
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALS Mobilization Working Party call on Wednesday, 19 February 2020 at 17:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Daniel Nanghaka, Barrack Otieno, Pastor Peters, Yrjo Lansipuro, Nadira Al Araj, Amrita Choudhury, Justine Chew, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Natalia Filina. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes, and also to please keep your lines muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise.

We also have Ali Almeshal on the line and we have received apologies from Judith Hellerstein, Maureen Hilyard, Bastiaan Goslings, Eduardo Diaz, and Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Thank you very much. With this, I turn the call over to you, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I note the link to the Mobilization Plan on the agenda is a bad link. If someone could update that, that would be appreciated. Or perhaps put the link in the chat – I can do that. All right, if we can have the document up, that's perfect. Does anyone have any

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

comment in the agenda before we proceed? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, then we'll proceed with the work.

The work plan at this point is to continue the review. We'll be going through the ones that are marked for final approval and then going on to new ones. If we can scroll down to the first one marked for final approval and that is on page 5 towards the bottom. There we are. That's perfect.

Now, this was the one that we originally had, a wiki page for every ALS. That had been decided at the meeting of February 3rd. Last meeting, we decided that that was probably overkill that for ALSes that had a web or similar presence, we did not need a wiki page. And the revised version is there and it reads, "If an ALS does not have a functioning website or a Facebook page present or comparable..." And I added "functioning" because if all they have is a splash page giving the name then it doesn't have much merit. But assuming they have some sort of presence which gives information about the ALS then that's fine. "If they don't have one, ALS 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 page if they wish."

Any comments on this? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, I'm assuming we all agree and we will accept that one as written.

The next one is a grace period and that's on hold until we have the expectation list completed. We can go to the section on not an ALS expectation but suggestions. We have for final review: "In addition to involvement with ICANN, and ALS should consider whether it should

become active in Internet Governance multistakeholder activities in their country and/or region.” That’s a slash, not a period. “Such activities are complementary with involvement with ICANN.”

Any comment on that? Nadira had suggested a minor wording change saying that ALSes should consider to become active. I think the decision point is whether they become active, whether this fits their profile of what they want to do or not. Some ALSes probably, it doesn’t make a lot of sense because the original purpose of their organization may not be particularly related to Internet governance at all. Any final comments on this one? Nadira, please go ahead.

NADIRA AL ARAJ:

My suggestion was regarding the future of the IGF because now the IGF – we’re trying to reach out to not only organization with the different stakeholders which are not the regular ones, so somebody in the agriculture, somebody in the medical field. That’s why I put this to become ... nothing else.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess from a language point of view, I think what I have is a little bit clearer because the real question is ... I mean, what you’re saying is the IGF is interested in various organizations becoming active in it but it’s still their decision whether they want to become active or whether they feel that this is not where their resources should be put.

NADIRA AL ARAJ:

Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we can mandate that they must do it. All we can do is suggest they consider it.

NADIRA AL ARAJ: Yeah. Because there is the "should." That's why I suggested removing the "should," because to me should mean like it's a must kind of request.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I guess based on the original comment – and I see Yrjo is next in line – his original comment was perhaps we should even make it mandatory. So I think this was in line with his comment that we believe every ALS should think about it. But Yrjo, please speak up.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. Yeah, not mandatory, really, perhaps. But I think that would be a suggestion, [inaudible] suggested. Because whatever the specialization of the ALSes is, I think that they still have something to do with the Internet. So they are not too far actually from Internet governance in the wide sense.

ALAN GREENBERG: So are you happy with the wording as is presented here, or do you believe a change needs to be made? Nadira is saying "should" may be too strong.

YRJO LANSIPURO: I think that ALS should consider becoming active. It's not mandatory. We're not telling them absolutely, but we ask them to consider becoming active.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so you're suggesting delete the "whether."

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That goes along with what Nadira said. I'm happy. We have a whole bunch of hands. Amrita? What is proposed by Nadira and Yrjo is ALSes should consider becoming active.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Alan, I agree to what Nadira and Yrjo just said. Should consider – it makes sense then. Should consider whether it should become active.

