YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALS Mobilization Working Party Call taking place on Monday, 10th of February 2020, at 1800 UTC. On our call today we have Alan Greenberg, Barrack Otieno, Pastor Peters Omoragbon, David Mackey, Amrita Choudhury, Ali AlMeshal, Nadira AlAraj, Raymond Mamattah, Yrjö Länsipuro, Roberto Gaetano, Bastiaan Goslings, Eduardo Diaz, Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

We have received apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Daniel Nanghaka, Justine Chew, Judith Hellerstein, Shreedeep Rayamajhi, and Maureen Hilyard. From Staff side we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Alperen Eken, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar. And I will also be doing call management for today's call. Before we start, a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes. And now I would like to give the floor back to you, Alan. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Yesim. Are there any comments on the agenda? The agenda is very similar to the last ones, we're going to continue on our way on trying to finalize as many of these expectation items as possible. Hearing no comments, seeing no hands, the agenda is accepted as displayed and we'll go on to the first item.

We've already finalized in the Expectations on Page 4 we've already finalized Item 1 and 2 and the next one is Item 3 for final review. There was some significant changes made here, so I'd like one last pass,

hopefully this won't take long. This was the item on Reference ICANN and At-Large prominently on the ALS Wiki site and the current wording is Reference ICANN and At-Large on its website, removed 'prominently' (or Facebook or whatever its Internet presence), either on its home page, or on a secondary page (or comparable) which is obviously linked to the home page (such as a pointer for group memberships or affiliations).

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. So, I think with "the intent," the detail words are not nearly as important and on retrospect now, I'm going to suggest that the wording "which is obviously linked to the home page" be omitted. Does anyone have any comments on that? So, in other words, stop that sentence at "or comparable." Not quite sure why the changes, oh, I'm sorry, I'm highlighting something in a Word document, no wonder it doesn't show up on the screen.

Hold on. So, I am suggesting that we delete that part and leave it with the intent to indicate exactly how it's connected. Eduardo, we're talking about Item #3 under Expectations. It's highlighted in the zoom room and on the Google doc. Alright, I hear no comments negative, nothing in support either, but I'm suggesting we eliminate the phrase that is in purple on the screen. And I see some support, I agree with the wording, so we will eliminate that phrase. Alright, so we'll consider that one final with that change. I see we have a hand up from Nadira. Please go ahead.

NADIRA ALARAJ:

Just want to make sure that I understood. Is the ICANN logo connected to the At-Large page? Or just displayed on the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We're not mentioning whether it's a logo, words, or whatever, we simply want that the web or other presence for the ALS should acknowledge that they're working with ICANN through At-Large, that they're an ALS. We're not being particularly prescriptive as to exactly how they do that.

NADIRA ALARAJ:

Yeah, because it's more like when I'm thinking about the member, it's easier if they click and then they are directed to ICANN At-Large site, then it's more helpful for the members. But if it's just for the acknowledgement they belong to ICANN, it serves the purpose, and I agree with that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, and we have to be a little bit careful. If we're going to mandate they use the ICANN logo we're going to have go through ICANN Legal to get approval to do that and I don't think we need to be that formal. We simply want to make sure that it members or others looking at the website have a reasonable way of finding out that they are working with ICANN. That's it, and that by the way has been a requirement ever since day one, we just haven't enforced it.

Alright, #4 is already final, that was basically when an ALS representative receives an email, they should respond to it. #5 was

deleted, #6 is deleted, and we now have #7 for final review, and it's a very short one. It says, "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." Any comments on this one?

You remember last time Cheryl requested that with add a web link as an alternative to an email address. Technically a web link may not be a way to contact the ALS, but I think it meets the overall intent of the expectation, that is so that people can figure out where to go if they want to talk to the ALS or want to join.

Heidi says, Alan, if and when an ALS is decertified, should there be effort to ensure that the At-Large logo, etc is removed from their website? I would think we should, but I don't know if we want to write that a rule, but that's a reasonable expectation for Staff to follow up on if an ALS is decertified. So I don't think we need to document in the public documentation, but it certainly should be on the checklist of things to do when an ALS is decertified.

