DUBLIN – At-Large ALS Criteria and Expectations Taskforce
Sunday, October 18, 2015 – 12:30 to 13:30 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

ALAN GREENBERG:	Ladies and gentlemen, if you are participating in the At-Large Criteria and Expectations Taskforce, either you're a member or you choose to sit in on it, please have a seat. If you are not participating in it, please vacate the room so we can hold the meeting. Thank you.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	I will participate after having something to eat.
ALAN GREENBERG:	We don't lock the door at the very start of the meeting. You are free to act as you wish. It might be a good idea. Thank you very much. We are starting only eight minutes late, which is the best we've done all week so far. Thank you.
	This is the taskforce that is assigned that is taking on the responsibility trying to draft for later ALAC consumption and approval a set of expectations and criteria for ALSs, and by implication, RALOs, because the RALOs have to carry out a lot of

this, with the intent of trying to ensure that we have better participation and engagement of our ALS community.

Those of you who were in the room at 8:00 this morning, I don't know whether you were or not, we were talking about the At-Large review. One of the At-Large review aspects is there is an expectation that the reviewer will actually survey ALSs, presumably a sampling – maybe all, I don't know – to find out in fact how engaged are they.

So I think it serves us well to have been talking about it ahead of time before anyone dumps embarrassing results on our lap. This group is acknowledging the fact that indeed we know we have some issues. We don't necessarily know how to fix them, but we're looking for ways of fixing it. It's more important perhaps to make sure as the ALS community grows that we try to make sure that we can have groups that are well engaged.

The task at the moment, there are some follow-on activities, but the current tasks are divided among four design teams. The first one is Design Team A, looking at the application process, a difficult one, because part of their job cannot really be complete until the rest of us do our jobs, but nevertheless, they're getting a good start. It's being led by Nathalie.

For the record, for those of you who weren't part of the process, it is moderately unusual within our groups to have a staff

member leading a group like this. It was unanimously decided that Nathalie was the right person.

The second group is the criteria that we should apply in accepting an ALS, and I am leading that group, and the third one is…that's DT-C. The letter of the design team basically is part of the name, so A is for Application, C is for Criteria. DT-E is operational expectations. That is, what do we expect ALSs to do on a regular basis? And strong implication on what we expect RALOs to do, and what do we expect staff to do in regular communication and engagement for the ALSs? That is being chaired by Yrjö.

Lastly, we have DT-I (individual members), and Cheryl has taken the lead on that. Cheryl has asked to lead off because she has a conflict in about 15 minutes, so I'll turn it over to Cheryl. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Alan. Hopefully, staff will be able to display a very brief (embarrassingly so) update on, if not our activities, which has been somewhat leaner than we would like to have been able to report to you all because of this little overwhelming task that many of us are engaged with other parts of ICANN, something to do with transition [inaudible] and accountability thingies.

We haven't progressed as far as we had wanted to, but I do want to in this small open meeting bring you all up to speed.

The primary focus for our work team is to look first at the level of uniformity and any possible need for harmonization between the RALOs regarding how they deal with individual members, which for the rest of our documentation we will call IM.

I want to make it clear now that this is not an optional exercise. It is an accepted recommendation from the review of the At-Large Advisory Committee, #1, that all regional At-Large organizations shall admit individual members. And to date, that is one of the tiny pieces of work that has not been fully completed from our first review. I think it's extraordinarily important that we show significant, if not complete, process of getting that in place, if not fully enacted, in each of the RALOs before the independent reviewer comes in and looks at us again, because that would be a big oops, and I think that's a little red flag — perhaps a little pink flag at this stage — that we need to deal with. This work seems a little banal, but it is actually important.

That said, a number of the regional At-Large organizations, and one in particular in North America, has had the capacity and indeed has had active individual members working with their RALO. I should come back from the microphone or do that. Slow

down, sorry. I am in a hurry. I apologize. To allow individual members, and that's enshrined in their bylaws and rules of procedure for the region, and have, in the case of North America, been that way since inception.

