing list, a combination of that then and that is tallied as one parameter. Wolf, go ahead.

Wolf Ludwig:	Well I think as previously remarked at previous meetings, I would like to suggest, at least for EURALO, a third criteria. Because I know that the mailing list is not very much appreciated and not considered being the utmost useful among our members. The workspace block, not even the EURALO Board is using a very fine what has been posted by At-Large staff or Wolf. I think there should be a third criteria via as communication channels. Because I have a lot of exchange with certain of our ALSes who have not expressed on the EURALO mailing list for the last six months of the last nine months, and I would never dare to call them, to describe them being in active.
	So I think there is two criteria, mailing list and EURALO workspace is too narrow for my understanding and I think there should be other communication channels, exchange channels where I communicate on political issues on the European agenda with several of our members regularly. I can just give you another example, there are people involved in the EuroDIG process, which is much closer to them, so they are active but they are not active on our mailing list. So this is not a proof of activity, but I think it needs to be considered. Thanks.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Thank you Wolf. I see Darlene.

Darlene Thompson: I think we have to be careful though to consider that okay, if an ALS is active in EuroDIG or some community like that, but what we're talking about it is are they active in the RALO. So we have to narrow it and say "what are they doing for the RALO." So whatever lines of communication you decide for them to be being active with the RALO that is what we're talking about as being active or inactive. Not if they are saving like rainforests or active in other spheres.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Alright I see there's a queue here – Roosevelt.

Roosevelt King: I think that my position is fairly well known among the Caribbean as far as this is concerned because my real concern is that if we are talking about the inclusion we should not find ways to exclude. The other thing is that I think we need to put some things in order because it's either to sort – it's one thing to be active on the list, it's another thing – you don't have to be active on the list to make a contribution.

And if an event is happening maybe there should be a different method of communicating it rather than just checking it on the list. For example, having an alert Board or something or sending special alerts dealing with event because I mean sometimes I don't have to read all that's going on the list. And if you post an event on the list, I mean I just look at my thing and I've got 380 messages between yesterday and this morning. So tell me if something is important in there how can I sift through that when I don't have time to go through all of them?

But if the relevant message is apart from the discussion, so you should have a list for discussion – and that is another thing too. There should be a summary and they should not all just come on the list. There's a need to organize how you disseminate information to the organization. And what happens is that all these things go on the list and people who may not necessarily want to join or

have the time, they miss out on the activities because they don't know. And then to say to them that they are inactive, that is basically a default. So I think that we need to organize how we do things.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Just to clarification here – this discussion was held before in Dakar and I think the consensus was that it's really to consider whether the ALSes are active or inactive. It started out in that terminology when we were trying to grapple with the topic, but we have moved on to say that it's more like how ALSes affect quorum in the RALO decision making and because they are not involved they are not participating in the RALO. So it's not so much active and inactive anymore, although it's still listed as that as a topic point; just to clarify that. Fatima, sorry.

Roosevelt King: Dev, before you go on, if that is so could we not clarify it and actually – (inaudible) and the Secretariat in Dakar was non quorate ALS. Sorry Fatima, go ahead.

Fatima Cambronero: Thank you Dev. I will speak in Spanish. (Inaudible). Are you ready? When it comes to the mailing list we have to make a difference between two things. On one hand we are talking about a mailing list of the active ALSes and this should be working. In LACRALO we have the problem of certain ALSes that haven't updated their email addresses and therefore we've lost communication with them.

And on the other hand we have to limit this issue to a positive and negative aspect because we are running the risk of exceeding or committing excess in the list on having spam just for the sake of appearing on the list in order to comply with the metrics. So I think we should limit this. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I'm not sure who was, I think Yaovi was one and then Tijani; Yaovi, go ahead.