Eduardo is asking who is going to police that, and Roberto, how do we enforce that? All we can do is look for it and send an email. If someone refuses to do it, do we have legal recourse? Probably, but I'm not sure how much effort we would put into doing that. I don't think we're going to get ICANN Legal involved sending a lawyer's letter saying please remove or cease and desist and remove. I'm not sure we care all that much. On the other hand, if someone is being decertified, it's probably because they have no interest in us. Any further comments on this? Then we will consider this one final.

And we move on to #8, Move To Optional Actions, that is the lists of "areas of expertise" among ALS members. I did add the note that was mentioned last time, should we go ahead and publish this, not as an expectation but as a suggestion that we probably want to standardize the format which will allow us to use the results, combine them and use it in a single database, which makes some sense.   But it's not an expectation, as such.

And we are now under #9 which is for review. This one is a little bit problematic because, well, let's read it and then I'll go through what I found since the last meeting. It says, "There will be a Wiki page for each ALS with basic information about the ALS, created by Staff, but updatable by the ALS if they wish. [Currently, most but not all ALSes have a Wiki page, but in MANY cases, its only content is the ALS name.]"

So, Staff are creating a Wiki page in most cases for ALSes, there are some that are missing. But in many cases they can name nothing but the ALS name, so they are effectively contentless. So, if we are to abide by this recommendation we, being Staff or the RALO, I guess, are going to have to go through all of these pages and add content to them which was not added at the beginning.

According to Cheryl, last week the intent had been that this Wiki page should include basic information from the ALS application. It turns out that is not what is happening. So, I'd like comments and I'd particularly like a comment from Staff, because if we go ahead with this, there is a significant effort that's involved in this. Ali, please go ahead.

ALI ALMESHAL:	Thanks, Alan. Ali Almeshal. Yeah, I guess the comments from Cheryl last time and what you have just said right now, our expectation is that whenever a new ALS is certified, this Wiki page will be updated with the information that was published to that agreement or to that form of the ALS. So, that's our understanding, unless there is something else right now.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Well, if you go and look at the Wiki pages, you will see a great number of them have no information other than the ALS name. I'm stating fact, not theory.
ALI ALMESHAL:	Yeah, that goes back then to your inquiry about Staff updating those Wiki pages once this ALS gets certified.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Well, even before it's certified, well, the Wiki page doesn't exist until it's certified, because the Wiki page is pointed to by our list of certified ALSes. Heidi asking, what is the purpose of these Wiki pages? The purpose as described last week is so that there is a unified common way of getting access to information about each ALS. Dev, please go ahead.
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	This is Dev. I would think that the annual survey, or sorry, the survey done once every two years, sorry, biannual survey, the part that survey says this will be published through the At-Large website or Wiki. And

the information is there. So to me this is a Staff function, as long as we think [inaudible] to ask ALSes [inaudible] simply because the ALS At-Large website would have the list of members of organizations and so forth, in which case logo webpage is sufficient.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, you're suggesting we reverse last week's recommendations?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, I think so, simply because the information about the ALSes which is on the At-Large website, At-Large dot ICANN dot org, slash whatever, it's already there. You have the name, the country it's incorporated in, and the website of the organization or public contact if they don't have a website.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, remember, there are ALSes with websites that have a web URL, it's just a single page that has virtually no content. So, the presence of a web URL does not imply this information there, just like the presence of our Wiki pages right now does not imply there is any content.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev, I would say that most ALSes or most organizations that you want to trust need to have a public presence somehow on the web.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're already saying that you need a presence. Now, we're saying you need a presence with a web, or Facebook, or something, or we will provide a Wiki. The question now that we're asking here is, is the Wiki mandatory even if you have another presence? Last week, the decision of this group was yes, it is mandatory and it must include basic information about the ALS.

A review of the actual contents now says in most cases there is a Wiki that Staff has created, but in many cases it is virtually empty. The question is, do we want to back and fill in all that information, or do we want to remove the requirement if indeed there is a web presence or some other presence that would replicate the Wiki.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. I would say to remove the requirement for the Wiki page with limited [inaudible] if for some reason the organization doesn't have a website or their website is down or something, then you create the Wiki page.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're suggesting that the Wiki page is there if they desire it or if they have no web presence?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yeah, that's a very limited, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay, the question is, is everyone else agreeing with you? Heidi, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	I agree with Dev and as I noted in the chat, I think there was a historical element that relates to the ALS membership. Ever since I started there was this requirement or this offer that hey, if you join as an ALS, one of the benefits that you will get is a Wiki page. And I think that since, in the times that we are now, pretty much everyone has their own website or at least a Facebook page.
	So it would seem to me that given that Staff work that would be required to mandatorily create a Wiki page, it would be more efficient if it was yes, we will create one if you reach out to us that you don't have a website or a Facebook page or any other public presence.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Or simply don't provide one. I mean, if they don't provide a URL then we are saying we will provide one with basic information for them.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Well, part of the due diligence is that we do ask, do you have a website? Do you have a web presence?

