| YESIM NAZLAR: | Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the ALS Mobilization Working Party call taking place on Monday, 20 January 2020, at 18:00 UTC. |
|---|---|
| | On our call today on the English channel, we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, David Mackey, Barrack Otieno, Roberto Gaetano, Amrita Choudhury, Ali AlMeshal, Sarah Kiden, and Eduardo Diaz. |
| | We have received apologies from Nadira Alaraj, Bastiaan Goslings. And Judith Hellerstein has indicated that she will be joining us a bit late. |
| | From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Alperen Eken, Claudia Ruiz, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar. I'll also be doing call management for today's call. |
| | I also would like to inform you that Dev Anand Teelucksingh has joined us as well on the Zoom room. |
| | Before we start, a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes. |
| | Now I would like to leave the floor back to Alan. Thanks very much. |
| ALAN GREENBERG: | Thank you very much. This will be a one-purpose call, and that is to start going through the ALS Expectations and try to come to closure as much as we can given the attendance. I'll note we do have all regions represented, and most regions have at least two or three people on it. |

So we are pretty well represented, but we will give the people who are not on the call an opportunity to comment also before finalizing anything.

If we could have the Google doc on the screen please and scroll to Page 4 under ALS Expectations. Before I continue, is there anyone who has any comments on the agenda? I see no hands.

All right, now these are the new proposals that we're making that will constitute things that the ALS agrees to when they join and continues to adhere to as we go forward. Since none of them are in violation of our current rules and they are in support of the bylaws, they will also apply to existing ALSes.

Now what we are providing here are the things that we deem to be mandatory for ALSes. So essentially if they don't do these things, then they are potentially subject to de-accreditation by the ALAC. So that's the level that we're looking at. We're not looking for a laundry list of all the nice things that an ALS could do but things that we are going to require that they do or they be subject to de-accreditation. So that's something to keep in mind as we're going forward.

Any comments on the overall ground rules before we start on a one-by-one discussion?

PASTOR PETERS:      Hello, Pastor Peters just joined, so I may have to listen in as we go along to contribute.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you. All right, so the first item that we're looking at is the "report annually or biennially—biennially means every two years—on its leadership, membership, major activities." And I think we probably mean major activities in relation to ICANN. "And linkages with ICANN." Or maybe we want to keep those separate. "To the extent practical, this reporting will be streamlined and easy."

I believe what we also want to include there are an identification of the current representatives. And it there have been a number of suggestions made. One is for each ALS to list the names and presumably contact information of all of their members who are interested in ICANN. And presumably if there are none, that is sending us a message.

So I am somewhat leery of the last one because of requirements/rules under legislation like GDPR that they can only do this with the permission of their members. It's a messy one, and I'm not quite sure that we want to restrict comments to who the ALS thinks is interested because, indeed, there may be other people interested who don't know enough about ICANN to express interest. And the whole purpose of our exercise here is to try to reach those people and try to get them into the gang.

So I'll open the floor now. We're talking about the first bullet, adding in identifying the representatives and discussing whether we want to ask these ALSes for lists of interested members. Maureen, please go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD:    Thank you, Alan. With regards to this, could we not in our introductory letter to ALSes say that if anyone is interested, that they can contact

staff? So they actually make the approach to staff to have their names added. And , of course, no other details need to be online, but we would actually keep that [inaudible] info that they provide for distributing the information that we want. As perhaps they are the better people to actually send the information to as well as the official people [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay, I think what you're saying is at joining time and presumably every reporting cycle, they identify people. But that's on a voluntary basis. They don't have to do it, but they have the opportunity to do it. Is that what you're saying?

MAUREEN HILYARD:     I would say so, yeah. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay, so that's not a requirement, but it's one of the list of "nice to do" that we can add which is not the subject of this list, but we need such a list. Thank you. Pastor Peters? If you're speaking, we can't hear you.

PASTOR PETERS:     Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG:     Yes, now we can.