Another thing is do we want them to be active in Internet governance? Because some ALSes might be working on ICT on the Internet path but not be directly getting into governance.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, that's the whole issue. Each ALS has its own life. Almost all of them have a life prior to ICANN. And the question is, it's their decision

whether that's an area they want to focus on or not. I mean, if the ALS is particularly interested in increasing connectivity or increasing knowledge about computers and the Internet amongst school children, they may not have an interest in Internet governance, and that's their choice whether they want to go into that area or not. Daniel?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: I agree with you. I think there might be an ALS who might be interested in domain names or names and numbers but not directly into the governance path. I think we need to be conscious of that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The current proposed wording is "ALS should consider becoming active." I personally think that's too strong. Because that says we're making a recommendation that they become active, and I think that is too strong for us. I think we should be saying they should think about whether they want to become active, whether it is appropriate for them. But currently, the recommendation is "should consider becoming active."

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: [Inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: They should consider or think whether they should be active. I think I agree with you. We should emphasize things.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So you're suggesting the "whether" goes back. Okay. Daniel, please go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: What I'm thinking is that the path that an ALS is considering to become active [inaudible], they should at least have some activities related to ICANN because it doesn't make so much sense in case we have an ALS and their activities are not complementary of what ICANN does or they have little or no contribution to different activities, say, domain name abuse or any other subject respectively. I think it helps to put at least a checkmark on the various ALSes and they could have at least active participation. That's my thinking. Thank you. Back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Daniel, I'm not quite sure if you're advocating we keep this or not, because this is not really talking about how active they are in ICANN issues. This is the recommendation that they should think about becoming active in non-ICANN Internet governance issues.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Absolutely, they should become. I thought the path that they should become active in IG issues.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dave, please go ahead. Dev Anand.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Silvia put in the chat, "How about encourage to become active?"

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess that has the same problem as "should consider becoming active." I don't feel it's ICANN's job, it's At-Large's job to tell them to become active. I think all we should be doing is alerting them to the fact that there are other activities that may be linked to what we're doing and they should consider them.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Understood.

ALAN GREENBERG: I really don't feel comfortable telling them they should become active.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yeah. But I thought encourage would be a softer way instead of being “should consider” or whether ... I thought encourage is a more softer approach.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I’m not sure we’re going to come to closure on this and I’m not sure how important it is. Silvia, please go ahead.

SILVIA VIVANCO: I read the article and the word “should,” the way it’s translated into other languages, it’s very great, an obligation on the organization to do it. So I have a problem with that word. That’s why I proposed the encouragement, the word “encourage” to consider to become active in ICANN issues, something broader. Because as you said, they have their own life, they have their own bylaws. They have their own scope of work like ICTs. Many developing countries are proposing more connectivity in their country so they are working with cybersecurity or cybercrime, legal organizations, they are members of At-Large, so the scope of work is related but not the same as ICANN’s scope of work. That’s why the word “should” it bothers me a little bit. I would strongly say that the word “encourage” will be more broader.

ALAN GREENBERG: That’s why the current version says not that they should become active but they should consider. In other words, I think it’s reasonable that any ALS think about whether they fit in the Internet governance or multistakeholder environment in their country. We definitely don’t

want to say “should become active.” That is most definitely too strong, but that’s why we said “should consider.” Again, there may be a translation problem.

Alp, you had your hand up. Do you want to speak?

ALPEREN EKEN: No, Alan. I think you answered my question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Pastor Peters, please go ahead.

PASTOR PETERS: I think people are concerned about the word “should.” Should I guess would be [inaudible]. It sounds authoritative. So could we suggest that they can be encouraged to be involved in non-ICANN activities?

ALAN GREENBERG: That’s the whole point. I don’t think we want to encourage them to become involved. That’s not our job. Our job is only to tell them to think about whether they should or not.

PASTOR PETERS: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Because if I say I'm encouraging you, that means I really am advising you to become active, and I don't think if an organization is really only there to increase computer literacy in school children that I should recommend they get involved in Internet governance. All we're saying is they should be aware of it. Let me try to reword this because we've gotten a lot of people speaking. Ali, we'll give you the last word and then I think we'll go back to trying to change the wording altogether. Ali, please go ahead.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thanks, Alan. Just a small note. As I have wrote in the chat, I am in agreement with the current text because it's all been flexible. There is no commitment because it says, "Should consider whether." So, you have the option to be or not to be. So I'm in total agreement to the current text. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. I'll leave the current text and try to provide an alternative if I can come up with something by moving the sentence around which doesn't use the word "should" but still has the same tone. I'm not sure I'll be able to do that but I will give it a try.

Okay, let's go on to the next item and that's the second one that we said is exclusively not an ALS expectation under our guidelines. So these are things that had been proposed as ALS expectations or things that we've talked about before but we are not planning to do it.

