

# ALS Mobilization Working Party Report

Issued: 21 October 2020; [Revised 28 November 2020](#)

## Table of Contents

Working Party Formation and Process.....	2
Working Party Mandate .....	2
Outcomes .....	2
Expectations and Criteria .....	3
What We Will Expect from an ALS.....	3
Explicitly Not Expectations .....	6
Other Participatory Involvement of ALSes .....	6
Suggested Activities .....	7
Applicability to Existing ALSes .....	7
Criteria for ALS Accreditation .....	7
Timing.....	9
Notes .....	9
ALS Accreditation Process.....	10
Process Steps .....	10
Suspension of Application Processing .....	15
Withdrawal of Accreditation.....	16
Proposed Bylaw Changes.....	18
Next Steps .....	20
Appendix 1: Draft Application Form.....	21
Appendix 2: Working Party Membership .....	28

## Working Party Formation and Process

The ALS Mobilization Working Party (WP) was composed of 21 members from the five RALOs plus Alan Greenberg (Chair), Maureen Hilyard (ex officio, ALAC Chair) and Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ex officio, ARIWG). All RALO/ALAC members who volunteered following public calls were made formal members of the WP, and RALO Chairs were given an opportunity to add Members before the group started its work. Once the group began deliberating, others expressed an interest to participate and they were added as participants (with full speaking rights). See Appendix 2 for full details.

The WP has met 29 times since the start of January 2020. At most meetings at least one member from each region was present. No decisions were taken at a single meeting and all WP Members had an opportunity to express disagreement. All decisions were made by consensus, generally unanimously. Attendance records can be found at <https://tinyurl.com/ALS-Mob-WP-Attendance>.

There was much discussion, many views presented and many alternatives proposed. Ultimately, there was general agreement on the final results. Should any issue have been very contentious, consensus (or lack of it) would have been judged among the formal WP Members giving equal weight to all regions. This never proved necessary.

## Working Party Mandate

A key aspect of the Board accepted At-Large Review Implementation was to ensure that At-Large Structures could fulfill one of their original mandates - provide an active communications path between ICANN At-Large and the At-Large Structures (ALSes). The WP needed to do a comprehensive review of the criteria for being accredited as an ALS, and what was expected of an ALS once accredited. As this would likely impact the ALS accreditation process, the WP was also expected to do a full review of this process to ensure that it would address the revised ALS profile. Moreover, since the process was last revised in 2007, the review would ensure that the process meets the needs of the current At-Large. The RALO Memoranda of Understanding and the ICANN Bylaws were also reviewed for possible changes.

## Outcomes

The WP completely addressed all of the issues before it and has fully fulfilled its mandate. As noted, all recommendations made here are the result of significant discussion and consensus, generally unanimous.

The WP is composed of members from the RALOs, and that each RALO Chair had the opportunity to ensure that the WP included members who could properly and fully represent their RALOs. In fact, the leadership of 4 of the 5 RALOs is represented within the WP

membership and of the WP 21 members, 12 have current or previous experience as a RALO leader or as an ALAC Member. It is therefore hoped that the recommendations contained herein will quickly receive the approval of the RALOs and the ALAC.

## Expectations and Criteria

A central recommendation of the Independent Reviewer in the At-Large Review was that the concept of ALSes be depreciated and that At-Large should depend solely on individuals unaffiliated with ALSes. Although unaffiliated individual members were believed to be a key component in a revitalized At-Large, there was also a strong belief within the community that ALSes could and should play a part. ALSes were always visualized as having great merit due to the large number of individuals that they could mobilize - the ALS members. Unfortunately, although this was always a part of the conceptualized At-Large, it was never effectively implemented. In many cases, the only members of an ALS that would have contact with ICANN would be the official representatives - others in the ALS might not even know about ICANN<sup>1</sup>.

Thus, an important aspect of the vision within the At-large Review Implementation Plan was to ensure that we could reach into the ALS and contact their members. Not every ALS member would have an interest in ICANN, but some will, and they will form a body of potential workers to complement the group of unaffiliated individuals.

The WP developed a set of expectations for each ALS. The intent was that if an ALS can deliver on these expectations, we will be able to achieve our intent of having ALSes whose members are a potential source of At-Large volunteers.

In addition, the criteria for accreditation as an ALS were carefully reviewed to ensure that a new ALS can fully address our expectations and to ensure that they matched the reality of At-Large in 2020 and going forward.

To go along with the revised accreditation criteria, the entire accreditation process was reviewed and updated addressing issues that have arisen over the years and to meet privacy concerns that were not a factor when the current process was developed in 2007.

## What We Will Expect from an ALS

1. An ALS must either:
  - a. redistribute targeted ICANN At-Large updates to its members; or
  - b. provide an e-mail address for direct distribution by At-Large.

---

<sup>1</sup> This has not been the case with all ALSes, but sadly has been the case with many.

These messages will be targeted at those less familiar with ICANN and serve both as educational material regarding what ICANN is doing and a “lure” to try to get people more involved.

This requirement may be waived on a case by case basis where the ALS has a mandate that clearly maps to only an issue of interest to At-Large and agrees to act as a resource for issues related to that aspect (such as phishing, spam or consumer protection, etc.)<sup>2</sup>. The waiver may be granted only by the ALAC Chair with the support of the ALAC Leadership Team.