PASTOR PETERS: Okay. Yes, I'm a little bit concerned with that requirement that an ALS should provide a list of its members that are interested in ICANN. I [inaudible] before an organization could apply to become an ALS that organization must have demonstrated the interest of that organization in ICANN activities. So an ALS [inaudible] from its members. So asking that the ALS should submit names of members who are interested is like saying the ALS and its members are two separate entities. Because to become a member of an ALS you do subscribe to the dictates or to the rules of membership and to the [inaudible] of that organization. So I don't see how [inaudible] that requirement. That's one.

And two is asking for an ALS to submit the names of its members that are interested, are we not trying to bypass the order, the [inaudible] structure of any organization in the [inaudible] do things? ICANN as an organization [inaudible] structures in place. It's just like myself saying, "Okay, I demand for the names of all the Board members of ICANN." And then I want to find out who among the Board members are interested in ALS, so let them tell us who among them is interested. So I think it's something we have to be very careful about [inaudible] try to make rules and to engage the ALS in a way that it will not look as if we are acting as supervisors over how they run their activities or how they do their [inaudible]. And the last has to do with what you said, GDPR regulation to provide [inaudible]. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you. I might point out first of all, remember, most organizations exist prior to joining ICANN. So their members have not necessarily espoused interest in ICANN when they joined that organization. Now Maureen has suggested that we not make it mandatory but voluntary. I think you are agreeing that we should not make it mandatory to ask for lists of members or lists of members who are interested in ICANN. So I think you're agreeing with Maureen. Go to Cheryl next. May I ask please we only have 50 minutes for this discussion, and there are many items. If people can keep their interventions brief, thank you. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you, Alan. Absolutely against this being any way, shape, or form mandatory. I can see nothing but [inaudible] problems and pushing of ridiculous administration onto our At-Large Structures. If the At-Large Structure is doing its other jobs—mandatory ones—properly, including communicating with its members on opportunities to interact with ICANN, it's a moot point. And they'll have the opportunity then and at regular intervals to [inaudible] to voluntary be listed in various work activities. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you, Cheryl. Ali?

ALI ALMESHAL:     Thanks. Totally agree not to be mandatory. And even in a formal volunteer I don't know why we would need to do that because having this organization [inaudible] as an ALS, so they showed the interest. As

you mentioned in the beginning, if there is no contribution in any form within the At-Large the long time that they were registered, then we see that there is no interest. But if we have a representative from this ALS and we are asking them to get people who are interested or list the people who are interested, it seems that we are giving a message to this representative that there is no trust of him delivering the message to his ALS members that these are the ICANN things that people are engaged in. So I am not into having it as mandatory and even not as a volunteer because we know it clearly if they are interested, if you look into the last ATLAS III, a message goes to all of the ALSes. And we have seen people who wanted to contribute and who continue contributing. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you very much. I'll point out that some of the people that we're looking to find are the people who indeed are not interested but we can make them interested by what we deliver to them. Dev, please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Thank you. I agree with what has been said regarding that it should be non-mandatory. Just as a question though, would these reports be shareable within the At-Large community? Do you envisage that? So it will be on a wiki space or something like that with a standardized [template]?

| | |
|---|---|
| ALAN GREENBERG: | I was going to add that after we discuss the content, but my proposal would be that it should be posted on a wiki or on some document excluding of course the personal information that requires confidentiality—[inaudible], names, email addresses, and such. Yrjö? |
| YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: | Yeah, thank you, Alan. This actually comes pretty close to what I had suggested in my email today. That is to say the list of expertise that exists at the ALS level. In other words, if we ask whether who is interested in ICANN, that doesn't bring us very far. And I suspect that there is an incentive actually to indicate that, yeah, we are very interested. |
| | Instead, I think we should try to find out and identify what kind of expertise relating to ICANN-related issues there is in the chapter. That would actually bring us the same result as what has been tried out in EURALO and NARALO so far establishing a list of experts who could be relied on when we want to have input from the ALSes to policy questions. Thank you. |
| ALAN GREENBERG: | Thank you, Yrjö. I have that listed as a separate item because I'm not sure it's part of the report every two years, but it's an activity that we may want to consider either as mandatory or voluntary. But I've listed that as a separate item, so we'll come back to that later. |
| YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: | Thank you. |

ALAN GREENBERG: I see no more hands up. If I can summarize where we are right now, nobody commented here on whether it should be every one year or every two years. If anyone would like to comment on that before I try to summarize, please either in the chat or verbally. Sarah, you have your hand up.

