

---

PRAGUE – At-Large Regional Leadership  
Wednesday, June 27, 2012 – 10:00 to 11:30  
ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

Wolf Ludwig: Representing?

Male: Presiding.

Wolf Ludwig: Representing.

Male: Oh representing, I'm just here as an observer.

Beau Brendler: Hi, I'm Beau Brendler; I'm the Chairman of NARALO.

Jose Arcé: This is Jose Arcé, and I am LACRALO's Chair, Jose Arcé, LACRALO's Chair.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Good morning, Wolf, my name is Sergio Salinas Porto, I am an ALAC member I represent LACRALO and I am here in my capacity as an observer, thank you.

---

*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.*

---

Darlene Thompson: ...secretariat part of this working group.

Sandra Hoferichter: Sandra Hoferichter EURALO and ALAC representative.

Wolf Ludwig: My name is Wolf Ludwig, Chair of EURALO.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani Ben Jemaa, Vice Chair of AFRALO.

Holly Raiche: Holly Raiche, Vice Chair of APRALO.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, ALAC member.

Sylvia Herlein Leite: Sylvia Herlein Leite, the new LACRALO's secretariat.

Natalia Enciso: Natalia Enciso.

Victor Ndonnang: Victor Ndonnang, ISOC Cameroon Chapter; ALS member of AFRALO.

Oksana Prykhodko: Oksana Prykhodko, EURALO secretariat.

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay, thanks a lot for this. I guess we are almost complete, we have representatives from all regions here around table and I think we can now slowly start what's next agenda item, adoption of the agenda.

As you may recall secretariats call five, six weeks ago where we basically discussed the items of our today's meeting. We came up after the call with a slightly different agenda, and we had some exchanges with some of you, I particularly recall my various exchanges with Beau and also with Fatimata saying it doesn't make too much sense to repeat again and again the same discussions we had over ICANN meetings the last two years.

And we should therefore cut down the old stuff what was discussed already, if it was not yet decided, we should reflect how best we can come with a decision just to recall this were regarding the inreach and the participation levels in the respective RALOs. The question by certain members contribute more, others less, et cetera. What is the circumstances and the conditions, we came up saying okay, due to regional culture or whatsoever reasons, the conditions in the RALOs may differ from one to another RALO therefore we cannot one fits all solution. We need to agree on a certain standard what can be applied by all the RALOs but the detail work must be done in the RALO itself.

And I think this was an agreement more or less we had – we found over the last meetings already, therefore, I think all these or there's no need to go into any person's schedule regarding this point, and we should concentrate on other issues which may be more interesting and more relevant.

---

One of these issues we did not discuss in detail so far or perhaps only on a bilateral way with NARALO was a question of what do you now put on the agenda item three. The individual membership within the RALOs; as you may remember. And to my knowledge, there two RALOs who provide this opportunity. The first one was the NARALO having this from the very beginning. The second one was EURALO which didn't have any formal provision for this, but in fact from the beginning of EURALO we included individual members even into EURALO bought.

The problem was simply not limited opportunities for participation; it was only about voting rights. They were not supposed to have any official voting at EURALO when we had consultations, when we let's say went for the Board seat 15 procedures, et cetera, but besides the voting we allowed more or less for participation.

But there was still some frustration by certain individual members by saying okay when it comes to the point I have not the same rights as the others do as ALS representatives even if we are sometimes more active, then certain ALS representatives. So this was still a kind of a weak point and then we decided we would go for a Bylaw modification that we did a year ago or accomplished a year ago but what was a procedure of a year before that to find the most appropriate solution.

So we did some kind of consultations, again we came up with two options, one option was closer to the NARALO regulation; the second option what was a bit too complicated for Europeans. The second option was to make it as simple as possible, and the simple option is that we decided we can create just an ALS as a home for individual members.

Darlene Thompson:                    You did what NARALO did.

Wolf Ludwig:                            Oh finally it's like that, okay.

[background conversation]

Wolf Ludwig:                            Yes, okay. So it was a spontaneous comment but it's taken into consideration, okay it's more or less the same as at NARALO and I think it really is one of the easiest solution to offer this opportunity in ALS which is not based in a country, but is across European ALSs where members let's say from Romania up to elsewhere into European region, again the European region is a very vague definition depending on what standards you use, but we are quite open and flexible.

The political point behind is we see an enormous potential of individuals in Europe who would like to participate, but do not necessary want to be affiliated to an existing ALS; it's what we did before, we had such cases where even an At-Large member from Moldavia where we didn't have ALS was a member a German ALSs was positively [brought].

So make it brief the consideration is to make it easy or as stupid as possible to increase opportunities for individuals and welcome them at the RALO level, because as said, I see an enormous potential by individuals and we have to encourage them besides outreach activities

---

finding new members and both is necessary. So if any of the other RALOs do want to adopt this model or to enlarge opportunities in their region, please feel free to come back us as a NARALO or the EURALO we can by now advise you in this respect.