There is no prohibition on using social media as the form of redistribution, but methods which can ascertain receipt are preferable.

*[Implementation notes: These updates will be created by ICANN staff but might be augmented by the RALO. They must be aimed at people who have little or no knowledge of ICANN and its terminology and buzzwords. They will be delivered in all of ICANN's official languages (as selected by ALS). We will need to give ALSes an expected communications rate and that might typically be 1 per month, but it could be as little as 3 per year or unusually as much as 3 per month depending on circumstances. **We will need to gear up to respond to people who do contact us in response to our messages.** If a redistribution address is not provided, the ALS representative will certify that redistribution will happen. Distribution material may include questions or links (which can be tracked) to facilitate understanding of how effective distributions are. It is expected that in some cases, an ALS may distribute our material to a wider audience than its members and there would be no prohibition about doing that.]*

2. Each ALS will report ~~to the ALAC~~ biennially (every two years). The report will include:
  - ALS leadership (with confirmation that leadership is aware of ICANN/At-Large affiliation);
  - formal ALS representatives,
  - membership - approximate numbers and optionally demographics for individuals (students, business, internet professionals, etc.) Membership should include different classes (individuals, Not-for-profits, Non-governmental-organizations, government agencies, etc.)
  - "linkages" with ICANN (i.e. why they are an ALS);
  - ALS activities related to ICANN (if any);
  - details of how information distribution to its members is carried out (Expectation 1 above);

---

<sup>2</sup> To not allow this exception would require that the ALS distribute what would effectively be messages unrelated to their rationale for existence - ie Spam!

- details of organizational membership in any other part of ICANN (if applicable);
- for an ALS whose members span regions and the ALS is deemed to be part of one region, the report should include a breakdown of (approximate) members per ICANN region.

To the extent practical, this reporting process will be streamlined and easy. Previous report data should be provided if applicable. The report, excluding personal information (names, contact details) will be posted for public access.

[RALO Leadership and At-Large Staff will have the primary responsibility to identify any issues that may need to be addressed.](#)

*[Implementation notes: Probably an online form. Implementation would probably be carried out on a rotating basis to spread staff effort throughout the year.]*

3. An ALS must reference ICANN and At-Large on its publicly accessible website (or Facebook or whatever its Internet presence), either on its home page, or on a secondary page (or comparable). The intent is to ensure that the ALS members and others looking at its web presence are aware that the organization is involved with ICANN through At-Large. The At-Large logo (<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/2265510/at-large-logo-3.png>) may be used in this context.

If an ALS does not have a functioning website (or Facebook presence or comparable) with basic information about the organization, At-Large will provide a basic Wiki space populated with information originally from their application. The ALS will have the option of being able to update this space if they wish.

The ALS should also consider including in its Internet presence current information about the organizations goals, structure, description of constituent group(s)/membership, working mechanisms, leadership, and contact(s) and a description of why it is involved with ICANN.

4. When specific issues are brought to the attention of ALS representatives, each ALS should evaluate whether they can contribute or not, and if they can, their ALS members should be involved. An ALS should respond if surveys or other issues are brought to their attention.

*[Implementation note: We will need to be careful and not flood ALSes with such requests.]*

5. Provide an e-mail address or web link which will be publicized (via the At-Large web/wiki) for prospective ALS members or others to contact the ALS.

6. Designate between two and four representatives, one of which will be designated as prime. All representatives will be sent general mailings and unless the ALS requests otherwise, mailings requiring action will go only to the prime representative.

There is no prohibition for an ALS Representative holding roles in other parts of ICANN (non-At-Large), but roles comparable to those listed below must be formally declared.

- a. Member of another constituent part of ICANN (AC/SO, sub-constituency)
- b. Leadership role in any of the above
- c. Member of a non-At-Large working group (such as GNSO PDP, CCWG, etc)
- d. Formally appointed representative of a non-At-Large ICANN group to a PDP, CCWG, Specific Review, etc)
- e. Leader of a non-At-Large working group (such as GNSO PDP, CCWG, Specific Review)

## Explicitly Not Expectations

The following issues were discussed as possible expectations. It was formally decided that they should not be included. It is conceivable that a RALO might consider these as important, but they will not be in the ALAC-established set of expectations for initial or continued accreditation.

1. Vote if there are things to vote on (note that some RALOs have very few votes, others more).
2. We will not track the participation of an ALS in our various activities. We will need to track the participation of individuals (whether a member of an ALS or an unaffiliated member) in activities (including GNSO, CCWG, etc.), probably using the forthcoming ICANN Client/Customer Relationship Management (CRM) System. Since individual records could include a RALO and ALS (if applicable), we may be able to derive ALS numbers, but it is not a requirement. These numbers could be interesting in the withdrawal of accreditation discussions and would certainly be of interest as feed-back to the ALSes.
3. Although we believe that the information distributed will attract new committed volunteers, we will not expect each ALS to produce active participants regularly<sup>3</sup> and will therefore not evaluate them on that basis. Such statistics will, however, be an interesting measure of our success with this program.