SARAH KIDEN: Hi. I remember last week I had pointed this out and I had suggested that we keep it at annually instead of like we just not even say every two years. But, I don't know, I think you responded to it. I still feel that we should just keep it annually. I don't know what you think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I'm not sure what you mean by "keep it as annually" because we don't have a requirement at all right now. Just a bit of background, when this was being proposed before, there were comments that an annual report would be too much of a load for the ALSes. And, moreover, it may be a heavy load on our staff to have to do every year because it will take a good number of months to complete from the time we ask for it until the time we collect the last one. So that was the background on it. So you're suggesting every year. We have a number of people saying—by the way, several people are saying biannual. Biannual means twice a year. I suspect that's not what you mean.

SARAH KIDEN: I mean once a year.

ALAN GREENBERG: You mean once a year, I know. But other people in the chat are saying "biannual." That means twice a year. If that's really what you mean, please make it clear.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Can I have the floor?

ALAN GREENBERG: Pastor Peters, please go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: It's Daniel speaking.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand, but Pastor Peters had his hand up. If he would like to speak, go ahead. If you don't want to speak, lower your hand please.

PASTOR PETERS: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please go ahead.

PASTOR PETERS: I wanted to be—my position on this is once in two years.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think we have a general consensus looking at the comments on once every two years. Heidi asked, is this staged or RALO by RALO? I think we're going to have to look at that organizationally. I would suspect we want to do them on a rotation basis. Either some from each RALO every month or every two months or perhaps RALO by RALO. I think that's an operational thing we need to discuss. I don't think there's any need to say they all have to be done January 1 and completed by the end of January. I don't think there's any benefit in trying to lump them all together, nor do I think that's a reasonable thing to ask for our staff to do.

All right, if I can try to summarize, we are looking at a report every two years. We're not trying to write the [inaudible] here, but generally including its leadership, some idea of its membership. We're not asking for the list of members, but we want to have an idea of how many members we're talking about, the names of their representatives, what their major activities in relation to ICANN are. And perhaps we want to ask what their interests in ICANN are and refresh that. And we will post that, excluding data, on a publicly available wiki or something like that. We will not ask them for a list of interested members. That is something we might suggest they could do on a voluntary basis, but it's not part of the mandatory requirements. Is that close to what we all feel comfortable with? Dev, please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:     Thanks, Alan. Just to say that perhaps also a section on their contact details if they are using any particular social media, email [channels], new domain name, whatever, that also [will be the] opportunity to update those contacts as well. So ALS contact information, so to speak.

ALAN GREENBERG:     All right, contact information. But are we asking them what social media they use internally?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:     I would say the social media that they are using to share the information about the ALS within the wider public.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:     Because then it comes back to do we distribute regular updates?

ALAN GREENBERG:     Regular updates we'll be talking about later on in the list.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:     Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I'm not quite sure I understand, but when you see the next version please comment if I don't have it right. Heidi, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you, Alan. I have put into the chat what you just said in terms of what the reporting should include so [Alp] can include that in the action items. I did want to ask, Alan, would this be an online template similar to what we've done for the ATLAS surveys or their reporting? So we would just get this back, we'd put these topics, have a space for them to respond, and then send it out via a link.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think it's our job to talk about that format, but we do have a caution here that to the extent possible it has to be streamlined and easy to do. And that implies both for them to fill out and for us to use. So I would think some sort of a form whether it's a Google doc or some other tool is probably the only practical way to go. But I don't think we really need to look at the details here. But clearly, this has to be streamlined for all parties or it's not going to get done properly.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, just one more comment on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:          Yeah, I know that we are internally preparing a CRM for all the SOs and ACs, and At-Large hopefully will have ours by August, I believe. We can definitely check into that.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Would you like to define what CRM is for people who may not know.