I see several hands raised. Let's me start with the left side, Sergio at first, then Holly and then Tijani.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Thank you, Wolf; for the record this is Sergio Salinas Porto. I have a question because I need some clarification. How does this ALS, this sort of trans-regional or trans-European ALS; how do you define or how do you decide who will be your candidate, in case there is a vacancy, and how do you decide voting rights when you have to vote on policy issues, or when you have to decide anything; how do you go about it? Because I need to understand this so as to fully understand what you're doing. Thank you.

Wolf Ludwig:

We continue with question of Holly. I suggest that Darlene give a short comment reply of this.

Darlene Thompson:

Sergio, in the North American RALO, what we've done and I'm not saying this is the way or anything, but what we've done is we have formed them into a quasi-ALS so they chose a rep from amongst themselves, and right now Alan is their rep; and he has the voting right for that ALS.

---

So they will amongst their own membership, which I have encouraged is choose someone to be their voice. So it's like any other ALS would be, they would choose someone to have their voting rights. So that's how we've dealt with it anyway.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, once more...

Sergio Salinas Porto: Excuse me, Sergio Salinas Porto speaking, sorry for the interruption. Okay, I was putting forth this question, because in my ALS every time we reach a decision, I let my ALS know what is going on so that I receive a mandate from them. So it is now clear to me. I know that you have individuals but then they choose somebody that will represent them, and that person decides without consulting them; is that correct?

Wolf Ludwig: Yes. The problem from the beginning simply was a question of balance. If you have let's say 25 ALSs and you have 10 very active individuals, and if you let the 10 very active individuals always decide and vote so the existing ALSs will say it doesn't make any sense to go for certification anymore, so we just present ourself participate as individuals.

To avoid this kind of conflicts we said from the very beginning individuals cannot have voting rights. Now since we modified the Bylaws we say you have to gather in an ALS, then you elect one representative, so you balance the set-up, and this is the only way that it really can work without creating any further conflicts. And NARALO is

---

practicing it already. We are now on the way to create this RALO which haven't been done so far, but I hope it will be – thanks Tijani – I hope it will be done until next year and then we can come back. Let me now just continue with the list, Holly first...

Holly Raiche: He asked the question I was going to ask so I'm happy with the answer.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Put your headphone I will speak French. I'm Tijani Ben Jemaa from AFRALO. In AFRALO this question has been addressed and I was the person who put it into debate and people was very annoyed because they thought it was not a good idea to have individual members of AFRALO, and the reasons were first if the person doesn't want to affiliate to an ALS, that person can be affiliate to something bigger that is a RALO.

And secondly I wanted to create a specific ALS for these people and they said the person who doesn't want to adhere to an ALS can't adhere to a specific group. It is the same problem and then surely the member who are affiliated would join an ALS they are going to come back to the ALS when they have a problem. So if we have a member who don't let the RALO working normally if there is a discussion, he wants impose his point of view, if he belonged to an ALS, we can ask the ALS to put somebody else and the problem is finished, is solved.



---

So when there is a member you can't do that. In my RALO the idea of the individual member was not accepted, not at all accepted. And I have asked discussion on that idea because I know there are some experiences in the NARALO for example but it was not accepted in my environment.

Wolf Ludwig:

Actually Tijani we had the same discussion at EURALO from the beginning. I think the problem was you can, whatever subject you take, start a discussion by potential abusers, and if you start it by the abuse side in internet governance, you always reach in a very defensive concept and perception of life of opportunities. And we realized okay there were some good reasons how by a potential troublemaker, the existing modalities could be abused and how can the current community deal with afterwards.

And then we realized if we take this as a standard of our perception, we do not get anywhere. And we had the offers of non-troublemakers as individuals who wanted to contribute but in a constructive way, and therefore we simply say okay, let's have the abuse potential in mind somewhere in the back if it happens, then we have to rediscuss again, but we cannot start everything by simply... I take one more, Fouad, and then it's Darlene and –

Holly Raiche:

I do have a question.

---

Wolf Ludwig: You have a question for this?

Holly Raiche: Yes.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay then you have your question, Holly.

Holly Raiche: I think my question is you've got clear tests and you've got an application forum for an ALS, I'd be interested and maybe this is an off line discussion with my dear sick colleague across the way as to what you would use in terms of trying to decide whether somebody can join this mythical ALS, and how you sort to say to troublemakers no, or is that the problem of this mythical ALS. It's a question I think of management that maybe is an off line discussion.

Fouad Bajwa: Thank you Wolf, Fouad Bajwa for the transcript record. I was waiving my hand because I actually wanted to add something to Holly's question. If this – what did you all it, what's the name of the ALS for this – now what do you call this ALS?

Holly Raiche: I called it the mythical ALS.