## Other Participatory Involvement of ALSes

There are a variety of activities that an ALS might be invited to participate in ICANN related activities. An example might be an outreach activity in their area or helping to organize activities

---

<sup>3</sup> Welcoming and integrating new workers will take time and effort. If we did get one person per ALS per year, the rate would be untenable.

if an ICANN meeting were held in their locale. None of these are obligatory, but our literature should give an overview.

## Suggested Activities

These are issues that were proposed as possible expectations. It was decided that they should not be included as expectations, but the ideas were felt to have significant merit and should not be lost.

1. ALSes may be encouraged to survey their members (not just ALS representatives) and provide lists of “areas of expertise” on which ALAC or RALO could request input or assistance. At-Large should set a “standard” survey format to ensure results are comparable and readily combined into a single database.
2. Participation in Internet Governance (multistakeholder) activities is often complementary with involvement with ICANN and At-Large. ALSes may wish to consider whether such involvement makes sense for them.

## Applicability to Existing ALSes

Everything being proposed would be applicable to all ALSes. There is nothing in the list of expectations that is not already required or implied, or is a relatively minor variation of what is there today. The prime difference is in how we inform the ALSes of their obligations, how detailed we are in the descriptions, and how serious we are in actually implementing what we are saying.

## Criteria for ALS Accreditation

1. *[Current rule]* Commit to supporting individual Internet users' informed participation in ICANN by distributing to individual constituents/members information on relevant ICANN activities and issues, offering Internet-based mechanisms that enable discussions of one or more of these activities and issues among individual constituents/members, and involving individual constituents/members in relevant ICANN policy development, discussions and decisions.
2. *[Current rule, revised to address ALSes spanning regions]* Be organised so that participation by individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the ICANN Geographic Region in which the ALS is based will predominate in the ALS' operation. The ALS may permit additional participation by others that is compatible with the interests of the individual Internet users within the region.

In situations where members from multiple regions are active in an organization applying for accreditation as an ALS and it is not possible or practical to identify the predominant region, the ALS applicant may select one region from among those represented among

its members and the ALS will be deemed to reside in that region and be part of that region's RALO. This may be done only with the explicit agreement of the receiving RALO.

3. ALS Application submitters and future representatives do not need to be organization leaders, but an ALS application must have leadership/management knowledge and support.
4. There is no formally specified minimum number of members for an ALS, but it should be more than just the representatives and the ALS leadership. Judgment calls needed to decide if a very small number is appropriate in individual cases (involving Staff and RALO leadership and possibly the ALAC - since denial or withdrawal of accreditation might be the ultimate result).

*[Rationale: If there are no additional members, the ALS cannot fulfil its prime role of informing its members about ICANN with the hope that they will become actively involved in ICANN policy activities.]*

5. Clear statement of the intersection between interests of organization and those of ICANN.
6. There is no prohibition about an ALS also being an organizational member of some other constituent part of ICANN, but such membership must be reported.
7. Certifications that:
  - a) the application is an accurate representation of the organization and its intents.
  - b) the organization commits to satisfying Expectations.
  - c) *[Current Rule: reworded.]* accreditation does not entitle ALS to expect or receive any funds from ICANN.<sup>4</sup>
  - d) The organization commits to actively participating in their RALO and to adhere to the provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the other ALSes in your Geographic Region and ICANN, as if it were an original signer of that document. The texts of the MoUs can be found at:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/Reference+Texts>.

The WP considered the case of an ALS where members came from multiple regions and where it was not possible or practical to identify a single region from which those controlling the ALS

---

<sup>4</sup> [This says that accreditation in its own right does not imply any funding. There may be cases where an organization accredited as an At-Large ALS may receive funding from ICANN, but such funding would not be based solely on the fact that the organization is an ALS. Examples might be if the organization applies for funding under some other program within ICANN or applies for funding for some specific local activity.](#)



came. There was a strong feeling that such a region-spanning ALS would be a good addition to At-Large, but was clearly in violation of the Bylaw requirement that an ALS must fit solely in a single region. The WP believes that such ALSes can be accommodated with a simple but clearly declared interpretation of the Bylaws. The interpretation would allow such an ALS applicant, to select their region from among those represented by their members, subject to the agreement of the RALO concerned. For avoidance of doubt, if accredited, the organization would be an ALS within the one region selected. This proposal has been reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel and they concur with this proposal.

## Timing

It is expected that once we approve any new rules, and get Board approval if needed, there will be a period of at least 6 months to implement and then we will begin the 2-year cycle of reports.

## Notes

These are issues that arose during WP deliberations. They are neither expectations nor criteria, but were either factors that were considered important in the WP decision making or were considerations that ultimately were not addressed but felt should not be lost.

1. We are not looking for 100% certainty. This applies to whether ALSes are perfectly meeting our expectations, or to identify whether a person is active in a meeting or just listening. We do however want a level of comfort that things are working as expected, and we should investigate anomalies when identified.
2. Although the WP members generally felt that RALOs should not make rules related to ALS participation, the group decided that we should be silent on the issue at this point. That notwithstanding, if a RALO should make such a rule, the ALAC would not be bound to consider it in the case of an ALS withdrawal of accreditation request from a RALO.
3. “On the ground” activities of an ALS which have no direct relevance to ICANN (perhaps the reason the organization was originally created) enhance the ALSes local credibility if and when the ALS, as a group, might become active in ICANN.
4. “Enforcement”, to the extent that the term is meaningful will come based on the reports and if applicable investigations related to specific reports of problems.