A number of other RALOs have come on board with this approach, and in fact, one thing that our staff is doing, which unfortunately I could not find on the website where it might be (it probably exists, because it was an action item out of our last meeting a month ago) was to put up a chart where we could look more easily at the comparison of how each of the regional At-Large organizations deals currently with individual members. What is their current criteria? What is the status? How do they deal with voting? And all those sorts of things.

At the same time, the Asia-Pacific Regional At-Large Organization, having just renewed and reviewed the rules of procedure, have a specific piece of work which is looking at how a potentially mammoth number, enormous number, of individual members could be dealt with because of the numbers we have in those countries. So we're looking at a capture aspect from the other way.

Most of the RALOs have a way, be it clustering all of your individual members together into what is effectively a pseudo-At-Large structure and giving it the rights, the responsibilities,

and the voting in the same way as another At-Large structure. But how one would justify, for example, that model being used where we could conceivably have 25,000 or 30,000 individual members in a region, that could hardly be argued to be valid for a single vote, as if it was an At-Large structure. APRALO will be putting out a white paper when Maureen and I draw breath at one point in some year in the future that is going to propose some models we've started to talk about as to how that can be dealt with. So that's a work in progress.

The review obviously can't be static. Work is ongoing, so we need to take a watching brief on what the regional At-Large organizations are doing with their individual members, and work in APRALO is an example. There is a lot going on, for example, in LACRALO at this time as well.

The next particular matter that we need to look at is the issue of on-site participation where you decide— Of course, if we were having a future summit, we have a mechanism where an At-Large structure gets to choose and send a representative. Again, we need to look at how we balance. Do we have equivalence of one for every five, one for every 50, one for every 500? How does one work on a parity for making sure that the voice of the unaffiliated individual member is heard within our regions and within our At-Large work.

And then what I'm flagging in this report today, which is new business, but I would like to be taken up as an action item if you'll all agree, and that is I believe we probably need to call for inter- and intra-RALO discussions on this. When, I'm not even guessing, but we certainly need to do that. It needs to get on the books. It needs to become an action item so we follow through. Perhaps Marrakech. I don't know, but need to do that.

And I think I've covered, and I don't want to go into the gory details, the matter of quasi-ALS and voting, but we do need to make sure there is quite reasonably a degree of harmonization and predictability for the rights, the requirements, the consequences of voting or not voting, and indeed the expectations of individual members, matters of [waitings], which I did indicate a little about before, [capture], and of course the equity in parity. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I would thank you and ask if there was any other questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Before I open the floor to any questions on that, I should have added Cheryl apologized for being late and not doing as much work as perhaps is warranted at this point. When I took office as Chair, this was one of my number one priorities, and my intent was by the time we came to Dublin, we would have formal proposals to approve by the ALAC and put

this into place. We clearly are not there. We started much later than we should have, and we haven't focused as much energy on it after we started as we should have, and that I'll take full responsibility for. Any questions on Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: "On" is a bit [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: On Cheryl's discourse.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: You know that LACRALO didn't find a way to get individuals. We had no time. This time we are drawn into this fight inside the LACRALO, so it's quite difficult. Anyway, it's something that… Probably one point that we started back in time discussing was start to accept people that already demonstrated some kind of commitment with the group. So, have been in some ICANNs, attending some calls, attending the webinars, some kind of criteria that we could accept it as an engaged person before [they] open up for any kind of… It's not because they are not engaged inside their day by day organization. Most of them, for instance, are just [inaudible] into one ALS just to participate.

But that was the main criteria we started to talking about, pre-engaged before you propose to be an individual. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Alan, just in response to that, two things. Yes, you've raised a really important point there, and even that somewhat-casual approach is something we need to capture, look at the data points, look at the benefits and what works and what doesn't, and is, like I say, on a perfect [inaudible] to — not my two minutes — to some of the features that you'll find in DT-A, because what applies to At-Large structures in many cases will be able to apply to our individuals as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We have one more speaker in the queue: Wolf. I will note, however, up until now, individual members have been an issue that we have delegated to the RALOs. There is a strong feeling among some people, not necessarily supported universally, that we need to have some overall ground rules — there may be variations, but some overall ground rules — which may differ from the current rules used by some RALOs. We're looking at an overall model so we have some level of uniformity and usability by the features.