Fouad Bajwa: Oh, yes, mythical ALS.

Female: Individual users ALS.

Fouad Bajwa: Okay, the IUS, how do you limit the number of members for it? It can just grow phenomenally, everyone comes in, you keep putting them in there. So that ALS actually becomes a potential conflict zone itself, because the diversity of people you're putting in there right, you're getting the best people who want to contribute, but they may go into conflict with each other, so you're actually sort of building a small RALO – no, okay.

Wolf Ludwig: Yes, you answer this now.

Darlene Thompson: I'm sorry for all the coughing but I've got bronchitis, so I will try to snuffle out my words here. Darlene Thompson for the record.

Yes, we can get a few people in that unaffiliated ALS. But the fact of the matter is, is that we have some our strongest people coming from that ALS. And if there are troublemakers or disturbers, if I may use that word, they usually patrol their own ranks much more harshly than I could or would as secretariat. So they only still have one voice, you know every ALS gets one voice, one vote. And they get one vote. So we can attract a lot of talent through the individual users ALS that perhaps wouldn't otherwise be seen in other RALOs and they still only get one vote.

---

So they have to somehow marshal their individual voices into one, through their one person that has been voted in. So we don't care how big it gets. It doesn't matter. It's like having a really big ALS, like what Beau used to be in charge of was Consumers Union which was huge. So we don't care how big it is, they still only have one vote.

But there is an incredible pool of talent there. And yes any of them can go for any elected position, such as for example Alan is their spokesperson, Beau is also one of their people and he is our Chair. But we all have to elect him in. So every ALS has one vote. So they are only as strong as we vote them in to be basically.

Wolf Ludwig:

Thanks, Darlene. There's one additional comment by Evan. I think it's also for clarification and then we have somebody from the remote participation.

Evan Leibovitch:

This is Evan, by the way. Just as a matter of this historical background, when this was originally envisioned, we had the luxury and I think NARALO still has the luxury of trying to do as much as possible by consensus rather than formal vote.

So having individual participation essentially means that the people that get involved in the decision making process are the people that participate in calls, participate in email lists, whether they're with an ALS, whether they're with the virtual individual ALS, it's the people that participate that actually get involved in the consensus-based decision making. In the RALOs case, we're fortunate enough that very little

---

actually needs to get taken to formal votes and this usually almost always just elections.

And when it comes to actual policy work this is generally done by consensus and the people that engage in the consensus are the people that show up and so the distinction of who is in an ALS and who is in the mythical ALS becomes irrelevant, because it's who participates gets their voices heard and becomes part of the policy making process.

So this may be a luxury that NARALO has been able to have and that most of what we've been able to do has been achieved through consensus, but it's a way that's worked for us and it's essentially made this well how many individual members in the virtual ALS is too many becomes almost irrelevant because it's the ones that show up that get their voices heard and become part of it. And also when this question had come up originally, it was almost a sort of let's get to the luxury of having too many individual members. And see how we deal with this horrible circumstance that we have to deal with.

At a certain point if it became a matter of coming up with a policy and saying well, if we have 501 individual members we'll create a second virtual ALS and allow people to sort themselves out, and having a maximum number of people in each of these virtual ALSs. So if we have 500 people they have one vote, if we have 1,000 they get a second vote, or that's something that can be implemented at the RALO level depending on how you want to go. So I consider that a fairly minor issue of how you deal with too many individual participants, heaven forbid we get that kind of problem.

---

[background conversation]

Evan Leibovitch: Exactly, it would be a great problem to have, so when we get to that, I think every RALO has the sensibilities to be able to make the decision of how you deal with accommodating too many people that want to get involved. Right now that isn't our problem in the real world. And like I say consensus has served us well in being able to deal with that. Thank you.

Wolf Ludwig: Oh, thanks Evan for this.

Male: Wolf?

Wolf Ludwig: Yes. I just wondered slowly by slowly you answer toward you directly in the chat. Okay, so I don't have to come back to it. Any more? Otherwise, Rudi you can follow up bilaterally after this as well. There was first Beau, now on my list, Fouad again, Holly and Carlton. Okay, Beau, Fouad and then Carlton, and then we have to cut down this point if possible because there is still other stuff on the agenda we have to talk about.

---

Beau Brendler: Thank you Wolf. I will withdraw my question as we're already half way through this meeting and still on the same topic that we discuss every time we come to one of these meetings.

Fouad Bajwa: Thank you Wolf, Fouad Bajwa for the transcript record. Just around the table when you deal with individual membership what is your mechanism to bring these people into your RALOs? Is there an application form to fill? Do they just join the mailing list and they're in and start contributing in this sort of page of ethics or something for them to immediately learn how to do it?

Darlene Thompson: Yes, you're right, there is no standard form that they fill in, but they do police their own ranks pretty much, much more harshly than I would. So if a registrar should slip in there, oh my God. So they're very ethical within themselves, mainly because they're extremely strong people.

