
HELSINKI – At-Large Leadership Work Session (Part 2)

Monday, June 27, 2016 – 10:45 to 12:00 EEST

ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

ARIEL LIANG: Nathalie, can you try again?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Hi Ariel, this is Nathalie, can you hear me?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I can hear you loud and clear, thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. Those of you who can hear me, please take your seats. I'd like to call this meeting to order on ALS Expectations and Criteria. We are unfortunately starting very late. If I could have everyone's attention, please. Can we have the document on the screen so we can see it?

Okay, to refresh people's memory – I would appreciate if side conversations can be carried on outside the room. To refresh

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.

people's memory, we have a task force that has been looking sporadically. We have not met as often as we should because of all the other demands that have been on us in recent months, but the task for the various parts of the task force have put together tentative recommendations or raised issues. The focus of this meeting is, to the extent possible, can we reduce the number of options, maybe even come to some conclusions?

You will recall that should we make some decisions on what the ALAC in general – this does not speak to what ARALO may do in addition to it – but should the ALAC in general change its current rules, which are very vague, as to what we expect of ALSes or what the criteria is for an ALS joining, there's a long process that goes along with changing that.

Our ALS criteria and admission process has to go to the Board for its – approval is not quite the right word. They have the right to object, so essentially, they have to accept what we're doing. It turns out that a fair number of the bylaws associated with ALAC are currently out of date and would be more out of date when we made these changes, so we're probably looking at a bylaw change. None of this is going to happen overnight, but the quicker we can come to closure on any of these things, the closer we're going to come.

Some of you may have seen, after I sent out this document, a long e-mail from Evan, essentially saying he thought there should be no rules, that an ALS should simply be allowed to exist, dormant or not, and it doesn't really matter. I tend to have a different position in that. If we are going to claim we have 200 ALSes or whatever the number is in whatever week it is, then we should be able to say why it is, what it is they're contributing and what is the value of them. Otherwise, we could probably get 400 or 2,000 if we simply send out a notice saying, "Please join us, there's no cost and there are no fees and you don't have to do anything." And I think the concept of an ALS was stronger than that.

So I'd like to open it to some general comments first. Again, we'll try to keep them brief, and then start going through some of these items, either discard them as being not worthy of our future discussion, making a decision saying, "Yes, this is the way we're going to go" and at least try to get farther down the line. We are not going to come to closure on everything today, that's quite clear. I have one hand being up, and I see two now. We have – sorry, I'm having trouble with names today. Tijani, someone whose name I can't remember.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I would like to disagree with Evan. I don't understand that someone who [adheres] to an organization or to any movement can say, "I am volunteer so I do what I want, I can stay without doing anything." So why you join? So I would like to emphasize on the fact that I disagree with Evan. We need to have this kind of work done so that in the future, we will have better quality of members. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Yes, I think we try to catch two horse with one – how you say in English? Okay, you understand what I am trying to say, that we have two needs. The one is to have members, and the other one is to have participation, and the fact that we want to solve two issues at once, it's a difficulty. I was against some of the decision taken by ALAC about some of the ALSes in North America, just because I think that at least two of them was with people who participate through ICANN in different capacities, and it's good to have them also into our team.

Not to come back to the discussion about if you have right to vote twice, but I think we need to embrace all the At-Large representative of end user within At-Large. But at the same time, we need people, we need organization who do the work, and we don't know how to go from one to the other. I understand both points of view, and I really think we need to discuss that. In each

region, it may be good to have more organizations joining, be aware, reading sometimes the mails, and if they are concerned, to participate. Even if they don't participate to each and every meeting or if they don't participate to the monthly meeting, whatever, it's important to have them as a member.

Then, do we need to have two types of members? Do we need to have to be open and to have some reflection on if they are not participating, they don't have the right to vote? Whatever, we can try to find something, but please, let's be open, let our door open to every organization who represent end users, because it's what we need. At the end, we are also the voice of the ones who are not members, and if we are more members, we are better to explain why we consider that we are the voice of the three billion users of the world of Internet. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Hello. Okay, I agree with what Sébastien just said, and we need to be open, you're right, but I also think that we need to have two levels of membership, two membership levels. That is to say, we can have some active members, and we can also have passive members. And for those passive members, we won't be afraid about the numbers and the quality of the participants. It is very important, because as he said, it is the entity in which we

are going to find some people who are not elsewhere, who won't be in other ICANN constituencies.