## ALS Accreditation Process

The ALS accreditation process must be thoroughly and carefully documented to help prospective applicants understand what they are entering into and committing to.

Included in this should be an explanation of the difference between the ALAC and At-Large.

Although not a major focus of this background information, there should be a pointer to the ICANN Bylaws which creates and governs the actions of At-Large and the ALAC as well as the ALAC and RALO governance documents.

RALO representatives and At-Large Staff may from time to time provide guidance to prospective ALSes as part of the ongoing Outreach and Engagement activities.

### Process Steps

1. A Prospective ALS submits an application. The form is available in English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, Chinese and Arabic. The form may be filled out in English or the language of the form. For non-English applications, a Google (or equivalent) translation will be done when the application is received. In parallel, the application will be sent for formal translation from ICANN Language Services. At-Large Staff may flag certain parts of the application (such as voluminous copies of Bylaws) as not requiring formal translation.

Any interactions with the applicant will be done either in English and/or the original language as appropriate (using Google translate or Language Services as needed).

New ALS applications are listed on the At-Large website (<https://atlarge.icann.org/als-application-tracking>) along with the application process status, and ongoing applications may be noted in regular At-Large meetings and reports. The application form (in full or redacted) is not part of this publication.

2. At-Large Staff will conduct due diligence (DD), reviewing the application and performing necessary tasks in an effort to ensure that the established ALS criteria have been/will be met and to facilitate the easy review of applications by the At-Large community.

For an ALS applicant whose members span regions where no single region is predominant, At-Large Staff, in conjunction with the ALAC Chair, will interact with the applicant to identify a suitable region to be associated with this application and prospective ALS.

For the purposes of this process, the RALO Leadership is defined as the RALO Chair, Vice-Chairs (if any), and Secretariat. In parallel with the start of DD, the application will be forwarded to RALO Leadership for any initial comments, which should be provided in no more than 7 calendar days. In the case of an ALS applicant that spans regions, this

will be an opportunity for the RALO Leadership to consider whether this ALS (if accredited) will be a good fit for their region.

This DD process may include, without limitation:

- verifying that all required questions are answered and that the answers are clear.
- requesting references;
- interviewing the applicant's contact(s);
- requesting input from ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement (GSE) related to the organization and/or people;
- gathering/requesting additional information on the applicant;
- requesting information on the applicant's leadership and operations;
- confirming the identity/existence of organization leadership and/or applicants.

Any relevant information accumulated during this process will be added (suitably annotated) to the application form or to the Due Diligence form. The content of the original submitted application should not be altered.

This step is expected to be complete within 42 calendar days.

3. Upon completion of the due diligence process, the Application (annotated if applicable) and the DD form completed by At-Large Staff will be forwarded to the Leadership of the RALO for the geographic region in which the applicant organization is located.

The process to be followed including who will have access to the application and DD in accordance with the RALO norms will be documented and the applicant will be notified of this during the application process.

- a) In accordance with the documented RALO process as formally decided by RALO Leadership<sup>5</sup>, the RALO Leadership may share the application as well as of the DD form with the region's ALAC Members, leadership council (if such a group exists) as well others deemed to be part of their extended regional leadership.
- b) In accordance with RALO processes as formally decided by RALO leadership and appropriately documented, the documents, or redacted versions thereof, will be made available to the primary representatives of the RALO ALSes for their feedback.

All RALOs will use a). It is a RALO's choice whether it uses b).

---

<sup>5</sup> Prior to implementation, each RALO must formally document their ALS application processing process.

In all cases, documents will be made available via a restricted access Wiki<sup>6</sup>. None of those provided with access to the documents may further distribute them in whole or in part.

[Implementation note: The extent to which documents need to be redacted before distribution to ALS Representatives needs to be explored. Note that the names and profiles of the prospective ALS leaders and proponents are often an important consideration.]

4. Those with access to the documents should comment on and discuss the application, with the intent of making a recommendation to the ALAC on whether or not to accredit the organization as an ALS. Comments could be accessible to the entire group, or sent directly to a specific person in the RALO Leadership allowing for confidentiality.

Should the RALO Leadership feel it necessary, they can ask for further information and/or clarifications. Such requests will be made to the At-Large Staff for relaying to the applicant. Any relevant answers will be incorporated into the Application (annotated as such) or the DD.

[Implementation note: his process and particularly those who will have access to what (and it may vary from region to region) must be documented and clearly stated to potential applicants with their explicit acknowledgment.]

5. At the completion of the consultation period, the RALO Leadership will inform At-Large staff whether:
  - a) The RALO recommends that the applicant should be accredited as an ALS
  - b) The RALO recommends that the applicant should NOT be accredited as an ALS
  - c) The RALO is not in a position to make a recommendation

The RALO Leadership may choose to include a rationale for its recommendation. In particular, a recommendation to reject an application should normally include a rationale. A rationale from the RALO may suggest that the applicant reapply after a specific amount of time or after some other conditions are satisfied. If a rationale is included, the RALO Leadership may designate to what extent the rationale shall be public or limited to ALAC Members. If the RALO does not include such a rationale, the ALAC may request that such a rationale be provided.