Wolf Ludwig: Quickly Evan again and then Carlton.

Evan Leibovitch: Just as a procedural answer, in the same way that we don't expect every member of every ALS to fill out a Statement of Interest, similarly the individual members that participate through this path can volunteer to put in Statements of Interest but we wouldn't make any demands of an individual member that we wouldn't make a member of an ALS. Thanks.





---

Working Group. Can you first of all please shortly tell us what ROP or it's procedures.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you Wolf, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Yes, in the long and I think steadfast vision of anything ICANN, we need to take words and then make words out of only the first letters of the word, so it is in fact, it should be ROPR, because it's the Rules of Procedure Review working group. So it's the ROPR which won't translate, don't even try Tina. It's far too great an effort is what I'm going to briefly talk to you about today.

Many of you as regional leads will have either been directly involved in this Work Group's activity or will have appointed representatives from your region, and I do mean from your region, not necessarily from your RALO.

Let me painfully clear, if I say RALO, I mean RALO, a Regional At-Large Organization who has a structural role in ICANN's At-Large model and specifically Bylaw mandated facilitation and input into ICANN practices, processes and policy development outlined. It's a real defined beast, and you all in the main serve as officers of RALOs. So if I'm going to say RALO, I'll be talking RALO.

When I say region, I am inclusive of RALO, but it does not mean limited to members, ALSs or your regional At-Large organization. So you'll hear me say region a lot, and it's important especially if you're listening to me in another language, or if you speak English, not Australian that you remember if I mean to talk and address your entity, the RALO, I'll say

---

RALO. If I say region, I mean RALO and everything else is in your geographic area. That's really very important, because we need regional representation in these working group.

The working group, like many of the working groups that the ALAC has recently chartered and directed to operate has a fairly short amount of time to do a heroically and I think fairly huge but important amount of work. I want to just tell you how we are doing things, why we are doing things and plea that your regular regional meetings at least have a standing place for just a tiny bit of feedback, a little report, written or otherwise from whoever is on this Work Group to keep all of your ALSs in your RALO up to date.

It is absolutely essential that those representatives know what the opinion is of your rank and file ALS members and individuals. If not, when we come to socialize this anything goes public, they're going to be embarrassed by having said that we want to have all chairs pink in the room whenever ALAC meets and everyone else saying no, the chairs must be green. So it really is important, not when we're finished, not when we put it out for comment but through the process.

So if you're a secretary or a chair of a RALO, you may say there is no report, it might happen month and month after that it says there is no report. But please have it in your agenda, and that will force your reps from your region to at least send you an update, it might just be the link to the most recent meetings, right, it doesn't have to take much discussion time, but it brings it to the floor.

Why is this important? We're all familiar and in some case painfully familiar with the ALAC, the At-Large Advisory Rules of Procedure version

---

11, some of us are painfully with the versions pre zero one. They are faulted, they were put together with the best effort, we have modified them, if we're up to version 11, in fact I think we should have been up to version 14 a number of times over the years, but we've always said we need to totally redo these. The implementation of the ALAC improvements has given us an opportunity to do that because there are a couple of rules it says we must change.

Term of Chair, term of officers, there's things that we've been told we need to implement as change. So while we've opened up the packet that says rules, there's an opportunity to not just change and vote and have resanctioned, just those bits, we're going to go through all 27, and it's 27 plus, because there's little outs as well that says you know if in doubt, go to the 64 page UNGA rules. It is my personal undertaking to have no reference to the United Nation General Assembly rules anywhere in the future Rules of Procedure for the At-Large Advisory Committee; that is my personal undertaking.

I have a vote as well a Chair role on this, and I will go through hell and high water to have something a little less complicated, a little more plain language and a whole lot understandable than we have now. You almost need to be a professional meetinger to manage through the UNGA rules.

We won't be presenting you with a numbered set that follow anything like the pattern you see now. What you will be given is a set of rules that are about definitions, requirements and aspirations. In other words, what is the ALAC? How does the ALAC get populated? What Bylaws is referenced to? What are the community's expectations of an

---

ALAC representative regardless of where they come from, RALO or region by NomCom appointment?

We might suggest that there is certain metrics that may be attached to these things, but that is a subcommittee that I'll talk about later. You will probably hear words like required to act in the best interest of the ALAC and the At-Large community. Note the word regional RALO is unlikely to find its way into that sentence, because the ALAC has to be part of an advisory committee with very specific purpose to it. So that's what you'll be seeing.

You'll then see some definition about what ALAC appoints. They appoint Liaisons which are Bylaw mandated liaisons to the other supporting organizations and in the fullness of time and with great hope in our heart; we would like to think the other advisory committees as well.

We have expectations of what they need to do and how they need to conduct themselves and from whenst they can be selected. Can they be in two offices at once? My view of course is no, but we need to – that's what you'll be seeing. So that's part one. That's big picture stuff.