Cheryl is concerned with 25,000 or 30,000 members in a virtual ALS. What does that mean? We do have a few ALSs which actually currently have that many members, so we already apportion our votes like that.

On the other hand, NARALO has had individual members since the very beginning, and I don't think we've ever exceeded ten, and probably significantly less than that. That may well just be an issue of publicity, but the problems vary, and we need perhaps some commonality or perhaps not. That's one of the things this group will be looking at.

Wolf, go ahead.

WOLF LUDWIG: Compared to NARALO, EURALO didn't have individuals from the very beginning. But it was the first couple of years we realized that there is a potential in Europe of [re-floating] highly engaged people. So just as a working example, most of you know Roberto Gaetano, who has a longstanding record on the ICANN board. It was difficult to get him somehow involved and included, and there was nothing. I could perfectly understand people saying, "I do not want to be forced to join an existing ALS. I cannot identify with this or the other groups; therefore I'm an individual."

Therefore, in 2010, we decided to amend our bylaws, and it was accepted by the vast majority of our membership. We needed 2/3 of members approval to have it confirmed, and we created the option that individuals could create their own ALS, EURALO individuals association. So they drafted some sort of very simple, stupid bylaws, and they applied for certification, and without any problem they became certified I think in Autumn 2013.

Since that time, Roberto [inaudible]. Meanwhile, there are a lot of other floating people involved. So this was the best opportunity. It was one of our best decisions we made over the years. And they are, on the ICANN level, according to my observation, one of the most active involved in ICANN. And there is still an ongoing gap compared with other ALSs. They are active on the ground.

I know most of them, and they are busy on the daily level on the ground in their country, but the link between the national level to EURALO, and then going even further to the next higher ICANN level, that is a considerable problem, and we are fighting over years how to bridge this gap between what they are doing actively on the national level, getting them better and more included, involved in EURALO issues, and then going to the next level, what would be more involvement in ICANN policy development.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just for the record, I am an unaffiliated member. I occasionally do something.

WOLF LUDWIG: By the way, Olivier as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I don't believe so.

WOLF LUDWIG: He became lately a member of ISOC France. He is a member of ISOC UK, but they are not a certified ALS, unfortunately. Olivier is one of our best working examples about excellence from our individuals.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Shows how much I know. Any other questions? Fatima, I see you. We are running short on time if we want to complete this, because we do have another group starting at 12:30, so we have just about a half-an-hour left. Nathalie, how long can you stay in this meeting? You have a full half-hour. Fatima and Tijani, and then I'm closing the queue.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Alan. I will speak in Spanish. I understand that the issue of deciding on the membership of ALSs and/or individual members has not been decided upon yet, whether it will be defined by ALAC or decided by each RALO. I think Wolf's example is excellent because it's related to the maturity of each RALO.

Not all RALOs are at the same level of maturity. In LACRALO right now we are going through some institutional crisis, and it would be very tough for us right now to tackle this issue of taking in individual members. So I think it's important to keep on discussing this within each RALO until we decide whether this will be a universally applied criteria coming from ALAC. This is my opinion based on our experience on the basis of what happens in our RALO. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We may make it easier for you by giving you the rules. The issue is, as Cheryl mentioned earlier, that this was a recommendation out of the last At-Large review. We're now starting the second one. We have not been really good at implementing it. Regardless, we are trying right now to catch up, and we will have to decide to what extent we have rules across the board. There will clearly be a rule across the board that we need to have individual members. We accepted that decision. Now the question is at what level do we decide all the details?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am the chair of a committee on the review of AFRALO, AFRALO rules. This issue of individuals (unaffiliated members, if you want) was one of the issues that got us very busy. There is very strong pushback from the AFRALO community, AFRALO ALSs, about this issue. I spent a very long time to try to convince. They have their reasons. I understand them, but they are not ready to accept this.

I managed at the end to have a resolution that we accept the principle. The implementation will be now to accept individual members that don't have any rights. They are here only to participate. They cannot take any decision or participate in the decision-making.

I hope that we will manage at the end to make people accept that they will have a right to participate in the decision-making, but. I would like to say that the individual unaffiliated members have shown a lot of merit, and I strongly push toward that. But this has also a lot of risk, and we have experience now, and we know more or less what are the problems and what might be the problems.