---

<sup>6</sup> The term “restricted-access Wiki” shall not be restricted to the Confluence Wiki currently in use by At-Large, but could also include any other comparable tool as decided by At-Large staff in conjunction with At-Large leadership.

The RALO response should typically be provided no longer than five calendar weeks after receiving the documents.

If a RALO recommends accreditation to the ALAC, the RALO may (but is not required to) inform the applicant of this and may grant the organization access to mailing lists and RALO activities pending an ALAC decision. This in no way implies the ALAC will vote for accreditation. Such status may be called “provisional”, “pending” or “observer” membership.

6. Once the regional advice has been given (including the ‘no recommendation’ option whether to accredit the applicant ), the advice, and any rationale shall be provided to the ALAC. The Application, annotated if applicable; DD; and any rationale provided must not be distributed in a public manner but limited to the ALAC-Internal list.
7. The ALAC and its Members will have six calendar days in which to ask for any additional information. If there are further questions, they will go to the RALO Leadership and potentially to At-Large Staff for forwarding to the applicant. ALAC Member question(s) should be forwarded through the ALAC Chair or delegate.
8. At the end of the ALAC review (either with or without additional questions), the ALAC will conduct a vote to decide whether to accredit or not.

The format of the vote shall be:

*Do you wish to accredit [name of applicant] as an ALS. The xxRALO has [recommended that the applicant be accredited | recommended that the applicant NOT be accredited | not provided any recommendation on accreditation of the applicant]*

*Options:*

1. *Yes, accredit the applicant [as recommended by the RALO | despite the recommendation of the RALO ]*
2. *No, do not accredit the applicant [despite the recommendation of the RALO | as recommended by the RALO ]*
3. *Abstain*

Decisions are made in accordance with the standard ALAC majority decision process as per ALAC RoP 12.2.1<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> Subject to the terms of Paragraph 11.4 requiring Quorum for all normal ALAC decisions, a vote is deemed to be successful if at least five ALAC Members cast a non-abstaining vote, and if the number of votes in favour is higher than the number of votes against. For a vote that explicitly requires a Super-majority, the number of votes cast in favour must be at least twice the number of votes cast against.

Decisions to accredit, or refuse to accredit, an ALS shall be subject to review as provided by the ICANN Bylaws, Section 4.2 Reconsideration.

Normally, as with other non-personnel-related ALAC votes, the results include how each ALAC Member voted. For ALS accreditation votes, at the request of any ALAC Member, the details of how each member voted may be kept confidential. Those details will still be available to At-Large Staff and the ALAC Chair in case a rationale for rejection may need to be formulated.

At-Large Staff will notify the applicant of its accreditation decision, and, if applicable, provide information on requesting a review of the decision. In the case of a decision to not accredit, the ALAC, should normally include a rationale for the rejection ~~but the decision to do so is at the sole decision of the ALAC Chair~~<sup>8</sup>.

Note: A minority of WP members felt that we should re-open the Bylaws and have RALOs make the final determination for accreditation of an ALS. The majority accepted that the ALAC is the formal entity within ICANN that has that responsibility and did not wish to try to re-open the issue.

9. Except as provided below under 'Suspension of an Application', the ALAC, RALO leadership and ~~the~~ At-Large Staff shall work concertedly to ensure that the process of reaching a decision to accredit, or not to accredit, an At-Large Structure applicant shall normally take no longer than ninety (90) calendar days from the date at which an application is received to the date at which the applicant is notified of the decision.

The occurrence of part or all of an ICANN face-to-face or virtual meeting (<https://meetings.icann.org/en/calendar>) during the 90 day period will automatically extend that period by 7 calendar days for each ICANN meeting.

Should it become apparent that this norm may not be achieved, the ALAC Chair or delegate may opt to extend the processing time by not more than 45 calendar days. Should the default time limit be extended, the applicant shall be notified of the situation along with the rationale for the extension.

10. An applicant may withdraw an application at any time. There is no restriction on resubmitting an application or revised application.

---

<sup>8</sup> The rationale for not including a rationale must be comparable to the reasons for non-disclosure of information in accordance with the ICANN Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/didp-2012-02-25-en>).

ALS Application Processing Timing		
Process step	Time in calendar days	Notes
Due Diligence	42	
RALO Review	35	5 weeks - Allows for hitting at least 1 monthly meeting.
ALAC Review	6	
ALAC Vote	7	
Slack time	0	
TOTAL	90	<u>May be elongated due to ICANN meetings or due to extenuating circumstances.</u>

## Suspension of Application Processing

Application processing may be suspended where:

- a) The suspension is requested by the applicant; or
- b) Additional information is requested by At-Large Staff during the due diligence process; at the request of RALO Leadership, or at the request of the ALAC Chair or delegate.

When application processing is suspended, time is not counted against the various time periods associated with application processing.

Wherever an application is suspended under part a) of this section, that suspension shall be lifted upon the request of the applicant.

An application that is suspended at the request of the applicant, or waiting for information from the applicant for more than 90 days shall be considered to be withdrawn. At-Large Staff should provide the applicant with appropriate warnings and reminders.

## Withdrawal of Accreditation<sup>9</sup>

An ALS may have its accreditation withdrawn at the request of the ALS or by a decision of the ALAC.