I think it should also be good to ask those who want to be active members to participate through reflections, through drafting documents, and also organizing activities that can be in their countries or in their environment, be in relation with At-Large, ICANN and its roles. That will help outreach for ICANN roles, that will help to send a message about ICANN and the role of ICANN in our society. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I put myself out of the queue. The current queue, for the record, is Satish, Garth, Cheryl and Seun. Have I missed any of them? Okay. This is interesting. This is the first time we've talked about – we've had unending discussions about whether we should put requirements and demands on ALSes. This is the first time we've said maybe we want two different classes, and that's not a discussion I think I've heard before. Cheryl I think is saying we have had that discussion before. I don't remember it.

I do have concerns about how does someone who is passive – how do we recognize when they become dead? And we have had situations where ALSes simply shrivel up and die. None of the

people are around anymore, but they're still on our books. So that's certainly an issue to address.

The expectations that we have from ALSes, going back to the original concept of this vibrant group on the ground who is going to be following every word that ICANN issues and caring strongly about ICANN issues, I think is a figment of the imagination of those who created the original structure and may never exist in the general case. There are a few ALSes where it is probably true.

Yet, I think if we're going to make claims about having N ALSes, whether it's 20 or 200 or 2,000, I think we have to be able to explain to someone – if they care – just what the impact of having these is. What do they do for us? What do they do with us? And there's not going to be a single uniform answer, but we have to have some idea, and maybe the answer is indeed multiple kinds. I don't know. It's an interesting discussion to have.

I do think that we need a level of clarity, however, regardless of where we end up, so we understand and people around us have reasonable expectations, and I'm not quite sure where that's going. Satisfy?

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, Alan. I tend to agree that we should respect diversity, and therefore we should welcome the strong, the weak, the struggling ALS, all types of ALSes, and the only criteria or criterion should be of vitality and participation.

Having said that, however, I would like to distinguish between active ALSes and dead ALSes. We're just coming back from a mission in China, where three of us from APRALO went to China. Of all the objectives we had for China, only one was unmet. That was to track down two of our missing ALSes, and we couldn't do that.

The question that we had therefore was, should we then think of – if we can't track down even within China, then what is the point in having them on our records? So from our side, we would like to propose that any kind of activity level is fine, vitality level is fine, but if they are proven to be kind of defunct, we should probably let them go. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Garth?

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you. Garth Bruen, ALAC North America. Having a number of phantom ALSes doesn't give this group legitimacy, so that's definitely a problem. We shouldn't allow that.

But with that being said, the job of all of the ALSes is to do volunteer work in their communities. That's their number one priority, and we should be enabling them to do so and helping their work as best we can.

Now, I had recruited a number of ALSes last year, and one in particular I spent quite a bit of time talking to, and once they started engaging, they had a very serious problem with the format of the way that work was conducted within At-Large. It was very off-putting for them and they just dropped it after a while. The organization still exists, they did not like the way that things were being run.

We also have organizations in parts of the world where just basic connectivity is a daily trial, and being able to participate fully in the Internet is an ongoing problem. And we need to allow for different levels of expectation, and we have to reach back down so people can reach up. And if we have a volunteer group that spends two years in the mountains helping people who have no computers and no Internet connection learn about new technology, they can't be contacted for those two years.

I think the one thing that many organizations do is they issue reports. They issue public reports about their work, and if we can find some way to collect these reports that each organization already issues and find a prominent place for them so we can showcase what our communities are doing, I think that's the best criteria we can ask for, is to say to all of the ALSes, "Give us your report, show us what you do in the community. Not necessarily how you interact with ICANN, but show us what you do in your community and we'll feature that, and we'll use that as proof of your organization's lifeblood." Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Garth. I raise a question for the people following to answer or think about. What Garth just said implies – didn't say it – implies that doing good stuff is important and sufficient. Should they need to demonstrate that there is some intersection with ICANN for us to say they're an ICANN ALS? I don't know the answer, but I'd like to hear from people as we go ahead. Next, we have Seun. Cheryl, sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

We're easily confused, Alan. Thank you. Okay, let me start by recognizing the fact that for some time, I had the title of – I think it was Queen of Process, wasn't it? And that I'm well known for

working metrics and measurables and having specific value attributes for performance, etc. So you probably all think you might know where I'm going to come from in this debate, and maybe you've worked with me in Asia Pacific long enough to realize that a little surprise does us all good from time to time.