HEIDI ULLRICH:          It's community management basically.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Customer something. I don't remember.

HEIDI ULLRICH:          Well, yeah, we don't have customers, so it's community or client relationship management.

[DAVID MACKEY]:          Customer relationship management.

HEIDI ULLRICH:          Thank you, David. I've drawn a blank on that. Thank you. Community relationship management. I believe in our internal reporting on that I believe that there is an element of reporting, so we could send that out. We're going to have the community members and definitely the ALS reps likely in that, so we could send that out relatively easily. And if we could….

ALAN GREENBERG:         Let's not….

HEIDI ULLRICH:          Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:         Let's not micromanage the operational part of it at this meeting, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH:          Yeah, well, when I'm hearing this, what I'm thinking is what it's going to mean to our team, to staff team.

ALAN GREENBERG:         I understand.

HEIDI ULLRICH:          So otherwise just allow us to determine the best way, that's the other option. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:         There will be discussions, not on this meeting though. Daniel, you had asked to speak and we never got to you. Would you like to speak?

# EN

| | |
|---|---|
| DANIEL NANGHAKA: | Yeah, I wanted to make my contribution regarding to the annual reporting of the ALSes. I think if we're looking at ALSes reporting the activities that [they're holding over a] given period of time, I would recommend a report at least once a year just to send us a kind of outreach and engagement where co-chairs are required to make reports of their respective activities. Sorry to bring in the issue of [inaudible] but if [inaudible] look at ALS reporting of activities, at least annually it would be good. And those activities should be related to what ICANN does. But in case they're going to be reporting about any changes in their respective structures or organization, then I would recommend at least every two years because in two years [inaudible] changes, their leaderships, and other respective things. |
| | And regarding to publishing of information regarding the [names] of the members who are interested in At-Large or ICANN, I don't think that would be so much relevant. Thank you very much. Those are my comments. Back to you, Alan. |
| ALAN GREENBERG: | Thank you. I'm not quite sure how we're going to incorporate an annual report for activities. I suspect that may be better presented in another way other than the report as such. But I'll note that and try to incorporate it. Any final comments on this first bullet? I see no hands. We'll go on to the next bullet. I do note we're halfway through the meeting, so I'm hoping we can do this on a somewhat faster basis. |
| | The second one is "redistribute regular ICANN updates to its members. (These updates will be created by ICANN staff and might be augmented |

by the RALO.) This requirement could be waived on a case…." Let's ignore the case-by-case basis.

What we're talking about now is not sending out all of the emails that we currently do on our current mailing lists. What we're talking about is introductory items on things that ICANN is working on where we may want to get other people active and interested.

They have to be done in such a way that they are not loaded with ICANN buzzwords, they are understandable. That implies they will not have very deep and complex details in them but try to get people who are not familiar with ICANN at all to be interested. Many people may well hit delete when they see them, but hopefully a small number of people will be interested enough to follow up.

These will have to be sent out in multiple languages according to the standard ICANN languages that we support. The whole target is to get to members who may or may not know anything about ICANN ahead of time and hopefully some percentage of them are people who will become active workers.

Clearly, there's going to be work done to when someone says, "I may be interested," how we do we develop them and educate them. But that's not the subject right here. The subject simply is the RALO must agree that we be allowed to send things to their members, probably via a mailing list or posting to some social media message. But that's the requirement that we're looking for.

That's something that's missing right now. In general. Most of our communication with ALSes is purely through the ALS representatives.