Then you will have the next layer. And the next layer is going to be much more about the expectations of how business is conducted. How a meeting is conducted, how elections are conducted, how Work Groups are chartered, what rules those work – what's the difference between a standing committee and an ad hoc committee, all of that then gets into the little bit. But you don't have go like this which is up and down and all around the place to just simply find how, if you wanted to be the next ccNSO liaison to the ALAC you've got to go

---

through I think six different, if not seven different paragraphs and sections of the Rules of Procedure just to get your job description and your likelihood worked out. So it's going to be a nice strata, three layer strata.

The last bit and meeting organizations in the middle is actually very, very important, it will include power of the Chair, discipline, what happens if metrics aren't met, there's a whole lot that goes in there. The last bit is one part that we haven't discussed terribly much at the moment and whilst it is important, it needs to be seen as the bottom part of a triangle; all of the supporting mechanisms, what interacts with each other, where we have – it's really getting into the nitty-gritty. It's the sort of stuff that says how much time can be taken for something. It would be very much could dos, and it's there that we're going to need more regional and RALO input than anywhere else.

I'll take you back to the middle bits and to some extent the top layer as well. We've mentioned metrics a couple of times and I know this group here has talked metrics very seriously for a number of meetings and that includes metrics that will be put on the At-Large structures in terms of what makes an At-Large structure still viable, if indeed you wish to review them at any time.

The business of metrics has been hived off deliberately to a subcommittee. What that subcommittee which is part of the Rules of Procedure Work Group, but it's a subcommittee, what that group does is look at the validity, ease and effectiveness of measures. It may say we believe a fixed number of attendances is required for an ALAC member. If there are 15 meetings of the ALAC an ALAC member is

---

expected to seat all 15, or it might say 10, or it might say must be seated at all or tender an apology in advance. I mean I don't know it will say yet, but that's the job of the subcommittee to make the metric.

It's the Rules of Procedure Work Group's job to take that metric, all that it is going to do for a very long time. I'm open to questions, thank you one and all.

Wolf Ludwig:

Thanks a lot for your elaboration on the Rules of Procedures. As we all know this is very important to having any structure in a governed or run in a regular way, but I hope, as you mentioned it, yourself Cheryl that we will never get as far as we can observe at the UN level where procedures entirely replace any substance and content. And the work is mostly blocked by some troublemakers who don't want to discuss about substance, and abuse procedures to boycott any debate on substance. This is just personal remark, so I think we are on a very good way in this direction, and I think there is a question or a comment from Fouad.

Fouad Bajwa:

Thank you Wolf, I'm Fouad Bajwa for the transcript, and thank you for the – I'm really to the point, the information about the ROP. I think it's something that we should at the other level definitely have as part of our regular monthly meetings, because it's not only about procedure, I guess, it's like sort of a code of conduct, right, which actually helps us operate in a more – in order to achieve our mandate, where it actually helps make our mandate deliverance result sufficiently.

---

At the RALO level are there any specific bullet points that you would like to share that need immediate input, immediate not as in like in one or two days but within the timeframe that you were sharing that it have to go the ALAC for approval and then upwards.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Absolutely, yes, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Thank you for your question Fouad. If I had to say what I would like to have coming in from the widest possible base, it's metrics, metrics, metrics, and more metrics. Because we're talking metrics on what makes an ALS and keeps the validity of an ALS.

Now the rules will undoubtedly say, because remember the ALAC accredit on behalf of ICANN, let's remember that, that's not a rule that's going to change. That's a Bylaw. That's an ICANN Bylaw. So you become an At-Large structure, accredited by ICANN, because the ALAC votes to do so.

We use regional advice, we do due diligence, there's a whole lot of stuff that makes it as inclusive as possible, but the test for that, all right, is a set of clear criteria and expectations. It is reasonable in fact it is required that we review whether those stated expectations are still being met. So it might be – let me use ISOC AU, because we're okay. ISOC AU became an accredited At-Large structure, I'm going to pull the figure off the top of my head, it was 2004-5 but to honest, it's blurry. And now I'm going to have to go and find that out so I can make the record accurate.

---

We have never had what we said and were accredited by looked at again. What if we had folded virtually to nothing? What if it's just Holly and I and we've started to – which is enough Holly, I do admit, we could run the world together, girl; but if we were no longer an ISOC chapter but we still had ISOC AU as our incorporated name in Australia, which could certainly happen, it just means that we're not on a chapter's list, right, easy enough to happen.

We've got to test are we still appropriate for accreditation, I mean somewhere between 13 and 15 months' time, the next ALAC and At-Large review process starts and guess what the focus is? We've done the ALAC this time, it's the roll of the RALOs, note what I said, the roll of the RALOs the continue purpose and roll of the RALOs and the validity of the At-Large structure system.