I am quite keen on having expectations clearly articulated for At-Large structures, and indeed individual members within our regions. I am equally committed to having clear and unambiguous guidelines and assistance and facilitation to new and continuing active At-Large structures and individual members to perform their work within ALAC more effectively. And we've seen a vast amount of that work done by our own At-Large staff and some of the work groups that have been involved over the years that I've been engaged, anyway.

It was very much you got the accreditation and then off you were. Somehow you were supposed to know how it all happened. That's vastly different now when we bring our At-Large structures on. So I would be very unsurprised to find a difference in the profiling of At-Large structures which were early on in the history of our particular movement, At-Large, and those that have been more recently onboarded in a far more effective, engaging and professional manner.

So we may find, Satish, that it is difficult to track down the two "missing" At-Large structures while you were visiting China, which, last time I checked, was a large place and probably couldn't have been completely covered by a couple of days' visit to only a single city. But I do happen to know that within ICANN, and certainly within the regional Internet governance space, at least one of the representatives of membership of both of those organizations exists, and we merely need to ask that person what the status of those original At-Large structures now is.

It may be that we can then retire them, because it was in the days where At-Large structures were formed so that they could have an impact in the early work of ICANN. Not all At-Large structures, and indeed not all individual members are going to be equally passionate about all things ICANN is doing at any particular time, and so I think it's quite natural to see different levels of engagement and a change of engagement during the lifetime of an At-Large structure or member services with us.

I am very comfortable with the concept that was born out of a discussion paper from AFRALO, and Tijani presented it on a number of occasions and that's why I said we have discussed multiple membership and the consequence of those membership model before, and I think it's one that's well worth revisiting. Perhaps with some modifications, because we've

explored more and thought in different ways since then, but that's a great foundation piece and I'd like Tijani to bring that back and make sure staff has access to it.

I just happen to remember it because I remember stuff, but what it was suggesting was that the status of passive or active – not defunct and no longer incorporated or existing, that is a different matter – but the passive or active was easily measurable. There were consequences, rewards and benefits depending on which side of that spectrum you found yourself on as an entity at any particular point in time, and you could transition to one and back and through.

So there was the ability to flow, and I think that's a very tempting thing to look at, but it doesn't mean we don't have clearly articulated criteria and objectives. We need those.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The speaker list we have right now is Seun, Kaili, Judith and Mohamed. We have to break in about 15 minutes, because the last 15 minutes of this session is devoted to a somewhat different subject related to this, so I ask everyone to be concise. If we cannot keep to two minutes per intervention, I will go to the timer with alarm. Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. One of the concerns I have about this is that we're setting this expectation at a global level, I mean at At-Large global level. It may be easier to set these multiple expectations, perhaps RALOs can have it, but having global level expectations this much, I think, could be an overkill and then could actually end up putting us in a situation where we may not have anybody participating in this community again.

I think we need to agree that there are just going to be two stages: somebody who is participating or someone who is dead. The dead ones go, and the people participating continue. We need to have that global requirement, and then each RALO can determine how they decide on who has actually participated. For instance, within AFRALO, we're doing that. We determined that, even though I still have issues with it because I think determining who is active and who is passive can also be just subjective, especially if you're going to the level of looking at the content of what people are writing.

How do you determine who is passive? I'm writing, I'm posting, for instance, sometimes I just say hi. Because I'm saying hi doesn't mean I'm not active, I'm available. So we need to determine who is going to be the judge for these things. Is it a fellow ALS member that's going to judge that another fellow ALS member is not active, even though the person is active, he's

participating? So it's easy to get a judgment for the dead ones, but we need to be careful with the people who are actually coming in once in a while, and let's not lose them.