So we have to be careful not to impose to any RALO anything. I don't agree to make it as a whole rule for the whole RALOs to

accept the individual member or the unaffiliated member. Let each RALO do it as it can. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll point out we already did accept that each RALO will have individual members. The question right now on the table is to what extent do we have rules that cross the RALOs and what rules do we let RALOs decide individually? I'm very glad it's Cheryl leading this group and not me.

I'd like to go next to revert back to the order of the… No, sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I apologize. I am now [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We can have no more questions for the invisible person. I'd like to go back to the original order, and call upon Nathalie to talk about DT-A.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Alan. We've had a few conference calls and a little work done on the mailing list regarding the Design Team A. The aim of this was to go over the application form from start to finish, whereby the applicant submits the application form right down to the end, where the ALAC members vote or

not the accreditation of the application. It was quite a vast project, because staff takes on a chunk application, so we had the staff perspective on that. We then had the RALO leadership perspective and membership on the regional advice step, and then we had the ALAC members' point of view regarding the vote right at the end.

So rather than tackle these individually, we tried to lay out all the issues from all perspectives regarding the application form. This took a while, but I think we got there. We managed to divide into four blocks. The first block was maybe more concerning staff and the way staff collects information. It was a lack of [qualitative] information, not in general, but a big difference between one ALS and another, and this didn't reflect necessarily the differences in their activities, but simply how much information we could get from that specific ALS.

This led to us deciding that staff would make an extra effort regarding the collecting of information, maybe asking for more in-depth feedback from the regional VPs, going further than the standard e-mail exchange with the applicant during due diligence. Sometimes the e-mail addresses are the ones for the organization, not the personal contact people one. Basically going the extra mile to make sure that the application is as honest and clear as possible.

We also decided in that case that — and this is why it's a tough one for me — that we have for some applicants very clear feedback. Any chapter application we get, we ask the Internet Society directly, they give us feedback that we can count on, and then we have another organization no one really seems to know about. Again, not a reflection of how productive or motivated they are. So we've had to take all that into account. Hopefully the extra steps from staff will enable that.

The next one was a big inequality in moments of community input. If we look at the application form procedure as a whole, there's quite a lot of staff decision, and community input is very [punctual]. This needed to change, or at least we needed to observe what was going on in the different RALOs to see whether maybe RALOs could pick up some practical information from each other. We managed to divide this into several chunks.

First, the way RALOs talked among themselves regarding regional advice. This was a big part of the discussion. Some RALOs will keep the information contained to regional mailing lists, discuss it among themselves. Within this practice you have differences. Some RALOs will attach the due diligence form to the e-mail to the mailing list, and other RALO leaderships will condense the information in an informative e-mail. It's a very different approach.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

Regarding the discussion, once the RALO members have received the information, some discussions will take place on the mailing list, and other RALOs will create a Wiki page on the Wiki to allow everyone to comment.

The next issue we had with community was the ALAC members' vote. ALAC members receive what we call the voting package, which is the application form, the due diligence done by staff, and any other document needed. So the bylaws or information from the Internet Society. They receive this, as you know, on the starting date of the vote, which is all right if you have the time to skim through and there's no particular issue with the application. If there is an issue with the application, or maybe there's a lot of documentation, this doesn't necessarily give you enough time for an informed vote.

That was decided fairly early on that we would extend the application time to an extra week. ALAC members would receive all the information needed a week before the time of the vote, so hopefully any issues raised then could be dealt with within that week, or at least we would have an agreed voting time where all ALAC members deemed they were informed enough before starting the vote.

The next issue we found — and that is a big one — it concerns again the time period of the application form. This is an issue

that we haven't actually resolved yet. It's the question of a hold period in the application procedure. There's no mention at the moment of any reason, any valid reason, to put the application on hold, and recently we've had many applications that warranted maybe a few days' hold or maybe an extensive period up to nine months, depending on the situation. This was studied in a case-by-case approach. This is complicated, because we need to decide therefore what would warrant a hold period. Would it be, for example, that the applicant isn't respond to staff regarding due diligence questions? Staff has three weeks to provide due diligence. What does that mean? Does that mean that there's just a typo in the e-mail address? Does that mean that we have to go and get the information elsewhere? In that case, three weeks with due diligence is maybe too little to go over the information. We've had issues where due diligence was forward to RALO leadership, who were unhappy with the information received and needed an extensive period to produce regional advice. Is that again an excuse to just put on hold? And equally the ALAC members receiving the information, unhappy with the quality of information received. Is that again a trigger to halt the vote? We hope to have resolved those issues with the additional week during the ALAC vote. We hope to make that easier, but we need a clear procedure regarding this, and we don't have it at the moment.