And we know in most cases, they don't go any further than that. They don't go to the members. The whole target of this item is to get things down pushed through the ALS into their members.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:       Alan, [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG:       Yeah, just one moment. The exception we're talking about is there are some ALSes that are focused on specific issues, phishing maybe, and they work on anti-phishing things. We're not asking them to necessarily get interested in other areas because they are very targeted. They have a very targeted interest. But they come into the area that Yrjö was talking about of expertise that we can avail ourselves. So there may be ALSes which are exempted from this if they have particular expertise that they can contribute when it's timely. Yes, please go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:       Regarding to the participation of the ALSes as respect to its members is that some ALSes activities are not directly related to what ICANN does. They could probably speak about the general Internet governance, speak about connectivity, and they will not mention anything regarding to ICANN. But in case there are certain activities that are tailored toward the domain name system, that's ICANN [inaudible], probably we need to specify the levels of engagement of which the ALSes have been together with its members with respect to ICANN.

And another thing is that bypasses the communication channel of the ALS. I think that would be a little bit problematic. I think if the information is delegated to the ALS representatives such that they can be able to communicate directly to its members, I think that's how best to [inaudible] the communication instead of jumping the ALS representative and then come directly to the community. Unless otherwise the community members accept to subscribe to key respective lists within ICANN.

I'll give an example. In my ALS ISOC Uganda there are some members who are actively subscribed to the mailing list and they can contribute further like maybe once or twice to the mailing list but then most of the time they are not contributing. But they are aware that these things are happening. But they do not get direct information from the ISOC Uganda chapter, and I think that we have to [inaudible] within ICANN.

So I think that we need to see how best communication can be bridged between the community and the members of the ALSes and ICANN respectively. So in other words, if a clause is added that all ALSes must be able to communicate to its members [inaudible] activities [inaudible] ICANN such that members can be interested, I think that would be more appropriate. Thank you. Back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you. The intent of this is that we be able to communicate with all members. And we're talking about a rate of perhaps one message a month. We're not talking about inundating people with these things. And I don't care whether we send it to the representative and they

certify that they are redistributing or they give us the name of a mailing list to send it to. Either of those is fine with me. But the important thing is that we reach all of their members. That's why we have the ALSes to begin with if you go back to the bylaws. So I think it's really important that we have that aspect, and that's the whole basis for the At-Large review recommendation we made is that we keep ALSes. We not abandon them as was recommended by the external reviewers. We keep them, but we be able to reach their members. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thanks, Alan. I just would like to see one word changed in this, and then I'm comfortable with it as a mandatory, just remembering that this is a [inaudible] mandatory [inaudible]. I don't like "regular" even though it does qualify that the quality of these missives will be controlled by staff and perhaps augmented by the RALOs. I think we should be saying redistribute specified by [inaudible]. And that way [inaudible] for wide distribution.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Sorry, what was that word you said?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Specified. And I don't care. There are a whole bunch of terms we can pick from, but we all know what it means when it says for wide distribution or press release. Whatever the equivalent is that we use as

a term that we say this is something we have designed to go out to rank and file, and I'm happy. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, would you accept "periodic" and an additional qualification that we're expecting not typically not more than 12 per year?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I wouldn't accept that at all because there might be a time when there might be three a month and there might be a time when it's three a year. So if it's clearly annotated as this is needing to go out, that's all it takes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, "periodic" okay instead of "regular" though?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't want "regular," no. I want "specified." A term. I don't care what the term is. "Specified" will do for now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I'm not sure what you mean by specified. Do you mean we're identifying them as needs to go out?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, if it says press release, Alan. Alan, if it says press release, then we mean it goes to everybody. If it says green eggs and ham, then we mean

it goes to everybody. But it is clearly labeled or specified that this communication is for wide distribution under any period and any regularity.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Understood. Thank you. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:     Well, I think we talked a lot about regular updates and [inaudible] skip that point. One question is, how exactly do you prove or verify I should say that the updates would be distributed internally to its members? I mean, I can see you can prove it when you do it publicly, and I posted a link as an example of what I did which I tend to do for the public face-to-face meetings.