Yaovi Atohoun: Thank you very much. For me I think the formulation is fine because there is no limitation to only the RALO mailing list. It is talking about mailing list or Wiki pages. So a RALO can have an internal mailing list. And then the issue of the number of mailings reaching my mailbox is not an issue, because if I have a 1000 of mails today, I just need to set a filter. And then if I'm interested in my RALO communications, if I have 1000 mails today and 10 from my RALO, I pay attention to that 10 messages. So I think the formulation is okay. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Dev. I am very sensitive to what Wolf and Roosevelt said. It is not a matter of…

[break in audio]

Tijani Ben Jemaa: …list you are not inactive. So at least we try to find way to communicate with those ALSes so that we can consider…

[break in audio]

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: …to please say their name before the make the contributions. I should have done that earlier.

Holly Raiche: Sure. Holly Raiche for the record, sorry, I should know better. I support what Tijani has said and that is if you do attend teleconferences yes. I think there are many ways in which people communicate, and some of that is really to avoid the spam. So I'm basically a personal crusader against the people who hit "reply all" because basically if it hits reply all it probably it's not directed at you and a lot of people take that view. So probably there may be a lot of communication that doesn't necessarily go on the list but that is important.

And so I'm not sure how that would be a measurable as well, but it winds up being "yes we still communicate but we actually communicate in a way that doesn't create spam for others," so maybe there's a way of thinking through those particular sorts of metrics and seeing what participation means. I certainly one measure is do you show up. Now if you don't show the problem is it does create a problem for quorum. And if you want to make decisions then in fact you can't because somebody who is ostensibly a member isn't there. So I think that's an important metric, but I think we have to be careful about how we measure what communication means otherwise.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Holly. Wolf.

Wolf Ludwig: Thanks Mr. Chair. I really don't want to be boring. I apologize in advance. But we are repeating the same discussions meeting by meeting. And in this context I have to say it again, we are talking about a vicious circle. And an important element of this vicious circle is, I can clearly say it for the EURALO level, we had two years ago an ICANN conference in Brussels, we had a showcase, our members were not supported, not funded; first frustration.

We have now next a second European ICANN meeting in Prague. No GA, no face to face, no support for the members. This is hardcore frustration. And what we need to activate our members is the opposite. We need incentives. We need encouragement. We need an enabling environment. Then I am sure the response of our members, the involvement in EURALO will be 100% increased. But I resist to blame our members for being "lame," "not really interested," "not enough involved" when I have to frustrate them now over two, three years.

So I'm not prepared to decide anything what could be understood or misunderstood as punishment here at such a meeting. Not reflecting the causality and origins, reasons and consequence, causes and consequences. I have to take this into consideration to make a real assessment of the situation. Thanks.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Wolf. Okay, well I want to try and see if we can summarize this. It seems that it is – so sorry, Fatimata. Make it quick though.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Thank you – it's Fatimata. I'm going to speak in French. I'd like to insist on a fact. I really respect what Wolf just said. It is very important when we want to send a message, the message that we are going to punish the ALS, it's good maybe at our level to say which ALS is more active or less active. Maybe it's what we try to do. But before Wolf was going to speak I wanted to say that we are repeating in each meeting the same things and we are not going forward. So I don't know why we need to say we are going to punish some ALS; we are not going to punish them.

Maybe we must find some solutions, just solution to have some more ALS actively participating. This is my opinion and I think we are not very well understood because this is our goal, this is our only goal. So Wolf, I think we agree with you, AFRALO agrees with EURALO on that issue. It is not a question of punishing. It's a question of seeing who is participating, who is not

participating and see how to motivate them to participate more. This is what I wanted to say. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Fatimata. Okay, it seems that we don't seem to have a clear consensus regarding how to measure, how to accurately measure the criterion of contributions on the email list because some may see it as spam or just "yeah whatever," and whether they do it on the mailing list or on the Wiki, or possible unofficial channels and of course that also brings the problem of then how do you measure them unofficial channels.