1. If an ALS voluntarily decides to give up its ALS status, the situation should be duly documented and the ALAC informed. It is the responsibility of the ALAC Chair to ensure that proper procedures have been followed, that any issues raised by ALAC Members are suitably addressed, and to ratify that the organization no longer has ALS status.
2. A request for the ALAC to withdraw accreditation may be raised by:
  - RALO leadership;
  - One or more ALAC Members through a request to the Chair or delegate;
  - At-Large Staff by notification of the ALAC Chair. Staff notification will generally come when Staff becomes aware of an ALS which is not meeting its obligations such as submitting its biennial report (after appropriate reminders and grace period)
3. For requests raised by ALAC Members or At-Large Staff through the ALAC Chair, RALO leadership will be consulted in the matter.
4. For any request to withdraw accreditation not voluntarily requested by the ALS, the rationale for the withdrawal must be formally recorded.
  - The ALS should be notified of the issue and given adequate opportunity to remedy the situation.
  - If attempts to communicate with the ALS through its representatives are not successful, other known contacts within the ALS should also be used. Typically, no less than four months should be allowed from initial attempts to communicate.
  - For RALO initiated requests, the RALO may choose to extend this period or put the ALS in a non-active status.
  - If an investigation indicates that the ALS organization no longer exists, this period may be cut short.
  - A record of all communications or attempted communications must be maintained. The record will also document the rationale for the request to withdraw accreditation.

---

<sup>9</sup> The ICANN Bylaws use the term “disaccredit”. It is not used anywhere else in ICANN. At-large has generally used the term “deaccredit”, a term that apparently is not an accepted word. It is used in a few other places in ICANN. The most common form of “accreditation” in ICANN is for registrars. Accreditation takes the form of the registrar and ICANN signing the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, and the act of “undoing” this is simply cancelling the agreement. The WP decided that we should abandon both terms and use the phrase “withdraw accreditation”.



5. Once all attempts to remedy the situation are exhausted, a super-majority vote of the ALAC shall be taken to withdraw accreditation.
6. Should accreditation be withdrawn by vote of the ALAC, the ALS:
  - Should immediately be informed;
  - Instructed to remove all representations that it is an ICANN At-Large ALS from its documentation and/or Internet presence;
  - Informed that the decision to withdraw accreditation is subject to review as provided by the ICANN Bylaws, Section 4.2 Reconsideration.
7. At-Large records should maintain the history of ALSes that have had their accreditation withdrawn.
8. For all cases where accreditation is withdrawn, efforts should be taken to ensure that the people involved in the ALS are aware of Unaffiliated Individual Membership in their region for those that wish to stay involved with ICANN At-Large.

## Proposed Bylaw Changes

In the course of carrying out its work, the WP identified a number of places where the Bylaws should be modified either to align them with the current embodiment of At-Large or to address changes in these recommendations.

The proposed changes are still under discussion with the Office of the General Counsel and will be proposed to the ALAC at a later time. None of the recommendations in this report depend on the Bylaw change proposals.

- ~~1. A revision to the Bylaws was done after the first At-Large review that was not accurate. Specifically, in 12.2(d)(i) it said that the ALAC was the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users. That was not correct. The ALAC is a 15 person committee and the change should have said that "At-Large is the .....~~

~~The first sentence currently reads:~~

~~***The At-Large Advisory Committee ("At-Large Advisory Committee" or "ALAC") is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users.***~~

~~It should be replaced by:~~

~~***The At-Large Advisory Committee ("At-Large Advisory Committee" or "ALAC") oversees the At-Large Community which is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users.***~~

- ~~2. This change addresses the Bylaw use of the term "disaccredit". These Bylaws are the only place in ICANN that the term is used, and it has never been used within At-Large. At-Large (and other parts of ICANN) have used the term "de-accredit" which apparently is not an accepted word by most authorities.~~

~~In 12.2(d)(ix)(G) replace "***disaccredit***" with "***withdraw accreditation from***"~~

- ~~3. The WP noted that the terms "certify" and "accredit" are used somewhat interchangeably. Moreover, it is not entirely clear that they are in reference to the same process. That being said, there has never been a situation where this potential ambiguity has caused a problem. There is no practical way to change to using a single term without extensive changes that do not seem to be worth the effort. A grammatical error was also noted during the review.~~

~~Section 12.2(d)(viii):~~

~~***Each RALO shall be comprised of self-supporting At-Large Structures within its Geographic Region that have been certified to meet the requirements of the***~~

~~**RALO's Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN according to Section 12.2(d)(ix).**~~

Should be replaced by (changes underlined):

~~**Each RALO shall be composed of self-supporting At-Large Structures within its Geographic Region that have been certified to meet the requirements of the RALO's Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN according to Section 12.2(d)(ix). At-Large Structures so certified are said to be "Accredited".**~~

4. ~~During the review of the Bylaws and the RALO Memoranda of Understanding (MoU), it became apparent that the Bylaws still treat the existence of individual users in RALOs as optional. The issue can be addressed by amending the four RALO MoUs that do not accommodate individual members, or through a simple Bylaw change. Although not strictly within this WP's mandate, we are recommending the following change. This change has been submitted to the Individual Users Mobilization WP and there has been no negative feedback as of the date this report was issued.~~

In 12.2(d)(viii), replace:

~~**If so provided by its Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN, a RALO may also include individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the RALO's Geographic Region.**~~

with

~~**Each RALO also includes individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the RALO's Geographic Region. For the purposes of these Bylaws, such individual members shall have access to the same communications facilities as members of an ALS.**~~

~~These proposals have been submitted to the Office of the General Counsel for review.~~

## Next Steps

The rules related to accreditation of ALSes are part of the ALAC Rules of Procedure (RoP) Adjunct Document 4. In accordance with RoP 13, there must be a 21 day notice of any planned changes, and changes require a super-majority (2/3) vote of the ALAC.