The first one is “We will not track participation of an ALS in our various activities. We will need to track participation of individuals, whether a member of an ALS or an unaffiliated member, in activities including GNSO, CCWG activities probably using the forthcoming ICANN Client/Customer Relationship Management System. Since individual records will likely include a RALO or ALS, if applicable, we may be able to derive ALS numbers, but it is not a requirement.”

If I could note, by the way, whoever is managing the screen, if you can switch into Suggest mode and not Editing, I don’t want to inadvertently make changes to this document. Thank you.

All right, comment on the wording we have here. I see Nadira’s hand is up. Please go ahead.

NADIRA AL ARAJ:

Not comment. Just a question. I’m wondering about what’s the CRM System? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

CRM just basically is a system to keep track of, in a business sense, clients or customers. ICANN is implementing such a system to keep track of among other things community members and this may be a mechanism. The only reason I put it in there is several people have pointed out that ICANN is implementing such a system and it might be used. So it’s just a reference to that.

NADIRA AL ARAJ: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other further comments or do we mark this as final? All right, we'll mark that one as final. Go on to the next one. Don't go too far. Thank you.

“We expect each ALS to produce active participants and will therefore not evaluate them on that...” Sorry. There's a “not” missing in that. “We will not expect each ALS to produce active participants and will therefore not evaluate them on that basis. Statistics will be an interesting measure of our success with this program.”

What essentially that is saying is although we are asking each ALS to distribute information and we are fully expecting some number of members of these ALSes to come forward and say they are interested in doing more work, it's not a measure of success. We also understand that many ALSes may go for a year or two years without having a hit. And as long as they're distributing the information, that's what we're looking for. The realistic position is if every ALS produced a single person, we would be overwhelmed and probably couldn't handle it, and it's probably not a realistic expectation anyway. So this is simply noting that we're not going to measure an ALS based on how successful they are. We're measuring them based on whether they are following our rules which include distribution dissemination of information.

Dev, please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I know some RALOs and in LACRALO at least, there's an attempt to try to measure participation and so forth. Others ALSes try to do this independently and I guess it involves the staff to answer, yes? Ask Silvia. If so, then it's not going to be a hodgepodge and it'd be coordinated at the ALAC level, so to speak. So I'm okay with the statement as is but I realized that we're trying to do different things differently. We say we don't want it but then the ALSes are going to be [inaudible] about it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Actually, what you're talking about is the first new item we'll be discussing today once we've finished this review. So let's hold that thought for a moment. You're just a little bit ahead of us. All right, I don't hear any comments, so we'll consider this one final.

Next one is under Other Notes. "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 at 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."

Comments on this one? This one again reiterates what we have said several times, is we're not looking for perfection. We are not trying to get absolute guarantees that everything is happening perfectly, but we want a level of comfort that our rules are being followed. And that goes along with, for instance, on dissemination information, certification, and occasional cross-checking by various means will be sufficient. All right, we'll consider that one final.

Next one. “On the ground activities of an ALS which have no direct relevance to ICANN, perhaps the reason the organization was originally created...” Can whoever [narrow all these] come off the document so I can read the words? Someone has just highlighted that section. All right. “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, may become active in ICANN.”

So that goes back to the comment that Yrjo made that although the activity may not have relevance to us, the fact that they have credibility locally is relevant to us, should they become active in ICANN. I think that’s a good point which had never been made before and I’m glad we captured it. Further comments? I’m not reading the chat so if anyone has something to say that’s relevant to the current item, they should mention it. I hear nothing, see nothing. All right, we’ve done all the final ones.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Sorry, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO: In the chat, I think Heidi pointed out that it’s “as a group,” not “an.”

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Got it. Thank you. All right. Next we're going on to the first bullet just above where it says Details. By the way, if any of you are wondering, I had numbering originally on these documents but Google Docs just would not keep the numbering proper when I added extra paragraphs, so I reverted to bullets. My apologies. It's not as easy to follow but I could not get the numbering to work properly.

All right, this is the point that Dev made. "To what extent can a RALO add expectations," so in other words, a RALO may say we expect our ALSes to do something, "and to what extent does the ALAC need to consider them in decertification requests?" So, for instance, if a RALO says every ALS must send its representative to every monthly meeting – I'm not saying anyone said that but if they were and they then come and say, "We want to decertify this ALS because they haven't been doing that," is that something that the ALAC is required? Obviously, the ALAC can consider it in decertification request, but is it something it must consider and to what extent do we want this kind of variation between RALOs in terms of expectations? I will open the floor. Dev, you may want to come back in or other people can.