If you plan to do regular updates like, all right, let's say once a month because if you try to do weekly, I think it would just be repetitive after a while. This comes back down to the At-Large working groups and so forth doing their monthly RALO updates and RALO doing its updates which I notice has fallen off completely over the past few years. So if you plan to do regular updates and the working groups have to provide some short updates with appropriate links and that could be redistributed. Otherwise, it's going to be a pain for staff to just manually come up with something. So [inaudible] community to its working groups, ALAC monthly meetings, [inaudible] synopsis of what's happened in a month.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we're looking at synopsis of what happens. I think we're looking at things going on in ICANN that we want people to get active in, that we want to attract people who are not familiar with ICANN to start getting active. So it may be a discussion on privacy and introduction to what's going on in ICANN enough to lure people in and get interested, or gTLDs or something like that. But as Cheryl has pointed out, it's not necessarily going to be regular for the principle of being regular.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I get that. But an update is basically to allow, "Hey, this is what's happening. Here's how you can participate," and so forth. It's not just updates for updates sake.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, I don't think we're looking at the subject matter of this. The principle is here we're asking for a commitment to redistribute a reasonable number of things that we send out clearly labeled for redistribution if we're sending it to a human being for redistribution or that we be allowed to simply access their mailing list. I don't hear a lot of disagreement that this is where we are targeting, and I don't believe I heard any disagreement on the waiver for certain classes of ALSes. So with the exception of the word "regular" and conveying the message that these are new things of interest, this is a message to us and to the people, I think I hear general agreement on this. Dev?

# EN

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Just the second part of the question, how do you verify that these were actually distributed?

ALAN GREENBERG:    Ah. Well, I think it's a two-part answer. The first is we are asking from certification from the official rep that it is happening. So in the case of us being given a mailing list address, there's no question. In the case of us sending it to someone, how do we know it really goes out? Well, at some level we don't.

But I think the way we're going to do this is periodically we will not just send an outgoing message but ask a question on some interesting thing. And we know the return on these kind of things might be only 20% but if an ALS has 200 members and nobody responds, then we have a pretty good idea that nobody is getting these messages. So there's no guaranteed way, but I think we can have a pretty good idea empirically whether these messages are going out or not. So I don't think we can do any better than that.

And we are asking for certification, and at some level if people are cheating and we don't catch it, then we have another ALS on the books that isn't doing something. But I don't think we need to be 100% sure on this. We just need to have a good level of confidence that most of them are going out and we are attracting people. If we never get anyone biting on any of these, then clearly the idea didn't work and we should just give up. But I don't think we need 100% certainty. Eduardo, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, look, by sending stuff to people and you don't receive anything, I don't think that would be a measure. I can tell you of events that we do here for ICANN [inaudible] and we hit our database two or three times and we get zero participation. Now imagine sending stuff from ICANN that people do not understand and then you send a question and you don't get any answers. I know we're trying here to put something that we're getting to the membership, but just sending something about ICANN….

Like, for example, the things that I really send to the membership is, look, ICANN has Fellowship opportunities to learn about ICANN. Apply to them. So they can go, have the chance to participate and get acquainted with ICANN Learn courses, learn about this, things like this. And I put a [wave] to any of the ALSes. If they are doing phishing, fine. But their membership should know all the things out there. [inaudible]. That's my opinion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think certification as you mentioned is, again, you're talking mandatory things here and the ALSes' responsibility, not the individuals' of the ALSes responsibility to respond [inaudible] ALSes. If the certification is getting [inaudible], well, we can do some other things to try and [inaudible]. I think certification is the only way you're going to work with. And then just like an issue of many, many things even in the domain name system, if a member of an ALS maintains they've never

heard of something important and that they are upset about that, they've got that as a, "Well, you didn't tell us and you certified you would tell us." We might need to deal with a complaint from time-to-time, but certification is the only way we're going to go through [inaudible] point of view.


ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you, Cheryl. Peters? Pastor Peters, you seem to be muted.


PASTOR PETERS:           Hello?


ALAN GREENBERG:          Yes.


PASTOR PETERS:           You can hear me now?


ALAN GREENBERG:          Yes, we can.