So, let me just throw a counter suggestion on this. How about just simply stating "the complete absence of any emails or Wiki comments" – complete absence, as regarding – go ahead Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I will make a suggestion. Since the parameters will be up to each RALO, so for all RALOs we can put "minimum emails received zero." So any ALS who never send an email is okay, since the minimum is zero. So the parameters will serve the problem. That's all.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Any other comments? Darlene.

Darlene Thompson: I just wanted to comment further and highlight what Holly said actually. We are not looking to punish people here. What this is all about is quorum. If we don't hear from an ALS for years it absolutely stops the business of the RALO because we cannot get them to vote. So, in the North American RALO we have ALSes that like to read the list but we never hear from them. So we just let them know that they are no longer part of the quorum and they're happy with that. Yes you're still an ALS but they won't be considered part of quorum. This

is not a punishment. This is a common business practice and that's all that we're really trying to forward here.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, I do realize we're going over time on this issue, on this topic though. I saw Evan though and since he hasn't contributed I'll let him speak. Go ahead Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks Dev, I'll keep it short and just build on to what Darlene had said. I've spoken to ALSes that haven't contributed and many just feel intimidated. They're still trying to learn things and they feel that the moment they open their mouth they'll show themselves up to not knowing anything that they're talking about. They're in a learning phase. They may not even feel qualified to vote on things, but they're still involved, they still care. And as such, they can still be part of the process. But as Darlene said, the issue is quorum. That kind of participation shouldn't hold up votes.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Evan. I couldn't agree more. Roosevelt it has to be a very quick one.

Roosevelt King: Very short. Quorum – bring it down to a number that you know will be there. You don't have to go into any criteria to do it.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: This is Dev, follow up to that. Then that raises the risk of a small group then making the decision for the entire RALO.

Roosevelt King:

Well tell me what you are going to do? If you have five people who are participating and 1005 who are not, are you not going to make a decision? That is the crux of the matter here now. You still need to make a decision. If, for example, the other 1005 decide well something is happening that is affecting them, then they would know that their duty is to come and find you.

Evan Leibovitch:

Dev, I have a quick answer for Roosevelt. It's basically two ways of looking at the same thing. Either a small proportion of everyone or a large proportion of the ones that have claimed to be active. And I just guess the North American approach has just said "Let's have a high bar for the ones that we know to be active."

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you Chair; Carlton Samuels for the record. I was about to say what my colleague just pointed out, so I won't bounce the rubble in that. To the extent that you have a decision, here is the North American perspective and here is why it works. It works because they tend to make decisions my consensus. That's why it works. And well I've given up actually to let people understand what consensus means. The context in which we operated was that we had a high bar set, like my colleague pointed out, for those who show up. But we insisted that they must show up and vote.

And that is where it went awry. Because they simply, we are struggling with understanding what consensus really means. If 10 of us show up and 10 of us agree to make a decision by consensus, when we do that everybody agrees this is what the group did; this is "group think," this is a group decision and this is what stands. When that happens and when you understand how that works, the idea of having a low bar for consensus or a high bar for show up goes out the window. And that is really the struggle for us to understand.

This is not just out of the air. It is based on certain assumptions. And the basic assumption is consensus and what that means. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Carlton. Very well, given that we now have taken 30 minutes on this, I suggest, may I suggest then let's see if we can defer it for now because we have other items on the agenda unfortunately. So with that in mind let's just look to defer it. And again, perhaps the thing to do is, perhaps a possible Action Item is to have a conference call within the month after and continue to discuss it.

Okay, so moving on to the next agenda item we have the development of criteria for recall of ALAC members. Darlene was the person supposed to lead on this. Darlene you have anything to say or contribute on this topic?