Onto more positive aspects, the decision we came to was that the application form, rather than just be an administrative procedure with discussion times, could be an engagement opportunity. We're seeing at the moment, as you know, that new ALSs who get accredited and who disappear and drop off. Staff are putting together an onboarding procedure. It's starting. We're quite happy with it, but there's a lot more to be done.

We think we should start the engagement opportunity from the beginning of the application process, and not upon accreditation. It is not because an application doesn't go through that time that the applicant cannot be immersed from the beginning in At-Large activities. The idea would be that they would be invited as observers to monthly RALO meetings from the start of the application period, and equally maybe have a brief introduction as informal with RALO leadership who would be able to provide some direction points to the applicant. We believe that this starting along the three-month application period would get them ready for much more productive activity once they're accredited. But that's [inaudible] suggestion.

That was a not-very-brief summary of the work we've been doing, so if you have any questions…

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks, Nathalie. I'll point out a subtle message that Nathalie was sending in part of that where she said we're extending by a week the period the ALAC has. That sends a message saying we expect the ALAC members to actually consider this. This should not be an ALAC rubber stamp of the regional advice. The regional advice should be one of the issues that the ALAC members consider, and an important one, but it does not remove from the ALAC members the responsibility to evaluate the application in its own right.

I say that because it's come to my attention that a fair number — or at least some ALAC members — feel that it is not something within their discretion, and they should just be accepting the regional advice, period. I'm not pointing to any individual person, but I have been made aware of that.

Any other questions for Nathalie, or any questions for Nathalie, not having any yet? Tijani, go ahead. Again, I am obliged to continue to point out that we have 18 minutes left in the session, and we have two design teams [who have] not yet spoken. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Thank you very much, Nathalie. You did a very good job. I am always happy with your work at any time because

always you make your work [propitiously], so thank you very much.

Coming back to the right of ALAC to consider the applications, yes, for sure, but I think that the regional advice is a compulsory or a necessary element of the assessment. We need to make the regional leadership give that assessment not too late, first of all, and ALAC can have a different view from the advice of the regional leadership.

So I think that we cannot, as ALAC members, assess the application if we don't have the regional advice, and we are not obliged to follow this advice. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Quite correct. Thank you. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you. Nathalie, I haven't fully seen your document, but what's really important if the secretariat or chair of a RALO needs to be working very closely with that application so that they actually can give some sound advice.

One of the things we're finding in looking back at a number of ALSs that have fallen off the map is the lack of correct information on the secondary person because the primary

person has disappeared. So I think we need to really stress to the applicants that the second person really is just not a name filler in the application.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I reserve discussion on that until we get to the next design team? Thank you. Anything else for Nathalie? Thank you, ma'am. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Very good idea to make the applicants participate informally in the RALO activities. There is only a small problem, because the RALO will have to decide on this application, and in this case, they have to not to be present, so I don't know how we can do that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think what Nathalie said is they will be invited to the teleconferences and perhaps put on a mailing list. That doesn't make them full members and part of the decision process.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: No, I agree with Tijani. Tijani does have a point that some RALOs use the RALO monthly meeting to discuss the application. However, it terms of calendar, it could be conceived that they

participate, for instance, in the RALO monthly meeting upon invitation during due diligence, and then once we get to the regional advice period, then they would not be invited or notified of that meeting. That would make sense.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll point out it's pretty hard to stop some from dialing into a public meeting as guest. Fatima, we really have to go on to the next one. If it's very, very short…