My final comment, which is actually a question, is which is priority for At-Large? Is it participation within ICANN or participation in the community, in the local community? What is the priority? I think the former should be the priority. If we have people participating within ICANN, that should be our requirement, we shouldn't go beyond that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. At this point, the queue is closed because we're not going to have time to go much farther. If we do have any time, I'll give it to you. Next, we have Kaili, but before Kaili, I will quickly respond to Seun – not respond, but comment. The reason that this task force exists that has driven this thing is there was a general feeling within the group prior to your involvement that having purely regional criteria was not sufficient, and that we should have some general ones. Whether it's this list or not is up for debate, but there was a feeling that we needed a little bit more commonality to allow the regions to essentially enforce things which otherwise they might not have the ability to do at their own level. So this is the pendulum swinging back and forth. Where it ends, I'm not sure. Kaili.

KAILI KHAN:

Yes, thank you, Alan. Well, currently, my understanding about the criteria of being an ALS is it's made up of end users. However, I think that it needs to be complemented. Well, my understanding of why ALSes need to be made up of end users or consumers is because we are to represent and defend the end users', consumers' interest. That is the spirit of it, so therefore, for example – just as Satish mentioned, the APRALO leadership, we've visited China, the ISC, Internet Society of China.

Although yes, it is a multi-stakeholder structure, however, it does effectively defend end users', consumers' interest in China, and to an extremely large extent. So therefore, I believe the criteria for being an ALS is to be complemented to that this organization or individual, whatever, can demonstrate that they or that individual indeed has defended consumers', end users' interest in certain fields and also to carry out the ICANN's mission. And that should be the fundamental criteria of becoming an ALS. So that is one point.

Another point is my understanding is that – because I'm from a telecom background, so telecom network is not the same as Internet. Telecom needs to be run by operators, while the Internet, everything is TCP/IP, so it's a self-running network. However, there's only one thing for Internet that needs human

intervention: that is name and numbers. That is ICANN's position, so therefore, ICANN is in that unique one and only position that is the governing body. Although, [inaudible] to the names and numbers, however, it is the one and only governing body of the Internet or the cyber world.

Therefore, the governing body – or to say, a government – the principle of it is of the people, by the people, for the people. That also means that ICANN itself should be and must be of the people, by the people, for the people. Who are the people for the Internet? The end users and the consumers. So therefore, I was surprised to learn over the last few minutes that even within ICANN, some people thought that ICANN is a professional society of the DNS industry. I said, well, maybe 20 or 30 years ago that might be true, but not now, because ICANN is not only global, but also social.

It [inaudible] every aspect of a human society, so therefore, ICANN is more and more a governing body and must be of the people, by the people, for the people. That means of the end users, by the end users, and for the end users. In that respect, I think ALAC, ALS, we have a very important mission to think about. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Could we have a three-minute countdown timer with alarm, please? Judith. And that's not aimed purely at you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. I also wanted to agree with Seun's comment. I think that the primary importance of the ALSes that we have and we've reached out to are to get them engaged in the process and get them to understand what we are about, how we can help them promote the work they're doing, and what we can do. And for that, one is they have to come to our meetings, they have to engage. And if they don't have any time to engage and if none of the staff in the organization have any time to engage – and I understand we're all volunteers – what are they doing becoming an ALS?

They may have great ideas and may be lurking on the side, but as I think what you have said before, Alan, is that then they could be an unaffiliated member. But if we're going to have an ALS, we need engagement, and we need – you could not come – say, you can't come to a meeting because you have too many other things going on, but you can engage on e-mail lists. You can engage in some of the working groups, you can post your comments, you can talk about things, but we do need some kind of engagement.