ALAN GREENBERG:	That's right. I understand.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, if they don't, and it would be, personally, it would seem a bit odd that a person or organization that is signing up as an ALS that doesn't have any web presence. But anyway, so perhaps we can make it like if it's proactive, that the organization request that a Wiki page is set up, then we'll obviously go ahead and create one. It should not be mandatory.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, I think what you just said at the end is the problematic part. If they do not have a web presence or have not provided us with a link to a web presence, then I'm saying they don't have to reach out to us and say please sir, may I have a Wiki, I think our obligation is to provide a Wiki in lieu of the web presence. So, that will be a Staff responsibility if they do not provide the web presence. Otherwise, if they don't have a web presence and don't reach out, they have nothing, and that's not acceptable.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, they should have a web presence or at least a Facebook page, which again, that's pretty much what most of them have if they don't have a web page. So yes, we can create one, but I think there should be effort made to, please, could you create a Facebook page first, and then we can create a Wiki page.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so, to be clear, we are reversing last week's decision and I'll note that Cheryl was the one who was adamant for it and is not on this call,

that we do not need a Wiki presence unless there is no other alternative. And I think that's the unanimous recommendation of everyone on this call at this point. If I'm misstating for someone, please speak up.

So, the expectation is they will provide us with a web or Facebook or other link, and should they not, we will provide a minimalist Wiki page in lieu of it. Alright, then the decision is made and we will proceed. It will of course come back for final reading next time, because it is a significant change from the last version.

The grace period, #10. For review, When announcement of the new expectations is made, we will give each ALS 12 months to put any new procedures in place. However, we will not be actively and thoroughly verifying until the next biennial report, which may of course come quicker than two years, because we will start those reports within presumably something like 6 months. And I would suggest that we not further discuss this until we finalize the list of expectations.

The reason is last time the question was, there was a question of but can an ALS realistically do all of these things in maybe six months and at that point there wasn't an awful long list of things they actually would have to do. All they would have to do is make sure ICANN is referenced on the Wiki page and start passing through messages if we send them.

So, at this point I think we will put this on hold until we finalize the list of what we expect them to do, and at that point we can go back and judge to what extent it is onerous thing to say it has to be done within some certain amount of time. And I see one comment making sense,

EN

and I see no negative comment. So, we will put this on hold and come back to it once we finalize the rest of the items.

Similarly, the next line, it says, does it make sense that if they do all of these things, then they're okay, and again, until we have the list, make sure we finalize the list of what we want them to do, it doesn't make sense to try to answer this question. So, we'll put that question on hold or move it down to the end and continue on in our list of issues to look at.

We're now on the list of Other Issues, and the first one is Tracking Participation. We have spent an awful lot of time over the years on discussing how we could track participation of an ALS, and it largely came down to, for most of that period, the only people in the ALS that we were familiar with were the representatives we would look for, for instance, how often are these representatives on our monthly RALO meetings, webinars, working groups, and in some RALOs they would say if you don't attend a certain number of meetings per month, you being the representative, then you're deemed not to be active.

If you look at the list of expectations that we have so far, what we're saying is an ALS has value to us not necessarily because of the meetings they attend, but because they have a list of members that will receive information at us and some of those might be interested.

So, the question is to what extent do we need to track activity of ALS representatives or ALS members, and that would mean of course we have to know which ALS everyone is a member of, and does it matter? If they are indeed following our expectations and sending out

information to their members, responding to questionnaires, period surveys, and doing the biannual report. Do we need more in terms of actually tracking?

Now I'll put my stake in the ground and say I don't think so. Ultimately we may want to track participation of individuals, whether they're unaffiliated members or members of an ALS, because of things like travel opportunities and other things where we may want to know is this person really contributing.