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: With regard to Tijani's words, in our RALO it happened that those who are applying to be an ALS were already included in the mailing list because they might have been fellows and they were already engaged or someone else invited them. They had already been included in the mailing list, and when reading our discussions on their acceptance as ALSs or not… Well, I think for the sake of transparency that should not be an issue, the fact that they are already in the list, if eventually those discussions are open, and the various opinions of the regions will be expressed to achieve this advice. But at any point in time, we need to get any clarification about them, there should be something in the procedure stating whether any explanation or clarification can be asked from them when they are already involved in the process.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll point out that the current rules as approved by the board call for confidentiality in much of the process of ALS acceptance, a process which is violated blatantly by some of the RALOs, perhaps all of the RALOs. So one of the things we're looking at is make sure that whatever rules we put in place are enforceable and are useable, just for that very reason. Some RALOs have chosen to make this a very public process, where officially we are in violation of the rules by doing that.

It turns out that almost all of the rules we put in place in 2007 are not being followed today in the details. The intent may be followed, but not the details, and that's one of the reasons we're looking at this overall process, to try to make sure that whatever we tell ALSs is what we're actually going to do, because right now it's not the case.

I thank you, and I will go on to the next design team, which is mine. It is not a very long discussion. Can I ask staff to put up the document, please? And I remind you, we do have one more coming, and we really do not want to tell Yrjö, "Sorry, no more time for you." Finns become very nasty people when you're not nice to them. Claws come out. It's really ugly.

That, again, for the record, was a joke. Soon we will have the document up on the screen. I can read it quicker than… Staff are telling the Chair to calm down, slow down. Staff is right.

Let me start reading them, and maybe it will show up as we go along. There are only six items in the chart. The first one is we do not… It's there. Can we make it readable? That's Yrjö's. Mine only has six bullets, and the title is in blue.

I will start reading them. I will read slowly, so people can hear me. I sent them a link to it on the Skype chat. Maybe we can have someone write them on a flipchart.

The first one is we are not planning any changes to the current rules which call for self-funding, largely individual-led ALSs. That is essentially the current criteria, that they be largely led by individuals. That doesn't preclude involvement by corporate or governments, because in some countries, that is the reality. But they be largely led by individuals, and they cannot presume funding from ICANN. Again, that doesn't mean we don't occasionally put some money in, but it shouldn't be necessary.

We are recommending that instead of the one contact there be three contacts. That has been the practice in APRALO and has been eminently successful in making sure that we have access to somebody — some human being — who will actually reply to an e-mail. And they tell us it has something that has been useful.

The contacts need not be the leaders of the organization, but the application must certify that the leaders of the organization acknowledge the application and support it.

We have specifically had cases where the contact person no longer is there anymore, so we did something that we thought was reasonable. We went to the organization's website, found out who the chair was, and said, "Who do you want to name as your ALS representative?" And they said, "ALS? ICANN?"

The application had been made with the name of the organization, but without any knowledge of the organization, certainly without the knowledge of the current leaders. Who knows whether the leaders at the time were involved or not?

So far, I hope I'm not saying anything that's totally unreasonable. We may get down to those in a minute.

Next point. The contact must have the ability to communicate with the organization membership. That's linked to the operational expectation, which we'll get to in a moment, that one of the tasks of the contact people are to re-distribute information to the membership.

Remember, in our current implementation, from the perspective of the RALOs (some RALOs), the ALS is the contact person. A year or so ago when we did a survey of what skills do we have in the

ALS, we in fact asked what skills do we have in the ALS representatives, and stopped there. And the ALS has to be more than just the representative. So we are presuming that there is a way to communicate with the membership and get the feedback back, should anyone care to give us feedback.

Now, that could be as simple as providing us with their mailing list address and we send things directly, but many people may not choose to do it that way. They may choose to filter, and that's fine. Language is also an issue in some cases, that the language we send out our messages in may not be particularly helpful to their membership.

The fifth item is the minimum size of the RALO. We are not specifying a minimum size. We expect that there are more people than just the contacts and that there are more people than just those listed as the leadership of the RALO. It will be a judgment call of the RALO and then the ALAC, based on the description that they provide, whether indeed there is a real ALS sitting back there or it's just one person who's becoming an ALS so that if there's ever any travel they can get it or something like that.