And then also, I know in our ALSes in North America, a lot of them want to engage, they just don't know how. They really have no idea how the system works. It's so complicated, the processes, and so we've been working one-on-one with our ALSes, and that should help them get reengaged and then pass it on to their membership so that members can understand and get engaged themselves. Not just one person or two people who are the contact people, but other people in the ALS to get engaged, and I think that should be what we're looking at in an ALS criterion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think we passed and we reached 200 ALSes mark, which is a good number. With that comes a diversity, rich diversity, which is basically different ways of communication, different working cultures. The loudest voice should not mean that this is the most active participant. The frequent e-mails at midnight or every day, that does not mean the active participant. But we need to be careful in terms of setting a global practice or at least benchmark what exactly constitute to be active, because we have a very diverse community and we need to be careful of

that. We should not alienate people or make them feel that this is the only way to do things. That will become very damaging I think for our members.

We can try to set minimum participation criteria, we can say this is the minimum that's required by all members, and those, I think, could be different options. It shouldn't be very few options. But I think we need to be flexible. The number of ALSes is going very big, we cannot micromanage that number and try to dictate how they communicate and how they interact with us. But let's have a minimum requirement of what exactly constitutes to be active. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. If I can try to summarize for a few minutes, we've managed to go through another meeting and not look at any of the individual items, although we have talked around them a fair amount. We've had some very different positions named, identified. I have some trouble saying that someone who comes to a monthly teleconference and sits there and doesn't do anything, but his name is logged as attending, is an active participant, and someone who – to be quite honest – finds those meetings boring as something, has nothing really to involve but monitors mailing lists, and when they have something salient to say, says it, is not active.

And as several people have pointed out, they come in many different forms. Can we actually have a set? If we only had 12 ALSes, it would be easy to sign a person to each one and sort of certify that, "Yes, I watched them do something that was important," but we're not at that stage and we're not going to be at that stage again. So short of saying, "Yes, well, we may notice if someone is completely inactive," certainly if they don't respond to e-mails for two years, it's easy, but then we should probably reach out and find out if that e-mail address is the problem, not the person.

We did have an experience a little while ago where the person who had applied and had been a representative disappeared, and so we reached out to the management of the chapter or whatever the ALS was, and the answer that came back was "ICANN?" Someone had applied on their behalf, had been the only person in the organization to ever interact with us, and when they moved on somewhere else, it was quite clear that there was no substance behind it. They may well have had 200 members, but they didn't know how to spell ICANN.

We have had cases in North America – more than one case – where someone said "I want to be an unaffiliated member. I swear I am not a member of an ALS," which is one of the criteria that we have, and it turned out they were, and that ALS had

publicized their involvement with ICANN so well that none of their members or their managers knew about it. So we have a complex situation. We've aired a lot of the options here. I'm not sure we're a lot closer to coming to any closure.

As Seun pointed out, maybe it should all be regional, but we only started this discussion because we decided that was inadequate. So I'm not quite sure how we go forward from this. Is Sandra going to tell us in one minute how to go forward? She is. Okay, then we'll give her the floor, and then we're going to turn it over to Nathalie, who I hope is connected remotely.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, she is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sandra is going to give us a minute of wisdom to solve the whole problem.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I might be. We just had a similar situation at EuroDIG when we redrafted our statutes, and we have also the same sort of issue. On the one hand, we want to stay inclusive and accept anyone to join the network. On the other hand, we don't want to

overcomplicate the whole process when it comes to a vote and when it comes to take decisions.

I understand the actual problems with inactive ALSes is more or less on a regional level within the RALOs, because they have to function, they have to take a vote at some point. I don't think we have that problem when we look at the global level, because at the global level, we have operating ALAC, and we take actually the output or the input which comes from the regional level, but the regional level has to function.

What we did for EuroDIG now – and I'm looking forward to it in the hope this will work – we have two types of membership. We have associate members which have no obligations, which can just join as they are available, which can participate, step in, step out at any time, and then we have a second type of membership, which is the full membership which includes the founding members, because there were only 24 founding members so far, but now we opened up to accept full members.

Those full members, they have an obligation, they have a role to play, they have to vote, they have voting rights, they have to fulfill – let's say a more defined set of criteria, and they have to be accepted by the existing founding/full members. But participating in the processes and in the general assemblies and then the EuroDIG of course as an event, that's open not only for

full members, founding members and associate members, it's open for everyone.