The ICANN Bylaws section 12.2(d)(ix)(F) requires that changes to the rules related to accreditation of ALSes shall be “subject to review by the RALOs and by the Board”.

Therefore the following steps are necessary to move forward with the ALS Mobilization Plan:

1. The RALOs must be consulted. The WP proposes that this be done via the two ALAC members appointed by each region (potentially aided by the NomCom appointee from that region). This consultation may be prior to, in parallel with or after ALAC deliberations.
2. The ALAC must decide on whether to accept the WP recommendations. If there are any changes required, the WP suggests that the issues be remanded to the WP for further work or clarification.
3. Once accepted by the ALAC, the new rules and process should be sent to the Board for ratification.
4. Any ALAC-approved Bylaw change recommendations must also be submitted to the Board for their consideration and adoption (in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws section 25.1). If there are other Bylaw changes foreseen, they should all be sent to the Board as a package to minimize effort.
5. Implementation of the new rules and processes will then need to be undertaken.

# Appendix 1: Draft Application Form

To be finalized during implementation.

**Notes for Implementation:** When reviewing application form:

- See whether any of the DD details should be incorporated into the application process.
- Ensure we flag mandatory fields and ensure notation is clear (ie what is the \* for?)
- Pull-down country list needs updating and it should be dynamically updated or linked.
- Make sure acronyms are defined when first used.
- Introduction: Describe what ICANN's remit is. Specifically, not anything related to the Internet or access to the Internet in their region.

## Organization Contact Information

\* a. Organization Official Name:

a1. Organization Name in English (if available):

a2. Organization Name in Non-English Language (if available):

a3. Organization Name Acronym (if available):

b. Organization's official Internet presence (website, Facebook page, etc.):

c. Organizational Social Media Accounts/Identifiers:

\* d. Organization email address:

\* e. Organization phone number, if any (include country/city codes):

\* f. Organization mailing address (location and postal address, if different):

\* g. Organization Country/Territory:

h. Organization City:

i. Upload Organization Logo (if any):

j. Primary and Secondary Contact for Organization

*If accredited, the Primary Contact will be assumed to be that contact who will cast any votes required, with the secondary person being the alternate. Your*

*Organization will also be able to specify additional representatives and may at any time change its voting and alternate representatives.*

## Primary Contact

\* Primary Contact Name:

\* Primary Contact Email:

\* Primary Contact Telephone:

If Primary Contact has additional contact information, please provide it below:

## Secondary Contact

\* Secondary Contact Name:

\* Secondary Contact Email:

\* Secondary Contact Telephone:

If Secondary Contact has additional contact information, please provide it below:

## Other contacts

Additional contact information (name, email, telephone, etc.):

## Background

Please describe how you heard about ICANN and At-Large and what prompted you to apply:

## Structure and Governance

You are applying for your organization to become an At-Large Structure (ALS) belonging to a specific Regional At-Large Organization (RALO). All countries and territories are assigned to an ICANN Geographic Region (which may not always correspond to its physical region). See <https://meetings.icann.org/en/regions> for the makeup of the ICANN Geographic Regions.

\* a. Are the majority of members of your organization citizens or residents of this specific region you seek to represent?

Yes

No

If No, please explain:

\* b. Are one or more officers of your organization residents of another region? If yes, please explain the circumstances.

Yes

No

If Yes, please explain:

\* c. To what extent are members who are individuals (not representing organizations) involved in the governance of your Organization and in making decisions within your Organization.

\* d. Is your organization formally incorporated or organized under a legal jurisdiction?

Yes

No

If Yes: Please describe what legal recognition it has and indicate the place of legal incorporation or registration

\* e. Describe your Organization's structure (e.g. governing and decision-making bodies and processes):

\* f. Provide information on your Organization's leadership (leaders' names, positions, emails):

\* g. Is your organization already a member of some other part of ICANN (such as the GNSO Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group (NCSG)) or the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO).

Yes

No

If Yes, please provide details:

\* h. In what language(s) does your Organization conduct its business?

## About Your Members

\* a. Do you have individual members with the ability to vote in or otherwise control the management of the organization?

Yes

No

If No, Describe what role individuals have in the management and work of the organization.

\* b. Do you have organizations as all or part of your membership?

Yes

No

If Yes, please describe whether they are profit-making, non-profit-making, a mixture of both, and/or what proportion of the total membership each type of private sector organization is. Please also describe what the nature of the organizational members is: For example, are they all of a similar type or interested in a similar activity or policy area?

\* c. Do you have governmental bodies, or quasi-governmental bodies, as members of your organization?

Yes

No

If Yes, Please describe their nature and role in the decision-making and work of your organization, and the proportion of the total membership made up of these types of organization.

d. OPTIONALLY, describe the general membership – are they predominantly of one (or more) professional background or interest group? (e.g. journalists, online rights activists, consumer organizations, individual consumers, etc.)