PASTOR PETERS:           Okay, it seems I'm lost [inaudible] out here. Are we still debating on still using the method of sending information directly to every member of an ALS? And if from what you said nobody responds from the ALS [inaudible] a message and then there was a [inaudible] remark as to if some ALSes are cheating, they will know who that is. I just don't quite

# EN

get that. I don't know what we're talking about. If we are [inaudible] for an ALS to submit the names of its members and contacts, it's voluntary. So why are we [inaudible] to measure whether an ALS is active or not because no member of the ALS responds to an email from ICANN?

Now I want to draw an inference again. [inaudible] may be that it's just the same people acting within an ALS [inaudible] no outreach. We should remember that everybody within an organization has his own role to play. Every one of us cannot play the same role. Now that's number one.

Number two, if we are looking at [inaudible] some people are more active within an ALS, it [inaudible] the ALS community. We have seen people over the years [inaudible] of ICANN within the At-Large community and all that. So [inaudible] measure the membership of the organizations, those individuals belong or they come from. Because I want to believe the majority of the ALAC leadership belong to some form of [an organization] from the RALO or whatever. I don't think every one of them are just individual members.

I mean, I want to be clear here because I think I am getting lost. I don't understand. So if I [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:         If I may answer you, we are not thinking here about metrics or activity of the ALS at all. We are simply talking about a requirement to redistribute or to allow us to distribute specific pieces of information to their members. We are not measuring how active they are, how active

the ALS or their members are, and we're not asking for the names of their members.

PASTOR PETERS:    Yeah, but there was a subtle remark that was made that if there was no response, we would know the [inaudible]. And if the [inaudible] there are some [inaudible]. I'm not trying to be confrontational here. What I am also saying is [inaudible] members do not respond does not mean they are not reading it. And if we are saying they must respond as a rule, that [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:    No, nobody has said that.

PASTOR PETERS:    Okay then.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Any other comments? I think we have general agreement on this one. It does need some rewording. Next item, and I note we're down to 10 minutes or 5 minutes before the end of the discussion period, so we'll try to do one more.

This is something that has, again, been essentially on our books but we have never been particularly proactive in making sure it actually is done. And we are going to try to make it clear to people that this is a responsibility.

That is specifically they should "reference ICANN and At-Large prominently on their website (or Facebook page or whatever its Internet presence), either on its homepage or on a secondary page which is obviously linked to the homepage." In other words, it shouldn't be buried somewhere where it can't be found. Just to note that they are affiliated with ICANN. Because right now in many cases for an ALS they may have a website or a Facebook presence and they mention ICANN and At-Large not at all, which means their members typically have no way of even finding out that they are affiliated with ICANN and At-Large. And we're saying that they should have a presence. Are there examples where they may ask for an exemption because it doesn't apply to them? Perhaps, but this should be a general rule.

Comments? I see agreement from David. I see no comments, nothing negative. Then just do it. Thank you.

Next item, "when specific issues are brought to the attention of ALSes, if applicable, each ALS should evaluate whether they can contribute or not, and if they can, their ALS members should be involved. They should respond if surveys or other issue [are brought to their attention]."

So that says that periodically the ALAC or the RALO may bring issues to the attention of the representatives of the ALSes. The ALSes are responsible for responding. So that doesn't say they will necessarily find five people who are interested or be able to contribute. They just have to respond, and nonresponse to these messages, and we're not talking about a [inaudible] them, is problematic.

Comments, questions? Maureen, your oops is accepted. If anyone wants to know what I'm talking about, you can read the chat. No comments on this one? We may make our way through the whole list before we finish today.

The next one on reading it really is a subset of the previous one, "respond to specific requests from the RALO or ALAC as needed." I think that really is a repetition of the previous one, so I hope there are no specific comments on this one.