But if you want to stay a little bit more engaged, then you at least are invited to general assemblies, you can raise your voice, but when it comes to a vote, then you have to be a full member. And with this, we hope to stay sort of operational, because we also have that problem in EURALO, that when it comes to a vote, Wolf could probably tell how difficult it sometimes was to mobilize all the members to get quorum. I think that's the point, to get quorum and to stay operational.

But on the other hand, we also did not want to kick anyone out just because they have been inactive for the last two years or they did not speak up on public mailing lists so often. So at EuroDIG level it's a different beast, I know it's not ICANN. We hope to resolve the problem with these two types of membership.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Sandra. We've heard that idea a number of times. Tijani, if you could dig up your old paper and distribute it to the ALAC and the – Cheryl says no.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm saying it's already on the wiki under the metrics site. We just need to copy and paste.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then distribute a pointer, not necessarily the – so let's look at what was proposed there, and we will carry on the discussion. Tijani, one last word. We're late for our next session.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, really a word. We have had this discussion several times since very long now, so we have to decide one day. I think if we continue to do that, we will never take a decision.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Tom?

TOM MACKENZIE: Just very briefly, obviously as reviewers, we're here to listen to the proposals, the discussions that you're having, and it's far too early in the process to be making any kind of suggestions as to how you should be organizing yourselves. But this is definitely going to be one of the points that we're going to be looking at as part of this review, and so this discussion is an interesting one.

I'm only just coming in on this discussion, but what Sandra was suggesting just now seems like a very interesting proposal. I would just say that there are all kinds of mechanisms that are used in different circumstances to boost membership in membership-based organizations. One of them, which I found reasonably interesting, is organizations that actually require of their membership – if I can take just 30 more seconds.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead, anyway.

MACKENZIE: Yes. That when members join an organization like this, they know that at any time, they could be sort of called upon almost at random to rise up to the occasion and come and present the interests of the users that they represent on a particular issue. In other words, becoming an ALS is not something you can just do casually. You've got to be aware that at any time, you have to – wherever you come from, Costa Rica or a small African country – that you have the responsibility to be able to rise up to the issue, the occasion, and to come and sit around a table to present the interests of your particular users.

Creating that kind of requirement means to say that there are those sections of the ALS membership that are maybe sort of

sitting quietly in a corner and not doing very much, it kind of puts a little bit of pressure on them and depending on the sort of circumstance. What's sometimes sort of surprising with these kinds of models is that you find that quiet sections of your membership suddenly reveal themselves to be rather interesting and with interesting contributions to make to your discussions. Anyhow, it was just a sort of thought about how you can call upon people, sometimes almost using these kind of random processes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm told Ariel has something. Sorry, you said I should call on Ariel.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, we're going to a presentation from Nathalie. Ariel has some involvement in it, I'm not quite sure I know what, so the presentation is up there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's a joint presentation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, it's joint. Nathalie and Ariel, I'm supposed to call on Ariel first. Thank you. I'm slow, but I eventually get it.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you very much, Alan. I'm doing this presentation on behalf of the team that helped develop the part of the At-Large website that will restore the ALS database and then reflect them in a public-facing site. Just I want to give a quick recognition of the team. We have Nathalie Peregrine from the At-Large staff, and also Ozan Sahin from the policy staff is also helping with this project. On the development side we have a new member. Her name is Corinna Ace and she's working with Laura's team to develop the ALS database. Then we also, of course, have the Indian offshore team and the ICANN IT team that help out for building this centralized database.

Just to give you a quick glimpse of what has been built out, I will do a demo quickly, but just a first point is that we have constructed the ALS application form on the new website to facilitate the ALS to submit their applications, and then it's in six UN languages plus Portuguese. Second, on the At-Large website, we have this internal-facing database. We can store about 30 different data points related to the ALS, such as their contact

information, their official English name, acronyms, website, social media links and all these points, and then we can store them in one place and they're no longer spread it in different spreadsheets that the staff juggle.

So that's the second thing that was built out, and then the third thing that was built out is the public-facing tracking page for any organization that just submitted their ALS application to see the status of their application, and once it's accredited, they will see all this reflected on the public-facing site.

All these three components will be ready by July 25. That's our target date to launch all these features on the website. So that's a quick overview. Now I'm going to share my screen and do a quick demo of how this appears, so just bear with me for one second.