Lastly, they must explain the intersection between their interests, the interests of the organization, and ICANN. In the past, we have not infrequently had organizations that have a

very strong interest in the Internet and no interest in ICANN. It was a great way of getting more ALSs, but not a particularly great way of getting more engagement.

So those are the criteria that we have to date. This is not a finished effort. There didn't seem to be any point in having 400 different criteria, because we're going to have to ask questions on the application. We're going to have to evaluate it. We tried to distill it down to this relatively small number of things that in our minds really matter. When I say "our", the people who cared to participate in this process. And that's it.

Now, I think they're up there. I certainly can't read that, but maybe the rest of you could, and maybe we can put in the chat the URL pointing to that document. We did already? Thank you. This is a document that's been around for a number of months since a recent taskforce discussion. It hasn't changed.. I open the floor. Glenn, go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: The second bullet, the three contacts; we're talking not just contacts, not a shopping list or a telephone book of names. These are genuine people that would stand up as substitutes if the primary person goes AWOL. That's my point that I said before as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is exactly the intent.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, it's not implied in that statement. We're talking three contacts that are actually… They have to be committed to it. We've seen so many ISOC applications around the world where there's a list of 20 names, but they're just a shopping list.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't say 20 names. We said three, and we expect these to be people who are contactable, and in fact, one of the things we're going to have to be doing is, on a regular basis, contacting them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: As I'm having an application right now, I totally agree to these application rules. But I was thinking about that, and in my mind arose a question. Do we check ALSs on a regular basis if we fulfill these criteria after a couple of years maybe?

ALAN GREENBERG: We do not. Should we be? You bet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Now, we're going to lose a lot of ALSs if we do so.

ALAN GREENBERG: When we get to Yrjö — and we now have three minutes left for him — one of the absolute requirements, I believe, for ongoing is an annual or bi-annual report. They can't just disappear. And if that means we lose half the ALSs because they're not really there, let's be honest with ourselves and deal with people who are there.

Sorry, we had one more question. Tijani, in recognition of the time, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry. Only to say that evaluating the importance or the volume of the ALS will not be easy. Yes, I agree that it shouldn't be only three or four members, the leadership only, but where you put the bar and how you evaluate that… They can tell you, "We have 3,000 members." How can you verify that? So I think that we need something to [inaudible] for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, I would hesitate to say it doesn't really matter as long as we actually find out there are living beings there who are interested, and for that we're looking at what our expectations are from them.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. Could you put up the slide on operational expectations? Meanwhile, I'll start talking about them.

The ALSs are expected to, first of all, identify as ALS in their Internet-related activities and communications, including their websites. Of course, they may be any organizations whatsoever for any purpose, but they should also say that they are an ALS.

Next, they should distribute information about the ICANN in their area. By area I mean their country or city or province, whatever is their sort of [fief].

Third, they should keep the RALO informed about important Internet related developments in their area in legislation, in. Fourth, they should participate in Internet-related multi-stakeholder activities in their area, and represent, of course, the end user point of view. They should network with all actors, multi-stakeholders, including the GAC representatives of those countries.

Next, they should offer their grassroots experience and expertise as inputs in the RALO/ALAC policy advice development process. And of course the RALOs should also be active in asking for that advice, and they should know who those experts in the ALSs are.

This leads back to the implementation and one of the ATLAS II recommendations about finding out who exactly are there knowledgeable about various things.

Then they should have their representatives participate. To participate on at least 50% of RALO conference calls. This is an arbitrary figure, but I think that it would be good to have a figure instead of just saying that they should participate actively or often or whatever.

Last, they should provide their RALO with an annual report of activities. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Yrjö, for the concise and I think useful set of expectations. Any comments or questions? Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Question on [those was that] right now we have laws on [decertification] of chapters. Some of these don't match with these. Are we going to be revising those to match with these? Because right now the only method we have of try to motivating ALS is doing a review once a year of which of the ALSs have not come to a meeting or have not voted in two years, three years, three elections, which could be really one year or two years,

depending on how you do. So are we going to be changing these criteria to match these, or what is there going to be [issues]?