But that's on a personal level, not on an ALS level. We may end up getting some ALS numbers out of it if our tracking system is sophisticated enough, but I don't really think we need to be tracking on an ALS participation level if we're tracking individuals. I see some hands, Eduardo first.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Alan, this is Eduardo for the record. I think I agree with you especially because tracking monthly meeting and attendance is just a pain in the neck. I was thinking how, and this is something I'm proposing, that as part of these expectations or making sure ALSes are attending, I think it is very healthy if we send once a year email to all the ALSes confirming if they want to stay as an ALS in ICANN and depending on who they respond, then if they confirm, then they stay. If they don't confirm or they don't even answer to the email after two or three times, we just decertify them. That's what I would do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Doesn't the request for biannual report do that? Obviously at that point they have opportunity to not respond a number of times, in which case we may take action, or to simply say hey, I forgot all about ICANN, we're not really interested anymore. I don't think we need a new process in addition to the biannual report opportunity.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, that will be only every two years to clean up the list.

ALAN GREENBERG: But we decided every year is going to be onerous, if not for them, then for Staff.

EDUARDO DIAZ: What about individual members? I know we're talking about ALSes.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're not talking about individual members here, clearly there needs to be comparable type things with individual members. Not our problem.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I will repeat my proposal then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, we have a queue. David please, go ahead.

DAVID MACKEY: Hi David Mackey for the record. So, the question I have it's a question and a bit of an observation. I certainly think that it would be too onerous to try to track all the individual membership participation. However, at an exit level, I do know that like I'm looking at the At-Large ALSes page right now, and for each RALO we have the number of ALSes per route.

I'm wondering if it would also make sense during this biannual checkup to request information about how many members are currently in each ALS so that we track the number of ALSes and potentially track at an exit level how members would participate in each ALS. That might give us a bit an idea of what we can expect from each ALS with individual participation in the At-Large. Just a thought, I don't know, Alan, if you could respond to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: We will be asking in the biannual report how many members do you have. So I think we're already getting that kind of information, unless I misunderstood you.

DAVID MACKEY: No, okay, that's good. And is that going to be recorded in the page, the At-Large structure, the ICANN ALSes page? Is that going to be published?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would be careful about that because it's one of these things that I'm not sure we could publish it without making sure they know we're going

to publish it and expectations, and there could conceivably be ALSes that don't want that number published. So I'm not sure it would be published. We'd have to think about that carefully. But certainly we would track it and keep that information.

DAVID MACKEY: Because I do think that information, whether or not it's published, I do think that information is relevant to the operations of At-Large and our expectations of an ALS who is in At-Large, what sort of, how successful are we at getting members from that ALS involved in ICANN. I think that's an operations metric that is important.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I think there are two answers to that. Not publishing doesn't say that At-Large and the RALO doesn't have access to it. So I think the information will be available, publishing it is a different level of access, so I would be reluctant at this point to say we will publish it, but conceivably we could at some point. But that's a different decision.

DAVID MACKEY: Fair enough I wanted to bring the idea of tracking the aggregate number of members per ALS is something, if we're already requesting it, that's good, and then that information needs to be available in some fashion to gauge how successful we are at pulling in participation, for instance, an ALS has a small number of members, we're going to expect something different from an ALS that has a large number of members. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: And something else to keep in mind, remember, is our overall expectations. Currently we have about 250 ALSes. If we said for every 100 members of ALSes we expect 1 person to participate, we expect him to bite at the lures we put out, we're probably talking about over several thousand people who suddenly show up. We're not geared up to handle several thousand people.

DAVID MACKEY: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're probably not geared up to handle more than a dozen, so the lack of someone coming from an ALS this year, I don't think is an indication that we want to discard them. And I know if Cheryl was on the call she would be adamant that we not do that.

DAVID MACKEY: No, no, and I don't want to force any rules that force to do something but it doesn't make sense, but having that information available in our operational decision making mechanism, that's a critical piece of information. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that will be available. Yrjö, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah this is Yrjö. I think the question is not whether we should track the participation of ALSes their representatives or members at the monthly meetings of the RALOs or not, and here I side with Alan, we should not give out resources and time and work to that in creating statistics.

However, a different question is, I think that we would like to maximize the participation of the ALSes and their representative at our monthly meetings, but then we have to think of some other mechanisms, some other incentives for that, rathe than mandatory tracking.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, and of course RALO is going to impose new rules. Now whether ALAC would decertify someone because those rules aren't being satisfied is a different question. But the RALOs can certainly set expectations.