Okay. I think it will appear. Yes, okay, and I'm hoping I can... Oh, sorry, just bear with me. Okay, it's a little bit difficult to see, but you can look at the left screen. So on the At-Large website right now – there's a little delay, maybe I will do this over here. Okay, so on the At-Large website right now there's a section where people can look at their applications or look at how to become a member. I'm sorry, I'm struggling a little bit with this Internet speed here, so still look at the left screen, please.

If you look at this top navigation called Take Part, and once I click on it, and then there's a place called Membership. I'm going to click on that and it will take maybe a second to reflect on the left screen. And this is where we list the three ways for a person to become a member of At-Large. One is to become a member of an already accredited At-Large structure, that will take them to the list of existing ALSes, and the second will be to accredit your organization as a new At-Large structure, and then you can click Read More to read the whole instruction how to become a ALS. Then the third one is Become an Individual Member. I know now we have NARALO, EURALO that have individual membership, and I know other RALOs are in process of finalizing that procedure, so we have provided these three ways.

Then if you'll click on the How to Become an ALS, and then this is the instruction listen on the website here. And if you scroll all the way to the bottom, we expect people to read the instructions thoroughly before they apply, and then you will see the application form right at the bottom here. But right now this application form is still linked out to the old one on the ICANN.org, but then we have built out this new one which I will show over here.

This is the new application form, and it's a little bit hard to see for you on this screen, but it's essentially very similar to the old

one, except we added different fields. For example, we now allow the organization to put in their official English translation and also their official acronyms, as well as their website and upload their logo, so that we want to motivate the ALSes to provide all this data by themselves, and so that's the new form.

And then, where this information will go. Once they submitted it, you will see this is an admin interface where all the data come into, and we have this tile called ALS List. Once you click on this, it will take you to this list that shows all these ALSes. These are the ones already accredited and we successfully migrated the information over from the old site to the new one. But if there's a new ALS, for example if you look at the top one, number 245, this one is still in progress, but we already got the name and some like country, city, and all this information over. So once they use the form to submit, all this information will be stored in this database so that an admin can take a look at it and can also modify it if it's updated later on. So this is the centralized database.

And another very cool thing about this database that I will show you is we also have a field to store information of individual members, and I will just give you a quick peek of that. So this is interface, and I'll go to the ALSes section, and then now you can see individual members list. And then here, we can create a new

individual member here and now we can put in their name, their address, contact information, also public profile, all stored here, so that's a new field.

And so that's a quick look of the database, and the third part is the tracking page, where a new organization submitted their application, where can they see the status? I will give you a quick look here. This is called At-Large Structures Application Tracking, and on here you can see it looks very similar to the existing ALS page, but what is different is that it can show the application form, and then if you look at this, this application form is already in a PDF format.

If it's submitted in other language, we will translate that into English and upload it here, and now you can also see the accreditation status, whether it's just received or the regional [advice] is received or ALAC is voting on that. You can see all the status reflected here and then also the associated date when the status changed. Once the status is changed, when we do this in the admin to change the status, the ALS themselves will receive an auto-message to notify them that their application status just changed.

So this is a quick kind of demo of these three sections that we just kind of constructed. Right now it's not viewable to the public yet because we want to make sure we do enough testing,

and then once someone uses the application form, we will receive all the data successfully, and then the applicant can receive notifications successfully before we roll it out. We don't want to just make it public, suddenly we stop receiving applications, and we want to make sure all of these are tested.

The last thing, on your left screen, this spreadsheet is a Google spreadsheet that you see. It's what Ozan has been helping us, is to collect all the metadata related to the existing ALSes. You can see this is a spreadsheet with a lot of columns. It's about 30 different fields. Then we have different spreadsheets that have certain fields of this and we're consolidating them into this one master table.

Then, after he consolidates the data, he will reach out to every individual ALS to verify the information and make sure to get the latest. Then, we will do a mass transport from this Google spreadsheet to the database that we built out in the website to store all the information there.