Now if we want external reviewers to come and tell us what we should do, that's fine, we can do nothing. But I certainly would like to have our house in order and have all the metrics there, and say yes, we've done this, we've looked at that, this is what's happened, these half dozen need remediation, these three we've taken off the books, and be ahead of the curve. Otherwise, some stranger is going to tell us how to build our house, and I'm not sure that I'm comfortable with that.

Wolf Ludwig:

Thanks a lot Cheryl. This is an additional question from Fouad. Yes, but please keep it short, because I don't want an hour dialogue.



---

Fouad Bajwa: Based on that experience Cheryl, the small question which comes in like for the case of Pakistan, my ALS is a loosely connected group and it has the flexibility to include the other Pakistanis which participate in the ICANN process, which is very important. So do you think the ROP is what affects my inclusion of those people in the process?

Cheryl Langton-Orr: No, it doesn't and let me tell you why. Because the declaration you make as an aspiring ALS is that in the main, note this, in the main you represent individual internet end users and domain name registrants. Now, that can be inclusive, you could be an ALS, I answered this question on the chat, and let me make it clear in the record. There is no minimum number of people who need to be gathered together to be an ALS. But our rules say you have to be an organization, right.

There are certain classes that we accept. There are certain criteria we want, and those classes would mean in some jurisdictions that you need to be for being an organization or a not for profit might be five people on an executive or a team, it might be three, it might be 23, it might be 17.

That's fine as long as it works for the local jurisdiction. We won't accept you if you're not going to fit in with the local jurisdictional rules, that's some of the due diligence that is done. So providing that's okay, it's okay.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, thanks Cheryl, I have two more people on my list. The first one is Sylvia and then I have seen Beau's hand, and after that, I would like to

---

close down this agenda item to go to the next and to let you escape, yes, exactly.

Sylvia Herlein Leite: Thank you this is Sylvia Herlein Leite for the record. I would like to thank Cheryl for the summary she presented, and I have a question. Do we have an ALAC 3.0 webinar, because if so, we would incorporate it in our capacity building sessions in our region, in our monthly teleconferences? Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record; Sylvia you know I love you and this is another reason why I do sister, it's a perfect idea. We don't right now, but it will be so.

Heidi Ullrich: This is Heidi Ullrich for the record. Silvia there is a podcast that Olivier produced about a year ago, where he mentions extensively about the ALAC 3.0, so we can send that around again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would want to review it to see that it's actually fitting with the current state and so we might do a cut and paste, because there's been a bit of work there, okay.

Wolf Ludwig: Beau, I think you have the floor.

Beau Brendler: I'll keep my comment very brief for self-evident reasons. We've spent almost the entire time in this meeting talking about process to the degree that it's become in my opinion somewhat absurd, if you consider that we have some regions that are not producing any policy. We have some regions that are not growing, they're declining in number. We have to get off this self-constructive – I mean RALOs have been around for five years now, and we're still talking about they should be constructed. We have got to move to policy, please.

Wolf Ludwig: Yes, Darlene do you want to comment to Beau?

Darlene Thompson: Yes, I would actually, Darlene Thompson, these secretariat/regional – these meetings are about process. There are other meetings to deal with policy, but unfortunately when you're in this meeting, we deal with process, whether we like it or not.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, thanks. Well let me finish this agenda item. Sometimes Rules of Procedure are set for necessity, they are instrumental – they are an element of any good governance, I think and they shouldn't be as you said, Beau, they shouldn't be abused, and replaced to avoid any other discussions. Not to enter into the same trap, we now leave this agenda item and go over the next one, which is a short input from Beau on the fiscal year 13 ICANN budget allocation for the regions. We have had

---

some questions on this, and some exchanges on this already, and I think Beau will make summary remarks on this what may prepare the ground for the discussion on this agenda item. Beau you have the floor.

Beau Brendler:

Thank you. I certainly don't intend to take 20 minutes, I will say briefly that the reason I think that this item is on here is because there was some confusion within our own region about whether or budget for the Toronto meeting had been approved and allocated.

We have in fact found out at the meeting yesterday that we did have final budget approval at this point, it does strike me in reference for the future that it is something of an organizational stretch to find out only a couple of months – a few months before the meeting happens that we have been funded, so we have a relatively tight window to make travel arrangements, but I assume that all regions find themselves in this position.

So I think that we should move to try to shorten the time that it takes for deliberation on budget so that regions can have more time to plan with real money in case they need to have people travel.

The second part of what emerged from this discussion on the list was that I had for the first time sort of noticed even though it had been long planned, I'm sure before I noticed it that some of the regions were planning to have meetings, general assemblies or whatever in the location of the IGF meetings, the forthcoming one in Baku I believe is the one that was at issue.