However, I'll be devil's advocate and say that I think the way to address what you posed is make those meetings really interesting and valuable to attend. If the meetings have value for people to attend, they may actually attend and participate. If they're perceived as having no value, then I think it's a futile effort to try to get more people to attend. That's a personal opinion. Ali, please go ahead.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thanks Alan, Ali Almeshal for the record. I'm just wondering, maybe I have missed the point before in the previous meeting. We are speaking about the ALSes within each RALO, so what about the individuals when

it comes to new tracking or new secretary that we are putting in place to monitor and have more active participation within the same ALS.

What about the individuals? We know that we have increased number of them in each and different RALOs. So how would we track that? For example, we say each ALS should link their website or Wiki page to ICANN or to Facebook and so on and so forth. How would the individual member be, then?

ALAN GREENBERG: When you're talking about individual, you're talking about unaffiliated with ALSes. That is a subject that need focus within ICANN, within At-Large, but it's not our subject. However, it is the same, the same answer to that one is how do you track participation of people who are members of ALSes who are active.

We've pretty well decided that when and if there are opportunities to attend general assemblies or ATLASes, presuming that we have another ATLAS, and I'm hoping we will in another five years or so, we have pretty well determined that simply being registered as an ALS does not give you a plane ticket. We're looking for people who are active or potentially active, and that means we're going to have to track them. It means we need some information about them, and we do take attendance at meetings, those records are there.

We are looking at a client management system which at this point we are expecting to be able to track or have records for individuals, that record will probably include information about which ALS are you a

member of, or are you an unaffiliated member of a RALO. So we will have the ability to track them.

How much effort we want to put into keeping that information accurate and up to date, remembering that we are not only looking at At-Large meetings but CCWGs and GNSO working groups, and things like that. So we're going to have to think carefully and make sure that we have the resources to do that kind of tracking and do it relatively well, and that's going to be a question for our metrics group to take up.

And that's common for both unaffiliated members and workers who happen to be part of an ALS. But that's our discussion here today. Remember, in the At-Large review we made a statement, a very strong statement, saying ALSes have value. That's why we're maintaining ALSes instead of effectively abolishing them.

Our exercise that we're going through is to try to determine how to make use of that value. So an important question to answer, but not the one we're answering today. I see no more hands. I think there is a pretty uniform decision that we do want to track participation of individuals, try to put that back into a measure of who active is an ALS is not going to necessarily support, be productive in terms of why we believe ALSes are there.

And in fact, not having any participation from an ALS but an ALS that is following all our expectations, including distributing information is not necessarily one we want to get rid of. So, I will try to put that in a statement and make that clear. I see no more hands, we have about 15 minutes left.

Next item, is 100% certainty necessary? We've talked about that a number of times when we talked about how are we sure that the ALSes are sending out information on our behalf, or how are we sure they're doing other things.

And I think our general answer has been up to now, no, we're not looking for 100% certainty, but we want to have a level of comfort that these things are happening, but we're not trying to put Staff effort, because it does amount to Staff effort, into making sure that all these things are at the 100% level. Open the floor to comments. Dev has a comment and it's not relevant to this, but I'll read it out while people are thinking.

Whatever the metrics, it should be uniform to all in At-Large and not have RALO differences. I think we have said that it is possible for RALOs to add particular things. I think they're going to have to think carefully about what the merits are of doing it. Is there a strong merit to doing it. I don't know to what extent the ALAC, if we're looking at the certification, would then have to consider those other issues.

I think that, remember, the RALOs make recommendations to the ALAC to decertify. The ALAC doesn't have to decertify based on that. So I think that's going to be something that we're looking at quite carefully, but certainly the rules we're putting place now are At-Large wide, they are not RALO specific. I'm not sure I want to confront some of our RALOs, and some of them are more adamant than others, to put it mildly, about RALOs have independence and can make rules themselves.

And I think that is to some extent true, as long as they're not counter to the rules that we've made for At-Large in general. Okay, I don't hear any comments on the 100% certainty and I think we've discussed it a number of times before. I think most of us feel comfortable that we want a level of comfort but we're not looking for guarantees on everything. We have agreement that RALOs need to be in sync.