Next one, "vote if there are things to vote on." Now this has been one of the criteria that some RALOs use as a sign whether you're alive or not. That is, there may be multiple votes and you've never voted, which is problematic. The question is, do we keep this rule, or is voting unimportant? We note some RALOs very rarely have any votes at all, so clearly we can't say everyone must vote, but vote if there are votes. Sarah says keep it. I see no hands raised, so I think there's general agreement.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    No, no, no, no. Not [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:    No, no, no, no. Okay, we have Dev with his hand up and then Cheryl with a voice. Dev?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Cheryl has also got to go to another meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Okay, then. Cheryl and then Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:  Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Thank you, Dev. I appreciate that. I'm actually running the other meeting, so I do have to join it. Yeah, I have a problem with this being a mandatory one. If there are votes, I think we report and record and even advertise if needs be. But that as a mandatory is a problem because you've got some regions which vote over what they'll have for coffee, and you've got some regions who never vote at all. And we cannot make a mandatory ALS activity linked to that sort of thing. Yeah, obviously, if it can be looked at if one was reviewing an At-Large Structure, but not I think as a mandatory requirement.

ALAN GREENBERG:          So you would want to move this into the RALO? Remember, RALOs can also add rules to these.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      And that's [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:          You would want to move this into a RALO one because you don't feel comfortable. Even though it says "vote if there are things to vote on," you don't feel comfortable making this a mandatory?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      I don't because of the variability of even what is a vote in the world of voting.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Noted. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:  Thanks. I feel [inaudible] say vote on things if there are things to vote on excluding elections I might think of because just people literally joined the ALS at the behest of another ALS to say so I can get support for elections and so forth and things like that.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Sorry, Dev, I don't mean to interrupt. I don't know if you're saying that you're saying that they don't have to vote on elections or for elections they do have to vote.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:  I'm saying the vote on things other than elections. So vote if there are things to vote on, excluding elections.

**EN**

ALAN GREENBERG:    Okay. I'm still lost. Maybe someone else understood. Should we make a mandatory requirement that they vote on elections and should we make it a mandatory requirement that they vote on other things other than elections? I'm not sure what you're saying about those.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Okay, a lot of times most ALSes from experience only become active when they are voting for candidates and they don't participate in anything whatsoever afterwards. So my thing is that voting in elections is the thing that isn't something that should be considered mandatory as such. If there is a critical issue that the RALO is asking for a vote on or the ALAC is asking for a vote on, some policy issue or something like that, then sure. That could be made mandatory. And I'm presuming it's not every week or something like that.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Okay, so you would not want to voting on elections mandatory. I think that's what you're saying, correct?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Fine. Thank you. Noted. Pastor Peters, last comment. We're just about to adjourn.

PASTOR PETERS:          Can you hear me? Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG:         We can hear you.

PASTOR PETERS:          Okay, I just want to ask a question. Which elections are we talking about now that we do not want to make mandatory?

ALAN GREENBERG:         We're talking about any votes that the RALO may hold.

PASTOR PETERS:          Okay. And what is the question here?

ALAN GREENBERG:         The question is, is it mandatory that an ALS must vote?

PASTOR PETERS:          Well, I don't think anywhere in the world voting is mandatory. Everybody has a right, the freedom. You are to decide to vote or not to vote.

ALAN GREENBERG:         Okay, I'll point out there are places in the world where voting is mandatory. Australia is one of them.

PASTOR PETERS: Australia? Okay, well, in my world where I come from, we have every right. We're talking about the universal, the United Nations declaration on freedom is I think everybody has a right to vote or not to vote, to say that we [cannot belong or believe].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, we are not talking about human rights here. We're talking about a rule that we make and we are allowed to make it either way. You are expressing a belief that we should not make voting mandatory. Noted.

PASTOR PETERS: It cannot be mandatory, yes. [People] should be allowed to express their freedom [inaudible]. I agree with a process and procedure, so [inaudible] mandatory [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: You have made your point. Thank you. Any further comments? We have one last item in the list, but we have a few others that people have added on so we'll cover them next week.

I thank you for your participation. We'll try to get out a revised version of the first six bullets in this one as quickly as possible. I won't promise it for tomorrow because that just won't happen, but we'll try to get it as soon as possible.

Thank you very much for your participation and attendance. See you on the list, and see you next week at the next meeting. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**