Darlene Thompson: Yes. Sorry, Darlene Thompson for the record. It's to my shame, I was supposed to get a working group together on this after Dakar, that never happened. So I'm going to do it this time. So I just want to let everybody know what this is about in brief, as to what this is talking about. Basically in the ALAC Rules of Procedure, in Section 21 there are minimum participation requirements of ALAC members – reading and commenting on ALAC online forums, and then there are quantitative requirements as well – members casting a vote including abstention in at least three-quarters of ALS accredited votes, and participation in at least two-thirds of the ALAC conference calls in any six month period, and attending at least one physical ICANN meeting in any nine month period, and completing at least one feedback survey on At-Large community issues/matters in any six month period.

We cannot change this. This is in the ALAC Rules of Procedures. I just want to make this clear that we are not talking about changing this. Then it goes on to say "the participation requirements set forth in this section shall be considered met if, and only if, the qualitative requirements stated in Rule 21.3 are met," so there has to be some substance there. Then 21.10 goes on to say "For ordinary ALAC members, in case of failure to meet the requirements the Chair will privately encourage the member to resign. If this does not happen by 14 days

from the communication, the Chair will formally notify the entity responsible for appointing the member, that would be the RALO, and the message may be copied to the public ALAC list and asked that the appointment is immediately reconsidered."

So, basically if a person, if an elected ALAC member, and we are talking about elected not NomCom, if they are not meeting these minimum quantitative and qualitative requirements then this is what is going to happen. Now, if the Chair does encourage that member to resign and they don't after 14 days, then it gets bounced back to the RALO. And right now the RALOs do not have anything, I believe, I don't think any of us have anything in our Rules of Procedures as to what happens then; then what do we do.

So that is the question that's on the table basically, is what do we do if we have an ALAC member that is not meeting these minimum requirements, the Chair ahs talked to them and now it's been bounced to the RALO. So I think there is quite a lot of discussion that could happen around this. We only have 15 minutes so I think it's completely unrealistic to discuss this. So what I'm going to suggest is that maybe we put it out onto the secretariats list, as well as any ALAC member that wishes to take part in the discussion, form a working group and talk about it, but that's just my opinion.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Darlene, very succinct explanation. Any comments on that? I see Tijani and I see Eduardo after.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Darlene. That will be a working group inside ALAC dealing with the metrics and dealing also with the Rule of Procedure and this is the main subject of this working group. So, as said Darlene, I think that we will not discuss it here. Perhaps anyone who has an idea about it can send it on the mailing list. But more importantly, we have to participate all together; any

RALO has to participate in the working group that will be Chaired by Cheryl. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Excellent suggestion Tijani, thank you. Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Eduardo for the record. Hello? I'm sorry. I will support a motion to do what Darlene suggested to defer this to talk about this somewhere else. Also the way this agenda was put together is kind of confusing because this item is under the participation of ALSes and you're talking about participation of ALAC label, so it wasn't quite – I didn't quite understand the way that part, but now I understand. So I suggest this is taken out of, put in a different context. Because we're talking here about participation of ALAC member, right? Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Darlene, go ahead, quick.

Darlene Thompson: I just wanted to comment on Tijani's – sorry, Darlene Thompson for the record. I just wanted to comment on Tijani's comment. Yes, of course the ALAC will be doing their own working group on these Rules of Procedures and examining them. So what this working group would be looking at is what do the RALOs do if according to the Rules of Procedures whatever that working group comes up with, if the ALAC member is not performing as per whatever they come up with and then it gets bounced back to the RALO, then what do we do. So that's what we would be examining.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Lance, go ahead. Make it quick though.