As I said, there may not be anyone on this call who is taking the opposite position, but I think many of us know who they are and I'm not sure we want to fight that battle at this point. At least I have no interest in fighting it, because I don't think we can afford delays on going through with this and I think if we try to say that RALOs have no ability to add rules of their own, I think we're going to have that.

Alright, last item in this list, is ALS "on the ground" activity relevant (or sufficient) if activity is unconnected to ICANN? Now, we've have many discussions in the past that ALSes are doing marvelous things, and in fact, if you go back to the days when we would have regular updates, either within a RALO or within At-Large, we did this a lot at general assemblies, and ALSes would tell us about all the great things the ALS is doing, and it may an ALS that's teaching people how to use computers or an ALS that is doing marvelous things in open source, or an ALS that is running IGFs in their country.

And the question is to what extent is stuff that the ALS is doing, remember most ALSes were organizations that had a purpose and a reason for existing before they joined as an ALS, so are things that an ALS is doing on the ground in their own countries that are not connected to ICANN, are they relevant to their participation as an ALS?

And that's the question, I see we have a whole bunch of hands up. Yrjö, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. I think I have been for a long time a proponent and advocate for appreciating the work ALSes are doing on the ground. Whether that's unconnected or connected to ICANN, it's hard to say, because if that is general in the area of the interest, then it's hard to avoid the connection somehow to ICANN.

But even if they are doing things that have no apparent connection to ICANN, I would say that being active, being a part of the multistakeholder internet community in their own countries, it gives them credibility and that is something that is needed when once in a blue moon they start talking about ICANN.

The other thing is that the local, in many countries we now have internet governance and I think that's something that the ALSes should be a part of. I would even go so far as to say that one of the expectations for ALSes is that they are active in the multistakeholder internet community of their own countries.

ALAN GREENBERG: Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo for the record. If we go back to the previous section on expectations we mention that we don't care if ALSes participate or not

in meeting and stuff like that, as long as they are there, because they have value for some reason. It really doesn't matter what they do, how are you going to know and if they don't come and tell you. If an ALS comes and tell you what are they doing, community are not going to get to ICANN.

I agree with you all that ALSes should be part of the multistakeholder internet ecosystem but really we need ALSes here that are connected to ICANN, to the work that ICANN does, because if it doesn't, then what are they providing, members that might be interested in ICANN? I'm not sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, providing there are members that might be interested in ICANN is indeed why we're saying ALSes have their primary value. The question we're asking here is does on the ground activity enhance that? Now Yrjö had a relatively interesting point which I hadn't heard before of it gives them credibility in their countries. Because they are doing good things, that provides credibility should they become active or should some of their members become active in ICANN activities.

I think that's a relatively interesting point that hasn't been raised before. The other point that Yrjö raised is we should require that they're active in internet governance type activities and I think that would be going too far.

A suggestion that they maybe should consider it, sure, but I can't see requiring an ALS, because remember an ALS has presumably had a life other than its ALS persona and requiring that the put resources and

time into something which may or may not have any particular interest to them I think is something that is going father than our mandate allows.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Then we need this. That's it, we don't care.

ALAN GREENBERG: I said that was Yrjö's suggestion, I didn't say it's something we have written here. Further discussion? Before I go to David, one of the reasons this is here is we have concrete examples in the past of ALSes being mentioned and saying they never do anything. They never show up at meetings, they never contribute any people.

Now we haven't had the expectation until now that they have to send out information but of all the things that we have valued until now, they have not done any of that except for perhaps voting in elections. And when that issue has been raised, their defenders say but they do a lot of good things on the ground. And the question is how relevant is that in terms of expectations. I have David and Dev.

DAVID MACKEY: David Mackey for the record. All I wanted to do was point out Nadira's comment in the chat, and it did have some resonance with a number of people, so if you could take a look at that, Alan, and I think it lines up with what you were just talking about.

ALAN GREENBERG: That says going back to the previous section, and if they are able to respond to At-large survey to reflect the end user then we have no concern if their work are not relevant to ICANN. The question never was do we have concerns if their work is not relevant to ICANN, the question was does that count in their favor. So we're certainly not going to stop an ALS that exists to teach people how to use computers. That may be unrelated to ICANN but if that's why they exist, we're not in a position to stop them from doing that in the extreme. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. I think that on the ground shows that the ALS is legitimate and it's not defunct, and therefore there is potential, even if not now, that we can get possibly members in the ALS involved in At-Large activities. So that means that when the survey goes out and they say that they are going to commit, and they meet those expectations, [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you, we're just about out of time so I'll try to summarize. In the previous world prior to our doing this work, if an ALS never did anything with ICANN, none of its members ever did anything, then I think we had strong reason to question why are they an ALS. It sort of adds a feather in their cap that they're an ALS but they're not really contributing at all.