\* e. Describe how your Organization keeps its constituents/membership informed about, and enables them to participate in, decisions regarding issues of interest:

\* f. Approximately how many members (or members of each type of membership if you have more than one) do you have?

\* g. Explain the eligibility requirements (if any) for your Organization's constituents/membership.

\* h. Are members (or leaders) of your organization, as individuals, involved in other similar organizations or involved in other aspects of ICANN or Internet Governance?

Yes

No

If Yes, please explain:

## Funding

\* a. What is the primary source, or sources, of funding for your Organization? (if unfunded/entirely voluntary simply indicate that).

\* b. Do you receive any funding from government agencies or for-profit entities? If so, please describe below and describe their involvement in the activities of the organization (if they do participate) and to what extent they have significant control over your organization.



## Communications

\* a. Does your Organization post on the Internet publicly-accessible, current information about your Organization's goals, structure, description of constituent group(s)/membership, working mechanisms, leadership, and contact(s)?

Yes

No

If this information currently is available, provide URLs

## Objectives

\* a. Please describe your Organization's mission and purpose:

\* b. What ICANN-related issues currently are of interest to your Organization's constituents/membership. You can find a list of such issues at <https://xxxxx.>

\* c. How do you envisage your members getting involved in ICANN activities in these areas (Please provide an answer to the best of your knowledge)?

\* d. Has your organization set up any event, meeting, or real-life activity pertaining to Internet governance issues, or other issues related to the interests of individual users?

Yes

No

If Yes, please provide examples:

\* e. Has your organization been active in international, regional or national Internet governance issues?

Yes

No

If Yes, please provide examples:

\* f. Does your organization have written bylaws or other constitutional instruments?

Yes

No

If Yes, please insert the text of the written bylaws or other constitutional instruments below or preferably point to versions on the Internet (in English if available)

## Certification

By submitting this application, you certify that the information provided is accurate and true.

If your Organization is accredited as an ALS, It will have the following obligations listed below (further details may be found at LINK)

- Periodically (typically every two years) report to At-Large as to the current status of your organization (link to report template)
- Commit to supporting individual Internet users' informed participation in ICANN by distributing to your full individual membership messages from ICANN (nominally 12 times per year but this may vary), or alternatively provide an e-mail address where such messages may be sent for automatic relay to your individual members.<sup>10</sup>
- Reference your status as an ICANN At-Large ALS on your Internet presence.
- Designate between 2 and 4 ALS members to act as formal representatives to At-Large.
- ALS Representatives will periodically interact with the ALAC or their RALO.
- Provide an e-mail address or web link to allow new prospective ALS members to contact you.
- If anything in this application substantially changes, ICANN At-Large will be notified without undue delay.

You also understand and accept that:

- Being accepted as an ICANN At-Large Structure does not entitle you to receive any funds from ICANN.
- Your organization commits to participating actively in your Regional At-Large Organization (RALO).
- Your organization agrees to adhere to the provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the other ALSes in your Geographic Region and ICANN, as if it were an original signatory of that document. The texts of the MoUs can be found at:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/Reference+Texts>.

Privacy Disclaimer [To be written]: Description of how your information will be processed and published.

**Certification that your organization understands and accepts the above expectations and understands and agrees to the [privacy disclaimer].**

---

<sup>10</sup> Note exception for some classes of ALS.

## Signature

Include the name (and title if applicable) of the individual who is authorized by your Organization to sign this application.

\* Signature

\* Name

\* Title

\* Date

## Appendix 2: Working Party Membership

Region / Status	Name	Attendance
Chair	Alan Greenberg	100%
Ex Officio	Maureen Hilyard	72%
Ex Officio	Cheryl Langdon-Orr	90%
AF	Barrack Otieno	90%
AF	Beran Dondeh	3%
AF	Daniel Nanghaka	41%
AF	Pastor Peters Omoragbon	48%
AF	Raymond Mamattah	31%
AF	Sarah Kiden	76%
AF	Vernatius Okwu Ezeama	0%
AP	Ali AlMeshal	72%
AP	Amrita Choudhury	72%
AP	Justine Chew	38%
AP	Nadira AlAraj	83%
AP	Shreedeeep Rayamajhi	10%
AP	Sivasubramanian Muthusamy	24%
EU	Bastiaan Goslings	55%
EU	Natalia Filina	72%
EU	Roberto Gaetano	83%
EU	Yrjö Länsipuro	90%
LAC	Dev Anand Teelucksingh	48%
LAC	Jacqueline Morris	34%
LAC	Maritza Y. Aguero Minano	7%
NA	David Mackey	93%
NA	Eduardo Diaz	59%
NA	Judith Hellerstein	86%
Participant-AF	Liz Orembo (May 2020)	7% (after joining)
Participant-AF	Remmy Nweke (May 2020)	38% (after joining)
Participant-AF	Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong (May 2020)	50% (after joining)
Participant-EU	Ephraim Percy Kenyanito (Jun. 2020)	0%
Participant-EU	Matthias Hudobnik (Aug. 2020)	60% (after joining)
Participant-LAC	Alberto Soto (May 2020)	27% (after joining)