Lance Hines:	Thank you Chair. Just one comment. Not to get into detail, but if the ALAC member is in violation of ALAC rules, I'm not sure I particularly care what the RALO thinks. What should happen is that ALAC advises the RALO that this ALAC member is in default and do that. Because while it would be nice to consult with the RALO, I think it gets far more complex at that point; just my thought.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Okay, thank you Lance. Maybe Tijani might want to respond to that and then we'll close off the topic.
Tijani Ben Jemaa:	Yes, for Darlene she is right, but we cannot set any kind of rules or a manner to do with this problem if ALAC don't set the right Rule of Procedure or the right decision. So that's why I said we will do this work perhaps after the work of ALAC. That's all.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Okay, thank you Tijani. Okay let's move ahead to the next agenda item. We've decided to defer items five and six, so item seven is now on the agenda, which is the review and next steps of the secretariats improvement plan. Holly and/or Charles Marks is listed as this – Holly, go ahead.
Holly Raiche:	Actually what I was going to say is really a question – Darlene, last I think it was Dakar or before, what happened to the other criteria which is somebody's got to do a report; everybody's got to do a report – where did that go?
Darlene Thompson:	That is still under 21.9 – "completing at least one feedback survey."

Holly Raiche: Well that was written up as a meeting report. In other words I thought part of the purpose of people going to meetings was to report back to your constituency. So did we talk about that as a survey? I thought we actually thought that was a report and a measure of achievement is how many report from people you see that are put up after a meeting.

Darlene Thompson: Darlene Thompson. This would go back to what Tijani was talking about as that kind of measurement has to come from the ALAC Rules of Procedure. That is not something that the RALO can say, so that's going to have to be dealt with, and is a great suggestion, to that working group.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Darlene. So, regarding the secretariats improvement plan is there any, do you have anything to comment on because this is listed on your agenda.

Holly Raiche: Can you move that while I refresh my memory please.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Certainly, no problem. Next item on the agenda, and I'm sorry regarding the Adobe Connect shot because I'm not seeing it, so if there was any questions I hope staff would just alert me to that. Tijani, go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: For the improvement plan of the secretariat I think that we have done a work already and we never followed up on it. I propose that one of the Action Items of this meeting Dev, one of the Action Items of this meeting would be to follow up on what was done for the improvement plan. There is a table, we worked on it several times ago. So we have to follow up, so we have to schedule calls for the secretariat to continue working on it. And if there is nothing to do on it we

	have to say it. We don't have to keep it like this. We have more than one year that we didn't touch to.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Thank you Tijani. I think one of the early proposals mentioned in the secretariats call last month, I think it was, whether we should consider giving the AT-Large improvements and the At-Large Improvements Task Force, whether we should even, well as you say, continue maintaining this completely. So one of the things for consideration is of course, a faster review of the secretariats plan and then see if we can retire this plan given the At-Large improvements covers all of these items in this.
	But again, we can, if no one is willing to make that suggestion now, we can of course defer to the next call. Does anybody want to make the suggestion to say let's not review the secretariats plan now at this point, or do you want to look at it one last time or…? Darlene.
Darlene Thompson:	I propose that we – sorry Darlene Thompson speaking. I propose that move that to a telephone conference. I don't think it has to be done right now.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Good. I just want to move the decision regarding the secretariats improvement plan to the conference call as well. Right, so we have one item in the agenda then, which is under any other business. Wolf, I think this is an agenda item that you requested. This is regarding cross RALO/At-Large structures. Can you, go ahead.
Wolf Ludwig:	Thank you. Well I requested – it's a given situation. A short reference – we also repeatedly discussed the model of the ICANN regional, the ICANN geographic regions. And there was a consultation at ALAC and we made some

comments etc. And from time to time in situations they are showing up like the famous exceptions. And there is this exception at the moment that is a phenomenon that Armenia is, according to ICANN part of Asia Pacific. Historically, culturally and for all other good reasons are into the West to Europe. So we had a case that we had the first application from ISOC Armenia. And they were certified and for them it was not a problem being put to Asia Pacific.

Now we have a second application, it's a Media Education Center, which is 100% working with the Council of Europe, European Commission, with European Universities, they have all explained contacts to Europe and they have nothing with Asia Pacific. And [Nareen's] applicant, in charge of the applicant, she's clearly saying for me it's like a condition becoming an ALS, being joined with AP makes no sense for me at all. This is again, the point what made be the motivation afterwards. Then we complain that these people are inactive because you put them in the wrong box.