Heidi says, "Would these ALS expectations need RALO Bylaw changes?" I'm not sure the word "bylaw" applies to all RALOs, but in any case, I'm guessing that if a RALO is allowed under our rules to make new changes, then they have to document them properly, so I would guess they have to document them in their rules of procedure, bylaws, whatever. Dev, please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks, Alan. This is our agreement. In my mind, I do have a problem with this where different RALOs have different expectations, requiring staff to track all these different expectations because I suspect the leadership of the RALOs are not going to do it. So staff will have a lot of work to try to track this type of participation statistics.

I think I have a problem with that kind of ad hoc different requirements, that being based on the geography, ALS can be considered active but inactive in another region based on geography and not on their work, by virtue of having different rules. I think I'm not for RALOs having different rules for participation. I should mention LACRALO has often been considering metrics on so on for LACRALO and the [inaudible] is that if you don't attest those metrics, then you are prevented from voting or being selected for funded travel, etc. I think you know that but I disagree with that. Although ALAC minimum [inaudible] of this Mobilization Plan tries to do rather than have RALOs try to add additional requirements [inaudible] that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll note one of the things you said is if these conditions are not met, they may be barred from voting. Since we don't have voting as a requirement, that might be an example of something the RALO could do without getting in the way of our rules here. That doesn't say they can be decertified from it but they could be barred. I'm not suggesting, I'm just noting that that is the kind of thing that the RALO might impose but that would not conflict with what we're talking about.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: My response to that is that what we can then do in terms of who they selected for their position within the RALO and/or to external things like the ALAC and so forth. So if you say these people [inaudible] therefore, they're not allowed to vote. The perception will be that those ALSes – some ALSes are targeted and some ALSes aren't. Those that are targeted are considered to be voting for a candidate that some in the RALO will not want. That type of thing. That's where I consider the issue regarding ... that's why in the Mobilization Plan, voting shouldn't be considered.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let me [inaudible] and ask questions. I don't see any other hands up right now. Does that mean the ALAC could or should set a rule saying you must not differentiate among the different ALSes for who is allowed to run for office, for instance? That is, you can't say that this ALS is disenfranchised and therefore, none of their members can run for office?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. That's potentially one of the rules perhaps that's coming up in operation procedures.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure I want to try to advocate that the ALAC should make a rule saying RALOs can't say that. I personally don't agree that the RALO should do that, but do we want to get into that kind of battle at this

point? Because that's really what it comes down to. Anyone else? This is an interesting topic. I'm surprised we don't have a list of hands.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're agreeing that we don't want to have that battle now? Is that correct?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All I'm saying is that you have that kind of confusing rule then many ALSes would say, "This whole thing is not worth my effort and my time." Especially if they would put an effort and things and then you cannot be selected to go to a meeting or you cannot apply for anything. I think that it's real [risk] to the Mobilization Plan. I guess I'm just looking at the monitor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll note, Dev, you're suggesting it would not be a good thing but I don't hear you suggesting we should have an absolute rule forbidding RALOs from doing this. Unless I'm mishearing you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I don't think that different RALOs should have different expectation for participation or being active. I think the reason for that, as I said earlier, I think it's strange that ALS and one RALO to do the exact same thing

and be considered highly active and in another RALO they'll be considered not active.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Dev, I understand your position. The question I'm asking is: should we put in a rule saying RALOs are forbidden from doing this? Or should we be silent on it? We're agreeing it's a bad thing.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'm thinking yes, unless approved by the ALAC or something to that wording to that extent.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so you're saying the ALAC has veto rights over the RALOs setting a rule.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I asked speakers to comment on that in addition to what else they may have wanted to say. Yrjo, please go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Alan, thank you very much. I'm afraid we are going deep into what I would call constitutional issues here between the Federation, which is the ALAC and the "space" with our RALOs. I don't know, I mean, as a

European, I would speak for what is called subsidiarity. That is to say that on the ALAC level, we have a few rules that could be basically taken into account in all RALOs. But we should not try to direct and/or prohibit too much what the RALOs are doing if they keep them in the general framework that we are legislating right now for the entire system. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so you're saying we should not be the European Union and tell the RALOs what they must ... everything they must do and must not do. Sorry. I'm trying to put words in your mouth. It's not fair. So you're advocating we be silent on this.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Nadira?

NADIRA ALARAJ: Yes, exactly. I'm also to be relaxed and usually the work of who's going to run for any position or to contribute to their work shows. So it's better to be silent. That's my position. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, that has to be?