So that's a demonstration of what has been done, and Nathalie and I do have some questions to ask, but I wanted to just take a quick moment and see whether there are any comments. And we're running out of time.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we are out of time. I see Seun has his hand up.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Just a quick one. When you were presenting the database, some of the ALSes had no primary contact. I thought that was a requirement by default.

ARIEL LIANG: Seun, I didn't really catch your question, can you just clarify?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, I said when you were presenting the database page, some of the ALSes had no primary contact. I thought that was a requirement by default when there's an application, so is there a reason why that's not the case?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, it's still a requirement. Every ALS should have a primary contact, and also secondary contact in them. Right now, we're doing the databases just to make sure all the information is accurate. We also have some of that information spread out in some internal spreadsheet we want to consolidate into one. That's why we're doing this work right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, this is under development. This is not production live. Humberto? We are eating into lunch time right now, but please go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay, it's just a short question. Because we have had some applications in the last year, there is a third criteria. The third one I think it should be self-funding. Most of the applications (I think we have three) and they put they're not self-funding instead of – well, in those cases, this ALS had been approved, certified. So my question is, it's a mandatory criteria or not? That's a good question, I understand, because we had some problems in LACRALO with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, I will address that. It depends what you mean by self-funding. ICANN makes no commitment to provide any funding. Now, whether the ALS is self-funding, that is they collect membership dues or they go and solicit money from local industry or their grandfather is very rich, it's not our problem. Okay, so certainly, they should not be accepted if there is a requirement that we put money into it. We do not look particularly carefully at how they are funded.

We do require that the organization is led largely by users, so if the funding implies whoever provides the money also is calling all the shots and appointing the president, they shouldn't be an ALS. If they get money through some independent source because they're talented at raising money, that's not our problem.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I think you are absolutely right, so my point is, we should correct the form, because the way how we ask, there is not enough explanation about. Because you only ask self-funded or not, something like that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are in the process of revising it, so thank you for that kind of input, and that is an important input. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to be absolutely specific – and I'm quoting verbatim – the minimum criteria on this point states, "Be self-supporting, not

rely on ICANN for funding," which is very different from self-funding.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: But you just need to click. You cannot explain. We have three applications put, "No," and you are not accepting the criteria.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's deal with it offline. If we have accepted ALSes that we shouldn't have, then we need to fix it. If we perhaps have a translation issue or something like that, then we need to clarify the forms and it'll go more forward. It doesn't sound like we have a theoretical problem; it sounds like we have an implementation problem. Anything else? Ariel? Sorry, next steps. The next steps from the application things, or back to the original one, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Back to the original [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: The next steps are we asked for a pointer to the document on multiple levels because we had a variety of people speak to the concept of different levels of ALSes, so let us get that. We will

reconvene intersessionally. The taskforce will be reconvened as opposed to the ALAC as a whole, and see if we can come forward and propose something a little bit more concrete. Clearly, we have many different views, and we are going to have to either decide there is nothing common at the At-Large level, or we will have to agree on something.

I sense we're maybe a little bit closer in that we have one concrete idea to focus on. I don't have a real high level of comfort that I know how to get from here to there. Any further comment before we break for lunch? Ariel has a comment, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you, Alan. Just want to mention we do have four questions that we want to ask the taskforce, but I know we are running out of time, about the ALS database and on the application on the website. So I think the best approach is that we're going to circulate the question via the mailing list and get some feedback. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. We're breaking for lunch. We reconvene at 1:30 here, I believe.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: And the session will be a session with Fellows, the focus however will not be on the Fellows as such, although we will have a brief introduction, but we will be focusing on the FY17 requests. We'll be reviewing all of the requests and what the outcome has been, and that will be both a good review for the Fellows and for the people in this group to know exactly how we're funding.

The outcome I will summarize just to encourage you to come. We had some projects which were accepted, some projects which were rejected. Amazingly, most of the rejected projects are being funded anyway through a different path, so the overall outcome was very promising.

We also have a session at the end on the CCWG and Work Stream 2, which is a very important part of the work going forward in the coming year. Heidi, do you have anything to add?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, then the meeting is adjourned for lunch. We'll see you here then. ALAC leadership team, the five people in the leadership team and the –

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]