---

And the question that came up is I'm not necessarily sure at this time and if there is, let me know, but is there a means by which regional leaders can discuss together the allocations or the planning for these types of meetings, because personally as I mentioned in the email as unpopular as this contention may make me, I don't understand why we are trying to conduct meetings with the IGF or at the IGF meetings because in my opinion, and it may be solely my opinion, that is a group of people who ICANN has already reached, I assume that everybody in IGF already knows who ICANN is.

They've probably already had a chance to join it's, they probably already had plenty of experience understanding and knowing about ICANN is whereas we have a huge number of people throughout the world who I think we need to reach and to help make aware of their concerns or the concerns that they should have given the way that ICANN is being managed.

So that was really – once I found out about the Toronto budget being approved I was less concerned about what other regions were spending to the degree that I'm really not concerned now, but now that I know that we have the money to plan for Toronto.

But I do still want to raise the question, can we be strategic in a group setting about how to address the problem of outreach. And I see the IGF as matter of outreach, or as you said a negative example of outreach, a group that already knows that we exist. That's really all I wanted to make in this point.

Wolf Ludwig:

Thanks Beau, I think that's a spontaneous remark coming from Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much Wolf, it's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And now I can say the word that is front foremost. Beau, I really do feel and appreciate the tension that you're describing because of the timing on all of this, because this is something that has not changed since the earliest days of any of us asking for any money at any time.

And it goes back to meetings at 2007-8 where we were told then by the staff that was – notice the slight slur there, yes, it was intentional, the staff, singular, that interacted with us amongst a whole lot of other things on their portfolio, that we would have absolutely no control over destiny, requests or anything else we could take our begging bowl and say please sir, we would like some bread, and someone else would decide whether or not we would get it.

That's not the place we are now, and I think the place we are now is much improved, and I think that needs to be on the record. But the ICANN budget is fixed by Bylaw when it can be and has to be approved. There is a time which you can then roll backwards from 30 June which is the latest time which the called-for comments and community input on discussing what is proposed as a draft budget can happen, and then you can roll backwards further to the development of the strategic plan from whenst all budgetary planning for a given fiscal year happens.

That said, we also know that ICANN itself is trying to get more room for community input on all of those processes. So in answer to you can we

have less time between finding out you've got money and actually doing something, if you're successful in an application, which is a hugely important question, the answer is yes and no. Only a yes, if you are aware, if it is within the first 30 to 45 or 60 days, if that's how long it's going to take you in the first quarter perhaps of a given financial year, you will not and cannot have confirmation of funding to any activity in that space until sometime, not too many days before June 30.

So we're never ever going to be encouraging unless there is no alternative for activity requests to go in that require a lot of logistics, in Q1 in a financial years. Because the problems you're facing are just going to be multi-folded. So part of it's planning on our part, part of it's fixed stuff. But you know what regional leaders and RALO leaders? Why are you putting your list together now, it's up to you, it goes into the budget and finance subcommittee, and you have two-thirds of the representation on that.

Effectively, you have 100% of the representation on that, because there is one ALAC member per region and two RALO members per region on the B&F and that's what does the sifting and sorting. So get your lists done now and be happy to realize that if you put it in Q1 you've got to have it as a contingency plan, sorry, but I wanted to clear that up. Thank you.

Wolf Ludwig:

Oh thanks a lot, Fouad is next.

Fouad Bajwa:

Thank you, Wolf, Fouad Bajwa for the transcript record. I'm sort of addressing the issue of the idea of and the expedience over there, the challenge is the IGF composition and in the internet public policy space. And that composition is 32% civil society, academia and research; 32% private sector; 32% government and the rest of the percentage is for international organizations and as you say like ICANN's presence and so forth.

The challenge over there is that the IGF [has worked to create] the image and the understanding in a large world, and IGF struggles by support of friends of IGF to bring in people from all across the world more targeting internet users, people who are affected by the internet. So basically the IGF gives you a perfect opportunity of introducing your organization, introducing a multi-stakeholder model which exists other than IGF.

The IGF is within the multilateral context. The ICANN is a private organization at the end of the day, right, its existence and its multi-stakeholder model is a private led model, not a private sector, but a private led model in the broader word.

For the IGF, the people in IGF are participating for them to realize that ICANN is just not about names, and addressing, and spaces, it's also about the evolution of a multi-stakeholder model, that presence is very necessary, and that's why I came to ICANN...

Wolf Ludwig:

Fouad, please we have five minutes only, keep it short. You don't have to explain to us ICANN know IGF, just make your point. Thanks.



Fouad Bajwa: In the IGF context I only came to ICANN to understand what ICANN was so that I could work on the image or the negative discussions which have been over there and within the broader context. And then for participation, I think their budget testifies to the level of activities and participation we should be at IGF our footprint as civil society, as the internet users should be big in the IGF. And I mean this for all public spaces. The G8 looks at IGF, the G77 with which I'm concerned looks at IGF, the OIC looks at IGF, it's a place which is very necessary to look at from here as well. Thank you.