And therefore we would like to suggest, but I only want now to introduce this discussion, we would like to suggest a model for exceptional cases; what may show up in other RALOs as well, when for good reasons an applicant wants a kind of self-determination. Then I think we should A – negotiate this bilaterally among the RALOs concerned. If bilaterally the RALOs find approval in the given case exceptionally, this may be good. Then we should be open and un-bureaucratic to approve something like this, but always keeping in mind that this should be an exceptional thing and not becoming a kind of rule.

And what I would not like or what I don't intend at all, to start any quarreling with another RALO on such cases. It mu be very well justified and I therefore think that Armenia is simply a model case. If it wouldn't be very well justified I wouldn't propose it and we wouldn't need it. But I will for the next meeting in Prague prepare something for this for a kind of in-depth discussion. And to facilitate the discussion we will send it around amongst the secretariats prior to the meeting to make up our mind and to discuss it in your region. Thanks for your attention.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Wolf. Any comments from anyone on Wolf's suggestion, on his proposal? Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Wolf. Wolf, you are right. You are right. And the most important thing is the involvement, is the willing of the ALS. And now we have Rule of Procedure and we have a geographic region distribution in ICANN, so if we can find – we have to check the Rule of Procedure, but if we can find it possible I totally agree with you if both RALOs agree and the ALS is willing to be in this RALO rather than the other, it's very good. But I want to tell you that in any geographic region distribution there will be such cases, because there is not a perfect distribution. So we have to try to do it pragmatically, but also according to the Rules of Procedure and Bylaws.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Tijani. Any other follow up or comments from anyone? Good. Well, going once, going twice, okay. Any other business? Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Dev. Olivier for the transcript. I had a look at the Rules of Procedure and it doesn't actually specify specifically which geographic regions, well what is the procedure for choosing what geographic region an ALS could apply to. It is widely understood that it respects ICANN wider geographic regions. But it's an understanding and I will require time; perhaps I can come back to you to have staff check, and might check also with Cheryl who is very proficient in those rules to find out how tight or how amenable those rules are to be able to see if such a proposal could be worked.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Thank you Olivier. I think we all realize we'll have to check that because I think it's a unique situation that has happened. Actually under "any other business" I would want to add one other thing. During the improvements, yeah the At-Large Improvements Task Force meeting we looked at the RALO dashboards that were initially proposed about a year or two ago and there's a look into possibly updating that into part of the metrics working group in terms of measuring the RALOs in terms of their, well seeing which ALSes are in which countries, which countries don't have ALSes in their RALO region and so forth.
	So there will be a look to updating these and also to maintain them accurately from once you've updated them. And again, on the email list I'll post something to that. Myself and Sala are going to be looking at developing a beta dashboard, possibly including things such as membership in the GAC for example and which ALSes are in a country and has a GAC representative or not; so those types of things. So more details about that will be coming up in a future call. Holly, go ahead.
Holly Raiche:	Holly Raiche for the record. Can we go back to my action item?
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Well we have four minutes, certainly you could go back there.
Holly Raiche:	I'll just say in that case could everybody just have a look at the link. These are the sorts of things that will make the information that we all have in our heads or not, more accessible to others. And if we're talking about outreach and bringing in more ALSes it's worth having a look at the sorts of suggestions that were made, including ones my Dev and others, in terms of maybe actually activating some inactive members might be one outcome.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Thanks. I do believe you were referring to item 5A and part B, outreach and participation enhancement, certainly. And I guess that goes into how do you deal with the non-quarate ALSes and how do you measure their involvement and so forth. Very well, any other business? I can't believe it but we have three minutes left. Very well, I take it from that there's no other business. So in that case going once, going twice, very well, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you.
Tijani Ben Jemaa:	Thank you Dev. Thank you Dev.

[End of Transcript]