NADIRA ALARAJ: We have to be relaxed, not to enforce anything. The work it shows by the community, the RALOs. They will notice this person is active by his work, by his contribution. It doesn't have to enforce any rules on them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anybody else? I see Ali says, "We should be silent." I'm sorry. He has his hand up now. So please go ahead.

ALI ALMESHAL: Just confirming that, just to be silent on that. I'm just taking your words whether to be silent or to have all on the ALAC. So to be silent from the level of the RALOs [themselves].

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. So if I add a comment under the Notes field that some people in this group felt that it would be inappropriate for RALOs to make rules regarding what their ALSes could do, which would result in an uneven playing field, the group as a whole decided that we are going to be silent on this issue. Does that match what we're saying? We're noting that we discussed it. We're noting that there is some feeling that it is not something we really want to see but we don't want to tackle it at this point. I see a checkmark from Ali and yeses from a number of people. All right, done.

Next item. The next item was one that basically said ... if we can scroll down until we see the green part. That's it. This in the original

document said there'll be no major changes in what the current expectations are in our document. What I have done is reproduce those expectations here. So for those of you who didn't go to the framework document, what the current rules are, the current minimum criteria is: "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."

Now, this is the part in our previous rules which essentially allow us to make the new rule saying, "You must distribute information." This is the basis by which we are built that. You may recall, I think it was Heidi in an earlier meeting saying, "How can we enforce our new rules among existing ALSes?" And the answer is, "Because it was already there. It just wasn't spelled out in any great detail."

Nadira, please go ahead.

NADIRA ALARAJ:

I think we mentioned something about responding to survey somewhere above. Have we deleted that or not?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No. The paragraph you see here is from our current rules. Those are the ones that have been in place since 2007. The question is, is there

anything there that we do not believe is still appropriate? We are adding new things to it. So this isn't replacing it. This section will be rewarded based on the outcome of this group. The question is, is there anything there which we feel is not appropriate?

NADIRA ALARAJ: Okay. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see no hands. The second one is "Be organized so that participation by individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of country within the geographic region in which the ALS is based will predominate in the ALS's operation. The ALS may permit additional participation by others that is compatible with the interests of the individual Internet users within the region."

Now, this one I'll note, we have an item later on which we may want to alter. That is an item of how do we handle organizations that cross our RALO boundaries. I think we want to flag this one as potentially being modified based on a decision we make there. For instance, we currently have a number of ALSes which cross RALO boundaries, but we have said the majority of their members are in one region or the management of their organization is one region. But we don't actually have a rule allowing that. One of the items on our list is to look at that and say, "Do we want to address that?" It could be addressed perhaps by saying a multi region ALS can join one of the RALOs. They can pick the RALO and we deem them to be part of them, even though their members may not actually be from that region. We could do that if we decide to. We're

not debating that right now. But this item might change if we make a decision there. Any further comments on this item?

Nadira, please go ahead.

NADIRA ALARAJ: I agree. They have to be not in two RALOs. At least you have to comply with one RALO. I kind of agree with what you have said.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. We're not discussing that special case right now. I'm just noting that this section might change if we make a decision there. All right, no further comments.

The next one is "Be self-supporting, i.e. not relying on ICANN for funding." I don't believe we have any choice but to keep that one because we know there's not going to be any funding for ALSes.

"Post on the Internet or on the ALAC's website or elsewhere publicly-accessible, current information about the ALS's goals, structures, description of constituents/membership, and so forth."

That's essentially the basis on which we are having the one thing. There'll be a wiki if there's not a website. This one obviously has a little bit more detail as to what we expect. I think when we finalize the document, we're going to have to look at the exact list here and decide whether that's still what we want but it's going to be something close to that.

The last one is a general catch-all: “Assist the RALO in performing its function,” which essentially says the RALO can call upon its ALSes for reasonable things. That includes things like surveys or participating in other things. Again, that’s a very general comment but it’s a good catch-all. Any comments in general? The presumption when we went into this from the first ALS expectations group several years ago is that this list would basically not change. There may be some rewording but the overall list is not changing, but we are of course adding some items to it based on our overall work. I don’t see any change here.

Okay. Sorry. Justine, please go ahead. If you’re speaking, we can’t hear you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry, I had to double unmute. Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

JUSTINE CHEW: Just on point three, can we just say be self-funded, rather than be self-supporting?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. I’m not sure there’s any functional difference, but yes. Dev says, “Why?” Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Because we are talking about funding. So let's just be clear on that. I don't really know what self-supporting entails really. But when you say you're self-funded, that means that you're taking care of your own finances.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. But currently the wording is be self-supporting in brackets, not rely on ICANN for funding.

