

ALS Mobilization

Alan Greenberg

November 2020

How We Got Here

- At-Large Review independent examiner did not see sufficient benefit from ALSes and effectively recommended that they be eliminated (made equivalent to a single user).
- At-Large disagreed.
- At-Large went back to the Bylaws and agreed that a main rationale for an ALS is to gain access to the ALS members – supported by all RALOs.
- We proposed (to the ICANN Board) to maintain ALSes and take action to reach those members!
- The Board accepted the proposal.

Basis for Plan

ICANN Bylaws 12.2(d)(xi)

Establishing mechanisms and processes that enable two-way communication between members of At-Large Structures and those involved in ICANN decision-making, so interested individuals can share their views on pending ICANN issues.

ALAC Rules of Procedure Adjunct Document 04 - At-Large Structure Framework

The 1st ALS criteria: 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.

Target

- Both Bylaws and RoP focus on communications with ALS members.
- With few exceptions, we have never done that, either at the global level or at the RALO level.
- “Mobilization” → Actually doing that.
 - Establish path(s) to communicate to ALS members
 - Hope for some to communicate back!
 - We don’t need that many to significantly increase number of active policy workers

ALS Mobilization Working Party (WP)

- 21 members from RALOs
 - Volunteers
 - RALO Chairs given opportunity to add people
 - AF: 7; AP: 6; EU: 4; LAC: 3; NA: 3
 - 6 current or ex-ALAC, 8 current or ex RALO leadership
- Chair – Alan Greenberg
- Ex officio: Maureen Hilyard and Cheryl Langdon-Orr

WP Work Methods

- Met weekly from January to September (29 meetings)
- All decisions by consensus, most unanimous
 - Often started a discussion quite divided
- Reported back to ALAC, Regional leaders, ALT+ regularly
 - Full status update at ICANN67 (vCancun)

Mandate

- Review the rules, processes and documents related to ALSes
- Focus is on:
 - Adjustments to address ALS Mobilization
 - General clean-up
 - Not a redesign on At-Large
 - Avoid substantial controversy and confrontations if possible
- Report back to the ALAC for consideration of the:
 - ALAC
 - RALOs
 - ICANN Board (for rules associated with accreditation)

What is Changing?

- Criteria for accreditation
- Expectations of an ALS
- Accreditation Processes

What is Changing?

- Criteria for accreditation
- Expectations of an ALS
- Accreditation Processes

But none of this is earth shattering

Criteria for Accreditation

- Application must have explicit support of ALS leadership.
- ALS must have sufficient number of members.
 - Sufficient not defined, but must exceed just reps/leadership
- Intersection between ALS interests and ICANN.
- No prohibition of overlap with other parts of ICANN but must be declared.
- Provision for an ALS with membership that does not map to a single ICANN region.

Expectations

- Forward messages to members (or provide us with an address to send them directly)
 - Targeted message aimed at attracting people not active in ICANN to get involved
 - Might be summaries of current issues, focused questions, etc.
 - Simple language
 - Translated into multiple languages
 - Low rate – Nominally 1 per month, but rate may vary
 - May take significant effort to produce
 - We need to be prepared to react if people “bite”.
 - Exemption for specific class of ALS.

Expectations - 2

- Biennial (every two years) report
 - Confirming aspects of original criteria
 - Representatives
 - Activities
 - Initiated by staff; online form; designed to be as painless as possible
- Must mention ALS status on their Internet presence

Expectations - 3

- Representatives must respond if/when contacted (perhaps surveys, requests for help on a particular issue).
- Provide address or link for prospective ALS members
- Designate 2-4 representatives
 - No prohibition on being active in other parts of ICANN but must be declared.

Applicability to Existing ALSes

- Yes!

Not Expectations

- Voting
- Participation of representatives in meetings
 - But individual participation (both ALS members and individual members) will be tracked.

The value of an ALS is in the access to its Members!

It is possible (but we are not recommending) that RALOs could include such rules.

Accreditation Process

- Largely unchanged, but cleaned up and clearly presented
- Still has an overall 90 day target in the general case.
- Flexibility for RALOs handling it in different ways preserved, but RALO processes must be documented and followed
- Information discovered during the process becomes a formal part of the dossier
- Opportunity for RALO leadership input during staff Due Diligence process.

Accreditation Process - 2

- Provision for suspending an application, but with limits.
- Time-line expands to allow for ICANN meetings
- Attention to privacy issues.

Withdrawal of Accreditation

- Terminology: Disaccredit and De-accredit no longer used.
- Process fully described with different paths depending on the circumstances.

Timing

6 months after formal approval and announcement

- Expectation of compliance
- Start of requests for biennial reports.
 - Note for some ALSes, it may take up to 2 years before their reports are due.

Proposed Bylaw Changes - 1

The At-Large Advisory Committee is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users.

Proposed Bylaw Changes - 1

The At-Large Advisory Committee is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users.

replaced by

The At-Large Advisory Committee oversees the At-Large Community which is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users.

Proposed Bylaw Changes - 2

Replace “disacredit”

with

“withdraw accreditation from”

Proposed Bylaw Changes - 3

Bylaws use term “certify” instead of or as an adjunct to “accredit”.

A small change clarifies the use of the terms.

Proposed Bylaw Changes - 4

The first At-Large review recommended that all RALOs have individual members, but the Bylaws still assume that the RALO Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) will specify if there are individual members. A small Bylaw change will remove the requirement to amend the MoUs.

The Bylaws also talk about communications with ALS members and this needs to be expanded to Individual RALO members.

UI-Mob-WP agreement needed.

Legal Review of Proposed Bylaw Changes

Review by Office of the General Counsel

- Not required
- Good practice to ensure no conflicts or other “surprises”

Next Steps

- Discussion in RALOs and ALAC
- ALAC vote
 - Possible return to WP for modification
- ALS-related processes need Board agreement
- Bylaw changes go to Board
 - Amendment as per Bylaw Section 25.1
 - Public Comment, super-majority vote, subject to Empowered Community rejection.
- Implementation

References

- Current procedures/rules:
 - RoP-Adjunct-04 –At-Large Structure Framework
 - <http://tinyurl.com/ALAC-RoP-AdjDoc4-2013-07>
- ALS Mobilization WP Wiki
 - <https://community.icann.org/display/atlarge/ALS+Mobilization+Working+Party>
- WP Report
 - <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/120821482/ALS-Mob-WP-Report-Final.pdf>

Discussion