Now that we're adding a primary requirement that they distribute information to their members, I think that puts their value right on the wall and it gives them value, even if they're not doing anything else

today. So, I think what we're doing here erases the need to worry about whether on the ground activity helps us or not. I think that Yrjö is probably right that it does increase their credibility and it certainly increases the interest within a RALO, but I think we already have sufficient reason to not worry about it.

So I think I will document the credibility one, I will document as a suggestion like the ALS surveys that this is something an ALS should consider doing, the internet governance and multistakeholder involvement, but I don't think it falls under the expectation section at all. Heidi asked in the chat quite a while ago and if I may paraphrase, what are we going to do with ALSes that are already members when we're adding these new rules. Heidi, did that roughly paraphrase what you said?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Just basically are new ones going to be grandfathered into this without having any acknowledge of that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I won't comment on acknowledge, but are they going to be grandfathered into these requirements? Absolutely, and the basis for that is the 2002 bylaws and the 2007 ALS requirements that they have already bought into which we have never enforced. So, are we going to enforce new rules that we have not enforced before and may that have impact on some ALSes?

It could, but that's the world they're living in. So I don't believe we have a problem with saying these are new rules, they are not in contradiction to anything they have not already agreed to, and is not already in our formal mandate. Have we been negligent in not enforcing them? Yes, but that's I think a different issue. So I think we're okay there.

With that, I will call the meeting to an end. I intend to create a version 3 of this document which will be a lot cleaner on the sections that we've been working on, so we have a much better organized and cleaner document going forward. I hope to do that early in the week, not to late this time. Please take a look at it when it is announced.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: All the proposals that have been made during the course of this discussion, at the end of this exercise, at what point are they going to adopt it? Is it automatic by the rules that becomes effective as soon as this committee finishes the job, or does it go for more discussion and dates before its adoption.

My other question, whatever is discussed today, when we meet again sometime next week or whenever, are we going to review some of these points that have been raised or discussed here today?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, to answer the second question first, our practice has been the decisions that we come to here are documented for review at the next meeting, so everything gets reviewed at the next meeting. And that's

the process we've gone through with all of the other decisions we've made.

In terms of what our mandate is, our mandate is to make recommendations to the ALAC. This group has people explicitly on it from each RALO with the support of RALO management. I'm hoping that there will not be very strong debate over what we are recommending and that the ALAC will adopt it without an awful lot of further debate and modification.

The ALAC may send it back to us if they find something completely wrong or missing, but I am optimistic that we are going over this carefully enough with input from all parties that indeed it should get adopted get adopted relatively quickly by the ALAC. It must be adopted by the ALAC, depending on exactly what may come out of it, we may need Board approval, as well. But at this point I don't think we need to go to the Board on any of these issues.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Every issue is relevant so that we be prepared, so that it be on the record, that is number one, number two, we are looking at ALS, whatever comes up today becomes something that would be adopted by ALAC or they will be strong debates, [inaudible] trying to bring some level of sanity within the ALS, there is also the need for us to look at some of the bylaws and activities of the ALAC community itself.

Because there are some rules [inaudible] I just want it to be on the record. Also the activities of the ALAC, they are omnipotent so to speak, so they should be subject to rules and regulations. So if we want to look

at ICANN as a multistakeholder body and as a democratic body, there are so many activities of ALAC [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I will point out that number one, the rules of the ALAC are not a consideration within this group, and number two, the ALAC has very considerable rules which have been decided over many years by large groups of people. If there are people who believe those rules need to be modified, there are processes for doing that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] everything that has to do with ICANN has to be brought in line with what is practical in democratic setting within the country with which ICANN is registered, United States of America, which is supposed to be the bastion of democracy all over the world. I just want to point out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Pastor Peters our rules were written many years ago, they have been revised regularly and they will be revised I'm sure again as necessary.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. This call is now adjourned.

EN

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all, this meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]