Also, I have a question on the annual report. [I think] that is adding too much to an ALS to do an annual report, if an ALS is a small ALS. It's putting too heavy a burden I think on an annual report. I think the listing of the activities is fine, but an annual report seems to be too heavy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yrjö, may I answer?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Well, these are just proposals and suggestions. I think that actually I sent this list by e-mail to all members of the taskforce, so they're welcome to comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, a couple of comments. If indeed filling in a web form for an annual report is too much to do once a year or once every two years, as I said, then I think we have a real problem. That's number one.

Number two, we expect virtually everything to be changing. The bylaws right now, we are in violation of almost all the bylaws associated with ALSs. They will have to be rewritten. It would be

foolish to presume that our detailed rules, both within the ALAC and within the RALOs, will not have to be adjusted. So, yes, but there will also have to be a very definite defocus on voting.

Right now, we use voting as a major criteria. As a result, we have a high percentage of people who vote. They never show up any other time. They put their hand up to vote. They put their hand up to travel. That's not the kind of contribution that we're looking for, so we will have to defocus those, but exactly what we will do is part of what we're trying to determine here.

We have Fatima and Glenn and Yulia, and I close the queue.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Alan. I'll speak in Spanish again. I agree with what Alan is saying. If an organization cannot submit one annual report, well, it shouldn't be an ALS, because it's the minimum commitment we ask from them. On the other hand, when we're talking about voting or not voting in the elections, at LACRALO we have had this many times. One way of expressing, making themselves heard, is by not voting because they are against the candidates or because they are against the procedures that have been [inaudible], so the idea of voting or not voting is not a valid criteria to define whether or not an ALS is active or not.

I am really happy that we're doing this review, and I hope that many ALSs will be decertified because they are not behaving or acting as an ALS, and I think we should have a new certification process with other enhanced standards. We have been trying to do this at LACRALO for some time now, but we haven't been very [inaudible] so as to put the focus on quality rather than on quantity.

Now we have been looking at the number of ALSs. We have an At-Large where many of them are not real. They are not participating. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the "pleasures" — and I put that in quotations — of being ALAC Chair is I tend to monitor things that are going on in the RALOs more than I might have before, and it's rather discouraging when we do have a vote that we can't find the people anymore, but that's the only time we find out we can't find the people. It's somewhat problematic.

Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I don't take offense to any of these expectations that Yrjö has created. I think they're minimal. I don't think they're much of a burden. I guess it gets down to who's actually going to chase

those RALOs, the secretariat of the RALOs or the staff? The devil is in the details.

It's absolutely astounding when you look at people's websites how they don't mention ICANN or any of their participation. I'm astounded, but that's the reality. No one has ever forced them to actually make that public declaration, so it's an issue.

I guess my question is who's actually going to impose these new rules? Who's going to follow-up? Whose responsibility?

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer it to be determined. There will be a significant staff component in it, however.

I support what you said about ALSs noting their ALSs. In NARALO a little while ago, we had someone who was applying to be an individual member claiming they were not a member of any ALS, and they were a member of a very large ALS, and that ALS had nothing on its website to tell them that they were an ALS. Yulia?

YULIA MORENETS: Thank you. I think that, concerning the report, I quite agree with what was said by Fatima. But I do think it's a good idea to encourage actually — maybe not to make it obligatory — but to encourage to provide an annual report. In [inaudible] case, each

civil society organization or ALS normally does… They must have an annual report in order to report to their sponsors, donors, etc. So it's a minimum accountability that they have already, and I think it will be very useful to other members to know what different ALSs they do and how they can interact or work together or maybe exchange information. So it also can be useful.

Maybe we should not use this criteria in order to make the decertification or eliminate the ALS, but we should definitely encourage. This is my personal point of view. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Notice we haven't talked about decertification at all.

YULIA MORENETS: Just adding this as a point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not supporting your annual report which was due yesterday is not likely to be a rationale for decertification tomorrow. But we will have to talk about that as we go on, and I encourage people to participate in this taskforce so we get it right. Thank you.

Have I missed anyone? No? Then I thank you all for this meeting. I call it to a close. We have another group coming in. [The] full

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

ALAC and regional leaders are reconvening at this point. Tijani, you have a Skype message saying can you chair this next 30-minute session?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I appreciate it. I'll be back, but at this moment…

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]