JUSTINE CHEW: If you say be self-funded then you don't really need to text in the brackets at all.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I would think that the clarity of not rely on ICANN for funding is something that gives some level of comfort to the ICANN Board. But I don't think there's a big difference in either. If most people would prefer self-funded, then let's suggest that change.

Yrjo, please go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Actually, self-funded or self-supporting. I think that the point here is of course they don't rely on ICANN for funding. For instance, those ALSes that are ISOC chapters rely some extent to ISOC funding. So that to say self-funded is actually not accurately ... it's somehow formulated so that they don't rely on funding from ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So take out the self-supporting, self-funding and simply say what we're trying to say.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm happy with that. Other people can live with that? I see said one yes and I see no nos, so done. Are we finished in this item or anyone want to stay on it? I noticed we're almost out of time. We haven't made nearly as much progress today as we have in the past. Yrjo, your hand is still up. I assume it's an old hand.

The next one is ... Typically right now we say in practice, you must have a representative. Most RALOs suggest but don't necessarily force – staff, if I'm wrong, please correct me – that there be a second representative identified so that if the first one disappears, we still have a contact. It has been suggested that we actually have three. The question is do we set it at two or three? I'm presuming we will designate a primary and one or more secondaries, and the mailings will generally go to the primary. Although I think we may want to allow give the RALO the ALS the option of mailings going to multiple recipients. So the question is two or three?

Natalia says, "Three is better. We have had some pushback from some RALOs saying it is excessive. we don't need three and two is sufficient." Ali says two. Nadira says, "Leave it optional. So we require two, we give

them the option of providing a third if they wish.” Settled? No comments? Several yeses. Done. All right. Next item.

“Contacts do not need to be organizational leaders. That is the person representing the ALS to ICANN does not need to be a leader but the application must have leadership knowledge and support.” That doesn’t say anything about ongoing. We can’t control what new leaders know but at least at the application time, must have the support of the leadership. I’m taking the absence of any comments as acceptance. All right, next item.

“Must have an e-mail address that will automatically or with manual intervention reach their membership.” That one we’ve already covered so that’s a duplicate. Because we’ve already covered that one in the section on must do distributions.

Minimum size. There has been a significant amount of discussion for how small can an ALS be. The source of that discussion is over the period of our existence, we have had a number of times ALS is created to be an ALS. The number of people involved has ranged as low as two. In other words, this predates individual members in some regions but this has happened in regions with individual members. That people have chosen not to apply as an individual member but to form an ALS. In reality, that ALS is nothing more than the one or two or three people who have created this. In at least one case I’m aware of, it was four people who created it, three of them immediately disappeared and there was one person left who was the ALS.

So the question is, is there a minimum number of people that we want to set as an absolute minimum for an ALS size or do we want to say something more generic? Now the wording we have here is minimum size not specified, but expected to be greater than just the contacts and/or the organizational leadership. Judgment call will be needed in deciding on an individual case. Comments, please.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Hi, Alan. Sorry for interrupting but I'm having some people join this call that I think needs to be on the call that's starting for APRALO. So I'm going to go ahead and put it in the chat because believe, like I said, you're joining the wrong room. One moment.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We're just about over anyway. We have two more minutes to go.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

I'm just putting the correct Zoom link in the chat for them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't mind other people being on the call. But if they think they're in another room, that is a problem. All right, so back on this one. I'm not sure we're going to finish this one. Are there any comments? Essentially, that says we're not setting a minimum number but we expect an ALS to actually have members and not just be one or two people.

Natalia says, “Number and size do not always correlate with participation. It doesn’t matter if more than two maybe.” The question is since we give ALS voting rights within RALOs, saying everyone can form their own ALS and get a vote I think is somewhat problematic. Remember, the reason for having ALSes to begin with, going back to the start of our work, is so that we can reach their members. If there are no real members other than the one or two people whose names we have, that ALS loses its benefits to us. I think on a number of reasons, we want to be a little bit restrictive but I’m not sure we want to set absolute numbers. All regions now have individual members, although they’re not all treated alike, unfortunately.

All right. I’m going to draft something for this one and we’ll discuss it for comment on the next call. Thank you for your participation. You should see a new version of this coming out moderately soon. I look forward to see you all next week. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone. Thanks, Alan.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Alan. Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks all. Bye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining the call. This meeting is now adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of the day. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]