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, that's a completely different level. Thanks for finally making your point Fouad, we have less than four minutes left. I have Sylvia on my plan, and please one minute intervention, otherwise I stop. Go ahead.

Sylvia Herlein Leite: This is Sylvia speaking, I will be brief. I have brought some sweets from my country so that we have an energy boost, and I will be circulating them now.

Wolf Ludwig: Fatimata.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Thank you Wolf, I would simply like to clarify Beau's intervention, is he mentioning a program which has already been approved, or a program

---

which will be voted on in the future, because to me what's been done is done, but we might have to organize ourselves differently because of his proposal, but we have to suit everyone, we have to cater for all, and maybe we would like to review our proposal strategy for the budget, but we have to see what we do for these here.

Wolf Ludwig:

I think we are all clear. One part was a comment from our side, and I share most of Beau's concerns, since that decision is taken, whether we found the decision we're taking in a transparent, comprehensive way or not is not the issue. I still see a problem of proportionality in this allocations. I do not share in this point totally Fouad's remarks. I think five years ago IGF related activities were very essential, important and necessity, because we have this tension between the two.

In the meantime, five years later, there was a lot of progress made in this direction, and if he concentrates this as one of our major outreach platforms, I'm starting, asking myself, we are simply heading to convince the converted. And I see my potential for outreach activities slightly different than just making a kind of – put it in a religious context, I'm making (inaudible) now. When you go praying year by year and if it becomes a routine here, it's that RALOs are simply demanding to organize workshops at the IGF.

I really ask myself the question whether this makes a lot of sense as a routine. If we do it once or twice, it may be okay, but it cannot be the end of our reflection and the end of our creativity I think.

---

We only have 45 seconds left over. So I would like for Toronto that we leave the previous points what have already taken again and again too much of our time, and I would like to suggest let's focus entirely on reasonable outreach activities, it can IGF one level, but IGF is not the only level. And there are many other for us in the world.

There is a region that can be presented and start including the internet user and not as the IGF always trying to convince the converted. We are at the end of our time I was told because the photographer is making a kind of proof photo here, otherwise we could exceed by some minutes because we started with some delay already. Okay.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Dev Anand Teelucksingh here for the record, thank you Wolf. I guess I came early to the meeting, so I'm sure if this was asked, do you think that perhaps the secretariat needs to make it – instead of trying to just meet one month before Toronto, to try to organize ourselves, that we should at least consider possibly a monthly meeting, so that we can...

Wolf Ludwig:

It could be – I think it could be a good planning instrument. I wouldn't see the need to have regular monthly meetings of secretariats, but before the meeting at least to have twice for coordination and to prepare the meeting here itself in an even more important way, to make sure that we have proper time allocations for issues, again and again doing briefing on briefing about procedures, what I found it a little bit too long today again; and the time at the end to talk about this substance and allocation issues, which are very relevant for any RALO

---

activity, what kind of means do you have allocated in your region to do any sort of effective outreach.

We didn't have anything from ICANN over the last years. All what we did, we organized more or less out of our own pocket or by other funding sources et cetera, and this cannot continue like this. If this will continue like this, I can tell you there will be RALOs like EURALO who might dead like a mouse. If you just let it go like it went for the last three years.

And this is a substantial issue, I wrote it down in the board report to our general assembly two weeks ago, and I think this show somehow the situation and therefore we should, in Toronto concentrate more time to discuss this issue.

What does this mean? Oh photographer says we have five more minutes. Okay, we can take any – if there is a comment, questions on this, we were allocated – it's interesting the photographer is not... Beau.

Beau Brendler:

I'm just wondering if this discussion has created a bit of tension between the notion of the regional leadership meeting and the secretariat meeting. In order words when I see regional leadership meeting, I think about sort of somewhat higher level issues of strategy for the RALOs. When I think of secretariat meetings to Darlene's point, there is a certain amount of process and whatnot that needs to be discussed, so maybe regional leadership and secretariat meetings should be two different meetings. It's an idea.

Wolf Ludwig: Well, a good point or to have allocations of time for both aspects. But always rounded, mix it up in one and the same meeting. Yes, good point, Beau. Any further comments, Holly, from your side? Carlton? Yes, I think it would make sense to make this an action item.

[background conversation]

Wolf Ludwig: Right or we even said that it would make sense to have two such –

[background conversation]

Wolf Ludwig: Okay, take it as an action item please; there is still space for any sort of improvement, Carlton you would like to have any further comment? Darlene? Everybody is getting tired or fed up or whatever. The photographer is here so then let me take the opportunity to thank all of you for your contributions and we noted action items to prepare this type of meeting as a separate or in a better combination at Toronto and now you have line up here.

[background conversation]

---

Wolf Ludwig:

Okay, thanks a lot.

[Applause]

[End of Transcript]